Translating Gender

Athena
Advanced Thematic Network
in European Women's Studies

http://www.athena3.org

Athena is a Thematic Network funded under the Socrates
programme of the European Commission

ATGENDER

European Association for Gender
Research, Education and Documentation

WWW.ATGENDER.ORG

Table of Content: The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction[1]

---

[1] All essays are marked by the volume-number they were published: 'The Making of European Women's Studies. A work in progress report on curriculum development and related issues'. Volume I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VIII

Introduction

Rosi Braidotti and Berteke Waaldijk

This CDrom contains a collection of "digital reprints" from publications that were prepared in the context of the ATHENA Advanced Thematic Network for European Women's Studies. They all deal with the possibilities of translation of concepts widely used within the field of women's, gender or feminist studies.

The ATHENA-network started its life in the year 1999, when for the first time in European history a network dedicated to the new interdisciplinary field of women's studies was funded by the EU to develop teaching material, to do research on education and to connect academia and civil society in the field of women's studies. The following years have made clear that the need for such a network was indeed great. Innovative results have been produced by partners from almost all European countries: teaching material, books, conferences, seminars and summer schools have been the result of intense cooperation across national and disciplinary borders.

Working across national and disciplinary boundaries involves inventing new languages, in order to understand and to be understood. For researchers, students and teachers in the field of women's studies the debates about the key concepts in the field have both disciplinary and geographical connotations. The famous concepts as 'gender' and 'sexual difference' and the question how and whether to distinguish between sex and gender has always been connected to the challenges of translation: gender is a word used in English, and many European languages have discussed whether and how this could be translated into different other languages.

The editors of yearly publication of ATHENA, under the title *The Making of European Women's Studies (*Volume 1-8, appeared between 2000-2008) decided to start a series of articles that discussed the distinction between sex and gender in different European languages. The idea behind this was not to provide the 'correct translation' but to show the many different aspects of working on women's studies in a European context: teaching in international class rooms, addressing different national and disciplinary traditions. The series of articles resulted in 21 articles that dealt with this theme. Copies of those articles have been used in summer schools to help students and teachers to understand each other when they discussed women's studies. They have been handed over to colleagues outside our field who needed more information on the concepts and the way they could be translated in different national languages. However, the articles were only available in the eight different Volumes of *The making of European Women's Studies*. With this CDrom we make the articles as accessible as they deserve. This way they can find their way again to new generations of scholars in the expanding field of women's studies.
The collection is not yet complete: several languages have not been addressed yet. The articles appeared over a number of years, the collection is not yet complete. The editors of The Making of European Women's Studies plan to invite and publish new additions to the series.

However, we hope that this collection of digital reprints finds its way to the practitioners in the field of women's and gender studies that it serves as an invitation to continue the discussion and intellectual debates on key concepts in the field, and as an invitation to add new articles to the series. At this CDrom we have also added two texts that address the translation of gender. The article by Rosi Braidotti, 'The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices' was published in the ATHENA-publication edited by Gabriele Griffin and Rosi Braidotti, *Thinking Differently. A reader in Women's Studies* (London: Zed Books 2002). In this article Rosi Braidotti discusses the first articles in the series.

The other text that we have put on this disc is the text of the Synthesis Report: Women's Studies published in 1995. Final Report of the evaluation of Women's Studies activities in Europe for the SIGMA Network and Directorate DGXXII (Education, Training and Youth) of the Commission of the European Union. Also a reprint from *The Making of European Women's Studies* (Volume I). This text will help scholars in the field of women's, gender or feminist studies to see and appreciate the development of the field since 1995. The report contains a working definition of the field, and explains that a wide diversity in

the political and intellectual perspective of each programme exists. The authors conclude that different names for programmes - such as women's studies, feminist studies and gender studies - do not take away the strength of a remarkable coalition between scholars, students, activists and other professionals who are in active in the field. Finally we have included the text that introduced the first contributions in *The Making of European Women's Studies.*

We do not expect that this collection of reprints will solve all problems of translations in Europe but we are convinced it will strengthen the field by showing the vibrant and strong diversity of European women's studies. Most of all, we hope it will invite new contributions and continue a crucial strand of research within the field of European women's studies.

The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction in European Feminist Practices

Rosi Braidotti

As stated in the introduction to this volume, one of the assumptions and starting points for European co-operative work has been the recognition that both the terminology and the bulk of the scholarship in Women's Studies have been generated in English-speaking cultures and traditions. Women's Studies as a term is in fact a North American invention; it was quickly and easily adopted by the Anglo-Saxon world because of the strong cultural ties existing between the two geo-political areas. The North of Europe also followed. Whether this concept can be applied systematically right across Latin, Catholic, Southern and especially Eastern Europe countries is, however, a serious question. It arises out of a concern for the respect for the great cultural variety of European feminist cultures, which is shared by all. There is a consensus therefore that it is important to try and be alert to the differences in culture, religion, political and educational practices which mark the different European cultures and which make the American-based model of Women's Studies not a universally applicable one. Ever since their beginnings in the late 1980s, the European co-operative projects, joint activities, exchanges and networks in academic Women's Studies have had to confront this complex reality. The whole field of Women's Studies has been marked by a series of debates and questioning about the aims and scopes of its practice This encompasses, not least, an important linguistic dimension.

Terminology
Even the simple and apparently straightforward 'Women's Studies' does not strike a note of adequate simplicity. Some groups prefer the more explicitly political 'feminist studies'; others go for 'sex-role' or 'gender studies', which aim at greater objectivity by suggesting a higher level of scientific precision or, as in the Scandinavian countries, for example, an emphasis on equality between the sexes, therefore pointing to women as well as men through the term 'gender'. The slightly older 'female studies' may sound neutral but is far too limiting in political scope; 'feminine studies', used in France, will probably please the Lacanians but it does beg the question. 'Feminology' was suggested and recently the term 'clitoral hermeneutics' has been proposed. More than anything else, this semantic euphoria stresses that the term 'Women's Studies' was never more than a compromise solution, revealing the depths of hesitation surrounding the very signifier 'woman'.

The point about the instability of the category 'woman' has been emphasized over the last ten years by the so-called post-structuralist wave of feminist theory as well as by radical lesbian theorists such as Monique Wittig and Marilyn Frye; it is complex enough to deserve a better treatment than I can warrant here. Suffice it to say that the question remains: how do we define the referent 'woman' and what epistemological value do we attribute to it in developing a field of study called 'Women's Studies'? What does the human being embodied female study, when she studies Women's Studies? In dealing with these issues different cultural traditions play a very large role.

Definitions of gender
Gender research at the international (Harding and McGregor 1995) and the European levels (DGXII 1999) has undergone considerable and significant developments in the last 10 years (Hanmer *et al* 1994). Most of these are the result of systematic and intense networking on the part of different social actors, both male and female, within a variety of institutions in Europe. The final report of the evaluation of Women's Studies activities in Europe (Braidotti, de Dreu and Rammrath 1995) states as the main aim of gender research and education the pursuit of the political, cultural, economic, scientific and intellectual concerns in the struggle for the emancipation of women. Gender research challenges scientific thought and it aims at enlarging the meaning and practice of scientific research so as to further reflect the changes in the status of women. Gender research is trans- or multi-disciplinary and it engages in a constructive dialogue with a number of established academic disciplines and scientific practices.

Those unfamiliar with gender research tend to assume that this field constitutes a unified framework for analysis. This is partly true, in so far as 'gender' plays the role of a constitutive concept. It does not, however, provide one monolithic framework of analysis. Rather, it caters for a variety of different methods that can be accounted for and evaluated with reference to specific theoretical traditions. The working definition of gender I want to present is the following: the concept of gender refers to the many and complex ways in which social differences between the sexes acquire a meaning and become structural factors in the organization of social life. Gender is a cultural and historical product, as opposed to an essentialist definition of the physical differences between the sexes. A gender approach in research focuses on:

- the study of the social construction of these differences;
- their consequences for the division of power, influence, social status and access to economic resources between men and women;
- the impact of socially induced differences upon the production of knowledge, science and technology and the extent to which these differences control access to and participation in the production of knowledge, science and technology.

According to this definition gender refers primarily but not exclusively to women. Not only does it include men, but it also defines 'women' as a very broad and internally differentiated category that includes differences of class, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation and age. All these variables are highly relevant to gender research.

Gender being a multi-layered concept, it needs to be investigated on three levels, according to the useful classification system provided by the feminist epistemologist Sandra Harding (1986, 1987, 1991):

1) Gender as a dimension of personal identity. On this level gender is investigated as an inter-personal process of self-consciousness, and as the dynamic relation of self-images to individual and collective identity.

2) Gender as a principle of organization of social structure. On this level, gender is investigated as the foundation of social institutions ranging from the family and kinship structures to the division of labour in social, economic, political and cultural life.

3) Gender as the basis for normative values. On this level, gender is investigated as a system that produces socially enacted meanings, representations of masculinity and femininity which are shot through with issues of ethnicity, nationality, religion. These identity-giving values are organized in a binary scheme of oppositions that also act as principles for the distribution of power.

In short, gender research aims at providing methodological and theoretical tools that study the visible and invisible power mechanisms that influence women's access to posts of responsibility in social, economic, political, religious, intellectual and cultural life. Gender research emphasizes issues such as culture, sexuality, family, gender-identity and the power of representation and language. It gives high priority to women's experience and women's access to and participation in democratic processes, with special emphasis on decision-making mechanisms. It aims at revealing the full extent of women's lives, which has been hidden because men were the predominant subjects and objects of knowledge. Most importantly, gender research aims at improving the status of women in society.

On the basic of this methodological infrastructure, the experience built up over the years of inter-European teaching and research exchanges has allowed the members of the network to reach a common definition of Women's Studies. Women's Studies is a field of scientific and pedagogical activity devoted to improving the status of women and to finding forms of representation of women's experiences which are dignified, empowering and which reflect the range of women's contributions to cultural, economic, social and scientific development. Women's Studies is a critical project in so far as it examines how science perpetuates forms of discrimination and even of exclusion, but it is also a creative field in that it opens up alternative spaces for women's self-representation and intellectual self-determination.

The issue of cultural diversity is built into the very practice of 'gender' and as such it cannot fail to reference the complex linguistic diversity which exists across the different European feminist cultures. As a mixture of critique and creativity lies at the heart of the Women's Studies project, a trans-cultural and trans-disciplinary enterprise, this extends to the languages we use to describe and operate Women's Studies. Accordingly, the focus of this chapter is on the cultural differences such as they become manifest in our own theoretical practices. As an example, do we think that the Anglo-Saxon idea of 'gender' has an equivalent in, say French or Italian? Conversely, is the idea of sexual difference or 'difference sexuelle' translatable in a meaningful manner into other cultural and linguistic contexts? Instead of taking shelter behind a facile sort of cultural relativism, we want to take seriously the conceptual challenge raised by these questions. We want to ask whether Women's Studies, feminist theory or the women's movement as a whole possess a common language: are we talking about the same sort of project? As the case studies of how different European countries use the terms 'sex' and 'gender', detailed below, show, 'gender' and 'sex' may diversely account for three different dimensions which have varying prominence and inflections in the different European languages. The three different dimensions relate to the use of 'gender'/'sex' to denote grammatical, biological and/or social differentiations respectively. As will become clear how 'sex'/'gender' figures in a given language has important ideological implications that need to be considered when dealing with these terms.

The Case Studies
When comparing the meanings of sex/gender in a number of European languages, it is - in the experience of most participants in the ATHENA project - very difficult, if not downright impossible to separate sex from gender. In most cases this is due to the fact that both meanings tend to be covered by a single term. Where the two terms are distinct, this occurs along dividing lines that hardly coincide with those operative in English.

Thus Eva Bahovec (2000) argues that in the Slavic languages, the words 'spol' (Slovenian), 'pol' (Croatian and Serbian) 'pohlavie' (Slovak), 'płeć' (Polish), and 'pol' (Russian) cover the meaning of both 'sex' and 'gender'; the same word is used for both. Similar examples of the use of a single word for both 'sex' and 'gender' can be found in dictionaries of the Slavic languages: the strong sex as opposed to the fair sex, the beautiful sex, etc. i.e. in the Slovak language: 'silne pohlavie' and 'nežne pohlavie'.[1]

In most Slavic languages the meaning of the word 'sex' denotes the biological characteristics of maleness or femaleness, as well as the grammatical gender (i.e. genus).[2] The equivalents of the term 'gender' in the Slavic languages derives from the Old Church Slavic word 'rod' (gender, generation, to engender)[3]; the word is the same for the Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Russian and Czech languages (Snoj 1997). Furthermore, the word 'rod' is related to the words 'to give birth', 'nation' ('rod' and the prefix 'na'), 'relatives' (Benveniste 1969 for the latter). The etymology of the word 'sex' in diverse Slavic languages derives from the Old Slavic word '(s)pol' (meaning 'half'). It developed from '(s)pholu-', meaning what has been cut away, cut into two.[4] This may be compared to the German 'Geschlecht', derived from 'schlagen'- 'to beat', and to the Latin 'sexus', derived from 'secare' -'to cleave', 'to dissect' (Snoj 1997).

In the Scandinavian languages, as Kari Jegerstedt (2000) argues, the words 'kjønn' (Norwegian),'køn' (Danish), and 'kön' (Swedish) cover the meaning of both 'sex' and 'gender.'

This is because, as the Norwegian dictionary *Bokmålsordboka* puts it, 'kjønn' denotes both the biological or physiological differences, the psychological traits and the sex of an individual. As a result, in feminist research work, the word 'kjønn/køn/kön' is generally used for both sex and gender. In order to make sharper differentiations between the two, markers such as 'biological' ('biologisk kjønn') and 'social' ('sosialt kjønn') are added.

In a similar vein, Sandra Perreira Rolle (2000) suggests that in Spanish the use of the term 'género' (from the Latin *genus-eris*) as a translation of the English 'gender' to designate the distinction between the sexes is political, and not grammatical. As such it is also highly polemical and contested[5]. In Spanish the word for sex is *sexo* which according to the *Dictionary of the Spanish Language* (Real Academia Española 1992) denotes the biological characteristics of individuals, in the sense of organic and physiological factors. In contrast to the naturalistic and biologizing connotations of *sexo* in Spanish, the term *género* functions more like a grammatical category. The question then becomes whether the terms of this distinction correspond to the English sex/gender dyad. Far from being a point of consensus, the efforts related to translating the terms led to quite a lively public debate in Spain, as we shall see in a later section of this chapter.

Working from the French language in its multi-cultural Belgian variation, Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2000) argues that the direct translation of gender into French is *genre*, but this by no means covers the feminist meanings and implications of the term. This is because the French *genre* is very close to the Latin *genus* and as such it refers to grammatical gender as a classificatory category that distinguishes groups of words; it is also, however, a general taxonomical classificatory category. Moreover, because *genre* covers such a large semantic field and has a common usage it is difficult to make space for the feminist meaning of 'social sex', originally coined in Anglo-American contexts. While a word has a *genre*, a person has a *sex*, and this is reflected in the translation that some English-French dictionaries provide for gender: the first, strictly grammatical,[6] is *genre*, the second one is *sex*.

From a different tradition, Ulla Wischermann (2000) states that the etymological definition of gender ('Geschlecht') in German includes several levels of meaning: it refers to grammatical gender, includes the binary classification feminine/masculine, and has connotations of sexuality and sex-specific social identities. Gender 'was originally used in a genealogical or ethnic sense' – as in descent, origin of birth, or 'people of the same descent' – as well as in the sense of a 'totality of people living in the same period of time' (*Duden* 1963). Drawing on the Anglo-American tradition, the sex/gender distinction is today used in Germany as a biological and socio-cultural category.

Again, however, the grafting of this linguistic implant was far from painless, as we shall see later on. This point is echoed by Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou (2000) who argues that no direct translation of 'gender' into Greek is remotely possible. The equivalent of the English 'gender', γένος [jenos][7], carries meanings in Modern Greek such as a 'general concept in whose extension specific concepts are contained', 'a group of people with common descent', 'ethnic group'. The most prominent meaning of γένος refers to grammatical gender, i.e. the grammatical category according to which nouns, pronouns, adjectives etc. are morphologically divided in Modern Greek into three declension groups: masculine, feminine, neuter. This means that, for example, the gender of any Greek noun can usually be determined on morphological grounds alone. Whenever it seems necessary to distinguish explicitly this meaning of gender from others, the phrase γραμματικό γένος [gramatiko jenos], 'grammatical gender', is used. Accordingly, the three types of gender are specified as αρςενίκό [arseniko], θηλυκό [thiliko] and ουδέτερο [udetero].
In grammatical contexts, (grammatical) gender is juxtaposed with natural gender, i.e. sex, which is then specified ασφισικό γένος[fisiko jenos]. Although generally grammatical gender is considered to be arbitrary, if we restrict our attention to animate beings only, we find that nouns referring to males are usually masculine, while those referring to females are feminine. In other words, when nouns refer to animate beings, and especially to persons, there seems to be a semantic motivation for the declension classes. In addition to grammatical gender, sex specification can also be achieved in Greek through lexical marking. Moreover, as in other

languages, the sex of a person can be specified by adding to a noun, which may be ambiguous as to grammatical gender, the words άνδρας [*andras*], 'man', or γυναικα [*jineka*], 'woman'.

Outside of grammatical contexts, in fact, the Greek equivalent for 'sex' is φύλο [*filo*]: τα δύο φύλα [*ta dio fila*], 'the two sexes', αρσενικό/θηλυκό φυλό [*arseniko/thiliko filo*], 'masculine/feminine sex', το ασθενές φύλο [*to asthenes filo*], 'the weak sex', and Simone de Beauvoir's Το δεύτερο φύλο [*to deftero filo*], 'the second sex'. Although φύλο has always pertained to the biological foundation (and determination) of the sexes, in the last fifteen years and within the context of feminist discussions, it has been used with the attribute 'social' to point to the social determination in the differentiation of the sexes. In other words, the equivalent of 'gender' in the feminist sense is not, as one would expect, κοινωνικό γένος [*cinoniko jenos*], but κοινωνικό φύλο [*cinoniko filo*]. Moreover, it is the word φύλο that gave rise to several noun phrases or derivatives which are important in a feminist context, e.g. κατά φύλα διαφοροπίση [*kata fila djaforopiisi*] 'differentiation according to sex', φυλετικές διακρίσεις[8] [*filetices djjakrisis*] 'sex discrimination', έμφυλο [*emfilo*]'gendered'.

The universalist appeal of 'genus'
Citing Karin Widerberg (1998), Jegerstedt (2000) suggests that in Scandinavia, 'attempts at introducing the equivalent of "gender", the Latin word "genus" (also a grammatical concept), have not proven particularly successful. Here the one Scandinavian word for the English "gender" and "sex", "køn", is still used and is seen as useful exactly because it does not force any distinctions between the biological and the social' (134). However, in Sweden, where the term 'genus' has acquired widespread acceptance, especially, as Anna G. Jónasdottir (1998) points out, since the mid-1980s, it has become 'the main term indicating the whole field of women's and gender research in certain research political and bureaucratic key texts as well as being used in naming newly formed research institutions' (1998: 8, in Jegerstedt 2000).

One of the leading theorists behind the use of 'genus' in Sweden, Yvonne Hirdmann (1988), argues that the term 'genus' should be used in a distinct way which differs from the English use of 'gender'. Whereas gender, and its Scandinavian translation 'sosialt kjønn', highlight the split between biology and culture, 'genus' is to accentuate the manner in which the two are intertwined. Thus, 'genus can be understood as changeable figures of thought, "men" and "women"—(where the biological difference is always exploited), which create representations and social practices. Hence it follows that biology can also be affected/changed—in other words, genus is a more symbiotic category than gender' (1988: 51). In Hirdmann's view genus is also more of a 'performative' category; it denotes 'masculinity' and 'femininity' as categories that are enacted—and not simply added to the biological in a manner that would also suggest that they are extricable (1988: 51, in Jegerstedt 2000).

Jegerstedt argues that nonetheless the use of the term genus in Sweden is by no means uniform or unproblematic and that there has been a recent 'backlash' against it. Although she has no qualms about using 'gender' when she writes in English, Jónasdóttir (1998, in Jegerstedt 2000) reacts against what she perceives as the linguistic and structural/poststructural foundation of the term 'genus' on the grounds that it is incompatible with her way of thinking social relationships (1998: 9, in Jegerstedt 2000). In her view, there is no 'sosialt kjønn', 'only male and female bodies on the one hand and, on the other, individual human beings who can freely form themselves and change the world' (Jónasdóttir 1998: 9, in Jegerstedt 2000). A more 'academic' take on the debate can be found in no.1/1998 of the journal *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift* which is devoted to the subject 'Sex and kön.' None of the articles specifically address the Swedish use of these terms, however. To a greater or lesser extent they all pertain to the Anglo-American debate, re-inscribing its terms.

Finland and Iceland represent a different problematic altogether. In these countries, the Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research (NIKK) is rendered simply as 'The Nordic Institute for Women's Studies' in their respective languages. Päivi Lappalainen (1996) suggests that the reason for the omission of the term gender in the Finnish translation is the fact that the

Finnish term for sex/gender, sukupuoli, is exclusively biological and associated with reproduction. Thus the Finnish term for sex/gender is highly complicit with what Adrienne Rich calls 'compulsory heterosexuality' and Judith Butler 'the heterosexual matrix' (Lappalainen 1996: 9). Lappalainen also argues against a Finnish adoption of the Swedish use of 'genus', since in Finland this word lacks the linguistic dimension as the Finnish language does not possess grammatical genders. The Finnish word for 'woman', on the other hand, has multiple meanings, pointing both to the biological distinction between 'men' and 'women' and to the social and cultural condition of 'being a woman'. Thus Lappalainen recommends the use of the phrase 'Women's Studies' in Finnish on the basis that it both includes research on gender ('kjønnsforskning') and preserves the political history of women's and gender-related research (10).

A foreign virus? The trans-atlantic disconnection
Considering the difficulties involved in translating and adapting the term 'gender' to the different European cultural traditions, it is not surprising that this term gave rise to very lively and at times polemical public debates. Sandra Perreira Rolle (2000) for instance argues that the adaptation of terms from foreign languages into Spanish is usually a long and difficult process. This was also the case with *género*, meaning gender. Though from the middle of the 1970s the use of *género* in Spanish feminism became generalised, not as a grammatical concept, but as a social and cultural one, this was not common in other realms of Spanish society. No extended debate around the term took place, perhaps because the equivalence of género for gender was to some extent accepted in the academy. More recently, the proliferation of an interest in gender issues in Spanish society has generated a bit of a 'national debate' about the term gender. In 1999, an article by Cristina Alberdi (signed by seven other feminists, too), appeared in the Spanish newspaper *El País* (18 Feb. 1999, in Perreira Rolle 2000), entitled 'Violencia de Género' ('Gender Violence'). The main subject of discussion was whether género should be used with the meaning of the English term gender, or whether one should use Spanish terms more widely known and understood in Spanish society at large. The use of *género* in the English sense of 'gender' was accused of being elitist in another article in *El Pais*, 'Sexo solo Sexo',[9] by Camilo Valdecantos, because that usage is not popularly accessible. Valdecantos' article also provided alternatives for the phrase 'violencia de género' ('gender violence') such as 'violencia del varón' ('male violence') or 'violencia del sexo masculino' ('male sex violence'). Vicente Molina Foix (*El Pais*, 9 March 1999), who responded with an article in the same newspaper, offered a quite interesting solution to this 'political' problem: why not place 'género' between inverted commas? What this discussion points to is the difficulty of adapting an important concept like gender into a Romance language such as Spanish. 'Género' is now used in the academy as equivalent to gender, and courses concerning gender issues are taught in most of the Spanish universities. As the English language is the lingua franca of our times, perhaps it would be easier to use the English word 'gender' and not attempt to translate it into *género*.

From Portugal, similar reports can be heard as from Spain: Ana Gabriela Macedo (2000) argues that in some ways 'gender' has been an unwelcome addition to Portuguese, in reaction to Simone de Beauvoir's (1949) famous claim that 'one is not born, but becomes a woman' and its development by Anglo-American feminism since the 1970s. This has been quite controversial, particularly among Portuguese feminist scholars and critics. The term has, however, gradually been assimilated into common speech (in part due to the impact of the media), and often unproblematically used in different fields of knowledge. This does not make it any clearer, however, nor any more accessible. In Portuguese 'género' presents a semantic ambiguity and may therefore be potentially inaccurate. In fact, besides being used to designate a grammatical category – masculine/feminine – 'género' also refers, in Portuguese, to distinct literary modes or categories - the poetic, narrative or dramatic 'género' (for which the word in English would be 'genre'). For this reason and as an alternative formulation, the expression 'Diferença Sexual' ('sexual difference') has also been used, bearing the same awareness of the mark of alterity and the social construction of identity. The term 'sex' is also used and often preferred by some critics, on the grounds of the awkward translation of the concept of 'gender' in Portuguese, allied to its imputed redundancy within feminist sex/gender politics.

The French context is notoriously the most resistant to taking in new terminology from the English language. Thus, Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2000) states that gender - as *genre* - appeared, in French-speaking academic contexts, in research on/by/for women of the late 1980s. Consequently the feminist Anglo-American meaning of 'gender' and its variations did not exist in French dictionaries before then. Gender is a concept that conquered a space of its own in Anglo-American academic, institutional, public spaces, the media and, finally also as an export item into foreign dictionaries. According to Puig de la Bellacasa the delay in the French reception of the term was due to many factors, some of which have to do with an obvious and well-grounded cultural, political and theoretical resistance to intellectual colonisation. Some material concerns also came to bear on this, in particular the fact that feminist research was less promoted and supported in French-speaking contexts (universities, institutions) during the last twenty years than in North European or Anglo-American contexts.

The debates that marked the introduction of gender into French feminism and institutions are complex and their evolutions differ from one discipline to another. For instance, French feminist historians have played an important role in spreading the concept. Feminist *genre* appears thus in French with an already charged conceptual background: as the feminist attempt to break with biological determinism, as a relational category, and as a concept with political connotations.[10] During the 1990s publications that had *genre* in the title proliferated mainly in publications from conferences and meetings using the notion of *genre* to approach the disciplines. An interdisciplinary conference (Hurtig *et al* 1991) highlighted and focused on the sex/gender distinction.[11] There are more articles on this topic than books. Words such as 'sexe', 'femmes' or 'rapports sexués' ('sexual relations') are preferred by editors as more attractive in book titles – 'genre' is considered an unknown term among the public (Thébaud 1998). Often, when 'genre' appears in a book title, an introduction of its meaning is provided.

Gender is mainly used in history and in the social and political sciences. Development studies were also seduced by *genre* in the second half of the 1990s and 'genre et dévelopement' has replaced 'femmes et dévélopement'. Appealing to the relational character of the gender category, this replacement has been theorised as the passage from a focus on 'problems of women' to a focus on problems caused by 'relations between the genders'. However, specific research on women has also continued to be developed (Jacquet 1995). Research on the 'rapports sociaux de sexe' (an expression used by some sociologists to denote 'social' sex) has been developed even when 'genre' is avoided (for theoretical, political or strategic reasons). There is a generational dimension to this: young researchers are more likely to use the word as part of their research vocabulary than their older colleagues.

International research networks have contributed to the spread of 'gender'. *Pluri-*, *multi-*, or *trans-*disciplinary networks are also sites of conceptual contagion. Not surprisingly, feminist researchers working in more 'monodisciplinary' national frameworks have difficulties in using a notion not recognised or simply not understood by their 'peers'. During the 1990s specialised dictionaries and glossaries in France began to include 'genre', introduced under sections with headings such as 'gender (genre)' (Rudinesco and Plon 1997), 'sexes (differentiation des)' (Mathieu 1992), or 'féminisme' (e.g. *Dictionnaire des notions philosophiques* 1990). Only exceptionally was 'sexe/genre' itself a heading (e.g. *Dictionnaire fondamental de la psychologie* 1997). From a feminist/Women's Studies point of view it is important to note the recent publication in France of a *Dictionnaire critique du féminisme* which includes a 'sexe et genre' heading as well as other headings such as 'sciences et genre' (Hirata et al 2000).

International and European institutions have been crucial in the spread of 'gender'. For instance, the platform of the 1995 UN Beijing conference imposed 'gender' as an omnipresent concept. When browsing in library websites it is noticeable that a huge percentage of the titles encoded with the word *genre* (in its 'social sex' meaning) are official publications from the European Commission or other institutional publications (e.g. from Swiss and French Canadian institutions on equality). In the context of the European Union's institutions the use of *genre* has imposed itself (or been imposed) not without some resistance from the commission translators. This institutional success of the word is influential in the fact that non-academic feminist structures (permanent education centres, associations or NGOs) - often interfacing with public institutional policy making and research - are using *genre* and organising meetings and seminars on related subjects. *Genre* is becoming the institutionally 'obligatory' word to

refer to issues concerning women or equality between the sexes. In French, then, g*enre* occupies an ambiguous position: it is still a 'minority' word that represents the difficulties of the feminist approach to gain a space in the disciplines. At the same time, it is appearing as a 'dominant' word in public institutions, imposed by an internationalising move whose language is English. *Genre* has a space in French language, but *which* space? In Europe at large it increasingly figures as a conceptual space with political implications.

Puig de la Bellacasa (2000) concludes that the introduction of a feminist variable of the classical, universalistic French term *genre* remains a complex and contested enterprise. This is not due to simple natinalism or over-sensitivity, but to questions of identity and recognition. The obvious hegemony of the English notion of 'gender' marginalizes local, at times ancient traditions and thus depletes the capital of diversity and cultural variety within Europe, not to speak of the wealth of feminist cultural and traditional histories.

Wischermann (2000) agrees on this point and stresses that debates about gender have played an important role both historically and in the new German women's movement. At the turn of the century, mainstream female theorists in Germany explained gender relations in terms of natural and social differences ('women are different, but equal'). During the 1970s, the question of how gender dichotomies are constituted became central to feminist theory, in particular within history (studies on the character of gender; Hausen 1976) and social sciences (research on sex-specific socialization; Scheu 1977[12]). Feminist research in the 1980s proceeded with an eye to the ever-present danger within gender theory of creating a masculine-feminine dualism and with the realization that the search for gender differences simultaneously generates such differences. 'Gender' was increasingly understood as a category of social structure as well as a dual system of symbols. Accordingly, two dimensions of the discourse on gender relations became particularly relevant. Drawing on the notion of a 'symbolic system of gender duality' (Hagemann-White 1984), human action was characterized as 'doing gender': gender was not something that we 'have' and 'are', but something that we 'do' (Hagemann-White 1993). The concept 'double societal function' ('doppelte Vergesellschaftung'; Becker-Schmidt 1987) was developed to elaborate the social foundations of the tensions in women's life contexts. The related thesis of 'gender as a social structure category' ('Geschlecht als gesellschaftliche Strukturkategorie') thematized patriarchal and economic structures of domination and elaborated the systemic character of women's oppression – particularly in relation to the division of labour in production and family.

Wischermann adds that the 'gender debate' took a new direction at the beginning of the 1990s. The catalyst was Judith Butler's (1990) *Gender Trouble* (which appeared in Germany under the title *Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter*), generating a lively and – perhaps typical – (west) German debate about abandoning the category 'gender' altogether. Dissolving the sex/gender distinction into gender and dismissing questions of bodily materiality as a symbolic, discursively produced and constitutive fiction elicited considerable dissent. Noteworthy in the reception of Butler's notion that the two biological sexes are a product of social and discursive processes was that the reactions among feminist scholars were divided specifically along generational lines.[13] In retrospect, it also became clear that although the critique of Butler was in part legitimate, the process largely erased the theoretical and political impact of her work. Her critique of the 'heterosexual matrix' and, along with it, the impulse this gave to defining a new field of inquiry, queer theory, was an unmistakable provocation for German mainstream gender research which had been oriented toward investigating hierarchies of gender difference.

Eva Bahovic (2000) also notes that in Slovenia there has been some public discussion over the last decade as to how to introduce feminism into the academy. On the one hand, it has been suggested by sociologists that the Slovene word for Women's Studies 'ženske študije' should be replaced by a supposedly more progressive, up-to-date, neutral term 'študije spolov' (studies of the sexes in direct translation - the somewhat misleading translation of the English term 'gender studies'). On the other hand, the choice of *Journal for Women's Studies and Feminist Theory* as the subtitle for the Slovene feminist journal *Delta* has been grounded in the idea of the necessity

of 'situated knowledges', 'partial perspectives', etc. (*Delta* 1995).[14] The Serbian journal in the field is called *Ženske studije* (*Women's Studies*), the Polish one *Pelnym Glosem. Periodiyk Feministyczn*y (*In a Loud Voice. A Feminist Journal*). Several proposals have been made as to how to translate 'sex' and 'gender' into Slovenian, the most widely used equivalents being 'biološki spol' (literally: biological sex) for 'sex' and 'družbeni spol' (literally: social sex) for 'gender'. The Russian translators seem to be working along the same lines (Ajazova 1999).

The Russian case
Irina Aristarkhova (2000) supports this in her analysis of the translation of 'gender' into Russian. She offers a complex and highly articulate genealogy of the concept 'gender' in Russian culture. She stresses the huge influence of revolutionary thinking upon the usage of this term, due to the Communist legacy. This problematizes the private and critiques the individualistic essence of the citizen, stressing instead the value of the collective and the communitarian. Sexual relationships, both in and outside of the family, are transformed by the Communist philosophy of love. Aristarkhova argues that the category of 'woman' was employed as a tool in the governmental constitution of the 'new proletariat family', built after the destruction of the individualistic 'peasant' and 'bourgeois' family (Lenin collapsed the distinction between them to legitimize the destruction of both as one).

Polovoi vopros (The Sex Question), formulated as early as 1924, stresses a healthy, rational and realistic relationship to sexuality. It claims that human sexuality and sexual relations were fundamental to the constitution of 'all aspects of our existence, not only in physical health, but in our moods, our capacity for work, our relations with people, our social activity, our creativity', and as such goes on to advise its ordered and healthy management. '(T)he new world', they say, 'can be created only by a thoroughly healthy, strong and cheerful generation. And only a generation which orders its sexual life on a rational and healthy basis can be healthy.' (L.A. and L.M. Vasilevsky, [1924], 1990: 95, in Aristarkhova 2000)

This attitude to sexuality became the distinctive trait of the Soviet-Russian emancipation of women from the bourgeois family and also from the dominant idea of love. Aristarkhova stresses, however, the limitations of this otherwise novel approach to the issue. For instance, Alexandra Kollontai's (1923, in Aristarkhova 2000) attempt to engage the question of men-women relationships without reference to children, to relations of reproduction, was both naive and contrary to the Marxist notion of social instinct. However, Kollontai made it clear that, from her point of view, love emotions should be directed for the benefit of the collective, thus 'biological instinct becomes spiritualized'. (Kollontai [1923], 1990: 84, in Aristarkhova 2000). Aristarkhova concludes that the discourses about women that characterised this period seldom engaged the complex interplay of sex and gender categories but rather preferred as a matter of governmental convenience to collapse the distinctions between them.

Post-Perestroika - Gender as Agenda
The most recent trends in Russian academic discourses specifically employ the term 'gender' in post-*Perestroika* discourses about 'gender'. They have been instrumental in its 'importation' into the Russian academy, as well as into official policy discourses.
In 'The New Women's Studies' Natal'ia Rimashevskaia shows how the notion of 'gender' (as *гендер*) has come to be used in academic circles in Russia through her activities as a participant of a special committee with the task to cover 'the social activities of women in the contemporary world' (Rimashevskaya 1992:118, in Aristarkhova 2000). She particularly emphasises the reluctance of the academic community within Russia to adopt the 'гендер' concept when she introduced it in her article 'How We Solve the Woman Question'. She notes that the new egalitarian approach she proposed in the earlier article was based 'on a mutual complementarity of the sexes' in opposition to the traditional assumption of the (natural) 'differentiation of role functions between the sexes' (119).

However, Rimashevskaia indicates that the concept of 'гендер' received many negative responses both within the academy and from the authorities. Rimashevskaya writes that the male majority at the top of the academy did not take such ideas as 'gender' seriously since 'public

consciousness is still extremely patriarchal, especially among men' (120). She notes in conclusion that as the 'conceptual analysis of the "woman question" develops the need for praxis is increasingly pressing' (120) in a way that seems to underscore a certain anxiety about praxis vis-à-vis conceptual analysis.

A Centre for Gender Studies, she says, 'focuses on the issues of sex, as socially constructed' (121),[15] attempting also to make its work intelligible to both men and women and presenting new approaches to the 'woman question'. Then Rimashevskaya presents a list of the activities the Centre provides, ranging from the development of theoretical perspectives to organising activities within the women's movement.

In her discussion of the women's movement in Russia Konstantinova, another Russian academic who has been actively engaged in feminist activities, echoes the libertarian/humanist rhetoric characteristic of the early women suffragists. She bemoans the fact that 'in the Soviet period the emancipation of women was not even an issue in the ongoing debate between the Slavophiles and the Westerniser authors' who set the intellectual agenda for Russia (Konstantinova 1992: 204, in Aristarkhova 2000). In summarizing the contemporary situation of women in post-Perestroika Russia she claims that the resurgence of the Orthodox Church has had negative effects on women's social positions. 'Religion once more plays an increasingly important part in society. The Russian Orthodox Church is deeply conservative and patriarchal, and its repressive attitude to women has emerged unchanged by the *perestroika* reforms.' (Konstantinova 1992: 204, in Aristarkhova 2000) Here, she seems to be caught within what Foucault has referred to as the 'repressive hypothesis', which has characterised traditional political analyses, where power is conceived as that which represses or oppresses instead of looking at the actual operations of power which defy such easy theoretical appropriations.

'Throughout the history of the Soviet state', Konstantinova asserts, 'the position of women has been determined by state-defined demographic and economic imperatives: either women must be productive workers or they must stay at home; at other times they are expected to combine the two, but never have they been able to make their own choices or to formulate the issues themselves.' (Konstantinova 1992: 204-5, in Aristarkhova 2000) In addition to drawing on largely impoverished paradigms of libertarianism and humanism, she also seems to be assuming that men have had the privilege to make free choices during the Soviet period or today.

Yet another example of a feminist academic who remains within and operates from the libertarian rhetoric of early suffragists is Posadskaya, the Director of the Gender Centre in Moscow, who, interestingly, seems to have been one of the first persons to have used the term 'gender' as *zhender*, in the Russian academic community. In addition to being instrumental in the formation of the Gender Centre (together with Rimashevskaya), she has remained one of Russia's foremost feminist activists constantly organising women's forums and workshops. In her most recent book, *Women in Russia* (1994), she has reiterated her conviction that the current situation in Russia threatens to develop into a 'Renaissance of Patriarchy' insofar as the rise of capitalist enterprise within Russia 'excludes' women from both the labour market and political participation.

I. Mamonova, a Russian émigré writer living in the United States, who has achieved great popularity within feminist circles in Australia, Canada and France, equally draws on this tradition. 'Where, then, is the moral imperative of feminism? What does feminism have to offer if it is to distinguish itself from patriarchy? What is the point of our struggle? For thousands of years men have not been not ashamed to assert their superiority, so why have we been so frightened by new alternatives that have opened up after a ten-year battle?' (Mamonova 1989: 172, in Aristarkhova 2000) [16] While showing an anxiety to 'get involved' and 'do something', her faithful reiteration and appeal to humanist principles and liberty seem to unduly restrict the scope of feminist political engagement.

'I believe in woman. A new path lies ahead of her, but the habit of enslavement that has been instilled in her for thousands of years has not been overcome. Yet there are in women reserves of

strength, unknown to the world, and resources of energy, still hidden, that are capable of enriching humanity. Men have already demonstrated their possibilities, but women have yet to reveal theirs.' (Mamonova 1989: 172, in Aristarkhova 2000) The constant reminder of the 'not-yet-unveiled' strengths of women, though rich in suggestion and promise, cannot but remain utopian in a situation where the articulation of women is still only with reference to their sex. Moreover, to present the strengths as unrealised wipes out the actual achievements of many ordinary women.

The term 'gender' seems to be employed (when employed at all) in the above mentioned discourses as a 'catch-all' term within which the general and more specific issues about 'women' and 'sex' can be and are practically engaged with or discussed. It seems to be used as a convenient locus around which to set the agenda for the Centre and for women's activities. It is possible that (though not very clear if) the urgency of the need to actively work with issues and problems that relate to women in Russia forced the Centre and its pioneers to promptly compromise the cultural commensurability and translational adequacy of the terms of /in their agenda. The fact that gender served the agenda seemed enough. However, the term 'gender', as an imported term, remained semantically empty; the discursive space it opened up within the academy and in society was filled with the terms 'women' and 'sex'. While, this made for prompt action, it may unfortunately have blunted the possibilities for a more concerted, long-term political engagement with regards to gender issues.

Род ('Rod') as GENDER: Rooting and Uprooting
Aristarkhova then reaches the conclusion mentioned earlier, namely that the term 'gender' is most appropriately translated as 'род' ('rod'). In addition to having a wider cultural currency, the term 'rod' is particularly suited for a more nuanced (feminist or otherwise) politics than that offered by the semantically empty, imported term 'гендер' and other translations like 'social sex' (социальный пол).

The word 'rod' has rich etymological roots in the Russian language/culture. The *Oxford Russian Dictionary* provides an idea of the diverse meanings that this word evokes. The word *rod* refers to the social entities of the 'family', 'kin', 'clan', 'generation'; it also means, not surprisingly given its associations with family and kin, 'birthing', 'origin' and 'stock'; denotes the 'genus', 'sort' or 'kind' to which a thing belongs; and finally the grammatical category 'gender' which differentiates between 'masculine', 'feminine', and 'neuter'.

Why is 'rod' a more appropriate translation of gender? Firstly because the term enjoys a greater cultural currency in having wider social usage and commensurability (thus, it is easily understood). The connotations that this term evokes are multiple - especially in the cultural memories of Russian speakers. Historically the pre-Revolutionary kinship structures were destroyed in relation to private property by reference to women's social position (i.e. liberating them from the oppressive 'traditional' peasant/bourgeois family). As such, a retrieval of women's issues through/as 'gender' (rod) inevitably implies a simultaneous recovery and remembering of such kinship structures. Despite (and because of) the fact that *rod* draws upon the historical and etymological associations between kinship and gender, it is important to employ this term with a sensitivity to the possibility of its corruption in what Posadskaya has called a 'Renaissance of Patriarchy'. Posadskaya claims that the post-Perestroika years have been characterised by a renewed emphasis on family and kinship relations which represent a renewal of the patriarchal structures that oppress women.[17] Thus in employing 'rod' as 'gender' one should strategically articulate its difference from and tensions with(in) kinship structures in a way that retains its *political efficacy*.

Secondly, the term allows for a more nuanced and politically sophisticated engagement and activism. In this sense it has greater political efficacy than a term like 'гендер'. While the term 'gender' as it has been used in English does not restrictively denote women only (though some feminists would disagree), the term as it has been 'imported' into the Russian (con)text has failed to articulate the complexity of gender relations by consistently excluding men from its discourses

framed within the term 'gender'. Too often, they even equate power with / as 'male' and 'gender' as (the repressed) 'female'.

Conclusion

All other differences notwithstanding, it is impossible to establish a one-to-one relationship between women and a country or national identity, not only because identifications are not one-dimensional, but also because in the multicultural societies of Europe today they are not easily classifiable in terms of 'national' versus 'international'. Under the impact of globalization and the repoliticization of religious affiliations as markers of identification, it is increasingly more doubtful whether the 'nation state' still functions as a matter of course as a major point of reference in identity-formation. Nonetheless, the efforts made by the Women's Studies community in Europe to investigate critically the uses and abuses of culturally dominant terminologies are of great importance.

In this respect one of the points of consensus among Women's Studies teachers and researchers cooperating in the European networks is to keep a very open, dialogical mode of interaction. A flair for the complexities involved in finding adequate modes of translation and adaptation from the dominant Anglo-American model is essential. It is also accompanied by an equally firm commitment to researching more adequately the historical material and sources of the many and rich different feminist cultures of Europe. In some ways, this approach is akin to the creation of a class of trans-disciplinary translators, who can transpose the assumptions and methodologies of one discipline or of one cultural tradition into those of another. This task-force of conceptual translators could well become the core of what might be called a feminist intellectual class. The work of G. Steiner (1984 or 1975??) comes to mind here; he argues that 'the currents of energy in civilization are transmitted by translation, by the mimetic, adaptive, metamorphic interchange of discourse and codes.' (202) And in so far as no translation can ever be a perfect duplication, approximations, deletions, omissions, a vast array of subjective factors are an integral part of the process of interchange which alone makes intellectual processes possible.

Moreover, hiding the complexities of cultural differences among women under the convenient umbrella of a universal, or global sisterhood (Morgan 1984) seems both unfair and unworkable. A critical discussion about the signifier 'woman' became necessary due to the emergence of the question of 'differences among women'. This has resulted in the rejection of the univocity of the term 'woman' and especially within feminist theory. The political urge to develop this issue has come from specific sectors of the movement: firstly from psychoanalytic feminism (Irigaray 1974, Melandri 1977, Molino 1986); secondly, in lesbian discourse, its theory and practice (Rich 1981, Wittig 1973); and thirdly, from the so-called 'post-colonial' discourse of third-world feminists (Lorde 1987, Mohanty 1992, Spivak 1988) who have analyzed the way in which the category 'Third World women' has been constructed by feminist discourse.

Another argument for translation as an epistemological stance is that unless we submit our own discourses to the test of feminist transdisciplinary translation we run the risk of re-inventing the wheel, i.e. of borrowing sloppily from the terminology and the conceptual framework of other disciplines and cultures. This may induce a false sense of creativity; thus, an idea from sociology applied to literature may seem revolutionary, though it is absolutely commonplace in its own originary discourse.

The experience of setting up Women's Studies in a European perspective has proved to be a delicate exercise in cross-cultural analysis and comparison. In its daily practice, this has turned out to be a labour-intensive process of confronting the differences among women, which has only just begun: we think it will keep us busy for years to come. One thing that is already clear to all concerned is that the idea of `Europe' that we have in mind is critical of ethnocentrism and nationalism. Fortunately, most European feminists dissociate themselves from the legacy of European nationalism and are deeply concerned about the rebirth of xenophobia, racism and anti-semitism on our continent. Moreover, without turning our back on our historical heritage, many of us have also voiced pertinent criticism of the increasing isolationism and protectionism fostered by the

idea of a 'United' Europe (Braidotti and Franken 1991). These concerns can be put to the task of contributing actively to the construction of a genuine European community spirit, where sexism, racism and other forms of exclusion will be targeted for elimination. As Helma Lutz (Lutz, Yuval Davis and Phoenix 1996) so eloquently puts it: in the EU today, we need to put an end to that century-old European habit that consists in holding onto an ethnocentric centre, confining the rest of the world to the position of a necessary and necessarily under-rated periphery. Lutz explores especially the condition of immigrants in the EC today as a significant case of peripheral existence within the alleged centre of this community. In other words, Women's Studies is not only education for women, it is the re-education of a whole culture, to help it move away from discriminatory practices, so that it can give the best of itself to the development of a renewed sense of a common Europe.

In order to construct effective inter-European perspectives in Women's Studies, due attention must be paid to cultural differences and to the specificity of national contexts. Noting in fact that both the terminology and most of the existing teaching material in this field is of North-American origin and consequently is available only in English, European Women's Studies scholars have been faced with a double task. On the one hand, they have had to struggle to get this new field of study accepted in their respective countries and institutions; on the other hand, they have had to develop their own instruments for teaching and research. In this regard, the support that Women's Studies academics have been able to gather from the Commission of the European Community has been and remains crucial in many different ways. Whereas countries where this field is under-developed have benefited from both the financial and the moral support of the EC, well-endowed programmes in other EU countries have experienced the EC support as a form of international recognition and therefore of scientific legitimation. In both cases, the impact of the EC's 'stamp of approval' is enormous.

The feeling is strong among European Women's Studies academics that this field can only be genuinely `European', if it addresses rigorously issues of ethnic identity, multi-culturalism and anti-racism. The issues of cultural and of gender identity are intimately inter-linked and cannot easily be separated. We would even like to go so far as to suggest that no perspective in Women's Studies can be considered truly `European' unless it addresses the need to produce non-exclusionary and non-ethnocentric models of knowledge and education. The new European consciousness that could emerge from the European Union can only profit from the enlarged definition of knowledge which Women's Studies implies and enacts. In this respect, many Women's Studies scholars feel very strongly that they need to strengthen and broaden the anti-racist European dimension of their work. More international exchanges and comparative research projects are needed in order to develop an in-depth understanding of the cultural diversity of Women's Studies traditions and practices in the European community today. Moreover, for this work towards a common and yet diversified definition to succeed, discussions are needed in a comparative framework with women from Eastern and Central Europe, from the United States and from developing countries. Research on gender methodologies is a top priority in our field today.

Bibliography

Ajvazova, S.G.
(1999). *Le Deuxième sexe en russe: les problèmes de la transmission [The Second Sex in Russian: The Problems of Transmission*]. Cinquantenaire du deuxième sexe, Paris: Coloque International.

Alberdi, C.
(1999). 'Violencia de Género', *El País*, 28 February.

Annuss, Evelyn
(1991). 'Grenzen der Geschlechtforschung', *Feministische Studien* 1: 91-102.

Aristarkhova, Irina
    (2000). 'Trans-lating Gender into the Russian (Con)text', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. II. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 67-82; www.aristarkhova.com.

Bahovec, Eva
    (2000). A short note on the use of "sex" and "gender" in Slavic languages' in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. I. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 28-9.

Baker, M.
    (1991). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*, London: Routledge: 180-215 (cohesion), 217-259 (coherence).

de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W.W.
    (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*, Harlow: Longman.

de Beauvoir, S.
    (1949). *Le deuxieme sex,* Paris: Gallimard.

Becker-Schmidt, Regina
    (1987). 'Die doppelte Vergesellschaftung - die doppelte Unterdrückung: Besonderheiten in der Frauenforschung in den Sozialwissenschaften', in Lilo Unterkircher and Ina Wagner eds, *Die andere Hälfte der Gesellschaft*, Vienna: 10-25.

Bell, R.T.
    (1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice*, London and New York: Longman.

Benjamin, W.
    (1973). *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn, London: Fontana.

Benveniste, E.
    (1969). *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-europeennes*, Paris: Minuit.

Bilden, H.
    (1991). 'Geschlechtspezifische Sozialisation', in Hurrelmann, K. and D. Ulich eds, *Neues Handbuch der Sozialisationsforschung* (4th edition), Weinheim-Basel: Beltz Verlag: 279-301.

Bock, G.
    (1999) 'La Historia de las Mujeres y la Historia del Género: Aspectos de un Debate Internacional.' *Historia Social* nº 9. Instituto de Historia Social, UNED, Valencia.

Borčič, R.
    (1998). *Ženski identitet u jeziku* [*Female Identity in Language*], Treča, Croatia 1: 37-46.

Brück, B., Kahlert, H. and Krüll, M. et al.
    (1992). *Feministische Soziologie. Eine Einführung,* Frankfurt a. M.: Campus.

Braidotti, R. and C. Franken
    (1991). 'United States of Europe or United Colors of Benetton? Feminist Thoughts on the new European Space.' *Differences* (Brown University, USA) Vol. II, n. 4: 109-121.

Braidotti, R. de Dreu, E. and C. Rammrath
(1995). *Women's Studies in Europe. Final Report of the Evaluation of Women's Studies Activities in Europe for the SIGMA Network and Directorate General XII of the Commission of the European Union*, Utrecht: Utrecht University.

Braidotti, R. and Vonk, E. (Eds.)
(2000). *The Making of European Women's Studies. A Work-in-progress Report on Curriculum Development and Related Issues.* ATHENA (Advanced Thematic Network in Activities in Women's Studies in Europe), Utrecht: Utrecht University, 2 vols.
Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble,* New York and London: Routledge.
Charolles, M. (1983) 'Coherence as a principle in the interpretation of discourse'**,** *Text* 3, 1: 71-97.

Corominas J. and J. A. Pascual
(1984). *Diccionario Crítico Etimológico Castellano e Hispánico*, Vol. III, Madrid: Ed. Gredos.

Delta. The Journal for Women's Studies and Feminist Theory (Slovenia: 1995-).

D'Amelia, Marina
(2000). '"Genere" and "sesso" in Italian language and feminism', in
Braidotti, R. and Vonk, E. eds *The Making of European Women's Studies. A Work-in-progress Report on Curriculum Development and Related Issues.* ATHENA Utrecht: Utrecht University, Volume 2: 83-9.

Dictionnaire des notions philosophiques (1990) Paris: Publications Universitaires de France.

Dictionnaire fondamental de la psychologie (1997) Paris: Larousse.

Directorate General XII (1999) *Women and Science. Proceedings of the Conference*, Brussels: Commission of the European Union.

Der Grosse Duden. Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (1963), Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 215.

Duelli-Klein, R.
(1983). 'How to do what we want to do: thoughts about feminist methodology', in Bowles, G. and R. Duelli-Klein, eds. *Theories of Women's Studies*, London: Routledge.

Duelli-Klein, R.
(1987). 'The dynamics of the Women's Studies classroom', *Women's Studies International Forum*, vol. 10, no. 2: 187-206.

Edmonson, L. H.
(1984). *Feminism in Russia, 1900-17*, London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Fox-Keller, E.
(1985). *Reflections on Gender and Science*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

García Monton, Pilar
(1999). *Cómo Hablan las Mujeres. Cuadernos de Lengua Española*, Madrid: Ed. Arco Iris S.L.

George, Z. Patrick
(1938). *Roots of Russian Language. An Elementary Guide to Russian Word-Building.* PhD. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd.

Hagemann-White, C.
(1984). *Sozialisation: weiblich-männlich?* Opladen: Leske und Budrich.

Hagemann-White, C.
(1993). 'Die Konstrukteure des Geschlechts auf frischer Tat ertappen? Methodische Konsequenzen einer theoretischen Einsicht', *Feministische Studien* 2: 68.

Hanmer, J. et al, eds
(1994). *Women's Studies and European Integration. A Report to the Equal Opportunities Unit*, DGV: Brussels.

Harding, S.
(1986). *The Science Question in Feminism*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S.
(1987). *Feminism and Methodology. Social Science Issues*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Harding, S.
(1991). *Whose Science, Whose Knowledge?* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Harding, S. and E. McGregor, Eds.
(1995). *The Gender Dimension of Science and Technology - Extract from the World Science Report*, New York: UNESCO.

Hausen, Karin
(1976). 'Die Polarisierung der 'Geschlechtcharaktere' - Eine Spiegelung der Disoziation von Erwerbs- und Familienleben', in Werner Conze, ed. *Sozialgeschichte der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas*, Stuttgart, Metzler, 363-93**.**

Hirata, H., Laborie, L., Le Doaré, H., and D. Sénotier, coord.
(2000). ' Politique d'aujourd'hui', Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Hirdman, Y.
(1988). 'Genussystemet—reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning', *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift*, vol. 9, no.3**.**

Hurtig, M. et al.
(1991). *Sexe et genre*, Paris: CNRS.

Irigaray, L.
(1993). *Sexes and Genealogies*, trans. Gillian Gill, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Irigaray, L.
(1994). *Je, tu, nous: Toward a Culture of Difference*, London: Routledge.

Jacquet, Isabelle
(1995) *Développement au Masculin/Féminin. Le genre: outil d'un nouveau concept,* Paris: L'Harmattan.

Jegerstedt, K.
(2000). 'A short introduction to the use of "sex" and "gender" in the Scandinavian languages', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. I. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 24-5.

Jónasdóttir, A.G.
(1998). 'Kvinnoord-i-Norden: Varför använda "genus" när "kön" finns?' In *Nytt fra NIKK* vol. 3, no.2**.**

Kollontai, A.
(1918). 'The family and the Communist state', *BV1*: 67-77.

Kollontai, A.
(1923). 'Make way for the winged Eros', *BV1*: 84-95.

Konstantinova, V.
(1992). 'The Women's Movement in the USSR: A Myth or a Real Change?' In Shirin Rai, Hilary Pilkington and Annie Phizacklea, eds, *Women in the Face of Change: The Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China.* London: Routledge.

Koster-Lossack, A. and T. Levin
(1992). 'Women's Studies in Europe', *Women's Studies Quarterly* 20/3 and 4.

Kozmik, V. and Jeram, J.
(1995). *Neseksisticna raba jezika* [*Non-sexist use of language*], Ljubljana: Bureau for Women's Politics.

Krupskaya, N.
(1922). 'What a Communist ought to be like', *BV1*: 26-30.

Landweer, H. and R. Mechthild (Eds.)
(1993). 'Kritik der Kategorie Geschlecht', *Feministische Studien*, No.2**.**

Lappaläinen, P.
(1996). 'Kvinna och kön är NAINEN och SUKUPUOLI på finska', in *Nytt fra NIKK* 2/1.

de Lauretis, T.
(1986). *Feminist Studies, Critical Studies*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Lenin, V.
(1920). 'Tasks of the Youth Leagues' Bourgeois and Communist Morality', *BV1*: 21-6.

Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B.
(1993). 'Effability, expressibility and translation', in Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk and Marcel Thelen, eds. *Translation and Meaning, Part 2.* Rijkshogeschool Maastricht: Faculty of Translation and Interpreting (Netherlands).

Lutz, H., Yuval-Davis, N. and Phoenix, A., eds
(1996). *Crossfires: Nationalism, Racism and Gender in Europe,* London: Pluto Press.

Macedo, A.G.
(2000). 'Gender-genero; diferenca sexual; sexo', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. II. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 93.

Mamonova, T.
(1989). *Russian Women's Studies: Essays on Sexism in Soviet Culture,* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Mathieu, Nicole Claude
(1992). 'Sexes (differentiation des)', in P. Bart and M. Izarod, eds, *Dictionnaire de l'ethnologie et de l'anthropologie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Melandri, L.
(1977). *L'infamia originaria,* Milano: Erba Voglio.

Mohanty, C.
(1992). 'Feminist encounters: locating the politics of experience' in Barrett, M. and Philips, A. eds. *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates*, Cambridge: Polity.

Molina, Foix Vicente
(1999). 'El Género Epiceno', *El País*, 9 March.

Moliner, María
(1992). *Diccionario del Uso del Español*, Vol. I, Madrid: Ed. Gredos.

Nicholson, L.
(1994). 'Interpreting Gender'*, Signs: Journal of Women, Culture and Society*, 20: 78-105.

Oakley, A. and J. Mitchell
(1987). *What is feminism?* New York: Pantheon.

Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula
(2000). 'Modern Greek "gender"', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. I. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 26-7.

Pereira Rolle, Sandra
(2000). 'Gender versus "genero"', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. II. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 90-2.

Puig de la Bellacasa, Maria
M. 'The sex/gender distinction in French-speaking contexts', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. II. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 94-8.

Real Academia Española
(1992). *Diccionario de la Lengua Española*, Madrid.

Rich, A.
(1979). *On Lies, Secrets and Silence*, New York: W.W. Norton.

Rich, A.
(1981). 'Compulsory heterosexuality and the lesbian experience', *Signs* 7/1: 158-99.

Rimashevskaia, N.
(1992). 'The New Women's Studies' in Buckley, M., ed *Perestroika and Soviet Women,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberg, W. G. (Ed.)
(1990). *Bolshevik Visions: The First Phase of the Cultural Revolution in Soviet Russia*, Part 1 (BV1) and Part 2 (BV2). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Rozanov, V.
(1972). *Dostoevsky and the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor*. Transl. with afterword by Spencer E. Roberts, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Rudinesco, E. and M. Plon
(1997). *Dictionnaire de la psychoanalyse*, Paris: Fayard.

Scheu, U.
(1977). *Wir werden nicht als Mädchen geboren - wir werden dazu gemacht. Zur frühkindlichen Erziehung in unserer Gesellschaft*, Frankfurt: Fischer Verlag.

Semashko, N.
(1919). 'The Tasks of Public Health in Soviet Russia', *BV1*: 130-3.

Semashko, N.
(1921). 'The Work of the People's Commissariat of Health', *BV1*: 139-46.

Snoj, M.
(1997). *Slovenski etimološki slovar* [*The Slovene Etymological Dictionary*], Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.

Solts, A. A.
(1922). 'Communist Ethics', *BV1*: 30-43.

Spivak, G.
(1988). *In Other Worlds*, New York: Methuen.

Spivak, G. C.
(1993). *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, London: Routledge.

Steiner, G.
(1984). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, Assen: van Gorcum.

Stites, R.
(1978). 'Women and the Russian intelligentsia: Three perspectives', *WR*: 39-63.

Thébaud, F.
(1998). in *Ecrire l'histoire des femmes*, Fontenay /St Cloud: ENS Editions: 112.

Vinogradskaya, P.
(1923). 'The "Winged Eros" of Comrade Kollontai', *BV1*: 112-21.

Valdecantos C., *Sexo, sólo Sexo.* **http://www.presenciaciudadana.org.mx/articuloelpais.html**

Widerberg, Karin
(1998).'Translating gender', *NORA* 2/6.

Wischermann, Ulla
(2000). 'The sex/gender debate in Germany', in Braidotti R. and Vonk E. eds, *The Making of European Women's Studies*, vol. I. Utrecht: ATHENA/Utrecht University: 30-1.

Wittig, M.
(1973). *Le corps lesbien,* Paris: Minuit.

Woolf, V.
(1939). *The Three Guineas,* London: Hogarth Press.

Endnotes

---

[1] See Smolej, V. (1983) Slovensko-slovaški slovar [The Slovene-Slovak Dictionary], Ljubljana: Državna založba Sovenije; Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika [The Dictionary of Standard Slovene Language] (1994) Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije; see also Kozmik, V., and Jeram, J. (1995), Neseksistična raba jezika [Non-sexist use of language], Ljubljana: Bureau for Women's Politics; Borčič, R. (1998) 'Ženski identitet u jeziku' ['The Female Identity in Language'].

[2] The examples for the words 'woman', 'female','man' 'masculine' seem to be telling as well (Borčič 1998; *Delta* 1998).

[3] 'The human race' in Slovenian: človeški rod (i.e. the human gender).

[4] From the same term the words for a 'a half of', 'one half', have been developed (Croatian 'pol', Serbian 'po', Russian 'pol', Czech 'pul', etc.).

[5] The reference to 'Spanish' covers a variety of languages which are officially recognized by the Spanish State: Catalan, Basque, Galician and Castilian or Spanish.

[6] Going deeper into grammar and genre it is possible to find a sub-distinction between 'grammatical' and 'natural' genre (as a function derived analogically from grammatical gender). A word such as 'father' has a 'natural' masculine gender because a father is a man. The constructed character of 'natural' genres was first pointed out by the Anglo-American definitions of gender (*Grand Robert*, Paris 1989).

[7] The pronouncation is given in the International Phonetic Alphabet.

[8] This phrase is ambiguous, since its original meaning was 'race discrimination' with the adjective φυλετιχες derived from the word φυλη 'race' and not φυλο 'sex'. This is the reason why some people prefer the phrase σιειστιχές διαχσισεις 'sexist discrimination' instead of the ambigous φυλετιχες διαχμίαεις.

[9] http://www.presenciaciudadana.org.mx/articuloelpais.html.

[10] I will not take up here the theoretical and political debates as to the preferability of a 'gender 'or 'sexual difference' approach, the binarism of the sex/gender distinction etc. These debates are of course very important but they are not specific to French-speaking contexts which are the object here.

[11] The resultant publication includes an influential article by Christine Delphy that was later translated into English and published in *Women's Studies International Forum* (1993) 16/1.

[12] Just how important this text was inside the new women's movement and beyond is illustrated by the fact that 45.000 copies were printed during the first half of 1977.

[13] About the Butler debate and her reception see Landweer and Rumpf (1993).

[14] An interdisciplinary study program, introduced in 1997 at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, has the same name.

[15] It is this idea of 'socially constructed sex' which has lent legitimacy to one more alternative translation of 'gender' into Russian academic texts as '*sotsialnii rod'* meaning 'social sex'. See especially Per Monson, ed. (1993) *Contemporary Western Social Theories*, published in the Russian language in Moscow, wherein 'gender' is translated as 'social sex'.

[16] Note that this article was written in 1986 in the wake of Perestroika and thus the 'ten-year battle' and 'new alternatives' were made with reference to that.

[17] Valentina Konstantinova (1992) gives as an example of such patriarchal 'rationalizations' Solzhenitsyn's (1990) article 'How are we to structure Russia: feasible considerations'. In this article Solzhenitsyn expresses views common to Slavophiles (Konstantinova refers to writings by Rasputin 1990, Belov 1990, Tolstaia 1990, and Tokareva 1989) and widely propagated that 'Today the family is the key to saving our future. The woman must be given a chance to return to the family to bring up children and men's pay must reflect this, though with anticipated unemployment in the initial stages it will not work successfully right away; some families will be better off if the woman continues to have a job for the time being' (cited in Konstantinova 1992: 204).

Case Study n.1. The uses and abuses of the sex/gender distinction. Four case studies from European languages

Introduction

This first case study illustrates and complexifies some of the issues raised in the previous chapter. The fact that the "sex/gender" distinction has become dominant in women's studies places a special burden on all other feminists cultures to find adequate translations for these key-terms. Such translations are never easy, and more often than not, they prove very confusing.

In the ATHENA Panel 1c our work concentrates on issues of terminology and key-concepts in women's studies, from a multi-cultural European perspective. A great deal of attention is being paid to both the variety of terminologies and political as well as cultural traditions that are available within Europe and to then historical roots. In some ways, Panel 1c aims at historicizing alternative formulations and approaches to gender theories and women's studies practices.

What follows is a selective overview of some of the difficulties involved in translating the dominant "sex/gender" distinction in a number of Euoropean languages. The kind of issues raised by these case-studies force the core-work of this ATHENA panel. A such they deserve a closer analysis and more in-depth study than we can warrant them here. One clear message which emerges from this brief comparative perspective, however, is that it is urgent to pursue this kind of local analysis.

Further research is needed not only at linguistic and historical levels, but also in the philosophical assumptions and political systems of thought of the different feminist cultures of Europe.

Until this basic groundwork is accomplished, most women's studies programmes will continue to import and adapt foreign concepts, which express cultural and political traditions linked with the Anglo-American world.

As scholars and citizens of the global economy, we are proud to partake in the *lingua franca* of gender-theory. As new Europeans, however, we also know that this is an area in which we simply need to work harder to produce our own perspectives.

A Short Introduction to the Use of "Sex" and "Gender" in the Scandinavian Languages

Kirsti Lempiainen

In the Scandinavian languages, the words "kjønn" (Norwegian),"køn" (Danish), and "kön" (Swedish) cover the meaning of both "sex" and "gender." Thus, according to the Norwegian dictionary *Bokmålsordboka* "kjønn" denotes

1: the sum of physiological characteristics in individuals producing the same sort of gametes 2: a group of individuals that possess either female or male characteristics 3: erotic temperament 4: the sexual organ 5: any of two or three divisions in which a grammatical class such as nouns, adjectives, articles, and partly pronouns, are divided (my translation).

There are no separate words that cohere with the Anglo-American sex/gender division. In translations the word "kjønn/køn/kön" is generally used for both sex and gender; when it is necessary to distinguish between the two, markers such as "biological" ("biologisk kjønn*")* and "social" ("sosialt kjønn*")* are used. In her article "Translating gender," Karin Widerberg argues that, in Scandinavia, "attempts at introducing the equivalent of "gender", the Latin word "genus" (also a grammatical concept), have not proven particularly successful. Here the one Scandinavian word for the English "gender" and "sex", "*køn*", is still used and is seen as useful exactly because it does not force any distinctions between the biological and the social" (134).

Although this claim holds true for the Norwegian and Danish context, it is doubtful whether the concept of "kjønn" is always used with such a high degree of political and theoretical awareness. As a matter of fact, it is still possible to detect a certain amount of frustration in many research circles over the lack of a simple way to distinguish between biological and social/cultural meanings of "kjønn". In Sweden, on the other hand, the term "genus*"* has acquired widespread acceptance. It has, as Anna G. Jónasdottir points out, since the mid-eighties become "the main term indicating the whole field of women's and gender research in certain research political and bureaucratic key texts as well as being used in naming newly formed research institutions" (8, my translation). The use of the term on the Swedish scene has also been prompted by the publication in 1987 of the anthology *Från kön til genus. Kvinnligt och manligt i ett kulturellt perspektiv* [From Sex to Gender. Feminine and Masculine in a Cultural Perspective], edited by Don Kulick, which uses "genus" as a direct translation of the English "gender".

One of the leading theorists behind the use of *"genus"* in Sweden, is Yvonne Hirdmann. In her article "Genussystemet—reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning" ["The Genus System—Reflections on the Social Subordination of Women"], she argues that the term "genus" should be used in a distinct way which differs from the English use of "gender". Whereas gender, and its Scandinavian translation "sosialt kjønn", highlight the split between biology and culture, "genus" is to accentuate the manner in which the two are intertwined. Thus, "genus can be understood as changeable figures of thought, "men" and "women"—(where the biological difference is always exploited), which create representations and social practices. Hence it follows that biology can also be affected/changed—in other words, genus is a more symbiotic category than gender" (51, my translation). In Hirdmann's thinking genus is also more of a "performative" category; it denotes "masculinity" and "femininity" as categories that are *enacted*—and not simply added to the biological in a manner that would also suggest that they are extricable (51).

However, the use of the term genus in Sweden is by no means uniform or unproblematic and there has been a recent "backlash" against it. Although she has no qualms about using "gender" when she writes in English, Anna G. Jónasdóttir reacts against what she perceives as the linguistic and structural/poststructural foundation of the term "genus" on the grounds that it incompatible with her way of thinking social relationships (9). She also refers to the journalist Maria Carlshamre who in *Dagens Nyheter* 20th of April, 1998 argues that the use of "genus" should be abandoned altogether. In Carlshamre's view, there is no "sosialt kjønn", "only male and female bodies on the one hand and, on the other, individual human beings who can freely form themselves and change the world" (Jónasdóttir 9, my translation). A more "academic" take on the debate can be found in no.1/1998 of the journal *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift* which is devoted to the subject "Sex & kön." None of the articles specifically address the Swedish use of these terms, however; to a greater or lesser extent they all pertain to the Anglo-American debate, re-inscribing its terms.

Finland and Iceland represent a different problematic altogether. As is pointed out in *Nytt fra NIKK* 2/96, in these countries The Nordic Institute for Women's Studies and Gender Research (NIKK) is rendered simply as "The Nordic Institute for Women's Studies" in their respective languages. Päivi Lappalainen argues that the reason for the omission of the term gender in the Finnish translation is the fact that the Finnish term for sex/gender, *sukupuoli,* is exclusively biological and associated with reproduction. Thus the Finnish term for sex/gender is highly complicit with what Adrienne Rich calls "obligatory heterosexuality" and Judith Butler "the heterosexual matrix" (Lappalainen 9). Lappalainen also argues against a Finnish adoption of the Swedish use of "genus", since in Finland this word lacks importance as a linguistic term due to the fact that the Finnish language does not possess grammatical gender. The Finnish word for "woman", on the other hand, has a more manifold meaning, pointing both to the biological distinction between "men" and "women" and to the social and cultural condition of "being a woman". Thus Lappalainen recommends the use of the phrase "women's studies" in Finnish on the basis that it both includes research on gender ("kjønnsforskning") and preserves the political history of women's and gender-related research (10).

Works Cited

Hirdman, Yvonne
"Genussystemet—reflexioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning." In *Kvinnovetenskapelig tidskrift* no.3, 1988, vol. 9. Uppsala, Sweden.

Jónasdóttir, Anna G.
"Kvinnoord-i-Norden: Varför använda 'genus' när 'kön' finns?" In *Nytt fra NIKK* no.2, 1998, vol. 3. Oslo, Norway.

Lappalainen, Päivi
"Kvinna och kön är NAINEN och SUKUPUOLI på finska." In *Nytt fra NIKK* no. 2, 1996, vol.1. Oslo, Norway.

Widerberg, Karin
"Translating gender." In *NORA* no.2 1998, vol. 6. Åbo, Finland.

Modern Greek Gender

Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou

The equivalent of English "gender", i.e γένος [jenos][1], carries meanings in Modern Greek, including a 'general concept in whose extension specific concepts are contained", "a group of people with common descent", "ethnic group", etc. In the following I will only discuss meanings of this word that have some pertinence to feminist discourse.

The most prominent meaning of γένος refers to grammatical gender, i.e. the grammatical category according to which nouns, pronouns, adjectives etc. are morphologically divided in Modern Greek in three declension groups: masculine, feminine, neuter. This means that, for example, the gender of any Greek noun can usually be determined on morphological grounds alone. Whenever it seems necessary to distinguish explicitly this meaning of gender from others, the phrase γραμμάτιχο γένος [Yramatiko jenos], "grammatical gender", is used. Accordingly, the three types of gender are specified as αρσενιχό {arseniko], Φνλνχό(Φiliko] and ονδέτερ [udetero] γένος.

In grammar contexts, (grammatical) gender is juxtaposed to natural gender, i.e. sex, which is then specified as φνσιχό γένος [fisiko jenos]. Although generally the correspondence between grammatical gender and sex is arbitrary, if we restrict our attention to animate beings only, we find that nouns referring to males are usually masculine, while those referring to females are feminine. In other words, when nouns refer to animate beings, and especially to persons, there seems to be a semantic motivation for the declension classes.

In addition to grammatical gender, sex specification can also be achieved in Greek through lexical marking. Moreover, as in other languages, the sex of a person can be specified by adding to a noun, which may be ambiguous as to grammatical gender, the words άντρας[andras], "man", or γυναίχα [jineka], "woman". Finally, it is probably worth mentioning that due to the pervasiveness of the grammatical category of gender in the Greek linguistic system and the diglossic past of the Greek society feminine occupational terms still remain an intriguing issue in Greece.

Outside grammar contexts, however, the Greek equivalent for "sex" is φύλο[filo]: τα δύo φύλα [ta dio fila], "the two sexes", αρσενιχό/θηλυχό φύλο [arseniko/θilikio filo], "masculine/feminine sex", αςθενές φύλο [to asθenes filo], "the weak sex", and S. de Beauvoir's Το δεύτερο φύλo [to deftero filo], "the second sex". Although φύλο has always pertained to the biological foundation (and determination) of the sexes, in the last fifteen years and within the context of feminist discussions, has been used with the attribute "social" to point at the social determination in the differentiation of the sexes; in other words, the equivalent of "gender" in the feminist sense, is not as one would expect χοινωνιχό γένος [cinoniko jenos], but χοινωνιχό φύλo [cinoniko filo].

Moreover, it is the word φύλo that gave rise to several noun phrases or derivatives with import in the feminist discussion, e.g. χατά φύλα διαφοςοηίση [kata fila djaforopiisi] "differentiation according to sex", θυλετιχές δκιαχμίαεις[2] [filetices djakrisis] "sex discrimination", έμφυλo [emfilo] "gendered".

---

[1] Pronunciation is given in the International Phonetic Alphabet
[2] This phrase is ambiguous since its original meaning was 'race discrimination' in which case the adjective φυλετιχές is derived from the word φυλη 'race' and not φύλo'sex'. This is the reason why some people prefer the phrase σιειστιχέςis διαχσισεις 'sexist discrimination' instead of the ambiguous θυλετιχές δκιαχμίαεις.

A Short Note on the Use of "Sex" and "Gender" in some Slavic Languages

Eva Bahovic

In the Slavic languages, the words "spol" (Slovenian), "pol" (Croatian and Serbian) "pohlavie" (Slovak), "plec" (Polish), "pol" (Russian), etc. cover the meaning of both "sex" and "gender"; the same word is used for both. Also, rather similar examples of the use of the word can be found in several dictionaries of the Slavic languages: the strong sex as opposed to the fair sex, the beautiful sex, etc. i.e. in the Slovak language: "silne pohlavie" and "nežne pohlavie".[1]

In most Slavic languages the meaning of the word "sex" denotes the biological characteristics of maleness or femaleness, as well as the grammatical gender (i.e. genus).[2] The equivalents of the term "gender" in the Slavic languages derives from the Old Church Slavic word "rod" (gender, generation, to engender)[3]; the word is the same for the Slovenian, Croatian, Serbian, Russian and Czech language (Snoj, 1994). Furthermore, the word "rod" is related to the words "to give birth", "nation" ("rod" and the prefix "na"), "relatives".[4]

The etymology of the word "sex" in diverse Slavic languages derives from the Old Slavic word '(s)pol" (meaning "half") has developed from "(s)pholu-", what has been cut away, cut into two.[5] (To be compared to the German "geschlecht"-derived from "schlagen"- "to beat", and to the Latin "sexus" derived from "secare" -"to cleave", "to dissect".) (Snoj, 1994).

In Slovenia there has been some discussion over the last decade as to how to introduce feminism into the academia. On the one hand, it has been suggested by sociologists that the Slovene word for women's studies "ženske študije" should be replaced by a supposedly more progressive, up-to-date, neutral term "∅tudije spolov" (studies of the sexes in direct translation - the somewhat misleading translation of the English term "gender studies"). On the other hand, the choice of the terms in the subtitle of the Slovene feminist Journal *Delta* (Journal for Women's Studies and Feminist Theory) has been grounded on the idea of the necessity of "situated knowledges", "partial perspective", etc. (Delta, 1995).[6] The Serbian journal in the field is called *ženske studije* (Women's Studies), the Polish one *Pelnym Glosem. Periodiyk Feministyczny* (In a Loud Voice. Feminist Journal).

Several proposals have been made as to how to translate "sex" and "gender" into Slovenian, the most widely used equivalents being "biološki spol" (literally: biological sex) for "sex" and "družbeni spol" (literally: social sex) for "gender". The Russian translators seem to be working along the same lines (Ajazova, 1999).

---

[1] See Smolej, V. (1983) Slovensko-slovaški slovar (the Slovene-Slowaque Dictionary), Državna založba Slovenije, Ljubljana; see also Benson, M. (1986), Englesko-sprskohorvatski rečnik (English Serbocroatian Dictionary) Prosveta, Beograd; Slovar slovenskega knijižnega jezika (The Dictionary of the Slovene Language) (1994), Državns založba Slovenije, Ljubljana; Kozmik and Jeram (1995), and Boriĉ (1998)

[2] The examples for the words "woman", "female","man" "masculine" seem to be telling as well (Boriĉ ,1998; Delta, 1998)

[3] "The human race' in Slovenian: ĉloveški rod (i.e. the human gender)

[4] For the latter see Benveniste (1969).

[5] From the same term the words for a "a half of", "one half", have been developed (Croatian "pol", Serbian "po", Russian "pol", Czech "pul", etc.)

[6] The interdisciplinary studying program, introduced in 1997 at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana has the same name.

Bibliography

Ajvazova, S. G.
(1999). *Le Deuxième sexe en russe: les problèmes de la transmission* [The Second Sex in Russian: the problems of transmission], Cinquantenaire du deuxième sexe, Cooloque international, Paris.

Benveniste, E.
(1969). *Le vocabulaire des institutions indo-europèennes*, Minuit, Paris.

Bori⑤, R.
(1998). *Ženski identitet u jeziku* [The Female Indentity in language], Treča (Criatia) 1, pp.37-46.

Delta. The Journal for Women's Studies and Feminist theory (Slovenia) (1995).

Kozmik, V. And Jeram, J.
(1995). *Neseksistična raba jezika* [Non-sexist use of language], Bureau for Women's Politics, Ljubljana.

Snoj, M.
(1979). *Slovenski etimološki slovar* [The Slovene Etymological Dictionary], Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.

The Sex/Gender Debate in Germany

Ulla Wischermann
Translated by Kathy Davis

The etymological definition of gender ('Geschlecht') in German is 'that which is of the same direction' or 'of the same kind'. 'Gender' was originally used in a genealogical sense – as in descent, origin of birth, or 'people of the same descent' – as well as in the sense of a 'totality of people living in the same period of time'.[1] Today the concept includes several levels of meaning: it refers to grammatical gender, includes the binary classification feminine/masculine, and has connotations with sexuality and sex-specific social identities. Drawing on the Anglo-American tradition, the sex/gender distinction is currently being used in Germany as biological and socio-cultural category.

Debates about gender have played an important role both historically and in the new German women's movement. At the turn of the century, mainstream female theorists explained gender relations from the perspective of natural and social difference ('women are different, but equal'). During the seventies, the question of how gender dichotomies are constituted became central in feminist theory, in particular within history[2] (studies on the character of gender) and social sciences[3] (research on sex-specific socialization).

Feminist research in the eighties proceeded with an eye to the ever-present danger within gender theory of creating a masculine-feminine dualism and with the realization that the search for gender differences simultaneously generates gender differences. 'Gender' is increasingly understood as a category of social structure as well as a dual system of symbols. Accordingly, two dimensions of the discourse on gender relations became particularly relevant. Drawing on the notion of 'symbolic system of gender duality'[4], human action was characterized as 'doing gender': Gender is not something that we 'have' and 'are', but something that we 'do'.[5] The concept 'double societal function' ('doppelte Vergesellschaftung')[6] has been developed to elaborate the social foundations of the tensions in women's life contexts. The related thesis of 'gender as social structure category' ('Geschlecht als gesellschaftliche Strukturkategorie') thematizes patriarchal and economic structures of domination and elaborates the systemic character of women's oppression – particularly in regard to the division of labor in production and family.

The 'gender debate' took a new direction in the beginning of the nineties. The catalyst was Judith Butler's book (1990) *Gender Trouble* (which appeared in Germany under the title *Das Unbehagen der Geschlechter),* generating a lively and – perhaps typical – (west) German debate about abandoning the category 'gender' altogether. Dissolving the sex/gender distinction into gender and dismissing questions of bodily materiality as a symbolic, discursively produced and constitutive fiction elicited considerable dissent. Noteworthy in the reception of Butler's notion that two biological sexes are a product of social and discursive processes was that the reactions among feminist scholars were divided specifically along generational lines.[7] In retrospect, it also became clear that although the critique of Butler was in part legitimate, in the process the theoretical and political impact of her work had been largely erased. Her critique of the 'heterosexual matrix' and, along with it, the impulse this gave to defining a new field of inquiry in the direction of Queer Theory was an unmistakable provocation for the German mainstream of gender research, which had been oriented toward investigating hierarchies of gender difference. [8]

References

Helga Bilden
>   (1991) "Geschlechtspezifische Sozialisation" In Klaus Hurrelmann and Dieter Ulich eds., *Neues Handbuch der Sozialisationsforschung* 4th edition. Weinheim-Basel: Beltz Verlag. pp.279-301.

Brigitte Brηck, Heike Kahlert and Marianne Krhll et al.
>   (1992) *Feministische Soziologie. Eine Einfηrung*. Frankfurt a.M.-New York.

Hilge Landweer and Mechthild Rumpf (Eds.)
>   (1993) " Kritik der Kategorie "Geschlecht", *Feministische Studien*, No.2.

---

[1] *Der Grosse Duden. Etymologie. Herkunftswörterbuch der deutschen Sprache* (Mannheim: Dudenverlag, 1963), p.215.

[2] An important text was the essay by Karin Hausen, "Die Polarisierung der "Geschlechtcharaktere" - Eine Spiegelung der Disoziation von Erwerbs- und Familienleben" In Werner Conze ed., *Sozialgeschichtre der Familie in der Neuzeit Europas* (Stuttgart, 1976), pp.363-393.

[3] Ursula Scheu, *Wir werden nicht als Mädchen geboren - wir werden dazu gemacht. Zur fruhkindlichen Eriehung in unserer Geselschaft* (Frankfurt: Fischer Verlag, 1977). Just how important this text was inside the new women's movement and beyond is illustrated by the fact that 45.000 copies were printed during the first half of 1977.

[4] Carol Hagemann-White. *Sozialisation: weiblich-männlich?* (Opladen, 1984)

[5] Carol Hagemann,-White, "Die Konstrukteure des Geschlechts auf frischer Tat ertappen? Methodische Konsequenzen einer theoretischen Einsicht" In *Feministische Studien* No.2, 1993, p.68.

[6] Regina Becker-Schmidt, "Die doppelte Vergesellschaftung - die doppelte Unterdrηckung: Besonderheiten in der Frauenforschung in der Sozialwissenschaften" In Lilo Unterkircher and Ina Wagner eds., *Die andere Hälfte der Gesellschaft* (Wien, 1987), pp.10-25

[7] About the Butler debate and her reception see the core article in *Feministische Studien* (No2, 1993): "Kritik der kategorie Geschlecht" eds. Hilge Landweer and Mechthild Rumpf.

[8] See Evelyn Annuss, "Grenzen der Geschlechtforschung" In *Feministische Studien* no.1, 1999, pp.91-102.

Trans-lating Gender into the Russian (Con)Text[1]

Irina Aristarkhova

Introduction: Wake-up calls

The Gender Centre (also known as The Centre for Gender Studies) was set up within the Institute of Socio-Economic Problems of the Population at the Russian Academy of Science in May, 1990.

Since the time it was set up the centre has been receiving a series of telling phone calls; wrong number, usually. For example,

Staff at the Centre:'Алло! Чентр гендерных исследований ('Hello! *The Centre for Gender Studies.*')

Caller: Каких исследований, - ядерных ('What studies, nuclear?')
Curious and funny as these mistakes may seem, it is not as surprising to a Russian speaker as the words for 'gender'(гендер) and 'nuclear'(ядер) sound very similar when expressed quickly (and the bad telephone reception does not help much either). Such mistakes reflect a more urgent and serious problem in the way the term 'gender' has been **imported** into and used within Russian academia. In my essay, I seek to present a history of 'gender' as a notion and concept in Russian official (both academic and governmental) discourses in a way that highlights the different ways in which it has been used and not used to 'talk about' and 'work with' women. It would be shown that the term 'gender' still remains 'to-be-trans-lated' into the Russian text insofar as it remains marginal to and has not achieved a **cultural currency** within the Russian context.

Historical (con)text

'Only that which does not have a history can truly be defined '(Nietzsche).
Before attempting to discuss the ways in which the term 'gender' has been used in the Russian context, it is important, I believe, to present a historical elaboration of the various terms and notions that were employed to 'talk about ' women' (gender?) prior to its introduction/importation. Instead of giving a strict chronological account of the different terms in Russian history, I intent to present a more thematic discussion of three exemplary [2] historical junctures, namely the **Pre-Revolutionary** period (prior to 1917, especially the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. **Post-Revolutionary** (after 1917, especially the 1920s and 1930s) and finally of the **post-Perestroika** period.

Pre-Revolutionary period

In this section, I intend to highlight the uses of the terms 'sex' and 'women' in the works of Rozanov (an important nineteenth-twentieth century Russian philosopher and writer) and in the discourses of the women's suffragist movement in Russia.

a) Rozanov presents sex as a (the) primary activity constitutive of one's religious life and claims that its relation to Christianity significantly differs from that which the Church sought to establish. He says, 'the tie of sex with God is stronger than the tie of intellect, or even

---

[1] This article was first presented at the Annual Conference in Russian and Slavonic Studies, University of Cambridge, March 1995. It was subsequently published in Labour Studies Working Papers, University of Warwick, 1995.
[2] In this essay, the various themes, discourses and authors that I have highlighted as 'exemplary' are not presented as if they are/were representative of the period or feature discussed. I have carefully chosen the examples that, in my view, most comprehensively and suggestively reflect the issues discussed. Thus, their exemplarity is not in their exhaustive representation but in their instantiation of an issue/period.

conscience, with God'. (Rozanov, cited in Roberts, 1972:221).[3]. For him, sexual intercourse allowed "man" (note not women) to actually come into direct contact with God and that the child that is born out of this divine encounter is testimony to it. Rozanov sees sexual activity as a means to bring souls from that higher world into this one. Hence sex that does not involve reproduction is divinely incorrect and 'the need for sex (therefore children) becomes a basis for the family and marriage, which are to end when this need ends (Roberts, 1972:221).[4] Rozanov saw children as a means to reject death insofar as some part of one's carries on this world long after one's death. Rozanov rejected Christianity as 'the pain of the world' which conquered 'the joy of the world'. The essence of a true religion for him was glorification of life; a semblance of which he found in the religious teachings of the ancient Hebrews and the primitive religions of early Egypt. He considered these 'religions of the flesh', more attractive options vis a vis Christianity as they centred on the sexual behaviour of man, urging man to be fruitful and to multiply being concerned with the here and now. Where are women? Are they not in Rozanov's view simply tools and mediators in this divine encounter between 'man' and God? It is interesting that Rozanov despite speaking so lovingly of the religious significance of the sexual act fails to mention that other half of the heterosexual pair – 'women'. What may seem to us as a failure on his part to mention 'woman' in sex may well be due to his not making that initial distinction between women and their sexuality that seems to characterise much of the philosophical musings on women before the Revolution.[5]

b) Women's Suffragist Movement
In the last decade of Tsarist rule Russia saw a dramatic development of women's social and political activism, what Richard Stites characterised as the 'sixty years old history of Russian feminism' (Stites, 1978:58) which came to an abrupt end after the Revolution. The range of diverse women's organisations and writings that cropped up during this period bear testimony to not just their enthusiasm and revolutionary fervour but also to their conceptions of what it was to be 'women'. There was a strong international character to some of these organisations, namely the National Council of Women (which had affiliations with its international counterparts in Europe and America and the International Woman Suffrage Alliance. The women's liberation with its libertarian and humanist rhetoric provided the discursive space within which these and other national organisations (e.g. Russian Women's Mutual Philanthropic Society and the Union of Equal Rights of Women) articulated their aims and objectives. This libertarian, humanist and egalitarian rhetoric that characterised the suffragist is also indicated by the various journals/magazines that were established before the Revolution. The following provides an indication of the range and discursive logic of the issues covered by the Russian suffragists:

Zenski Novosti	(Women's News)	St. Petersburg	(1866-1868)
Zenskoe Obrazovanie	(Women's Education)	St. Petersburg	(1876-1891)
Zenskoe Delo	(Women's Issues)	St. Petersburg	(1899-1900)
Zenskii Vestnik	(Women's News)	St. Petersburg	(1904-1917)
Souz Zenschin	(Union of Women)	St. Petersburg	(1907-1909)
Zenskoe Delo	(Women's Issues)	Moscow	(1910-1917)

It is interesting to note that the word 'woman' is appended to all the various journals in a way that marks these texts and the issues covered therein as 'relevant' to women. A casual perusal of the issues discussed in these various journals/magazines, shows an emphasis on

---

[3] His first book devoted to the themes of sex and marriage, was *In the World of the Obscure and Uncertain (1901)*. Other works on such themes – *Around the Church Walls* (1903), *The Dark Face (1911), Moonlight People* (1913).
[4] Rozanov even coded genitals, both male and female, with religious significance, as 'holy'and at times this views about them amounted to a deep fixation even: 'If I can't smell and kiss the sex of woman', he says in one of his letters, 'then let me suck the udder of a cow' (Rozanov, cited in Roberts,1972:222).
[5] This characteristic of attaching women to or making them inseparable from their sexual identity is found in much of the key figures of Russian literature and philosophy prior to the twentieth century (eg. Turgenev, Dostoevsky, Vladimir Solovyev and especially Tolstoy).

questions of women's 'rights' with reference to education, domestic realm, political participation, divorce, family law, medical practices and prostitution.[6]
Associated as it was to the women's liberation in Western Europe as of the USA, their approach of the issues employed a libertarian rhetoric/agenda.
Post-Revolutionary period – Constituting the 'New Individual'.

'The dictatorship will have to become softer and milder as the economic welfare of the country is raised. The present method of *commanding human beings* will give way to one of *disposing over things*. The road leads not to the robot but to man of a **higher order**.' (Trotsky, [1933]/1970:50).

The Revolution of 1917 left the Bolsheviks with an immense task at hand – how to rule the Russian population without seriously compromising their own power. I have argued elsewhere that they sought to address this immediate governmental problem of achieving control and social order through constituting the 'new communist individual'.[7] It is within the discursive and historical construction of this 'new individual' that discourses about women need to be examined. Two main themes dominated discourses about 'women' during this period, namely,

   a) Freeing women from the shackles of oppressive peasant family and kinship structures so as to facilitate and increase women's free participation in the new social order/future through work.
   b) Management (through rational ordering) and construction of the new communist family – where sexuality of women (and men) becomes an object of governmental problematization through notions such as **polovoi vopros** (sexual question), **polovye otnosheniya (**sexual relations), **polovaya zisn'** (sexual life).[8]

Both these issues were (or at least, pretended to be?) framed with reference to 'correcting' bourgeois (peasant?) morality that was deemed detrimental to the creation of a communist social order. And in doing so these discourses employed the terms 'women', 'sex' and 'sexual relations' as if they were synonyms of each other, for an articulation of the difference between them would have amounted to the insertion of the notion of 'gender'.
I would now move on to discuss each of these issues.

a) Kollontai, one of the leading voices of Communist feminism, in an echo of Lenin, condemns the old order of sexual (gender) relations in a way that problematizes the pre-Revolutionary individualistic essence of privacy and household: 'Bourgeois morality demanded everything for the beloved person. The morality of the proletariat prescribes – everything for the collective' (Kollontai, [1923]/1990:93) Lenin defines the notion of 'communist morality' in his famous work "Tasks of the Youth Leagues (Bourgeois and Communist Morality)'. This work served as the cornerstone of educational and socialisation discoursed and practices throughout the entire Soviet period. Lenin says that Communist morality is based on the united discipline and serves the purpose of helping human society rise to a higher level, which is the communist future: 'Communist morality is based on the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism. That is also the basis for the communist training, education and teaching'. (Lenin, [1920]/1990:24). Thus, the task of the new generation – struggle with the constant bourgeois threat 'outside' and building the edifice of communist society in order to bring it to completion.

---

[6] Some of these issues, especially those about medical practices and prostitution were extensively explored during the First All-Russian Congress of Women in 1908. See, Edmondson, *Feminism in Russia, 1900-17* (1984) for a detailed discussion of the congress and pre-Revolutionary Russian feminism.
[7] In my MA dissertation 'Women and Government in Bolshevik Russia' (University of Warwick, 1994), I have employed Foucault's concept of 'governmentality' to analyse the complex interconnections between the governmental technologies involved in this construction of the 'new individual' and of the 'new woman'.
[8] The notion of сочиальный (sexual life) has been mostly employed within Soviet medical discourses to normalize the sexual conduct of 'new' individuals, especially Soviet youth.

A Communist became an example for the rest of the population and, as Krupskaya puts it, 'a communist is, first and foremost, a person involved in society, with strongly developed social instincts (in opposition to the biological instincts) who desires that all people should live well and happy' (Krupskaya, [1922]/1990:p.26; words within parentheses mine). Here she clearly tries to apply a scientific language of physiology and biology to the communist discourse. She indeed uses such words as instinct and desire with references to the sociality, providing the future road of articulating socialist agenda empowered with the energy of instincts. The sexual revolution, however, was announced only on paper by means of being superficially addressed by Bolshevik legal reforms. The Bolsheviks themselves, seemed more interested in employing these legal reforms to effect the 'withering away' of the *bourgeois* family, to be substituted by the new framework of sexual relations, namely that of the *proletarian* family. Kollontai aptly notes that.

'…..the old type of family has seen its day…But, on the ruins of the former family we shall soon behold rising a new form which will involve altogether different relations between men and women, and which will be *a union of affection and comradeship, a union of two equal persons of the Communist Society, both of them free, both of them independent, both of them workers' (*Kollontai [1918}, 1980:179).

Moreover, these legal reforms helped Bolsheviks to directly interfere into and thus reconstitute the private realm. This institutional legitimacy that the Bolsheviks gained through their laws that affected the private realm served to inculcate people's docility to their power. The concept of the 'new proletarian family' (vis-à-vis the traditional, peasant family) and the task to construct it through the management of sexual relations were part of a governmental strategy that afforded the institutionalisation of greater control over the lives of private individuals and through their families. As Trotsky says:

*'A long and permanent marriage, based on mutual love and cooperation – that is the ideal standard. The influences of the school, of literature, and of public opinion in the Soviets tend toward this. Freed from the chains of police and clergy, later also from those of economic necessity, the tie between man and woman will find its own way, determined by physiology, psychology, and care for the welfare of the human race…In any case, the problem of marriage has ceased to be a matter of uncritical tradition and the blind force of circumstance, it has been posed as a task of collective reason.'(*Trotsky, [1933], 1970:53).

Here Trotsky reveals that while the Church was responsible for the 'old family', now the communist regime became the new actor empowered to organize and channel sexual relations. And the direction was of the same order – marriage and motherhood:

Communist Society therefore approaches the **working** woman and the working man and says to them: You are young, you love each other. Everyone has the right to happiness. Therefore live your life. Do not flee happiness. Do not fear marriage, even though marriage was truly a chain for the working man and woman of capitalist society. Above all, do not fear, young and healthy, as you are, to give to your country new workers, new citizen-children. The society of **the workers** is in need of new working forces…The child will be fed, it will be brought up, it will be educated by the care of the Communist Fatherland…'(Kollontai, [1918], 1980: 178-170; emphasis mine).

In other words, family became an instrument to achieve particular kind of Bolshevik governing, and a target of governmental problematization. In 1936 *Family* was put into Soviet Constitution as a basic and smallest unit of socialist society, thus, it became 'the true proletarian family' and children became 'appropriated' by educational, medical and academic authorities.
The category of 'woman' was employed as a tool in the governmental constitution of the 'new proletariat family', built after the destruction of the individualistic 'peasant' and 'bourgeois' family (in Lenin the distinction between them was collapsed to legitimize the destruction of both as one).

b) *Polovoi vopros* (The Sex Question)
In a 1924 article in a book, *Polovoi vopros* (The 'Sex Question'), two popular physicians and writers on sex issues claim that human sexuality and sexual relations were fundamental to the constitution of 'all aspects of our existence, not only in physical health, but in our moods, our capacity for work, our relations with people, our social activity, our creativity' and as such go on to advise its ordered and healthy management. '(T)he new world', they say, 'can be created only by a thoroughly healthy, strong and cheerful generation. And only a generation which **orders its sexual life on a rational and healthy basis can be healthy'**. (L.A.& L.M. Vasilevsky, [1924], 1990:95, emphasis mine).

Vinogradskaya, a member of central Zhenotdel, and the editorial board of journal for women Kommunistka [Communist Woman], in her 1923 essay in the journal *'Molodaia Gvardiia'*('Young Guard') delivers an interesting critique of Kollontai's essay. 'Make Way for the Winged Eros' of the same year. In criticising Kollontai's thoughts about the possible varieties of relationships between men and women, she argues that 'moving on to the situation of our everyday existence, to our reality, we must say that **all questions of the rationalizations of sexual relations turn first of all (under our conditions of poverty, unemployment, especially among women, lack of social education) on the questions of the family, of children'**.
She, in a way that echoes and draws on Trotsky, asks rhetorically: 'Is love really, taken in a social and biological connection, some sort of art for art's sake? Is it really not the prelude to reproduction, to the bearing of children? (Vinogradskaya, 1990[1923]: 119; emphasis mine)
Vinogradskaya's position is that the 'new' permutations of relationships between men and women that Kollontai conceives as made possible by communist society, are very much 'ideal' conceptions which do not have referents in the real world as the abject conditions of poverty and unemployment that characterise the real conditions of man and women are not amenable to the developments of such relationships. More importantly, she says that Kollontai's attempt to engage the question of men-women relationships without reference to children, to relations of reproduction, is both naïve and contrary to the Marxist notion of social instinct.
However, Kollontai made it clear that, from her point of view, love emotions should be directed for the benefit of the collective, thus 'biological instinct becomes spiritualized'. (Kollontai [1923], 1990:84).

Thus, it can be seen that the discourses about women that characterised this period seldom engaged the complex interplay of sex and gender categories but rather preferred as a matter of governmental convenience to collapse the distinctions between them.

Post-Perestroika period – Gender as Agenda

In this section, I would highlight the more recent trends of academic discourses specifically employing the term 'gender' in Russia, particularly referring to the writings of Russian academic-feminists like Rimashevskaya, Posadskaya and Konstantinova and of the émigré feminist Mamonova. Their writings serve as good examples of post-Perestroika discourses about 'gender' especially because they have been instrumental in its 'importation' into Russian academia (as well as into official policy discourses) and in establishing the semantic parameters through their pragmatic applications of the term.

Natal'ia Rimashevskaia in her article *The New Women's Studies* presents how the notion of 'gender' (as гендер) has come to be used in academic circles in Russia through her activities as a participant of a special committee created with the task to cover '**the social activities of women in the contemporary world'** (Rimashevskaya, 1992: 118; emphases mine). She particularly emphasises the reluctance of the academic community within Russia to adopt the 'гендер' concept when she introduced it in her article *How We Solve the Woman Question*. She notes that the new egalitarian approach she proposed in the earlier article, is based 'on a mutual complementarity of the **sexes'** in opposition to the traditional assumption about (natural) **'differentiation of role functions** between the **sexes' (**p. 119).

However, Rimashevskaia notes that the concept of ' гендер' received many negative responses both within the academy and the authorities. Rimashevskaya writes that on top of the Academy male majority did not take such ideas as 'gender' seriously since 'public consciousness is still extremely patriarchal, especially among men' (p.120). She notes in conclusion that as 'conceptual analysis of the 'woman question 'develops the need for praxis increasingly pressing (p. 120), in a way that seems to underscore a certain anxiety about praxis vis-á-vis conceptual analysis.

A Centre for Gender Studies, she says, 'focuses on the issues of sex, as socially constructed' (p. 121)[9], attempting also to make its work intelligible to both men and women and presenting new approaches to the 'woman question'. Then Rimashevskaya presents lists of a variety of activities the Centre provides, ranging from the development of theoretical perspectives to organising activities within the women's movement.

Konstantinova, another Russian academic who has been actively engaged in feminist activities, in her discussion of the women's movement in Russia echoes the libertarian / humanist rhetoric characteristic of the early women suffragists. She bemoans the fact that '(i)n the Soviet period the **emancipation of women** was not even an issue in the ongoing debate between the Slavophiles and the Westerniser authors' who set the intellectual agenda for Russia (Konstantinova, 1992:204; emphasis mine). In summarizing the contemporary situation of women in post-Perstroika Russia she claims that the resurgence of the Orthodox Church has had negative effects on women's social positions. 'Religion is once more playing an increasingly important part in society. The Russian Orthodox Church is deeply conservative and patriarchal, and its **repressive** attitude to women has emerged unchanged by the *perestroika* reforms'. (Konstantinova, 1992:204) Here, she clearly seems to be caught within what Foucault has refereed to as the 'repressive hypothesis', which has characterised traditional political analyses, where power is essentially conceived as that which represses or oppresses instead of looking at the actual operations of power which defy such easy theoretical appropriations.

'Throughout the history of the Soviet state', Konstantinova asserts, 'the position of women has been determined by state-defined demographic and economic imperatives: either women must be productive workers or they must stay at home, at other times they are expected to combine the two, but never have they been able to make their own choices or to formulate the issues themselves'. (Konstantinova, 1992:204-5) In addition to drawing from a largely impoverished paradigms of libertarianism and humanism, she also seems to be assuming that men have had the privilege to make free choices during the Soviet period or today.

Yet another example of a feminist academic who remains within and operates from the libertarian rhetoric of early suffragists is Posadskaya, the Director of the Gender Centre in Moscow, who, interestingly, seems to have been one of the first persons to have used the term 'gender' as 'гендер' in the Russian academic community. In addition to being instrumental in the formation of the Gender Centre (together with Rimashevskaya), she has remained one of Russia's foremost feminist activists constantly organising women's forums and workshops. In her most recent book, **Women in Russia** (1994) she has reiterated her conviction that the current situation in Russia threatens to develop into a 'Renaissance of Patriarchy' insofar as the rise of capitalist enterprise with Russia ' excludes' women from both the labour market and political participation.

Mamonova, a Russian émigré writer living in the United States, who has achieved great popularity within feminist circles in Australia, Canada and France, equally draws from this tradition.
'Where, then, is the moral imperative of feminism? What does feminism have to offer if it is to distinguish itself from patriarchy? What is the point of struggle? For thousands of years men have not been ashamed to assert their superiority, so why have we been so frightened by

---

[9] It is this idea of 'socially constructed sex' which has lent legitimacy to one more alternative translation of 'gender' into Russian academic test as сочиалный meaning 'social sex'. See especially, Per Monson (ed.) **Contemporary Western Social Theories** (1993) published in the Russian language in Moscos, wherin 'gender' is translated as 'social sex'.

new alternatives that have opened up after a ten year battle'[10] (Mamonova, 1989: 172) While showing an anxiety to 'get involved' and 'do something', her faithful reiteration and appeal to humanist principles and liberty seem to unduly restrict the scope of feminist political engagement.

'… I believe in woman. A new path lies ahead of her, but the **habit of enslavement** that has been instilled in her for thousands of years has not been overcome. Yet there are in women reserves of strength, **unknown** to the world, and resources of energy, **still hidden**, that are capable of enriching humanity. Men have already demonstrated their possibilities, but women have yet to reveal theirs'. (Mamonova, 1989: 172; emphases mine). The constant reminder of the 'not-yet-unveiled' strengths of women, though rich in suggestion and promise cannot but remain utopian in a situation where the articulation of women is still with reference to her sex. Moreover, to present the strengths as unrealised she wipes off the actual achievements of many ordinary women.

The term, 'gender' seems to be employed (when employed at all) in the abovementioned discourses as a 'catch-all' term – within which the general and more specific issues about 'women' and 'sex' could be and were practically engaged with or discussed. It seems to be used as a convenient locus around which to set the agenda for the Centre and for women's activities. It is possible that (though not very clear if) the urgency of the need to actively work with issues and problems that relate to women in Russia forced the Centre and its pioneers to promptly compromise the cultural commensurability and translational adequacy of the terms of /in their agenda. The fact that gender served the agenda seemed enough. However, the term 'gender', as an imported term, remained **semantically empty**, but the discursive space it opened out within the academy and in society was filled with the terms 'women' and 'sec'. While, this made for prompt action, it, unfortunately, may have blunted the possibilities for a more concerted, long-term political engagement with regards to gender issues.

Problems of translation

'The traditional concepts in any discussion of translation are fidelity and license – the freedom of faithful reproduction and, in its service, fidelity to the word. These ideas seem to be no longer serviceable to a theory that looks for other things in a translation than reproduction of meaning.'

(Benjamin, 1972:78)

Having thus far highlighted the historical context within which the term 'gender' has come to be 'imported', it is possible now to present a more critical discussion of the problems of translating 'gender' into the Russian (con)text.

Much of the more formal theoretical approaches to language (and by implication, to translation) draw upon the **universalist** assumption. Such an assumption 'accepts the existence of a universal system of language independent entities (**semantic primitives** or **semantic primes**)' where these **semantically primary** entities are seen as a 'common-denominator of utterance-specific realizations…. and a **tertium comparationis** for language-specific entitities that are considered to be translationally equivalent'. (Lewandowska-Tomszcyk, 1992:85). However, in thus assuming a language-independent ontological basis for and hence possibility of translation across languages, the translations proceeding from the **universalist** foundations, tend to both ignore and obscure the cultural differences between the languages involved.

While the universalist assumption complacently iterates the possibility of translation there is yet another theoretical tradition constantly pronounces the impossibility and indeterminacy of translation. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk succinctly summarizes this so-called 'Indeterminacy of Translation' thesis as the theoretical position that is sceptical about the possibility of translations for various reasons, namely, that '(e)ither languages of the world have such

---

[10] Note that this article was written in 1986 in the wake of *Perestroika* and thus the 'ten-year battle' and 'new alternatives' were made with reference to it.

disparate systems that they do not fit one another, or human conceptual categories are so diverse that they cannot be 'calibrated' or else a foreign speaker can never be certain about the correspondences between the native interlocuter's and his own interpretations of the perceived reality'. (Lewandowska-Tomaszcyk, 1992:85). And W.V. Quine is one of the more famous proponents of this thesis.

Though sharing the scepticism of the indeterminists, I believe any translational exercise cannot even begin without the optimism that characterises the universalist assumption of the translatability of experiences. In a summary of the contemporary task of translation, de Beaugrande and Dressler state thus: '*Probabilistic* models are more adequate and realistic than *deterministic* ones. Dynamic accounts of *structure-building* operations will be more productive than static descriptions of the structures themselves. We should work to discover *regularities*, strategies, *motivations*, preferences and *defaults* rather than *rules* and *laws*. *Dominances* can offer more realistic classifications than can strict *categories*. *Acceptability and appropriateness* are more crucial standards for texts than *grammaticality* and *well-formedness*. Human reasoning processes are more essential to using and conveying knowledge in texts than are *logical* proofs. It is the task of science to systematize the *fuzziness* of its objects of inquiry, not to ignore it or argue it away' (de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W.W. 1981:xiv). In addition to the themes highlighted by them, I would like to add two other themes of relevance to achieving more politically engaged and culturally sensitive translations. The following discussion which focuses on some of the problems involved in the translation of the term 'gender' into the Russian (con)text will be organized around these two themes, namely 1) Cultural Currency and Commensurability, and 2) Political efficacy.

Cultural Currency and Commensurability

'**Translatability is an essential quality of certain works, which is not to say that it is essential that they be translated; it means rather that specific significance inherent in the original manifests itself in its translatability'.** (Benjamin, 1972:71) And what is true of the work could be reasonably and critically made applicable to the word too. In a rather optimistic note, Benjamin observed that translatability remained a possibility inherent in certain works insofar as some element of the original invited it. While Benjamin's optimism seems to derive primarily from what he called the 'purity of language(s)', I believe that translatability is directly related to the general commensurability with regards to that which is to be translated. For the problem, whether for the reader or the translator, is too often is not one of translatability as re-presentability, but rather of 'cultural commensurability'. [11]
The existing translation of 'gender' in Russian however, lacks a cultural currency and in fact has not and may well never gain currency outside the walls of academia insofar as it is incommensurable.

Political Efficacy

Spivak, in her excellent article *The Politics of Translation*, suggests that translation affords a creative contention with the language (and difference) of some 'other'. This 'working with' the language of the other(s), that is 'not-mine', is for her 'one of the seductions of translation'. In her view, translation is, in this sense, 'a simple miming of the responsibility to the trace of the other in the self' (Spivak, 1993:179). Here, it is noteworthy that it is a not a seduction that involves an irresponsible submission but one with strings attached; with responsibilities to 'the other'.

Starting from the position that 'it is not bodies of meaning that are transferred in translation', Spivak claims that it is more pertinent in translation exercises to examine the way in which a language facilititates the 'agency' of its users (both readers and writers).[12] She claims that the

---

[11] This notion of commensurability is borrowed from Thomas Kuhn's 'incommensurability thesis' as espoused in his The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.

[12] This notion of agency implied by gender seems to have been borrowed from Irigaray: 'Gender as index and mark of the subjectivity and the ethical responsibility of the speaker…constitutes the

'task of the feminist translator is to consider language as a clue to the working of the gendered subject', for in her view, while the 'writer is written by her language…the writing of the writer writes agency in a way that might be different' for different translators/speakers (179).

'How does the translator attend to the specificity of the language she translates?'

There is a way in which the **rhetorical nature** of every language disrupts its **logical systematicity**. If we emphasise the logical at the expense of these rhetorical interferences, we remain safe.
'Safety' is the appropriate term here, because we are talking of risks, of violence to the translating medium'. Spivak believes that in translations there is a need to carefully allow both the rhetorical and the logical elements of the origin language to be retained though, (she seems to imply) these elements could in the act of translation by way of their (necessary?) oppositional relationship mutually exclude each other. Spivak feels, it seems, that most translators prefer to be 'safe' by choosing between one or the other element.

She also claims that thus far, '(t)he politics of translation from a non-European woman's text too often suppresses this possibility because the translator cannot engage with or cares insufficiently for, **the rhetoricity of the original'**(181: emphases mine). Spivak's notion of rhetoricity is a necessary element in all languages though it is, according to her in a relationship of communicative tension with, what she calls, the logical systematicity of languages.
She says that 'the simple possibility that something might not be meaningful is contained by the rhetorical system as the always possible menace of a space outside language' and that it is this that is 'most eerily staged (and challenged) in the effort to communicate with other possible intelligent beings in space'. Thus she claims (mysteriously, within parentheses). '(a)bsolute alterity or otherness is thus differed-defered into an other self who resembles us, however minimally, and with whom we can communicate'. (181)

While rhetoric in language works in between the interstices of what is communicated in and by words, logic threads them together in a manner that communicates by connections. 'Rhetoric must work in the silence between and around words in order to see what works and how much' and Spivak asserts that this 'jagged relationship between rhetoric and logic, condition and effect of knowing is a relationship by which a world is made for the agent, so that the agent can act in an ethical way, in a political way, a day-to-day way….
Unless one can at least construct a model of this for the other language, there is no real translation; . (181; emphasis mine). Thus, compromising on the rhetoricity inherent in a term/phrase in an effort to make intelligible (i.e. logical) to some others, serves not only to distort/blunt the cultural significance of that term, but more importantly affects the agentiality of the speakers as of the readers. It is in this sense that an alternative term for 'gender' is required within the Russian (con)text as the uncritically imported term 'гендер' which merely mimics (phonetically) its English equivalent, makes its Russian users empty vessels that merely echo it.

Род (Rod) as GENDER: Rooting and Uprooting

Having thus far examined the historical and theoretical issues pertinent to translating 'gender' into the Russian (con)text, this concluding section will go on to provide an alternative translation of the term. It is suggested here that the term 'gender' is most appropriately translated as '*Род* ('rod'). While a detailed discussion and defence of the translational appropriateness of the word is well beyond the scope of this paper, I hope to show at least that in addition to having a wider cultural currency, the term 'rod' is particularly suited for a more nuanced (feminist or otherwise) politics than that offered by the semantically empty, imported term, 'гендер' э and other translations like 'social sex' (социальный пол).

---

irreducible differentiation that occurs on the inside of the human race. Gender stands for the unsubstitutible position of the I and the you (le tu) and of their modes of expression'. (Irigaray, 1993;169-70).

The word 'rod' has a rich etymological rootedness in the Russian language / culture. The Oxford Russian Dictionary provides an idea of the diverse meanings that this word evokes. The word, rod refer to the social entities of the 'family', 'kin', 'clan'; it also means, not surprisingly given its associations with family and kin, 'birth', 'origin' and 'stock'; denotes the 'genus', 'sort' or 'kind' to which a thing belongs; and finally to the grammatical category 'gender' which differentiates between 'masculine', 'feminine' and 'neuter'.

Why is 'rod' a more appropriate translation of gender?

Firstly because the term enjoys a greater cultural currency in having wider social usage and commensurability (thus, easily understood). The connotations that this term evokes are multiple – especially in its entrenchment in the cultural memories of Russian speakers.

Historically the pre-Revolutionary kinship structures were destroyed in relation to private property by reference to women's social position (i.e. liberating them from the oppressive 'traditional' peasant/bourgeois family). As such, a retrieval of women issues through/as 'gender' (rod) would inevitably imply a simultaneous recovery and remembering of kinship structures. Despite (and because of) the fact that *rod* draws upon the historical and etymological associations between kinship and gender, it is important to employ this term with a sensitivity to the possibility of its corruption in, what Posadskaya has called a 'Renaissance of Patriarchy'. Posadskaya claims that the post-Perestroika years have been characterised by a renewed emphasis on family and kinship relations which represent a renewal of the patriarchal structures that oppress women.[13]
Thus in employing 'rod' as 'gender' one should strategically articulates its difference from and tensions with(in) kinship structures in a way that retains its **political efficacy**.

Secondly, the term allows for a more nuanced and politically sophisticated engagement and activism. In this sense it has greater political efficacy than a term like 'гендер'. While the term 'gender' as it has been used in English does not restrictively denote women only (though some feminists still carry on as if it did), the term as it has been 'imported' Into the Russian (con)text has failed to articulate the complexity of gender relations by consistently excluding men from its discourses framed within the term 'gender'. Too often, they even equate power with/as 'male' and 'gender' as (the repressed) 'female'.

In conclusion, it is not my intention to point to the 'poverty' of feminism as activism but rather to suggest a radicalization of pre-existing feminist struggles drawing from a more sensitive trans-lation of 'gender' into the Russian context instead of merely posing itself as a faint echo of a distant voice, whether from the past or other contexts.

---

[13] Valentina Konstantinova (1992) gives as an example of such patriarchal 'rationalizations' Solzhenitsyn's article 'How are we to structure Russia feasible considerations'(1990). In this article Solzhenitsyn expresses common for Slavophiles (Konstantinova refers to writings by Rasputin: 1990, Belov: 1990, Tolstaia: 1990 and Tokareva: (1989) and widely propagated views that '(T)oday the family is the key to saving our future. The woman must be given a chance to return to the family to bring up children and men's) pay must reflect this, though with anticipated unemployment in the initial stages it will not work successfully right away; some families would be better off if the woman continues to have a job for the time being'(cited in Konstantinova 1992:204).

Works cited

Baker, Mona
(1991). 'In Other words: A Coursebook on Translation' *Routledge* Pp. 180-215 (cohesion), 217-259 (coherence).

De Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W.W.
(1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Longman, Harlow.

Bell, Roger T.
(1991). *Translation and Translating: Theory and Practice.* Longman: London and New York.

Benjamin, Walter
(1973): *Illuminations Trans.* Harry Zohn, Fontana Charolles, M. (1983) 'Coherence as a Principle in the Interpretation of Discourse'; (Text 3, 1: 71-97).

Edmonson, Linda Harriet
(1984). *Feminism in Russia, 1900-17*. Heinemann Educarional Books Ltd.

Irigaray, Luce
(1993). *Sexes and Genealogies*. Trans. Gillian Gill. Cornell University Press.

Irigaray, Luce
(1994). *je, tu, nous : Toward a Culture of Difference*. Routledge.

Kollontai, A.
(1918). 'The Family and the Communist State'. In BVI *(* pp 67-77).

Kollontai, A.
(1923). 'Make Way for the Winged Eros'. In BVI (pp. 84-95).

Konstantinova, Valentina
(1992). The Women;s Movement in the USSR: A Myth or a Real Change*?'* In Shirin Rai Hilary Pilkingon & Annie Phizacklea (eds). Women in the Face of Change: the Soviet Union, Eastern Europe and China. Routledge

Krupskaya, N.
(1922). 'What a Communist Ought to Be Like'. IIn BVI (pp. 26-30).

Lenin
(1920]). 'Tasks of the Youth Leagues (Bourgeois and Communist Morality)' In BVI, (pp. 21-26).

Lewandowsky-Tomaszcyk, Barbara
(1993). 'Effability, Espressibility and Translation' in Barbara Lewandowsky-Tomaszcyk & Marcel Thelen (eds) Translation and Meaning Part 2. Rijkshogeschool Maastricht, Faculty of Translation and Interpreting (Netherlands).

Mamonova, T.
(1989). ' Russian Women's Studies: Essays on Sexism in Soviet Culture.' Pergamon Press

Nicholson, Linda
(1994). 'Interpreting Gender'. Signs: *Journal of Women, Culture and Society*, 20, 78-105.

George Z. Patrick
(1938). *Roots of Russian Language. An Elementary Guide to Russian Word-Building*. PH.D. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd.

Rimashevskaia, Natalía
(1992).*The new women's studies in Mary Buckley (ed) Perestroika and Soviet Women,* Cambridge University Press

Rosenberg, W.G. (Ed.)
(1990). *Bolshevik Visions: First Phase of the Cultural Revolution in Soviet Russia Part 1 (BVI) and Part 2* (BV2), The University of Michigan Press

Rozanov, Vasily
(1972*). Dostoevsky and the Legend of the Grand Inquisitor.*Transl. With afterword by Spencer E. Roberts. Cornell University Press.

Semashko, N.
(1919]. 'The Tasks of Public Health in Soviet Russia' . In BVI (pp. 130-133).

Semashko, N.
(1921). 'Work of the People's Commissariat of Health'. In BVI (pp. 139-146).

Solts, A.A.
(1922). 'Communist Ethics'. In BVI (pp. 30-43).

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravarty
(1993). *Outside in the Teaching Machine.* Routledge.

Steiner, G.
(1975). *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation van Gorcum.* Assen.

Stites, Richard
(1978). 'Women and the Russian Intelligentsia: Three Perspectives'. In WR (pp. 39-63).

Trotsky, L.
(1970). *Women and the Family Pathfinder Press.*

Trotsky, L.
(1923). 'From the Old Family to the New'. In BVI (pp. 77-84).

Trotsky, L.
(1924). 'Revolutionary and Socialist Art' In BV2 (pp. 275-292).

Vasilevsky, L.A. and L.M.
(1924).'The Sex Life of Man' .In BVI (p. 95-99).

Vinogradskay, P.
(1923). 'The 'Winged Eros'of Comrade Kollontai'. In BVI (pp. 12-121).

Genere and sesso in Italian Language and Feminism

Marina d'Amelia

In the Italian language both the word *genere* and the word *sesso* may be used to designate differences between the sexes, both biological differences but also social of psychological differences. This is at least theoretically the case: if on the one hand, we consider the relative ambiguity which distinguishes the history of the language (in this regard the interest by the most important dictionaries has tended to vary depending on whether they refer to a linguistic tradition covering a long period of time or current language today), if on the other hand, we isolate aspects which must be considered in order to understand the recent history of the word *gender*.

Obviously, what I mean by extra-linguistic aspects is the radical criticism which has swept over the field of linguistics, and the desire for linguistic innovation which characterised feminist theory in the past. Hence, the difficulty I have in limiting myself to an abstract linguistic treatment as found in the dictionaries, apart from the intentional context of whoever uses them.

In conclusion? While the element of intentional research of discontinuity and rupture which marked a period of women's research may give way, on the theoretical level, to research of continuity and intelligent recovery of the oldest linguistic traditions, it seems to me more difficult to ignore the use which *genere* and *sesso* have in today's spoken language.

A look at the linguistic tradition

Let us begin with the word *genere.* It is perhaps worth noting here that Wittgenstein's 'labyrinth of roads' is particularly stimulating with regards to language: the Latin origins - *genus-generis* is, in fact, related to *gignere-generare* and to the Greek words *yenos* gender, race, *yènois*-origin, *yiyomai* – to be born.

The term genere in Italian is a strong pole and is involved in a very wide range of discursive contexts.

As Salvatore Battaglia's *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana* points out, the term *genere* has such a great many meanings (15 listed[1]) that those usages which refer to the differences between the sexes are of secondary interest.

The primary grammatical definition of *genere* ('all those properties which in variable parts of speech (noun, pronoun, adjective article) language uses to distinguish the masculine from feminine sexes') representing the most basic level of literacy for Italians is mentioned only in the seventh place, coming after those definitions pertaining to the discursive practices of literature ('those classes by which the forms of literary expression are traditionally distinguished'), botany, music, all of which carry much more weight in the history of the Italian language.

I should point out that it is as part of philosophical discourse that the word *genere* includes the definition' all those individuals of a certain sex' alongside the various 'widest genus, most universal class' or 'substantial and accidental' and so on, according to the ontological connotations of classical logic.

While Battaglia's *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana* reminds us that this definition is a submeaning 'all men taken almost exclusively as the human race', we get quite a different picture if we look at the *Dizionario etimologico della lingua Italiana* by Manlio Cortellaxxo and Paolo Zolli. Here the word *genere* is given as indicating 'all those individuals of a certain sex' and is traced back to the sixteenth century. It appears to be contemporary with the other two meanings which are no less fundamental to the history of the language: 'systematic group used for classification' and 'type of composition presenting certain characteristics of content and form'.

---

[1] Including the locution in genere and the diminutive generino

Let us profit from this indication and look at it in relation to the great erudition of Battaglia's *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana*. The outstanding feature of this dictionary is to show by means of the great number of examples it provides, how much this use has entered the linguistic tradition and has been accepted by many writers. One need only be familiar with the history of the literary language to see how many intellectuals have used *genere* in the sense of 'all those individuals of certain sex'distinguishing between a *'feminine' genere (genere donnesco, genere femminile*) and a 'masculine' *genere*.

This is a usage which has been reinforced over time, also thanks to the wideness of the semantic field of *genere* which includes:

> ➢ quality, form, the way a fact is developed, or an action is performed, or a circumstance is determined;
> ➢ class, order, category, group of persons and, therefore, an individual in whom all the characteristics proper to her/his group are distinctly present;
> ➢ whom all the characteristics proper to her/his group are distinctly present;
> ➢ type of life form;

Unfortunately, here Battaglia refers to quotations only by men (from Pietro Aretino to Luigi Pirandello) while today, thanks to work done in the field of women's studies, one might well extend recognition to a usage of the term as employed by intellectual women in different periods of history. In this regard it might be interesting an *ad hoc* recognition elaborated by Athena for those countries in which we know answers exist that have a certain weight and interest.

A similar picture is provided by dictionaries which have been published more recently like Il *Grande Dizionario della Lingua Italiana Moderna,* which does no more than update the repertory of quotes already contained in Battaglia. But – it is worth mentioning – the meaning 'all those individuals of the same sex' completely disappears.

While the first example indicates that for the language of philosophy, jurisprudence and other disciplines *genere* is understood as 'a notion which comprises in itself a number of species and represents what is common to more species', according to the second definition, that of common speech, *genere* is 'the group of essential characteristics by means of which a thing is similar to others or different from others, and according to the definition is similar to quality sort of type'.

Thus, only things are dealt with here and not individuals or persons!

The *Lessico Universale Italiano* only gives *genere* as the human race alongside the definition of genere as a grammatical category.

At this point a problem arises. How to interpret the double passage in the *Lessico Universale Italiano* with respect to Battaglia's *Dizionario*: as a faithful transcription of what has occurred in usage, that is to say, a semantic impoverishment connected to modernity? Or rather, should we speak of a simple reception of what has already taken place in the spoken language? In this regard it should also be borne in mind that feminist women have refused to commit themselves to the term *genere femminine* to express their identity.

Let us now look at the term *sesso*: here too Salvatore Battaglia's *Grande Dizonario della Lingua Italiana* does not confine itself to the biological differences between the sexes, but includes among all the definitions it provides, social and behavioral aspects.
The first meaning of *sesso* given ('in sexually reproducing organisms the group of anatomical, morphological, physiological and behavioral characteristics which distinguish masculine from feminine individuals within the same species' and therefore 'the condition of male and female thus determined') is reinforced by the following list of meanings:

- ➢ 'the sum of individuals who because of these characteristics belong to one or the other of these genders';
- ➢ 'sexual activity, sexual relations, also from the point of view of various psychological, emotional, moral and cultural implications and regarding their implications both at the narrowly individual level and collectively';

In the history of the literary language we again find a wide variety of usages for the term sesso to indicate women collectively as opposed to men, and Battaglia's dictionary offers, as usual, a good number of examples: *sesso fragile, bel sesso, gentil sesso/sesso forte, sesso ruvido,* etc.

The word *sesso*, and above all its derivatives, has attracted a greater number of sexist connotations of various types and degrees than the word *genere.*
Sesso also has the meaning of backside, anus (from the Latin *sessus* the past participle of the verb *sedere*). But this definition (also present in Old French and in Catalan, *ses*) has been completely forgotten, except for a few expressions like *altro sesso, sesso proibito.*

The meaning provided by the *Lessico Universale Italiano* is distinctly more biological. The entry in this dictionary devotes a large amount of space to biology, the determination of the sexes, and the various modes of reproduction, in addition to a brief discussion on the history of religions. Thus according to the *Lessico Universale Italiano, sesso* is:

- ➢ 'the sum of anatomical and psycho-physical characteristics which distinguish male from female individuals in the same species.'
- ➢ 'the genital organs, male and female. '

According to the *Lessico universale Italiano* expressions like sesso *forte* (men) or *bel sesso* or *gentil* sesso (women) are now only used jokingly.

I am far from convinced that these locutions are on the way out in the language of every day speech or in the language of journalism. In many cases they are used in the opposite sense to attribute new meaning to new relationships between the sexes (which of the two sexes today is the *sesso forte*?)

In spoken language the first meaning *fare sesso*, *sesso a pagamento*, *sesso sicuro* and so on.

And feminist vocabulary

Italian feminists have come back several times to the question of the language and its sexist connotations. Positions vary between passive acceptance of the term gender and an attempt to find suitable translations. They have not, however, made the collective effort to solve the problem of finding a correct translation for the term *gender,* nor have they wondered about why this neologism has been so successful in Italy.

The need not to neglect this linguistic problem arose, in fact, when Joan Scott's article was translated into Italian in 1987. In the preface to the translation Paola di Cori stressed the difficulty of using the term *gender* for two main reasons:

- ➢ a difficulty of literary translation (in Italian is not possible to use the past participle[2])
- ➢ in English *gender* implies a more obvious idea of sex difference and this is not the case for *genere*.

While the first of these two observations is quite valid (as all those which stress how the Italian *genere* includes too many different things and that it is necessary to be specific) the second reason is less valid, in the light of considerations we have already made on Battaglia's *Grande Dizionario*.

---

[2] P.Di Cori, 'Dalla storia delle donne ad una storia di genere', in *Rivista di Storia Contemporanea,* 1987, 4, pp.548-559.

What initially appealed to those who adopted the word *gender* was the fact that it went beyond the mere physical aspect of the body understood as a natural given, that it offered the possibility of an ongoing mutability in masculine or feminine identity within a context in which male and female are the result of changing social, cultural and linguistic constructions.[3]

The reason why feminists choose *genere* (which has however declined) instead of *sesso* is that *genere* takes into account a group of processes and cultural modalities through which society transforms biological sexuality into differences between men and women and imbalances of power. In other words, the capacity to support the observation that there is an unequal distribution of power among the sexes.

Genere, on the other hand, has not been the object of attention as a part of the linguistic tradition except in the general sense 'way of classifying into types'. Simonettea Piccone Stella deals at length with the linguistic conditions which precede the introduction of *genere* into feminist studies (women's issues, condition of women, subordination of one sex to the other, the two sexes, sexual roles all comprise the semantic field used). This is one of the rare attempts to understand the preceding context and the need for linguistic innovation.
At the same time Piccone Stella also points out the ambiguity which *genere* and the identity of genere risk producing in research in Italy: the risk that in the absence of rich elaboration of men's studies, on transgender or post-transgender studies, *genere* will come to be almost solely identified with the feminine.

The rapid success of the word *gender* in Italy (extended to *gender studies*) adopted enthusiastically by many women scholars and historians was followed by an equal measure of hostility and a good deal of mistrust. Many felt the term to be anonymous and that because of its foreign origin, it tended to ignore the political aspect and the character of autonomous research and conquest of recognition for the history of women on the Italian intellectual scene. The preferred to use the more Italian *storia delle donne or studi femministi.*

The word gender is still undergoing a process of sedimentation while at the same time research continues into suitable translations. It is not possible to say where this will arrive.

The result is that the picture provided by the current state of research is very eclectic and includes a very wide range of linguistic behaviours"

> ➢ the use of the term gender (in italics) generally preferred by those scholars who tend to make the most frequent use of English words. *Gender* has entered into common usage along with trend, household, welfare, network analysis;
> ➢ the use of the term gender accompanied by an explanatory footnote;
> ➢ contamination of different definitions by accumulation or because they are used interchangeably. Here we move from *genere* to *ruoli sessuali* and *differenza sessuale.* In many studies, be they historical or literary, political or sociological, not only are *genere* and *differenza sessuale* treated as synonyms, but we are witnessing a very interesting widening of the semantic field: *prospettiva di genere*, *differenza di genere, disugualianze di genere*; definitions of the attributions and equilibria of genere.
> ➢ avoidance of the problem and the adoption of the words *maschile* and *femminile.*

Concluding remarks

With a few compromises and a few contaminations with the term *differenza sessuala* which I have just mentioned, the term *gendere* has by now imposed itself in the discursive practices of many historians, sociologists and writers. In addition to this, the term *genere* after playing an important role in the process of self-identification and a sense of belonging to an intellectual community appears at the same time to be a programmatic concept which indicates prospects for future research and general orientation.

---

[3] S. Piccone Stella, C. Saraceno (eds), La storia di un concetto e di un dibattito Introduzione a Genere, Bologna Il Mulino 1996.

It is to a large extent the diversity of questions and concrete problems which women historians, sociologists, writers and philosophers encounter in their research which accounts for the different theoretical weight assumed by various linguistic terms in recent years. (In the Italian lacking of women's studies as such).

There would be nothing to prevent the use of *genere* instead of *gender* to indicate biological aspects as well as the social aspects of being men or women in the complex and relational sense of the term as used by Joan Scott.

But, in reality, a number of difficulties would arise in the spoken language. Apart from glottologists, intellectuals and graduate students, who would be able to understand whether or not we are speaking about the differences between the sexes?

Other meanings have prevailed in spoken Italian: those related to food (*generi alimentari*) to be seen displayed in grocery shops around the peninsula and *generi* donoting a specific family relation. *Generi* used as a plural in Italian means sons-in-law.

In everyday use a very common confusion exists with regard to the term *generico* which means 'not having specific characteristics, indistinct, ordinary' and the more learned 'having to do with *genere*, pertaining to or referring to *genere'*.

Feminist intellectuals are thus faced with a false alternative: whether they use the term gender in English or *genere* in Italian they will only be reaching a very restricted number of persons.

Gender versus Género

Sandra Pereira Rolle

'The use in Spanish of the term 'género' which is used to designate the distinction of sexes in political, and not grammatical'[1]

In Spanish[2] the use of the word *género (*from the Latin genus-eris) as an equivalent of the English term gender is not free of polemic. In Spanish the word for sex is sexo, and if we look into the Dictionary of the Spanish Language[3] we find that sexo denotes:

1. The sum of organic factors that distinguish the male from the female;
2. A group of individuals that belong to one (male) or other (female) sex;
3. Sexual organ.

Therefore *sexo* in Spanish is the term used to characterise biologically the sex of individuals. In the case of the term *género* we see as this word has a grammatical category. Taking as reference the dictionary mentioned above, *género* has the following meanings:

1. Group of beings with common attributes;
2. Merchandise/Goods;
3. Fabric;
4. Grammatical category that indicates the sex of substantives: male, female or neuter.

As in English the term gender can admit a grammatical and sexist sense, in Spanish the word *género* has a specific grammatical character. The adaptation of terms from foreign languages into Spanish is usually a long and difficult process. In the case of *género* as gender is not different. Though from the middle of the 1970s the use of *género*, not as a grammatical concept but as a social and cultural one in Spanish feminism became generalised, this was not common in other realms of the Spanish society. Moreover, we cannot find many articles about the debate gender/*género* in Women's Studies journals in Spain, perhaps because the equivalence of *género* for gender is more accepted in the academia. As I mentioned before the introduction of *género* with the meaning of gender into Spanish language has created a certain polemic. In the last years through the proliferation of an interest for gender issues in Spanish society, the use of this term has been brought up to 'national debate'.
More specifically last year a polemic appeared after the publication of an article by Cristina Alberdi (signed by other seven feminists, too), in the Spanish newspaper *El Pais* titled Violencia de Género[4] (Gender Violence). The main subject of discussion was whether género should be used with the meaning of the English term gender, or to make use of Spanish terms that can be adapted to cover the necessity of expression by a part of the Spanish society. The use in this way of género was accused of being elitist in the article *Sexo solo Sexo*[5] by Camilo Valdecantos, the reader defender, because that way of using the language is not popularly accessible. On the other side this article also gives alternatives, instead of using violencia de génereo (gender violence), perhaps a better solution could be violencia del varón (male violence) or violencia del sexo masculion (male sex violence). Vicente Molina Foix, who answered with an article in the same newspapers to this polemic, gave quite a interesting solution to this 'political' problem: why not to write *género* between inverted commas?[6]
What this discussion points out is the difficulty of the adaptation of an important concept such as gender into a Roman language as Spanish. By now in academia de term género is equivalent to gender, and courses concerning gender issues are taught in most of the

---

[1] Cristina Alberdi, former Minister of Social Affairs, and Socialist delegate. (My own translation).
[2] As Spanish, we mean the Castilian or Castellano language. We must point out this in order to create misunderstanding since Spain as State recognise four languages; Catalan, Basque, Galician and Castilian or Spanish.
[3] Real Academia Española, Diccionario de la Lengua Española, Madrid, 1992.
[4] El País, 18th February 1999.
[5] http://www.presenciaciudadana.org.mx/articuloelpais.html
[6] El País, 9th of March 1999.

Spanish universities. As the English language is the lingua franca of our times, perhaps it would be easier to use gender as such and not to translate it as *género*.

Whatever is used in Spanish *gender* or *género* is obvious that the situation of women in Spanish society is a subject of concern and that it must be discussed deeply. Therefore it is refreshing in a way to recycle the Spanish language and to give room for creativity to subjects related to women issues.

Works cited

Alberdi, Cristina
Violencia de Género. El Pais, 28 de Febrero de 1999.

Bock, Gisela
(1999). La Historia de las Mujeres y la Historia des Género: Aspectos de un Debate Internacional. *Historia Social* no. 9, Instituto de *Historia Social*, UNED, Valencia.

Corominas J.& Pascual J.A.
(1984). Diccionario Critico Etimológico Castellano e Hispánico, Vol.III, Ed.Gredos, Madrid.

García Monton Pilar
(1999) Cómo Hablan las Mujeres. Cuadernos de Lengua Española. Ed.Arco Iris S.L. Madrid.

Molina Foix Vicente. El Género Epiceno. *El Pais*, 9 de Marzo de 1999.

Molina María. Diccionario del Uso del Español. Vol.I, Ed. Gredos, Madrid, 1992.

Real Academia Española. Diccionario de la Lengua Española, Madrid, 1992.

Valdecantos Camilo, Sexo, sólo Sexo.
http://www.presenciaciudadana.or.mx/articuloelpais.html

Gender – Género; Diferença Sexual; Sexo

Ana Gabriela Macedo

The translation of this concept in Portuguese, after Simone de Beauvoir's famous claim that 'one is not born, but becomes a woman'(1949) and its development by the Anglo-American feminist critique since the 70s, has been quite controversial, particularly among feminist scholars and critics. The term has however gradually assimilated in common speech (in part due to the impact of the media), and often unproblematically used in different fields of knowledge and areas of study.

The polemics revolves, first of all, around the fact that 'Género' presents a semantic ambiguity in Portuguese and may be, therefore, potentially inaccurate. In fact, 'Género', besides being used to designate a grammatical category – masculine/feminine – also refers, in Portuguese, to distinct literary modes or categories – the poetic, narrative or dramatic 'género' (for which the word in English would be 'genre'). For this reason and as an alternative formulation, the expression 'Diferença Sexual' (Sexual Difference) has also been used, bearing the same awareness of the mark of alterity and the social construction of identity.

The term 'Sex' is also used and often preferred by some critics, on the grounds of the awkward translation of the concept of 'Gender' in Portuguese, allied to its imputed redundancy within the feminist sex/gender politics where, as Donna Haraway has written, 'the political and explanatory power of the 'social' category of gender depends upon historicizing the categories
of sex, flesh, blood, race, and nature in such a way that the binary, universalizing opposition that spawned the concept of the sex/gender system at particular time and place in feminist theory implodes into articulated, differentiated, accountable, located and consequential theories of embodiment, where nature is no longer imagined and enacted as resource to culture or sex to gender'(Haraway, *Gender for a Marxist Dictionary*, 1991:148).

The sex/ gender in European French-speaking contexts

Maria Puig de la Bellacasa

The problems of translation of the sex/gender binary into French are mainly linked to the difficulties of translating the notion of 'gender'.

Dictionaries

The translation of gender into French is genre, but feminist meanings of gender are not easily covered by this term. The main contemporary meanings of *genre* (from Latin *genus*) are:

➢ Grammatical gender: a classificatory that distinguishes groups of words (mainly masculine/feminine/neuter but not only);
➢ Type, kind, species: a general taxonomical classificatory category;
➢ Style or category of art or literature.

While a word has a *genre*, a person has a sex, and this is reflected in the translation that some English-French dictionaries give to gender: the first, strictly grammatical [1] is *genre*, the second one is sex. In addition, because genre covers such a large semantic field and has a common usage is difficult to make space for the feminist meaning of 'social sex', originally coined in Anglo-American contexts.

Thus, French-speaking contexts are reluctant to use the word genre to design gender, but this is changing. The sex/gender distinction and the concept of gender have been used in French-speaking contexts in spite of this linguistic inflexibility. Historical, theoretical and political factors explain this phenomenon. Focusing on France and French-speaking Belgium what follows are some elements to approach this complex scene.

Academy

Gender – as *genre* – appears, in French-speaking academic contexts, in research on/by/for women of the late 80's. Debates on the notion are complex and evolutions differ from one discipline to another.

For instance, French feminist historians have played an important role in spreading the concept. A very important moment was the publication by the Belgian-French review Les Cahier du Grif of a special issue entitled *'Le genre de l'histoire.'* This issue included the French translation of Joan W. Scott's influential article: '*Genre. Une categorie utile d'analyse historique.*' Feminist genre appears thus in French with an already charged conceptual background: as the feminist attempt to break with biological determinism, as a relational category, and as the concept with political connotations[2].
During the nineties publications that specify the word *genre* in the title proliferate – surely a very modest proliferation if compared to the presence of 'gender' in Anglo-American publisher's catalogues. These are mainly publications of conferences and meetings using the dimension of genre to approach one discipline or topic even though an interdisciplinary

---

[1] Going deeper into grammar and genre it is possible to find a sub-distinction between 'grammatical' and 'natural' genre (as a functionderived analogically from grammatical gender). A word as father has a 'natural'masculine gender because a father is man. The constructed character of 'natural' genre that was pointed by the first anglo-american definitions of gender out of the cultural connotations of grammar could also therefore be explored through this linguistic subtilities. Grand Robert, Paris, 1989.
[2] I will take up here the theoretical and political debates as the preferability of a 'gender' or 'sexual difference' approach, the binarism of the sex/gender distinction etc. This debates are of course very important to the issue but they are not specific of French-speaking contexts which is the object of this short piece.

conference published in 1991. *Sexe et genre*, highlights and focuses on the sex/gender distinction[3].

Articles and sections are more numerous than books and words as '*sexe*', '*femmes*' or '*rapports sexués*'(sexual relations) are preferred by editors as more attractive in book titles – genre being considered as an unknown term from the public[4]. Often when the notion appears in a book title, an introduction on its meaning is provided.

The notion is mainly used in history and in social and political sciences. Development studies have been also seduced by *genre* in the second half of the nineties and '*genre et development*' has replaced 'femmes et dévelopment'. Appealing to the relational character of the gender category, this replacement has been theorized as the passage from a focus on 'problems of women' to a focus on problems caused by 'relations between the genders' – though without forgetting to develop specific research on women[5]

Of course, research on the '*rapports sociaux de sexe*'(expression used by some sociologists to design 'social' sex) is developed even when the notion is avoided (for theoretical, political or strategically reasons). In such contexts there is also a 'generational' remark to be made: young researches are more likely to use the word as part of their research vocabulary than their older colleagues. International research networks have contributed to spread the notion. *Pluri-multi* or *trans*-disciplinary networks are also sites of conceptual contagion, not surprisingly feminist researchers working in more 'unidisciplinary' national frameworks have difficulties to use a notion not recognized or simply not understood by their 'peers'.

It is also possible to notice that specialized dictionaries and glossaries edited during the nineties are beginning to include '*genre*': introduced under sections with headings as '*gender (genre)*'[6]; 'sexes (differentiation des)'[7] or 'féminisme'[8]. Only exceptionally '*sexe/genre*' is itself a heading[9]. From a feminist/Women's Studies point of view it is important to note the recent publication in France of a *Dictionnaire crititique dus féminisme* – which includes a sexe en *genre* heading as well as other headings as sciences et *genre*[10].

Institutions

International and European institutions have been crucial in the expansion of the word. For instance, the platform of the Beijing, UN, 1995 conference imposed 'gender' as an omnipresent *evident* concept linked to the women's movement though it's meaning remains polyvocal. This fact reveals political and theoretical conflicts and confusions that I will not develop here because they are not specific to French-speaking contexts.

It is striking to notice when browsing into library websites that a huge percent of the titles encoded with the word *genre* (with the 'social sex' meaning) are official publications from the European Commission or other publications (e.g.: from Swiss and French Canadian institutions of equality). In the context of European Union's the use of genre has imposed itself (or been imposed) not without some resistance from the commission translators.

---

[3] Sexe en genre. Hurtig et al. CNRS, 1991. This publication includes an influential article by Christine Delphy that was later translated into English and published in *Women's Studies International Forum* 16, 1993 no.1.

[4] F. Thébaud, in *Ecrire l'histoire des femmes,* ENS Editions, Fontenay/St Cloud 198, p.112.

[5] Développement au Masculin/Féminine. Le genre: autil d'un nouveau concept, Isabelle Jacquet, L'Harmattan, Paris, 1995.

[6] *Dictionnaire de la Psychanalyse* E. Rudinesco & M. Plon, Fayard, Paris 1997.

[7] Sexes (differentiation des)'by Nicole Claude Mathieu in, P. Bart, M Izarod (dir.) *Dictionnaire de l'ethnologie et de l'anthroplogie.* Presses Universitaires de France, 1992.

[8] *Dictionare des notions philophiques*, Publications Universitaires de France, 1990.

[9] *Dictionare fundamental de la psychologie.* Larousse, Paris 1997.

[10] Hirata, H.F., Laborie, H. Le Doaré, D. Sénotier (coord). Paris, Presses universitaires de France 'Politique d'aujourd'hui ', 2000.

This institutional success of the word is influential in the fact that non academic feminist structures (permanent education centres, associations or NGO's) – often at the threshold of public institutional policy making and research – are using genre and organizing meetings and seminars.

Genre is becoming the institutional 'obligatory' word to refer to issues concerning women or equality between the sexes. Thus, *genre* is in French in an ambiguous position: it is still a 'minority' word that represents the difficulties of the feminist approach to gain a space in the disciplines. At the same time, it is appearing as a 'dominant' word in public institutions, imposed by an internationalizing move whose language is English.

Genre has a space in French language, but which space? That is something that is to be permanently (re)constructed and (re)thought; a conceptual space with political implications.

Concluding remarks

It is useful to remember that the feminist Anglo-American meaning of 'gender' and its variations didn't exist in dictionaries before the early eighties, it was not an evident meaning of the word either. Gender is a concept that conquered a space of it's own in Anglo-American academic, institutional, public spaces, the media and finally…in dictionaries.

Its relative absence in French responds to many factors. Brought together, this factor translate cultural, political and theoretical resistances but also it also reveals the fact that feminist research has been less promoted and supported in French speaking contexts (in universities, institutions) during the last twenty years than it has been in Anglo-American contexts. It is therefore important to support and implement Women's studies research in French speaking European contexts and international networks or crucial for this.

The role of the politics of translation is also important here, very little work by Anglo-American feminists is translated into French. It is important to be able to relay feminist debates in other languages (e.g. the (re)questioning of the binarism of the sex/gender distinction). European feminists are sometimes worried by the domination of American feminist agendas and resisting to 'gender 'seems to be an issue in these debates because the concept may not respond or reflect other possibilities offered by other feminist traditions and languages.[11] This is very important for translation is a back and forth movement between two languages, implying power relations. Thus, the introduction of the notion of *genre* remains a complex issue because this notion carries meanings marked by a history started and developed in Anglo-American contexts. The increasing hegemony of the concept risks to erase the importance of local feminist research and traditions and their own political, cultural and historical specificities, not to speak of the diversity of feminist theoretical and political standpoints. This is not merely a 'nationalistic' problem or a 'cultural protectionist' preoccupation but a contested issue, not easily solved. It is important to keep in mind times of a European integration that runs the risk of homogenizing cultures.

It is not less true, that to be able to challenge the so-called 'American domination' in feminist issues we need to be able to work on the issues this tradition has built. Even if we want to transform or contest these issues, as the sex/gender distinction, we need to translate them in order to negotiate it, readapt it or even reject it.
Because languages are strongly inter-twined with cultures it is difficult to say if it is a culture that produces language or language that produces culture. The 'gender culture' that is being produced in European context is a new territory for feminists. This poses many questions. Which directions will the becomings of feminist (and non feminist) gender cultures take? What role are European (and in this case French-speaking feminists) going to play in this constant (re)tracing of language and power maps? English is a dominant language but as all dominant languages it is being transformed by the ones it dominates and assimilates. English is also the language of international alliances and resistances. French is also historically a dominant language, but in some contexts (as EU institutions) it is in a minoritarian position.

---

[11] Cf: Karin Widerberg, 'Translating gender' in NORA no. 2 1998, volume 6.

How can we exploit as feminists this position as one of resistance without falling into macho-nationalistic confrontations? How are we to welcome the new visibility of *genre* in institutions as signifying an increased interest for equality while resisting the depolisation of the notion? All these questions are part of the construction of a French *genre* culture and politics.

A Short Review of the Finnish Concept "sukupuoli" (gender)

Kirsti Lempiäinen

The concept for gender in the Finnish language is "sukupuoli", which literally means "half of the kinship/half of the family". The implications of the concept are quite clear. Gender is a relationship, gender is always half of the relationship which makes the "family" full. It is a heterosexual notion although sexuality is hidden, except for its reproductive aspects (cf. Rantalaiho 1997, 21; Pulkkinen 1993). Sukupuoli creates a relational construction, or even structure, instead of (sexual) difference. It is actually similar to the concept of gender which can be a sexless and fleshless notion. "Puoli" can also be translated as side, so the female and male are sided, they have their own places in cultural and social contexts. Although equality has been an official policy in Finland for a long time now, there are still places and spaces in social life which are gendered in a bipolar way; for instance the strong segregation in working life.

As Merja Kinnunen (1995; cf. 2001) has suggested, the word sukupuoli appeared in 1865 for the first time in written form in Finland in the official demographic statistics. Kinnunen states that sukupuoli is formed by the different and separate development of the words suku and puoli, and that there has been a sort of formal or doctrinal interest to put them together into one word. Suku refers to foetus, family, ancestry, clan, relative, "being alike", child, breed, quality, to conceive, to inseminate, and to the adverbs 'little', 'some', 'a few' (The Etymological Dictionary of the Finnish language IV 1980, 1098).

Puoli refers to half, gender (!), kinship, side and area (The Origin of the words in the Finnish language, part 2, manuscript 11.5.1995) and also to decrease, to bisect, to halve, to favour, a dichotomy, to defend, to divide, incomplete, a cask of beer, consort (half), marriage partner (mate), "other sex", to another who belongs to other sex, filling, defenceless, helpless, effete, excessive, asymmetrical, enormous, poor, impecunious (without means), anchor and safety ("tower of strength") (The Etymylogical Dictionary of the Finnish language III 1962, 646, ref. Kinnunen 1995, 41-45). "Menhalves", "wifehalves" (together with children), women, wives, "sexe masculin", "sexe feminin" were the actual words used in the statistics. Kinnunen (1992) states that "wifehalf" refers to married women and that unmarried women were categorised as "unmarried wives".

Auli Hakulinen has discussed what the doctrinal interest in creating the concept is, and she argues that the interest was awakened by the philological revolution in which the Finnish language was brought out from the shadow of the Swedish[1]. Hakulinen states that:

> - *The word 'suku' (family) comes from the verb 'sukea, siittää' (to sire), the same way as the word 'puku' (dress) has its origin in the verb 'pukea' (to dress). This is very old Finnish language. Neologisms were made in those days under the leadership of Elias Lönnrot, by taking words straight from the dialects, or by deriving new words from old basic words or by combining two old words into a compound. 'Family-half', meaning gender is a very transparent, even 'logical' compound, whoever may have halved it.[2]*

Hakulinen's reference to logic in this context probably means that the Finnish society was (and still is) a heterosexual and family centered social system, so that there are not many options offered for other sexual and gendered subject positions. The overall Finnish message about sukupuoli is that what is important is who you are related to and that you are only a half without the other (opposite) sex. You cannot be "whole" in the Finnish gender. On the other hand, I would also like to argue that the Finnish society at a public and official level is strangely genderless, although there is a strong reference to banal sexuality in everyday practices, e.g. schools, working places, universities (Lempiäinen 2000). Part of the gender neutrality may be due to the strong equality politics in Finland but, partly it may be explained by the overall ethos of the Nordic, protestant society.

Päivi Lappalainen (1996) has argued that the notion sukupuoli also bears signs of biology and sexuality. The halved nature of the word evokes reproduction and family. She points out that sexuality can be translated in Finnish sukupuolisuus which further emphasizes the strong union between sexuality, gender and reproduction, and which then makes a basis for the heterosexual matrix as Judith Butler calls it.

The feminist scholars in Finland have of course not settled with the heterosexual and bipolar notion of gender - the conceptualization of gender in Women's Studies[3] is rich (Liljeström 1996). The Anglo-US sex/gender division inspired feminist scholars in the early 1980s and from there on the debate has continued towards a contextualized and localized knowledge on gender. The gender system, a term further theoreticised in the Nordic feminist circles and introduced in Finland by Liisa Rantalaiho, has kept its position especially in the social sciences, and it's worth noting that the graduate school in the area of Women's Studies is called "Sukupuolijärjestelmä" (gender system). There are also many other conceptualizations of gender in Women's Studies which come from different origins; for instance sukupuoli as a sexual difference; as a style; as a technology; as a performance and so on. As the new millennium was approaching, the embodied nature of sexual difference has, in my opinion, given rise to more and more questions about the ways of understanding gender in the Finnish academia.

References

Kinnunen, Merja
(1992): 'The construction of gender in the classifications of social positions'. Unpublished working paper in Gendered practices in working life – a workshop with Joan Acker, Murikka 14.-18.9.1992.

Kinnunen, Merja
(1995).'Tilastojen sukupuoli. Lisensiaatin tutkielma. Tampereen yliopiston sosiologian ja sosiaalipsykologian laitos'. (*The gender of statistics*. Unpublished Licentiate's thesis. Department of sociology and social psychology at University of Tampere.)

Kinnunen, Merja
(2001). Luokiteltu sukupuoli. (The categorisized gender.) Tampere: Vastapaino.

Lappalainen, Päivi
(1996). 'Kvinna och kön är NAINEN och SUKUPUOLI på finska'. ("Woman and gender are Nainen and Sukupuoli in Finnish".) *Nytt fra Nikk* nr 2/96 (pp. 9-10).

Lempiäinen, Kirsti
(2000). 'Being Finnish as a context for gender. A case study on sociological texts'. In Leppänen, Sirpa & Kuortti, Joel: Inescapable horizon. Culture and context. Research Unit for Contemporary Culture, University of Jyväskylä, (pp. 87-111).

Liljeström, Marianne
(1996). 'Sukupuolijärjestelmä'. ("The gender system".) In Koivunen, Anu & Liljeström, Marianne (eds.): Avainsanat. 10 askelta feminismiin. (The key words. 10 steps towards feminism.) Tampere: Vastapaino (pp.111-138).

Pulkkinen, Tuija
(1993). 'Keinotekoista seksiä. Luonto, luonnottomuus ja radikaali sukupuolipolitiikka'. ("Artifical sex. Nature, freaks and radical sexual politics".)
Tiede & edistys, 18:3 (pp. 298-313).

Rantalaiho, Liisa
(1997). 'Contextualizing gender'. In Liisa Rantalaiho and Tuula Heiskanen (eds): *Gendered Practices in Working Life*. Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire and London: Macmillan Press Ltd (pp.16-30.).

[1] Finland has two official languages, Finnish and Swedish. Finnish got its official place aside Swedish in 1863 when Finland was a Grand Duchy in the Russian empire (1809-1917) after having been a part of the Swedish kingdom for centuries.

[2] Comment on the Finnish e-mail list *Naistutkimus* 27.4.1997; translated by kl.

[3] Women's Studies covers many different studies on gender in Finland, e.g. studies on sexuality, equality, even studies on masculinity, and so forth. The debate whether the name of Women's Studies should be changed to "Gender Studies" (or in Swedish "genus vetenskap") has started mainly by those who do not themselves function in the field of Women's Studies, which is an interesting detail.

From a "non-science" to gender analyses? Usage of sex/gender in Hungarian

Andrea Pető

The Hungarians are notoriously famous for their pessimism. In a comparative study of the different national anthems, the Hungarian one turned to have the most pessimistic and the most depressed lyrics. This pessimistic "national character" is also obvious if we look at the translations of sex/gender into Hungarian: since both terms are translated with the same word: nem, which equals with the negative particle (non or no). The first written document to introduce gender studies in the Hungarian higher education system was, accordingly, submitted to the accrediting institution under the title of a proposal to accredit "a non-science" (nem-tudomany). Needless to say, it met with very limited success.

In the Hungarian scientific discourse, the most common way to translate gender and sex, is by inserting an attributive adjective, which is differentiating between social sex and biological sex. However, the situation is more complicated and it also offers further ground for the legendary Hungarian pessimism. I compared three official (meaning governmental) translations of the terms sex and gender in the very same document: one published in Slovenia in 1998, and two attempts by the Hungarian Ministry of Social and Family Affaires which hosts the Secretariat for Women's Representation in 1999 and in 2000 to illustrate the problems with the translations.[1]

The translation of the term sex is easy, because it can be translated directly to nem, and to its attributive form: nemi. The term sexual is even easier: it is translated in Hungarian as sexual (szexualis), and everybody seems to know what that means. The trouble starts with sex/gender system, which is translated in the Slovenian version "a system based on gender", in the first Hungarian version "a system between genders" and in the updated version as "a system between men and women." These differences in the translation reflect the first problem: narrowing down the meanings of gender in the best case to men and women, but more frequently simply to women. Moreover, in this translation the construction process is unclear and the self-reflexivity of gender is impossible to comprehend from the translation.

The second problem in translation appears if we look at different versions of translating the term gender. In the Slovenian version we find the simple negative particle: nem, the first Hungarian version comes up with the translation of "social role of genders" as a translation, and in the updated version again with "nem", but inserting a comment in brackets that this term refers to a "social gender", whatever that means. Using the much-debated social role theory for translating gender is one option for the translators. It works smoothly in translating the term gender analyses to "analyzing the social gender roles" in the updated Hungarian version.

The other linguistic tool available for the Hungarian translators is totally alien to the strict linguistic meanings of gender, but it fits into the political agenda of gender research. This statement can be illustrated with the translation of the term: "gender blind", which is translated in the Slovenian version as "non-sensitive to gender", in the first Hungarian translation as "ignorance of equal treatment" and in the second version as "non-sensitive to differences of social genders". In the Hungarian translation "equal treatment" and "social equality" are used as synonyms of gender, which are referring to the political agenda of the gender.

The question that should be asked at this point is: would it not be easier to simply adopt the word gender into the Hungarian language? It would be technically easier than clumsily struggling with nem, although, it is easier to use it in its inflected forms. But adopting a term in English would unavoidably raise the problems around the definition of gender. That is one of the problems; it is difficult to find two academics that would share without a fierce argument the same definition of gender. Moreover, in Hungary gender is very often used to substitute "women" so as to make a more "modern" impression on the audience.

I personally never encountered any difficulties when I am using in my writing or teaching in Hungarian the distinction between "social gender" and "biological gender"

(biologiai/tarsadalmi nem). This locution offers an intellectually and politically acceptable framework for social analyses. I also find it important that we should finish the translational debate and test our terminology in the field: in translating those works which were previous unavailable in our country because of the Iron Curtain[2]. The Cold War was not only a war between political but also between linguistic systems, and the language of liberty won. It is only a question of time until Hungarian society will face the task of building a new political system, one that acknowledges inequalities and that develops a new body of social knowledge and vocabulary, which recognises gender distinctions as a part of human dignity and freedom. That might even change the legendary Hungarian pessimism…

---

[1] *10 languages 100 words for equality*. Vlada Republike Slovenije, Urad za zensko politiko, Ljubjana 1998, *100 szó az egyenlőségről. A férfiak és nők közötti egyenlőséggel kapcsolatos kifejezések glosszáriuma, (*100 words for equality. The glossary of words of equality bertween men and women*)* Szociális és Családügyi Minisztérium, Budapest , 1999. *100 szó az egyenlőségről. A férfiak és nők közötti egyenlőséggel kapcsolatos kifejezések szójegyzéke*, Szociális és Családügyi Minisztérium, Budapest, 2000,
[2] See the series run by the Balassi Publishing House in Budapest: *Feminism and History* and the Csokonai in Debrecen: *Artemisz*, which publishes translations in the field of Gender Studies.

Translating Gender: the Bulgarian Case

Miglena Nikolchina

The various attempts to translate "gender" - a concept that, as all too often has been pointed out, was disseminated by Anglo-American feminism - into Bulgarian have produced a proliferation of terms. This proliferation is presently creating its own problem field and is opening a curious perspective on the theoretical and practical implications of the sex/gender distinction. The various translations might hence be regarded as turning inside-out the internal multiplicity of the concept itself – by, on the one hand, exposing its contradictions and, on the other, spelling out its manifold potentials. Each translation thus becomes a meta-reflection on the issues that the concept is raising or trying to solve: the nature/culture division, essentialism, sexual difference and the appropriate praxis for confronting questions of inequality and discrimination. Beyond this, the very impossibility for agreement as to the "proper" translation lays bare the fact that feminism cannot be regarded as a monolithic doctrine, but is rather a field of contention that cuts across any debate today. Rather than complain, as sometimes has been done, about the intranslatability or the alien character of "gender," in what follows I will try to emphasize the productive "dialogic" encounter that materializes in the different renditions of the term.

Rod is the Bulgarian word for grammatical gender that, after a lot of deliberation, was postulated as the most unobtrusive translation of the feminist term by the Bulgarian Association of University Women. In recent years, among many other cases, it has appeared in two important normative collections prepared by BAUW: one with translated texts and one with texts by Bulgarian scholars.[1] In spite of its equivalence to the English term in so far as grammar is concerned, rod is nevertheless a problematic choice because of its other meanings. On the one hand, these meanings mostly refer to blood kinship and filiation; they are related to the words for "give birth" and "motherland," and make possible the frequent usage of the word as a synonym for "nation" or "people". On the other hand, these meanings are unmistakably "a-sexual", the type of relatedness they imply is organic in a manner that takes us to vegetative and agricultural inspirations (the Mother Earth gives birth to everything that grows), and the growth and connectedness they celebrate are concerned with maternal continuities rather than differences and divisions. To put it short, the choice of this word as the translation for "gender" inscribes the idea of grammar differences (there are three genders in Bulgarian whose artificiality is sometimes laid bare as in the case of the most acceptable word for the male organ, being in the feminine) into the larger framework of kinship and continuity. The grammar meanings of gender divisions thus appear as a fragile superstructure over the continuity of flesh and blood: whatever is essentialist about rod, it does not concern the sexes. The choice of rod was hence dictated not by essentialist meanings but by the desire and the hope that gender issues could be smoothly smuggled into the general fields of discussion: not through conflict or confrontation but through relatedness and togetherness. Consequently, the removal of a certain edge, that is, precisely the edge of sexuation, of the drama of sex per se, as well as the drama of disagreement and division, was the price for this attempt at an unbiased "integrationist" approach.

Curiously enough, this drama with ensuing conflicts and discontents was brought into focus precisely by the translation of "gender" by the Bulgarian word for sex, pol. This bold move materialized a year ago in the newly established MA/PhD Program for Gender Studies at the Sofia University Department of Philosophy whose title in Bulgarian was finally formulated as Center for Social Research on Gender (pol). Although it could appear in phrases of the type "the stronger pol" or "the fair pol", in most cases pol used to have until quite recently an almost clinical meaning, very narrowly referring to the sexual organs, the sexual act, or to sexually transmitted diseases. That these medical and anatomical preoccupations could be brought into the focus of social research and even merit an interdisciplinary post-graduate program was in itself a challenging message. Yet, the use of pol in this novel manner was also facilitated by some additional linguistic developments. One of them was the gradual displacement of pol from its traditional usages by the lingua franca word "sex." While "sex" was marking the changes in sexual mores and invading larger and larger territories, pol was shrinking and even beginning to acquire a somewhat archaic and hence more abstract flavor. To put it differently, the broadening of the usages of "sex" expropriated the essentialist aspects of pol, its deployments as "nature," and exposed its etymological closeness to the Bulgarian word for "half" and "divide". This endowed the otherwise trivialized medical connotations of pol with a philosophical potential that pointed back towards Aristophanes' myth in Plato's Symposium: according to this myth, the creation of both heterosexual and homosexual women and men was the result of the division, literally the halving of certain primal unitary creatures. The result was that, in marked contrast to rod, the present usage of pol (as in the name of the Sofia University post-graduate program) testified to a somewhat aggressive intention to

emphasize division (sexual difference), individual (be it man's or woman's) incompletion, as well as debate and contention of the proper approach to gender issues.

It seems clear to me that the duality of these two most frequently used renditions of gender (I tend to use them both – with a growing preference for pol - depending on the context) expounds the sex/gender debates not so much in terms of the essentialist/anti-essentialist opposition, but rather in terms of a certain understanding of the praxis of feminist theory. This is perhaps the reason why neologisms that could render more precisely the original intentions of the sex/gender distinction (like sociopol or rod-pol) could not gain wide support and had only sporadic appearances. In the meantime, while the choice of rod or pol was accompanied by intense discussions that frequently spilled over into different academic and cultural publications, a number of NGOs adopted simple transliteration as the most appropriate solution without much effort to explain why. The paradox is that while the theoretical justifications for the usage of rod or pol ultimately take us to a different understanding of the practice of feminism, the division between translation and transliteration uncovers a split in implicit theoretical assumptions: rod and pol insist that the contemporary feminist concerns are derivative from a certain history that the words themselves imply, while the transliteration of gender imposes these concerns as a ready-made novelty. It is obvious, then, that the multiplicity of renditions of "gender" spells out certain tensions and divisions in the uses of feminism in Bulgaria (including the split between academia and NGOs) and creates new nodes of intranslatability. Should we grieve about this state of affairs? It is my belief that we should rather welcome it as the possibility for further explorations.

---

[1] Miglena Nikolchina (ed.), *Women's Time*. A collection of translated essays in feminist theory, Sofia: Sofia University Press, 1997 (*Времето на жените. Англо-американски и френски феминизми,* София: Издателство на Софийския университет, 1997);
Milena Kirova and Kornelia Merjanska (eds.), *Theory Across the Borders: An Introduction to the Study of Gender*, Sofia: Polis Publishers, 2001 (*Теория през границите. Въведение в изследванията на рода*, София: Полис, 2001).

Behind translation as a linguistic issue: the case of Romania

Enikő Magyari-Vincze

Let me begin this paper by locating myself within the social-political, and the ethnic and/or national order that I am living in. This reflects the fact that no matter how much I may dislike to define myself in the terms of hegemonic arrangements, I cannot avoid it, simply because I cannot escape others perceiving me in these terms. Belonging to the Hungarian minority in post-socialist Romania requires me to be conscious of the specific ways in which women's, gender and feminist issues need to be addressed in this particular context and of their consequences, including the implications of naming of what one is doing in these domains.

That is why my whole argument about translating 'gender' into Romanian is embedded in the conviction that translation is not only a linguistic challenge, but also a cultural one. By extension (gender) discourse is not simply a site of language and naming, but also a field shaped by the interconnectedness of language, culture, society and politics, i.e. translation is about producing socially embedded meanings. Some of these significant (local) meanings of gender discourse constitute the focus of the first two paragraphs of my paper, which deals with meanings that acquire significance in the context of post-socialist and multiethnic Romanian society.

Gender-discourse and Romanian post-socialism

In order to talk about this issue, one has to have some basic information about the broader frame of practising feminism in Romania today. It is important to stress that - in a post-socialist context - academic feminism resulted from the disciplinary developments of individual scholars, who, in some cases, managed in the course of time to build up collective structures for research and teaching.[1] Most importantly, they are not empowered either by existing local women's and/or feminist movements, or by governmental or other kind of public support for such work. The success of the programmes consequently depends on the commitment, prestige and position of the interested academics and on their willingness to negotiate the recognition of their work and their results in this field. Nevertheless, the European integration process - to which Romania is, at least formally, committed - might be used as source of legitimisation for mainstreaming gender in all fields of the social life, including (higher) education.

One may notice that these intellectual efforts are supplemented by activist-like initiatives by the same scholars, who are committed to have an impact on civil society and politics. These initiatives consist of direct civic actions organised in co-operation with several women's non-governmental organisations, and of the dissemination of the results of their empirical and theoretical investigations in different public circles. Both types of activism aim to increase gender awareness in our society and to prove that women's issues are important social and political matters of today's Romania.[2]

Contested by some, both politically and scientifically, blamed by others as being a Western import in vogue, in Romania feminist studies became a field where scientific production has increased spectacularly in the last few years, proving, once and for all, that it is a field of research embedded in local realities. In

---

[1] Examples of this organisation might be seen at the National School of Political and Administrative Studies of Bucharest (where an MA program now called 'Gender Studies and Public Policies' was set up in 1999); at Babeş-Bolyai University of Cluj, where the Interdisciplinary Group for Gender Studies has offered, since the year 2000, a four-semester long undergraduate program on gender studies and is preparing to develop an MA in this field; at Bucharest University, where The Centre for the Research of Feminine Identity – 'Gender' offers courses in feminist literary criticism; and at the Western University of Timişoara, where the Centre for Feminist Studies focuses as well on feminist literature, but also on social-political issues.

[2] Noteworthy are the activities of 'ANA - Societatea de Analize Feministe' (The Society for Feminist Analysis) from Bucharest, the DESIRE Foundation from Cluj, the Centre for Curriculum Development and Gender Studies FILIA from Bucharest, which are non-governmental organizations with an expertise on gender research, but committed as well towards building bridges between the academic sphere and the incipient feminist movement in Romania.

this respect it is worth mentioning, on the one hand, the translation of some foreign literature into Romanian,[3] and, on the other hand, the publication of books resulted from indigenous research done in our country.[4]

All these developments are taking place in the background of an academic and political 'consensus', which is basically hostile to feminism, more precisely, it is irritated by and ironical about the concept itself. It is also, however, overwhelmed by experiences linked to the by now demonised socialism, in particular to the failures of the socialist politics on women.

One has to notice that socialism, as a project of modernisation, made important changes in women's condition, making it possible for them to participate in mass education and to use the right for full employment. However, it is important to remember also that the achievement of these rights has not resulted from the movement of women as independent subjects. On the contrary, it was part of the same cultural politics that defined women's subject position as equally subordinated as men's to the paternalist nation-state, which required them to act according to the needs of the forced industrialisation policy. What one might consider on some level as a gain for women, turns out on closer scrutiny to be their devaluation by the general state policy, when viewed in the dynamics of the entire social context. Romanian women's life was marked by the experiences of a severe pro-natalist policy that criminalized abortion (Kligman, 1998), by the burdens of multiple responsibilities within a shortage economy, by perceiving one's self as being dependent on, grateful to and basically the property of the Nation- and of the Party-State. The policies of state socialism reduced women's emancipation to labour force participation (Einhorn, 1993), and even in this field occupants of masculine roles were favoured, and the economic sectorial segregation increased the gender gap (Pasca Harsanyi, 1995). Contradictions between the productive and

---

[3] In the 'Gender Studies Series' of the Polirom Press the following titles were published: Moira Gatens: *Feminism şi filosofie. Perspective asupra diferenţei şi egalităţii* (Feminism and Philosophy. Perspectives on Difference and Equality); Mary Lyndon Shanley: *Uma Narayan - Reconstrucţia teoriei politice. Eseuri feministe* (The Reconstruction of Political Theory. Feminist Essays); Gloria Steinem: *Revoluţia interioară. Cartea respectului de sine* (The Internal Revolution. The book of self-respect); Andrea Dworkin: *Războiul împotriva tăcerii* (The War Against Silence). In the 'Cultural Analysis Series' of the Publishing House of the Foundation for European Studies the Romanian translation of the book edited by Susan Gal and Gail Kligman (*Reproducing Gender. Politics, Publics, and Everyday Life after Socialism*) is under publication, and the 'Feminist Studies Series' of the Desire Press is preparing to publish the Romanian translation of *Gender Transformations* by Sylvia Walby.

[4] The 'Gender Studies Series' of the Polirom Press published: Mihaela Miroiu: *Convenio. Despre natură, femei şi morală* (Convenio. On Nature, Women and Morality); Otilia Dragomir - Mihaela Miroiu (eds.): *Lexicon feminist* (Feminist Lexicon), and are under publication the following titles: Laura Grünberg: *(R)evoluţii în sociologia feministă. Repere teoretice, contexte româneşti* ((Re)volutions in the Feminist Sociology. Theoretical References, Romanian Contexts); Ştefania Mihăilescu (ed.): *Din istoria feminismului românesc. Antologie de texte. 1839-1929* (From the History of Romanian Feminism. A Reader. 1839-1929); Renate Weber - Roxana Teşiu: *Dreptul de a fi femeie* (The Right to be Woman); Otilia Dragomir: *Femei, cuvinte şi imagini* (Women, Words and Images). The 'Feminist Studies Series' of Desire Press published: Enikő Magyari-Vincze (ed.): *Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic* (Women and Men in the Multiethnic Cluj); Ghizela Cosma - Enikő Magyari-Vincze - Ovidiu Pecican (ed.): *Prezenţe feminine. Studii despre femei în România* (Female Presences. Women's Studies in Romania); Enikő Magyari-Vincze: *Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe* (Difference Matters. Social-cultural Diversity through the Lenses of Feminist Anthropology). In this respect it is worth mentioning the publication, in 2000, of the results of the opinion poll called *Barometrul de Gen*, carried out with the support of the Foundation for Open Society from Bucharest, the publication entitled *Femei şi bărbaţi în România* (Women and Men in Romania), made by the National Committee on Statistics in co-operation with the United Nations Development Program. But one should not forget either about some 'older' publications, pioneering in this domain, like: Mihaela Miroiu: *Gândul umbrei. Abordări feministe în filosofia contemporană* (The Thoughts of the Shadow. Feminist Approaches in Contemporary Philosophy), Editura Alternative, 1995; Mădălina Nicolaescu (ed.): *Cine suntem noi? Despre identitatea femeilor din România modernă* (Who are We? On Women's Identity in Modern Romania), Editura Anima, 1996; Margit Feischmidt - Enikő Magyari-Vincze - Violetta Zentai (eds.): *Women and Men in East European Transition*, EFES, 1997; and the volumes *Gen şi Educaţie* (Gender and Education), *Gen şi Societate* (Gender and Society), *Gen şi Politică* (Gender and Politics) edited by ANA – Societatea de Analize Feministe (The Society for Feminist Analysis).

reproductive function of women were not even questioned. Women's work was undervalued despite the fact that the system exhorted them to participate in the labour market. 'Femininity' became associated with the citizens' infantilisation and powerlessness in front of the nation-state. The 'emancipated woman' however, was viewed as being in a strong complicity with the socialist regime that destroyed traditional family ties, morality and men's authority. In short, socialism has not liberated women in the sense of improving their personal autonomy and social status, but in contrary, it reproduced a patriarchal gender regime under the hegemony of the paternalist state (Verdery, 1994).

Today many women and men are avoiding 'feminism', due also to the fact that they identify it with the discourse that blames women's emancipation for its 'complicity' with socialism. Some of them are willing to use 'gender studies' as an ideologically neutral substitute for 'feminist studies', or as a linguistic surrogate that does not bother one's ears even before one begins to listen to what these studies might be about.

Under these conditions it might be the feminist scholars' role to make a radical break with this attitude, and to refuse to identify with the anti-feminist frustrations of the so-called Elena Ceauşescu-syndrome.[5] It may be crucial to initiate eventually an autonomous discourse that is not anxious, but is conscious of the paradoxical ways in which institutional sexism and patriarchy are making a politically instrumental use of the link between feminism and the socialist practice of gender equality on the one hand, and on the other hand between anti-feminism and the post-socialist determination to re-legitimise the traditional, pre-socialist gender order.

It is my conviction that gender discourse might have only a limited contribution to this project, and - without becoming intertwined with feminism - it would not have either the analytical or the theoretical capacity to develop a critical approach towards either the paternalism of the socialist state or the re-strengthened patriarchy professed by the nationalist and/or liberal post-socialist politics. This ineffectual nature of gender discourse becomes obvious if one looks at the stand taken by some academics interested in practising and institutionalising gender studies. All they do is to emphasise the so-called scientific innovations produced by gender and this restricts its impact to the introduction of some new research subjects into several disciplinary fields. They do not even consider the political option of resisting to and fighting against different forms of discrimination and systems of power and oppression that place women in disadvantaged social and economic positions. Accordingly, they do not choose feminism as a discourse and practice that is committed to construct a new political identity for women. The latter - as Susan Gal (1997) affirms - assumes a subject that is neither the worker recipient of the communist entitlements, nor the sacred and inert mother of the nation, nor the naturalised, sexualised private being of civil society. As a result, willingly or not, they reproduce all the frustration, anxiety and embarrassment, which are associated with talking about women's issues and gender equality, and do not do anything about changing the public attitudes towards paternalism, patriarchy and sexism in Romania.

What is more, let me express my conviction that no real (post-socialist) change might be imagined without recognising the relevance of feminist voices in the public sphere, including the academic settings. And this is due exactly to the potential of feminism to serve not 'only' the interests of women located in subordinated positions, but also of highlighting any mechanisms of oppressive powers. Feminism thus works towards empowering citizens as autonomous and accountable subjects. This is not to say that the gender discourse may not involve this kind of positioning: if defined and understood in terms of feminist agency, it could fulfil all these roles, besides remaining a useful tool for academic strategies, which aim to accommodate the expectations of an environment that is harsh to feminism.

---

[5] As known, Elena was the wife of the president of the Socialist Republic of Romania, Nicolae Ceauşescu, and - as such - she held many crucial political and scientific positions during the 1970s and 1980s. She thus became the symbol of the powerful, diabolic woman who is controlling her man, who fails to make good decisions due to her womanness, but who is clever enough to use her femininity in a regime that was supposed to promote women as women despite their personal inabilities. After 1989, the 'syndrome' named after the dictator's wife was used by many women and men to explain why women would not like and should not like any more to be promoted to the top positions of different spheres of public life. Strangely enough, however, the maleness of the dictator himself was neither blamed for his mistakes, nor was it used to frustrate men about their participation in politics or public life.

Gender discourse and the multiethnic and poly-linguistic order

When I was asked to produce a paper on translating sex/gender in 'my language' my first reaction was to wonder which language was mine. On the one hand, I was wondering if I should dare to do this work about how sex/gender translates into Romanian, because I belong 'only' to the Hungarian minority of Romania, and there might be others who could do this work better. On the other hand, I read Andrea Pető's (2001) paper on the problems of translation into Hungarian, and obviously I decided that there were no reasons to re-open this case. From the consciousness of these dilemmas, I resolved to take the only possible option, namely to enquire wheter there was any place of enunciation that would both do justice to and show the wealth of information implies in this position of in-betweenness, which I was socialised to occupy with dignity?

As already argued in the first paragraph of this paper - while talking about translation -, one has to take it a step further than a mere linguistic issue. One has to remark, among others, that (gender) translation means also choosing to focus on certain topics within the discursive frame (of gender), while trying to adapt them to one's own language and ethnically marked condition. Talking about translation becomes a way of understanding the complex relationship between language(s) and social circumstances. It also brings into focus the personal motivations for the selection of some issues like those of the interconnectedness of gender and ethnicity, rather than on others. Translation is about rendering, but also about transmuting the meanings produced through the (gender) discourse in a certain location into another linguistic and social-political medium. This is accomplished by an agency - who at her/his turn - is an embodied subject, shaped by gender, ethnicity, class, age, sexual orientation and other markers of differences.

As far as the ethnic aspects of our issue are concerned, one should think about the topics that might be handled, in this respect, through gender discourse. From a Romanian perspective the agenda must include the relationship between ethnicity and gender, the question of multi-linguism, the differences between women of different languages and ethnicity, the role of feminism in a multiethnic and poly-lingual context, and its usefulness in fighting against nationalism, ethnic cleansing, and racism. Stake the social inequalities, which are produced and the systems of oppression that function at the crossroads of ethnicity and gender - as part of the social realities, which become intelligible through the feminist discourse of gender. As Henrietta L. Moore (1988) puts it, feminism makes a difference in talking about differences, and facilitates the understanding of differences between women as differences within each woman. It helps us to comprehend why ethnicity and gender, for instance, are not simple additives, which shape one's experiences, but are reciprocally implicated in forming one another. Gender and ethnicity acquire dynamic meanings in the process of personal identification with certain subject positions and the related norms about being a woman of a particular ethnicity in a specific context.

In Romania, too, scholars should make good use of feminism's ability to understand the re-assertion of nationalism and of essentialist ethnic identity politics, as well as the social inequalities produced at the crossroads of gender and ethnic hierarchies after the collapse of socialism. Our country is in fact still confronted, on the one hand, with the dormant hostilities embedded in the politics of the Romanian-Hungarian relationship, and, on the other hand, with the racism and (self) segregation intrinsic to the so-called 'Roma issue'. The key issue is that of differences within and between ethnic communities in terms of the gender order(s), which are accepted as appropriate by women and men, but also in the terms of opportunities that gendered subjects have in education, economic prosperity and independence. I think that such complex issues should and might come to be addressed through the conceptual and methodological instruments of gender analysis informed by feminism. Translating 'gender' means for me to focus on this very potential, while, being backed up by the feminist viewpoint that uses this term as a meta-concept. As such it refers to a complex system of power relations that are embedded in discourses and institutions, which produce subject positions, hierarchies and inequalities between women and men of different ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, age, etc. In this framework, translating, for example, 'ethnicity' as a principle of social organisation that arranges differences into a certain social and cultural order according to the interests of the agencies involved in these processes, looks at least as difficult as translating 'gender'. Both of them are still considered by so many people in all walks of my society as biologically based internal essences transmitted through blood and marking out one's destiny. This is why

one may suggest that the feminist gender discourse and the social constructivist paradigm of ethnicity studies can strengthen each other, and furthermore they can inform one another about the whole range of differences within and similarities across 'ethnic groups' and/ or 'genders'. Among others, this is the motive and the reason for translating 'gender' into the multiethnic, poly-linguistic environment that I am living in.

Reading through Romanian gender translations

According to the *Explicative Dictionary of the Romanian Language* 'gender' (*gen*) is a grammatical category based on the distinction between objects and living beings – of masculine (*gen masculin*), feminine (*gen feminin*), neuter (*gen neutru*) kinds –, respectively between males (*sex masculin*) and females (*sex feminin*). The word is used as well to define literary modes of writing (*gen literar*), but, in a broader sense, it also refers to any general taxonomical classificatory category (for example, the phrase *'nu sunt genul de om'* translates into English through 'I am not that kind/ type of man').

Despite these terminological confusions, and even against the ironical remarks on what 'gender studies' might possibly become in the net of these linguistic perplexities, one may observe that 'gender discourse' has in fact already begun its career in Romanian academic and public life. How does one explain this, besides the fact that the scholars working in this field are necessarily faced with its challenges? The analysis of Maria Puig de la Bellacasa (2000) on the fact extent to which references to gender have become almost compulsory in the context of the European integration project, while they encounter resistance at the national level in France, are helpful in the case of Romania too. This seemingly paradoxical process can be explained as already mentioned in the paragraphs above as the effect of history. In the Romanian case it has to do with the de-legitimisation of 'the socialist emancipation of women' and to the fact that 'feminism' was linked to the negative experiences of 'socialism'. In such a context, the reference to the European integration process and the legitimisation that comes with it may help the cause of gender equality. The Romanian government in fact has also undertaken the obligation to make concrete steps in this direction. The European Union consequently provided the umbrella under which 'gender equality' might acquire the public respect needed for its development in spite of the fact that some think that this should be possible without feminism

Since the beginning of the 1990's, when some scholars were starting to talk about women-related and gender issues in Romania, one could read texts, in which the term 'gender' was used as an not-translated English idiom. In some cases, in order to delimit it explicitly from gender *(gen)* as a grammatical category, it was rendered as *gen social* (a kind of 'social gender'), which raised in turn, a lot of definitional problems. By now 'gender' is translated predominantly by the term *gen*, and this might reflect the rise of the certainty and respectability surrounding the analytical and political use of this term. One may even affirm that the culture of gender identities, relations and orders and the language centred on these terms started to reinforce each other in our context too. As usual, linguistic norms proved to be dependent on a socially built consensus. In order to demonstrate this more strongly, one may point to the case of translating the concepts of 'gendering' and 'gendered' into *genizare* and *genizat.* Whereas at the beginning this was upsetting some people's sense of the proper Romanian language, and is not accepted even today by all the scholars writing in this field, for many these idioms are reasonable enough to get at the heart of certain processes and features of societal life. Just to make a parallel: the terms 'ethnicising' (*etnicizare*) and 'ethnicised' (*etnicizat*) are unacceptable mainly for those, who consider that ethnicity is a natural given of human life, with which one is born in their blood and which is separating once and for all several groups of people. They are however used as appropriate analytical categories by those for whom ethnicity is one among the socially constructed markers of differences that became a significant or structural difference which matters under the circumstances of the political nation-building processes.

The recently published 'Feminist Lexicon' (*Lexicon Feminist*, 2002) gives us a comprehensive view on translating 'gender' into Romanian. According to the aims of the editors, as a native product and not the 'simple' translation of an existing glossary or dictionary beside treating some of the crucial concepts and authors of feminist studies, the book is able to offer information about Romanian feminists theoreticians or activists, about the contributions of Romanian women in general to political and cultural history, and about many gender-related issues of Romanian society. Most importantly, for this purpose, it may become an

efficient instrument for the deconstruction of the prejudice according to which feminism is a Western import. Moreover, it might function as a model for assuming explicitly the feminist viewpoint instead of that of the neutral gender discourse. This is especially important in an environment, in which, as stated in the Lexicon, there is the danger that if women are silent on women, one may hear only the voice of the patriarchal prejudices.

In our Lexicon, under the heading of *gen* - followed, in brackets, by the English term 'gender' - one may read about the grammatical use of the term in Romanian, and about the dynamics of understanding the relationship between sex and gender in feminist theory. It is clearly stated that gender is not only a binary difference, but it is as well a hierarchy, and this position is in accordance with undertaking the feminist perspective in dealing with gender differences (pp. 156-157). Reflecting the fields of the authors' expertise, in the vicinity of 'gender' several satellite terms are also defined, such as gender and … education, mass media, language, non-verbal communication, security, television, etc.etc. Other idioms, too, are discussed which reflect the basic understanding that in a feminist reading 'gender' is not a neutral analytic category, but one that conveys the nature and dynamics of power relations between women and men. It also suggests the gendered nature of the institutional arrangements and their role in (re) producing the social inequalities between women and men. These are *sisteme sex/gen* (sex/gender systems, pp. 324-325), *stratificare de gen* (gender stratification, pp. 344-346), *diferența dintre genuri* (gender gap, pp. 72-74), *socializare de gen* (gender socialisation, pp. 329-331), *putere de gen* (gender power, pp. 309-312). Additionally, many other expressions are defined to get across the significance of 'gender' as the set of socially constructed meanings assigned to and/or the cultural expectations associated with femininity and masculinity, which might explain the ways in which one becomes a gendered person and acquires a certain sense of being an embodied subject. Among these the most important are: *identitate de gen* (gender identity, pp. 192-193), *feminitate* (femininity, pp. 146-149), *masculinitate* (masculinity, pp. 240-242), *roluri de gen* (gender roles, pp. 313-315), *stereotipuri de gen* (gender stereotypes, pp. 341-344). 'Sex' has not its own entry in the Lexicon as such, but related issues are treated under the headings of the terms *sexualitate* (sexuality, pp. 323), the already mentioned *sisteme sex/gen* (sex/gender systems), *eliberarea sexuală a femeilor* (women's sexual liberation, pp. 89-92), *heterosexualitate* (heterosexuality, p. 194), *homosexualitate* (homosexuality, pp. 185-187), and *lesbianism* (lesbianism, pp. 229-230). Morever, in relation to gender discrimination the Lexicon defines idioms like *sexism* (sexism, pp. 317-318), *sexism instituțional* (institutional sexism, pp. 318-319), *sexism în limbă* (sexism in language, pp. 319-321), *sexism subtil* (subtile sexism, pp. 321-323). The discussions focusing on 'gender' make also several references to *raporturi/ relații între sexe* (relations between the sexes), *diferențe biologice dintre sexe* (biological differences between sexes), *rol sexual* (sexual rol), *sex biologic* (biological sex).

Concluding remarks on translating gender into Romanian

The fact that translating (gender) is not only about finding proper terms in another language, but is an effort to produce and disseminate meanings through the academic and public consciousness is as true in the context of Romania as it is in other environments. This paper also argues that the translation of gender and feminist discourses from those linguistic and social mediums where they are more developed and have a longer history is a process of defining issues related and relevant to women's condition and gender relations across national and linguistic borders.

The Lexicon under scrutiny above introduces the Romanian reader into several, academically and politically neglected aspects of women's life before, during and after socialism. It aims to make intelligible the feminist and the gender discourse for the indigenous public and provides an analytical and critical instrument for dealing with them. The editors consciously acknowledge the situatedness of their knowledge and the fact that the expertise of the team working on the book was shaping its structure and contents. They are doing this as feminists and this situated, local form of feminist practises also show in their whole effort to 'domesticate' feminism in an environment hostile to it for the reasons, mentioned in this paper.

As in other contexts, in our country too feminism has developed as a field of internal differences resulting from a dialogue between different perspectives. This is the very space where my voice was formed at the crossroads of my ethnicity, gender, profession etc. This is where the position of in-betweenness, which I was talking about at the beginning of this article, might find a location. And from this position a particular

contribution to the feminist and gender discourse could be generated. It is certainly the case that my sensibility towards and research on ethnicity and gender, gender and nationhood, feminism and nationalism, feminism and racism (terms that are - by the way - missing from the Lexicon) is also a situated attitude and practice (Magyari-Vincze, 2001, 2002). As such, it provides insights and contributions that can play a complementary role in the field of feminist knowledge recently produced in Romania. This may also explain the reason why I chose to talk about translating 'gender' into Romanian as a Hungarian minority woman living in Romania, and/or as an anthropologist who believes in the analytical and critical potential of feminism, among others in its force of resisting to and acting against nationalism and racism.

References

Bellacasa, Maria Puig de la
'The Sex/ Gender Division in European French-Speaking Contexts', in: Rosi Braidotti, Esther Vonk and Sonja van Wichelen (eds.), *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Volume II, 2000, Athena/Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands (pp. 94-99).

Dragomir, Otilia and Mihaela Miroiu (Eds.)
(2002). *Lexicon Feminist,* Polirom.

Einhorn, Barbara
(1993). *Cinderella goes to Market. Citizenship, Gender and Women's Movements in East Central Europe,* Verso, London and New York.

Gal, Susan
(1997). 'Feminism and Civil Society', in: Margit Feischmidt, Enikő Magyari-Vincze and Violetta Zentai (eds.), *Women and Men in East European Transition,* EFES.

Kligman, Gail
(1998). *The Politics of Duplicity. Controlling Reproduction in Ceauşescu's Romani,* University of California Press.

Magyari-Vincze, Enikő
(2001) *Femei şi bărbaţi în Clujul multietnic* (Women and Men in the Multiethnic Cluj), Editura Fundaţiei Desire.

Magyari-Vincze, Enikő
Diferenţa care contează. Diversitatea social-culturală prin lentila antropologiei feministe (Difference Matters. Social-Cultural Diversity through the Lenses of Feminist Anthropology).

Editura Fundaţiei Desire, 2002.

Moore, Henrietta M.
(1990). *Feminism and Anthropology*, University of Minnesota Press, 1988.

Moore, Henrietta M.
(1994). *A Passion for Difference. Essays in Anthropology and Gender*, Polity Press.

Pasca Harsanyi, Doina
'Participation of Women in the Workforce: The Case of Romania', in: B.

Lobodzinski
(1995). *Family, Women and Employment in Central-Eastern Europe,* Grenwood Press,

Pető, Andrea

'From a 'non-science' to gender analysis? Usage of sex/gender in Hungarian', in: Rosi Braidotti, Ilse Lazaroms and Esther Vonk (Eds.), *The Making of European Women's Studies*, Volume III, Athena/Utrecht University, Utrecht, The Netherlands, 2001 (pp.90-92).

Verdery, Katherine

'From Parent-State to Family Patriarchs: Gender and Nation in Contemporary Eastern Europe', in: *East European Politics and Societies,* Vol.8, No.2, 1994 (pp. 225-256).

A Short Note on the Use of 'Sex' and 'Gender' in Ireland

Rebecca Pelan and Ann Lyons<reference>*

The Introduction to 'The Uses and Abuses of the Sex/Gender Distinction' in Volume I of *The Making of European Women's Studies*, states that "the fact that the 'sex/gender' distinction has become dominant in Women's Studies places a special burden on all other feminist cultures to find adequate *translations* for these key terms. Such *translations* are never easy, and more often than not, they prove very confusing" (23, our emphasis). As a result of this emphasis on translation, all of the published discussion so far, understandably, has centred on countries with a first language other than English and all have added a great deal of previously absent contour to the landscape of European Women's Studies.

At the same time, however, the emphasis on translation, together with the stated assumption that the sex/gender distinction is 'dominant' in Women's Studies, implies that there are only two main categories of the sex/gender distinction in European feminist critical practices: first, as a relatively un-problematic part of any English-language discourse; and, second, as a linguistic and conceptual challenge for non-English-language discourse. Our particular interest in the discussion is generated by the fact that Ireland's principal and majority language is English, but an indigenous, though minority, Irish language still exists, yet the ways in which the sex/gender distinction is used both in English and Irish does not seem to fit quite as comfortably as the categories might suggest.

In an effort to broaden, rather than challenge, the discussion to date, we suggest that in Ireland there are linguistic, grammatical, conceptual, and cultural distinctions that can be made in the use of the terms 'sex' and 'gender'. In addition, the appropriation and application of the terms by state institutions, legislators and policy -makers, creates other complexities. The Employment Equality Act (1977), for instance, used the term 'sex', while in the Employment Equality Act (1998) (which replaced the 1977 Act), the term has been changed to 'gender'. In the collection of statistics for policy purposes the term 'gender disaggregated' statistics rather than 'sex disaggregated' statistics is used. Within the academy, too, there has been an interesting use of 'gender' as a substitute for 'women' which begs other questions: does 'gender' *really* mean 'women', or is the term now being used to 'invisibilise' women in curricula and instate the more politically palatable 'gender'?

A brief survey undertaken by us has revealed that the sex/gender distinction is, indeed, a recognised part of contemporary Irish feminist/critical practice and, in general, its usage is defined as 'biological/physiological sex' and 'cultural/social gender,' respectively. In both Irish and English, at a linguistic level, a distinction is made between 'sex' and 'gender.' While there are variations of opinion as to the nature of the relationship between the two - particularly with regard to the extent to which 'sex' can be understood to be the foundation upon which 'gender' differences are created/constructed and cognisance that the distinction between the two terms is more blurred than has been previously understood - there exists a widespread application of 'sex' and 'gender' as binary opposites. Two terms are distinguishable in the Irish language: 'gnéas,' which means 'sex,' and 'inscine' which means 'gender,' and both these terms have a long history of use, albeit primarily linguistic. In a significant example of the use of the terminology of the Irish language *B'Ait Leo Bean,* (on the position of women in the Gaelic tradition) its author Máirín Nic Eoin writes that "the concept of gender is being used in this work… as a concept which encompasses the social and cultural formation of individuals on the basis of their sex". This suggests, perhaps, that while the Irish terms 'gnéas' (sex) and 'inscine' (gender) originate strictly as linguistic/grammatical terms, their existence in the language at the very least permits their appropriation and use in a much more critical way.

Interestingly, however, an overview of contemporary (English language) feminist journals (*Irish Journal of Feminist Studies, Women's Studies Review*) produced in Ireland suggests that while there is a clear application of the binary of sex as biological and gender as social, there is also an absence of critical debate/interrogation, or theoretical engagement with the sex/gender distinction in Irish feminist practice. Superficially, at least, this seems to confirm that Irish feminists have

* We thank all those who contributed comments and responded to the survey.

straightforwardly adopted the sex/gender distinction from Anglo-American discourses and are un-problematically applying the same to Irish feminist practices in English. We would want to suggest, however, that while Irish feminists have an understanding of the terms and their uses - both in Irish and English - the absence of evidence to suggest internal, theoretical debate rests with the fact that while Irish feminists are aware of critical and theoretical discourses, there is a reluctance to engage with them in a more interrogative manner.

One possible answer as to why this is so relates to the use or usefulness of critical theory in a specifically Irish feminist context. In a wider theoretical context, the distinction between 'sex' and 'gender' and the construction of subjectivity have been at the heart of feminist debates, beginning in the 1980s and continuing to the present day. In *Real and Imagined Women*, Rajan pinpoints the gains and losses of the theoretical 'unfixing' of the subject undertaken by post-structuralist critics that has most effectively deconstructed and, thus, challenged entrenched understandings of the 'real', and exposed notions of essentialism, particularly as they apply to women in both cultural and literary contexts, and which has allowed a feminist analysis of the political construction and regulation of the category 'woman.' On the other hand, this problematization of the subject has created an apprehension that "without an ontologically grounded feminist subject there can be no politics" (Rajan 10). These debates have had a similar influence in Ireland as elsewhere, in that there has been a relatively recent reassessment of just how useful they are to critical practices in countries that do not have an emphasis on the abstract and philosophical or in those places, like Ireland, where history has not necessarily been relegated to the past. Confronted with long-standing images of Irish women of legendary proportions - both in the mythology and literature of Ireland - as well as the colonial relationship between Ireland and England which created a 'feminisation' of Ireland, and, of course, the sometimes overwhelming existence of Irish history and nationalism (which continues in Northern Ireland where forms of intense nationalism still represent, at the very least, an at least potentially mobilising ideology), Irish women - both in their cultural and creative practices - have tended to favour the 'real' and the material. Within Ireland itself, the work of many feminists has been central to critical debates around (Irish) nationalism, identity, and the postcolonial construction and representation of femininity for a long time. These critics are by no means of one mind on these issues, yet precisely because of the extent of disagreement, the debates generated by their critical and theoretical work have been crucial components of Irish feminism - both culturally and politically - since the late 1980s. Part of this discussion has been an attempt to show how a large part of Irish feminist and critical activity has been allowed to slip through the cracks of the major theoretical debates since none of the diverse 'Irish' theoretical positions quite fits the 'international' positions and, in turn, none of the diverse 'international' positions quite fits the 'Irish'. All the more reason, then, that none should be applied unproblematically to it: postcolonial theory merges 'minority' with non-white and has not developed a critical discourse appropriate for analysing texts by non-hegemonic (Irish women) writers; post-modernist theories such as *différance, écriture feminine,* deconstruction and psychoanalysis all problematize assumptions of essential identity, but may underestimate the politics of material reality and deprive (Irish) feminism of its mobilizing force. At the same time, an unproblematic gynocritical approach to Irish feminism homogenizes and silences atypical voices. Irish feminist critics generally, then, have been selective in their use of critical theories for reasons directly connected to the development of Irish feminism, which has its own history - one that is connected to, but quite different from that of other western European countries. It is also very difficult, as a result of Irish colonial history, to talk of a straightforward connection between Ireland and, say, England or the United States. More likely, then, Irish feminists in both English and Irish have *adapted*, rather than *adopted*, the theoretical 'sex/gender' distinction for quite specific purposes that relate much more to the development of their own critical practices, than for any reason relating to the dominance of Anglo-American debates or discourses.

References

Braidotti, Rosi and Esther Vonk. (Eds.)
  (2000). *The Making of European Women's Studies,* ATHENA/Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Nic Eoin, Máirín
  (2002). 'Introduction to 'B'Ait Leo Bean' (English translation)', in: *Field Day*, *Volume 4 - Women's Writings and Traditions*, Cork University Press, Cork.

Rajan, Rajeswari Sunder
  (1993). *Real and Imagined Women: Gender, Culture and Postcolonialism*, Routledge, London.

The use of 'sekse', 'gender', and their variants in the Dutch language[1]

Esther Vonk

In addressing the extent to which the sex/gender distinction can be translated from English into the Dutch language and context, the first point to note is that in the Dutch context - within feminism and Women's Studies - the sex/gender distinction is made, indeed, for quite the same reasons and with quite the same connotations as in English. While 'sex' in Dutch translates as 'sekse', the term 'gender' is directly imported from English language, and is left untranslated.

In what follows, I will present a short overview and analysis of the use of the concepts of 'sex' and 'gender' in the field of Women's Studies and feminism in the Dutch context. In the first volume in the ATHENA series *The Making of European Women's Studies,*[2] an annotated bibliography on the lifeline of Dutch Women's Studies was published.[3] As an introduction to the many publications about Dutch Women's Studies that are gathered in this bibliography, a very short history of the development of Women's Studies in the Netherlands is given. The length of the bibliography shows that, indeed, the field is thoroughly documented: national and international publications on Women's Studies in the Netherlands appear, with emphasis on specific disciplines[4] or on the interdisciplinary nature of the field; with attention to Dutch Women's Studies in an international or European[5] perspective; with specific attention to the process of institutionalization of Women's Studies; to the impact of Women's Studies on policy-making,[6] or to the link between 'the academic branch' of feminism and the women's movement outside the Higher Education system; or with specific attention to the multicultural dimension, and the possibilities to further develop the link between gender and ethnicity in Women's Studies education and research in the Netherlands.[7] It would go too far to discuss all relevant publications in relation to my subject: the use of 'sex' and 'gender' in the Dutch context. Consequently I chose to be very selective. The publications I selected as my sources for this article are highly relevant and to some extent representative of the Dutch situation.

My main sources are two introductory textbooks in the field of Women's Studies; reports on the history and development of Women's Studies in the Netherlands; and written sources of the Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies. Furthermore, I will shortly discuss the use of the terms 'sekse', 'gender', and their variants in (institutionalized) women's organizations, as well as in government reports and policy-making in the field of women's emancipation and equal opportunities.

'Sex' and 'Gender' in women's studies

In the field of Women's Studies, two introductory textbooks in Dutch that are widely used in introductory courses in Women's Studies were both published in the mid-nineties (respectively 1993 and 1995). While 'Vrouwenstudies in de cultuurwetenschappen' (Women's Studies in Cultural Studies: WSCS) focuses on debates and developments within the field of Humanities and Cultural Studies, 'Vrouwenstudies in de jaren negentig'. Een kennismaking vanuit verschillende disciplines' (Women's

---

[2] Rosi Braidotti and Esther Vonk, *The Making of European Women's Studies. A work in progress report on curriculum development and related issues*, ATHENA/Utrecht University, Utrecht, 2000.

[3] 'The life-line of Dutch Women's Studies as a national initiative. An annotated bibliography by the ATHENA Central Coordination and the International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement'.

[4] A range of reports on the status of Women's Studies in anthropology, medicine, law, economics, the social sciences, the humanities and other disciplines in different periods (late 1970's – 2000) is documented in the bibliography.

[5] Publications and reports on Women's Studies in different European countries: the GRACE reports and the SIGMA reports on Women's Studies in Europe.

[6] For example, Alkeline van Lenning, Margo Brouns and Jeanne de Bruijn, *Inzichten uit Vrouwenstudies: uitdagingen voor beleidsmakers*, Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid and Vuga, Den Haag, 1995; Alkeline van Lenning et al, 'Vrouwenstudies en beleid', Special issue of: *Op gelijke voet*, 16 (1995) no. 3.

[7] For example, Geertje Mak and Marjolein Verboom, *Meer kleur in het Vrouwenstudiesonderwijs*, GEM/Universiteit Utrecht, , Utrecht, 1998; Troetje Loewenthal and Marjolein Verboom, *Kleur in het curriculum: perspectieven voor multicultureel Vrouwenstudiesonderwijs*, Nederlands Genootschap Vrouwenstudies, Utrecht, 1997.

Studies in the nineties. An introduction within different disciplines: WSN), introduces debates and issues that were and are central in different disciplines, mainly the Humanities and Social Sciences, but also the fields of women and technology and women and science. Both books are used for teaching and are popular sources of knowledge for a general interested public.

'Vrouwenstudies in de cultuurwetenschappen'[8] includes a glossary of key terms, in which the terms that the authors considered central in the book and in the field discussed, are explained in a very concise way.

'Gender': sometimes left not translated, sometimes translated as 'sekse' and sometimes as 'geslacht'. Within feminist theory this term initially referred to the distinction between biological sex and social role. In current feminist theory it refers primarily to sexual identity as the effect of historical, social and cultural processes. Unconscious processes do not play a significant role in these views of the construction of gender. To a certain extent, feminist thinking in terms of gender conflicts with thinking in terms of sexual difference.

> 'Geslacht': no entry

> 'Sekse': no entry

> 'Sekseverschil': refers to the opposition between women and men, in biological and sociological sense.

> 'Seksueel verschil': used in the Netherlands as a concept that relates to psychoanalytic thinking about sexual identity and sexuality, without relating to the 'sexual difference' debate.

> 'Seksuele differentie': distinct from thinking in terms of 'sekseverschil'. Refers to psychoanalytic ideas of sexual identity and sexuality; more specifically, the notion of sexual difference is linked to the debate which primarily took place in French theory. Theories of sexual difference start from the fact that a subject is born with a female or male body, and develops a related psychosexual identity. Where gender theorists understand the construction of femininity and masculinity as more determined by cultural and social processes, sexual difference theorists understand it as more determined by (unconscious) intra-psychological processes.

These terms typically refer to Dutch language and to Dutch debates; not all are used in the glossary that is included in the English translation of the book. The distinction between 'sekseverschil', 'seksueel verschil' and 'seksuele differentie' is an example of a distinction, which is not necessarily made in the English language and which makes translation - from Dutch to English - both difficult and irrelevant.

Furthermore it is remarkable that, while the term 'sekse' figures in the compound word 'sekseverschil', and is mentioned in the explanation of the term 'gender', the term itself is not one of the entries in the glossary.

The opening sentence of the first chapter, on Feminist Theory, is the following: 'Feministen geven betekenis aan het sekseverschil': Feminists give meaning to 'sekseverschil'. If 'sekseverschil' refers to 'the difference between women and men', 'sekse' would 'simply' refer to the difference between women and men, whether that be biologically determined or socially constructed.

The same chapter, that functions as a background to which the other chapters in the book should be read, offers a reading of the development of feminism and feminist theory, introducing a classification system that is based on an emphasis on respectively equality, difference, and deconstruction. These perspectives refer to different strategies and theoretical positions in feminist theory. In the introduction to 'equality feminism', the terms 'sekse' and 'sekseverschil' are used to define the aims of feminist theory and politics. The term 'gender' appears in the description of 'difference feminism'. Here, the

---

[8] Rosemarie Buikema and Anneke Smelik (eds.), *Vrouwenstudies in de cultuurwetenschappen*, Coutinho, Muiderberg, 1993. Translated as: Rosemarie Buikema and Anneke Smelik (eds.), *Women's Studies and Culture. A feminist introduction*. Zed Books, London, 1995.

distinction between sex and gender ('sekse' and 'gender'), is placed in the originally Anglo-Saxon debate on the distinction between on the one hand biologically determined sex, and on the other hand the identities as well as the social positions that are 'attached' to biological sex.

This observation needs clarification at two points: first, that this clear distinction between sex and gender might be an adequate description of the way the term 'gender' was introduced, and served the original purpose of the distinction between sex and gender, but it does no longer - either in English language or in Dutch language - hold to describe the many and complex theories and uses of the terms. In the early 1980's, the developments in the academic branch of Dutch feminism introduce the question whether the 'oppression hypothesis'[9] is still an adequate starting point for feminist research. This 'oppression hypothesis' is being criticized because of its assumption of what 'woman' is: it implies, firstly, a universal female subject, and secondly, it strongly pre-supposes a given, 'natural' distinction between two sexes, the female sex and the male sex. These assumptions are questioned, and new questions appear as a result of it: What is female identity based on, if this question is not answered with an essentialist notion of sex? How to think sexual difference (sekseverschillen), if we do not want to assume that these differences are a natural given?

The introduction of the term 'gender' partly solves the problems that arise. Gender allows for an escape from the dichotomy male/female, and, importantly, gender can be thought *as a process*, and allows for the analysis of how hierarchical differences between women and men, femininity and masculinity, are constantly produced and re-produced.[10] This way, the *working of gender*, on all levels, could become the central focus of analysis.

A second point of clarification is that, because the term 'gender' does not have an adequate translation in Dutch, in some cases the word 'sekse' is used to refer to either biologically determined sex, or to identities and social positions that, in English, are described under the term 'gender', as is pointed out under the 'gender' entry in the glossary. In this context, it should also be stressed that in the feminist project, 'sekse' never referred to biological sex only: think of Simone de Beauvoir 'The second sex', translated as 'De tweede sekse', in which she claims that 'one is not born a woman, one becomes one'. De Beauvoir typically is an 'equality feminist'; the term 'gender' was not introduced in feminist thought when she wrote 'The second sex', but clearly De Beauvoirs subject was the subject that is *made into* woman, thereby referring to the identity and social position of women. However it has not been until recently that the relationship of mutual dependence of the concepts of 'sex' and 'gender' as they are commonly used, was theorized extensively.[11] To emphasize this point, Ines Orobio de Castro in her book on sex/gender in transsexual perspective,[12] rephrases de Beauvoirs statement as follows: 'One is not born a women, but one becomes a women because one is born a woman'. 'Geslacht' is another term referred to in the explanation of the term gender, but is no entry itself, and it is, in feminist debates and feminist theory, hardly used, likely because of its biological, 'natural' and even genital connotations (see the part on dictionaries below).

The second textbook that I want to discuss, '*Vrouwenstudies in de jaren negentig. Een kennismaking vanuit verschillende disciplines'*,[13] includes a chapter on key concepts and debates in Women's Studies, in which what the authors consider to be the key concepts and debates in Women's Studies are outlined and discussed, historically as well as conceptually. In the following, I will shortly outline the statements made in WSN where the key-concepts 'sekse' and 'gender' are discussed.

---

[9] Margo Brouns, *Veertien jaar Vrouwenstudies in Nederland; een overzicht,* Rijksuniversiteit Groningen/Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen,, Zoetermeer, 1988 (p. 11).

[10] I thank Margo Brouns for her suggestions on this point.

[11] The work of Judith Butler is the most well-known on this issue. See especially *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*, Routledge, 1990, and *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, Routledge, 1993.

[12] Ines Orobio de Castro, *Made to order. Sex/gender in transsexual perspective,* Amsterdam, Spinhuis.

[13] Margo Brouns, Mieke Verloo and Marianne Grünell (eds.) (1995), *Vrouwenstudies in de jaren negentig. Een kennismaking vanuit verschillende disciplines*. Bussum, Coutinho.

'Sekse'

In 'mainstream' research, 'sekse' is almost always used as a 'neutral' variable. One simply is a women or a man, like everyone also has a certain age, or level of education. 'Sekse' is often, explicitly or implicitly, linked to its supposedly biological basis, which naturalizes the concept.
One of the first 'projects' in Women's Studies was, therefore, to 'de-naturalize' sekse, to undo the word from its biological connotations, thereby explicitly countering the idea that the difference between women and men is a natural, biological 'fact'.

The Second Wave insisted, firstly, on a different reading of 'sekse': the idea that biology, so often used as an instrument to naturalize sex discrimination (seksediscriminatie), is destiny, was strongly resisted and the historical, cultural and socio-political dimensions of 'sekse' gained attention. The idea of a biological distinction between two sexes remains, however it is the consequences of the meanings that are attached to this distinction in our society, that is considered the problem and that becomes the key of feminist analysis and politics.

The author, Margo Brouns, refers to British sociologist Ann Oakley (1972) in describing the 'translation' of this distinction between biology and culture into the two terms 'sex' and 'gender'. Sex hereby refers to biological categories and gender, to the cultural adaptations. The concepts of 'sex' and 'gender', introduced in order to express the difference between biology and culture, were soon also used in the Dutch feminist debate; 'sex' translated with the already existing 'sekse', and 'gender' was often left not translated. Brouns mentions translations of 'gender' with 'geslacht'[14] or 'genus',[15] but these terms never became common or satisfactory alternatives.
One of the first aims defined in the new field of Women's Studies reflects this sex/gender distinction: Women's Studies are defined as the studies that aim to acquire insights in the ways in which sexual difference (sekseverschil) leads to inequality on the basis of sex (sekse-ongelijkheid).[16]

'Gender'

The key concept 'gender' is discussed by, firstly, a reference to Joan Scott (1986), who, as Brouns states, importantly contributed to the further development of the term 'gender' in feminist thought. Furthermore, Sandra Harding (1986) is introduced as an important feminist scholar who, like Scott, distinguished the multi-layeredness of gender, thereby complicating the original distinction between sex and gender as merely 'biology' and 'culture'. Gender, in her view, is active in, and should be analyzed on, three levels, in short: gender as a dimension of personal identity; gender as a principle of organization of social structure; and gender as the basis for normative values.
The notion of 'power' stands central in all gender-analysis from a feminist perspective.

After discussing the key-terms 'sekse' and 'gender', WSN poses the question if the sex/gender distinction is a useful, and even tenable distinction. The objection to keeping with this distinction is the implicit assumption that biological sex, i.e. the distinction between women and men, is still taken as a given, a fact of nature. However, we should wonder if our idea of nature is not as much defined by culture as culture itself; theorists like Judith Butler (1990) claim that it is exactly the result of the (cultural) gender-system that we distinguish (only) two sexes; the gender definitions in language and culture acknowledge only men and women, and force every human being into one of these two categories. This is, in fact, not nature's natural distinction, but human (and culture's) inability to think beyond the dual gender system. Instead of the distinction between sex and gender, it would be more appropriate to think of several 'sekseposities' (sex positions).

The legitimacy of these arguments notwithstanding, the authors of WSN chose, for the purpose of clarity, to keep with the terms 'sekse' and 'gender' in the context of this book, in their, what the authors

---

[14] In Margo Brouns, *Veertien jaar Vrouwenstudies in Nederland; een overzicht.* Zoetermeer, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen/Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, 1988, Brouns refers to Gayle Rubins 'sex-gender system' as the 'sekse-geslacht systeem'
[15] Anna Aalten, in 1986, translates sex-gender system as 'sekse-genus systeem' in Anna Aalten, 'Over indianen en onderneemsters. Enkele opmerkingen bij het sekse-genus systeem'. In: *Antropologische verkenningen (Feministische antropologie 2)*, 1986, no.4.
[16] Tijdschrift voor Vrouwenstudies, 1980

call 'everyday meanings'. That is, in referring to concrete women and men, the word 'sekse' is used, and when the issue is cultural constructions of femininity and masculinity, the word 'gender' is used.

On the website of the *Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies,*[17] it is stated that 'Women's Studies focuses on the central role of the term 'gender'. This term refers to the social and cultural meanings that are attached to sex ('sekse')'.
The concept of gender is explained in more detail on the website and in the NOV brochure.
Gender refers to the many and complex ways in which social differences between the sexes acquire a meaning and become structural factors in the organization of social life. Gender is a cultural and historical product, as opposed to essentialist definitions of the physical differences between the sexes. Gender, in the definition of the Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies, operates on and should be studied at three levels:

1) Gender as a dimension of personal identity. On this level gender is investigated as an inter-personal process of self-consciousness. It also studies the dynamic relation of self-images to the individual and collective identity.
2) Gender as a principle of organization of social structure. On this level, gender is investigated as the foundation of social institutions ranging from the family and kinship structures to the division of labour in social, economic, political and cultural life.
3) Gender as the basis for normative values. On this level, gender is investigated as a system that produces socially enacted meanings, representations of masculinity and femininity, which are shot through with issues of ethnicity, nationality and religion. These identity-giving values are organized in a binary scheme of oppositions that also act as principles for the distribution of power.

This definition of gender is based on the classification system provided by the feminist epistemologist Sandra Harding,[18] also referred to by Margo Brouns in WSN. In this definition of gender, the intrinsic co-constructedness of gender with other categories of 'difference' is contained. The simultaneity of potentially contradictory effects should not be confused with easy parallels or arguments by analogy. The simultaneous analyses of gender, ethnicity and other constitutives of difference always start from the and /and approach in stead of the either/or. The categories of gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality and nationality have to be taken into account alongside each other. These observations lead to a relatively new term in the vocabulary of Women's Studies and feminist research: intersectionality.

The book *Caleidoscopische visies,*[19] which presents an overview of the development of the black, migrant and refugee women's movement in the Netherlands, opens with a chapter on the history of 'gender- and ethnicity-thinking' in the Netherlands.[20] The authors of this chapter, Gloria Wekker and Helma Lutz, alternately use the terms 'gender- en etniciteitsdenken' (gender- and ethnicity-thinking) or 'kruispuntdenken' (crossroad-thinking), as terms for what is more generally (internationally) known as 'intersectional theory'. The intersectional approach highlights the complex interactions between ideological categories and the identities informed by those categories.
The term 'intersectionality' was introduced by Kimberlé Crenshaw[21] to describe the interactions between 'race' and gender in the way they shape society, ideology and practice. Although the concept

---

[17] www.let.uu.nl/nov
[18] Sandra Harding, *Feminism and Methodology. Social Science Issues*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 1987; Sandra Harding, *Whose Science, Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1991.
[19] Maayke Botman, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (eds.) *Caleidoscopische visies. De zwarte, migranten- en vluchtelingen- vrouwenbeweging in Nederland*, KIT Publishers, Amsterdam, 2001.
[20] Gloria Wekker and Helma Lutz, 'Een hoogvlakte met koude winden. De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland', in: Maayke Botman, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (eds.) *Caleidoscopische visies. De zwarte, migranten- en vluchtelingen- vrouwenbeweging in Nederland*, KIT Publishers, Amsterdam, 2001.
[21] Kimberlé Crenshaw, *'Demarginalizing the Instersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics'*,.1989. Crenshaw uses intersectionality exclusively in relation to black women; others have opened up the term to include everyone, hereby gaining the specific point that whiteness is also an ethnicity; male is also a gender; i.e. the natural status of the dominant position is being de-naturalized.

of 'intersectionality' appeared only in the 1990's,[22] the idea that gender is not an autonomous 'system' but is interacting and simultaneously constructed with other systems of meaning, is by no means a new insight in feminist thought. Valerie Smith (1998) opens her book on intersectionality, 'Not just race, not just gender', with the statement that "Black feminist thinking has always assumed that race and gender are mutually dependent, interlocking cultural constructions and projections".[23][24] Similarly, lesbian feminists called for attention to the intersection of gender and sexuality.[25] In 1981, the volume 'This bridge called my back. Writings by Radical Women of Colour'[26] appeared; the contributions, by women of different ethnic backgrounds, deal with the simultaneity of different constructions of difference, and the importance, and inevitability, of analysing the categories of gender, ethnicity, class and sexuality simultaneously.

Intersectional analysis shows how gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality and nationality function as interrelated ideologies that produce relations of domination and subordination - everyone is situated on the axes of gender and ethnicity (and other axes), *and therefore* in the power positions that are attached to these positions - but that also can function as sites of social change.

The Dutch translation of the term 'intersectionality', 'intersectionaliteit' or 'kruispuntdenken', has only recently entered the debate, and is becoming more common as more attention is being paid to simultaneous analysis of gender and ethnicity as (what should become) a standard practice in feminist research. Efforts of the Centre of Expertise for Gender, Ethnicity and Multiculturality (GEM) at Utrecht University[27] - a joint initiative of the Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies (NOV), the National Foundation of Women's Studies (NGV)[28] and the International Information center and Archives for the Women's Movement (IIAV),[29] and E-Quality - and notably the publication of *Caleidoscopische Visies* on this front are stimulating the further introduction of these concepts.

Women's organisations

The use of the term 'gender', alongside 'sekse' is quite established in the discourse of most women's organizations. The following examples are randomly chosen; I do not necessarily consider them representative of the discourse that is generally used in women's organizations. Important to note is that many women's organizations do not choose to use the terms 'sekse' or 'gender' in their mission statements, the definition of their aims and goals, or their statutes. In many cases, the key words are rather 'women's emancipation' or 'equality'; in other cases, 'feminism' is the key word, along with 'women' as the central subjects to all projects and activities.

'E-Quality, Experts in Gender and Ethnicity'[30]
E-quality is a government-funded organization that focuses on power-divisions between women and men and images of femininity and masculinity in relation to ethnicity, sexual orientation, age, class, culture, nationality and religion, in which it formulates their own standpoints. E-Quality was launched on the 1st of January 1998, with the aim to give the emancipation process a new impulse. E-Quality

---

[22] See Gloria Wekker and Helma Lutz (2001) for a introduction to the concept and a 'hands-on' example of intersectional analysis, with emphasis on the Dutch situation.
[23] Valerie Smith (1998), *Not just race, not just gender*. p. XIII
[24] This can be traced back to an occasion as early as the much-quoted 'Ain't I a Woman' speech of Sojourner Truth in 1851. bell hooks (1981) explicitly refers back to this in *'Ain't I a Woman. Black women and feminism'*, and continues to work on the intersection of gender and ethnicity in *'Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black'*, 1989, and *'Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics'*, 1990.
[25] The Radicalesbians in 1970 wrote their manifesto *'The Woman-identified Woman'*, confronting straight feminists with the homophobia in the movement, insisting that the assumption of heterosexuality should be left and serious attention be given to the issue of the implications of a lesbian/straight orientation; Adrienne Rich (1980) questions compulsory heterosexuality and introduces the idea of the 'lesbian continuum', introducing lesbianism in the notion of feminist sisterhood.
[26] Gloria Anzaldua and Cherrie Moraga (eds.), *This bridge called my back. Writings by Radical Women of Colour*, 1981.
[27] http://www.let.uu.nl/gem
[28] http://www.fss.uu.nl/ngv/
[29] http://www.iiav.nl/
[30] http://www.e-quality.nl

wants to improve the quality of Dutch society by promoting equal gender- and ethnic relations in the Netherlands.

On its website, E-quality defines the word 'gender' as follows:
Gender is an English term for which - as of yet - no adequate Dutch translation is available. The concept 'gender' refers to the meaning that a society gives to masculinity and femininity; i.e. the characteristics that, within a specific context, are ascribed to men and women. Gender also plays a role in the structural organization of society: women and men structurally are linked to different tasks and activities (unjustly, as E-Quality insists).
Besides this, gender also is a symbolic system: a system that structures norms and values, within which that which is 'female' is usually valued less and considered minor in relation to that which is 'male'.

E-Quality answers to the move (in the field of policy-making) from thinking in terms of emancipation (emancipatie) to thinking in terms of gender and ethnicity. E-Quality explicitly thinks and operates from the standpoint that gender is always intrinsically linked to ethnicity: the intersectional model.

Guidelines 'equal treatment' EC treaty

EU-Quality, the section of E-Quality that focuses on EU policy and issues, together with the national bureau for the combat against racial discrimination and the expertise center 'age and society' made available on the Internet a dossier on the implementation of the Guidelines 'equal treatment' based on article 13 of the European Communities treaty. In this dossier, a thematic index of links to related websites is presented, divided by grounds of discrimination: age, disability, race or ethnic background, sexual orientation, religion. 'Gender', it is stated in this dossier, is not explicitly addressed in the Guidelines; however, it is one of the categories in the dossiers thematic index, because 'the experience of and developments around '*gender*' or '*geslacht*' is of crucial importance in the development of other and new Guidelines.

Vrouwen.Net

Vrouwen.net is an on-line information forum providing information on and links to NGO news related to 'women's issues'. One of its stated aims is 'to facilitate access to information on gender issues (gender-kwesties) in all parts of the world.

Government

The discourse concerning issues related to 'sekse' or 'gender' differs in the different ministries. The term 'gender', however, started to feature only since the introduction of the concept of 'gender mainstreaming' in national politics. Below, examples of the key terms used, and their definitions, by the Ministry of social affairs and employment, and the Ministry of education, culture and science, are given, to show, on the one hand, the use of the term 'gender' in the context of 'gender mainstreaming' as a strategy and, on the other hand, the absence of the term 'gender' in any other issue.

Ministry of foreign affairs and employment[31]

The key terms used by this ministry are 'gelijke kansen' (equal opportunities) and 'gender mainstreaming'. 'Gelijke kansen' is defined as the policy that should prevent that 'personal characteristics like race, sex (the word *geslacht* is used here*)* or religion' should play a role in employment.

'Gender mainstreaming' is a term directly imported from English language (and the concept itself, imported from the EU level to the national level). The ministry states that 'an important aim of emancipation policy (emancipatiebeleid) is that emancipation should be a self-evident integrated part of the policies of each of the ministries. If in the process of policy-making the potentially different effects of those policies for women and men are taken into account, both quality and efficiency are

---

[31] Ministerie van Sociale zaken en werkgelegenheid; http://home.szw.nl/

enlarged.' Gender mainstreaming is, in the ministry's definition, 'the integration of the gender perspective (*genderperspectief*) in regular policies.

A positive effect in the introduction of 'gender mainstreaming', is that the definition of the problem shifts: where in emancipation policies, women are defined as the problem – women should be emancipated – in policies based on gender mainstreaming, the policy itself is the problem, in so far as the question is what the effects of policies for women and men are.

Ministry of education, culture and science[32]

The Ministry, in formulating the central aims of emancipation policy (emancipatiebeleid) for the 21st century, states that the first aim is to do justice to differences. This should enable the integration of emancipatory aims (emancipatiedoelen) in regular policy-making. The idea behind this is that the emancipation of women and girls is everyones responsibility, and not only something that women should be concerned with. This statement resonates the ideas of 'gender mainstreaming', without actually using the term. Note that, in stead of using the concepts of 'sekse' or 'gender', the emphasis is on 'the emancipation of women'.

In the emancipation note for the period of 1998 - 2002, in which the agenda for the years 1998 - 2002 is presented, it is suggested that 'this note could be a transition, a bridge, between strictly girl- and women-oriented policies, to an integrated, sex-independent (sekse-onafhankelijke) emancipation policy.

It should be noted that, although the word 'gender' became common in (some) governmental discourse, mainly through the introduction of 'gender mainstreaming', the sex/gender distinction does not feature in this discourse. 'Gender' merely features as a replacement or synonym for 'sekse' or 'geslacht'. The introduction of the word 'gender' does not imply a questioning of the biological basis of the division of society in 'women' and 'men'; like the terms 'sekse' and 'geslacht', 'gender' points mainly to inequalities between women and men that should be overcome, leaving the biological basis for the division unquestioned but, at the same time, combating the discrimination that is caused by it.

'Sex' and 'Gender' in the dictionary[33]

To complete the picture of the use of sex and gender, and the sex/gender distinction in Dutch language, I looked for the terms 'sekse' and 'gender', and the variants on these terms as they appeared in the survey presented here of the different discourses used in the fields of Women's Studies, women's organizations and different ministries.
My source is the Van Dale Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal, the largest and most widely used dictionary of Dutch language.

'Gender': no entry

'Genus': 1. *Geslacht*: in genere, in general, as opposed to in specie 2. Linguistic gender (male, female or neutral); 3. (Biological) level in taxonomy of living creatures; higher than 'kind'

'Geslacht': 1. The collective descent from a common ancestor; 2. All creatures who naturally belong to the same kind: the human kind; the third kind; 3. Botanical, zoological; 4. The collective of persons that at a certain time originate from humankind, synonym: generation; 5. *Kunne, sekse*: sex: a child of the male sex; 6. Sexual organs, genitals; 7. Linguistic, synonym: *genus*: the male, female, neutral gender; the natural sex: the natural distinction between male and female creatures, synonym: *sekse*.

'Sekse': 1. *Kunne*, natural sex, persons of both sexes; 2. (succinct) the women; sex-discrimination: discrimination based on *geslacht*, sex.

[32] Ministerie van onderwijs cultuur en wetenschap; http://www2.minocw.nl/
[33] Van Dale Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal

In conclusion

Although 'gender', in the field of Women's Studies, is considered to be maybe even *the* key concept, it is important to historicize the origins and history of this concept in a Dutch context. Both textbooks discussed here refer to the concrete appearance of the word 'gender' in Dutch feminism and feminist theory, thereby pointing explicitly to the Anglo-American origin of the concept. It should be noted that, while the term 'gender' became the key word in feminist theory, the meaning of the concept varies, depending not only on the national and historical context, but also on the theoretical framework it figures in. In the 'popular' reading of the word 'gender', it is placed in opposition to the word 'sekse', 'sekse' thereby only referring to the 'biological' and gender to the 'social' dimension. However it should be emphasized that the word 'sekse' (like the English word 'sex') never referred to only the biological level or dimension. It would be a false reproduction of feminist history to claim that before the introduction of the word 'gender', feminists did not theorize and politicize exactly the historical, cultural and structural factors that give meaning to the categories of 'women' and men'.

Although the imported term 'gender' is widely used in the discourses of Women's Studies, was introduced in the discourse of the women's movement and women's organizations at a slightly later date as a result, where it is now part of common language, and is, since relatively recently, also being used in institutional and governmental discourse when the issues of 'vrouwenemancipatie' (women's emancipation), 'sekse-ongelijkheid' (sexual inequality) or 'sekse-discriminatie' (sex discrimination) are at stake, it should be noted that 'gender' has still no entry in the 'default' dictionary of Dutch language. This points out two significant features: firstly, that indeed the word 'sekse' usually is understood as having a much broader meaning than strictly 'biological sex'. Secondly, a conclusion that can be taken from this is that the import of foreign (read: Anglo-American) concepts into the Dutch language, can add to confusion around the precise meaning of certain concepts and, moreover, does not necessarily lead to adequate ways of expressing the specificity of the historical, cultural and theoretical traditions of Dutch feminism. As 'gender' is really the key-concept in Women's Studies, the fact that 'gender' is not even mentioned in the dictionary, says at least something about the dubious integration of feminist ideas in 'mainstream' discourse. The fact that no satisfactory alternatives for the word 'gender', i.e. an adequate translation of the term in Dutch, is available to date, may or may not have to do with this.

However, as stated, although the word 'sekse' generally covers more than just biological sex, we are far from general acceptance of the idea that the concept of a biological base to social distinction between 'women' and 'men' is contestable. This said, the question remains about how feminists will be able to influence the political and public debate, and will succeed to integrate feminist ideas about the ways in which gender operates as a structuring principle in people's lives, in institutions and in society at large, thereby emphasizing the power dimensions of gender. Whether we call it 'sekse' or 'gender', what is crucial is precisely what these terms are understood to imply, and, most important, the strategies we use to make sure that it will be the feminist versions of these terms that will impact the circles of policy-making, institutions and the public debate.

References

Aalten, Anna
(1986). 'Over indianen en onderneemsters. Enkele opmerkingen bij het sekse-genus systeem'. In: *Antropologische verkenningen (Feministische antropologie 2)*, no.4, 1986.

Anzaldua, Gloria and Cherrie Moraga (Eds.)
(1981). *This bridge called my back. Writings by Radical Women of Colour*, Persephone Press, Watertown, Mass.

Botman, Maayke, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria Wekker (Eds.)
(2001). *Caleidoscopische visies. De zwarte, migranten- en vluchtelingen- vrouwenbeweging in Nederland*, KIT Publishers, Amsterdam.

Braidotti, Rosi and Esther Vonk
(2000). *The Making of European Women's Studies. A work in progress report on curriculum development and related issues*. Utrecht, ATHENA/Utrecht University

Braidotti, Rosi
(2000). 'The relevance of gender for the issue of 'women and science', in: Braidotti, Rosi and Esther Vonk, *The Making of European Women's Studies. A work in progress report on curriculum development and related issues*, ATHENA/Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Braidotti, Rosi, Ellen de Dreu and Christine Rammrath
(1995). *Synthesis Report Women's Studies in Europe,* NOISE/Utrecht University, Utrecht.

Brouns, Margo, Mieke Verloo and Marianne Grünell (Eds.).
(1995). *Vrouwenstudies in de jaren negentig. Een kennismaking vanuit verschillende disciplines*, Coutinho, Bussum.

Brouns, Margo
(1988). *Veertien jaar Vrouwenstudies in Nederland; een overzicht*, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen/Ministerie van Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, Zoetermeer.

Buikema, Rosemarie and Anneke Smelik (Eds.)
(1993). *Vrouwenstudies in de cultuurwetenschappen*. Coutinho, Muiderberg, 1993.

Buikema, Rosemarie and Anneke Smelik (Eds.)
(1995). *Women's Studies and Culture. A feminist introduction*, Zed Books, London.

Butler, Judith
(1993). *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of 'Sex'*, Routledge, London/New York.

Butler, Judith
(1990). *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, London/New York.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé
(1989). 'Demarginalizing the Instersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics', in: *Feminism in the law: Theory, Practice, and Criticism*, University of Chicago Legal Forum, Chicago.

Dale, Johan Hendrik van, Guido Geerts and Nicoline van der Sijs
(1999). *Van Dale Groot Woordenboek der Nederlandse Taal*, Van Dale Lexicografie, Utrecht.

GRACE: 'Women's Studies in the European Community'. In: *Les Cahiers du GRIF. Women's Studies Concept and Reality*, Editions Tierce, Paris, 1991.

Harding, Sandra
(1987). *Feminism and Methodology, Social Science Issues*, Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

Harding, Sandra
(1991). *Whose Science, Whose Knowledge? Thinking from Women's Lives*, Open University Press, Milton Keynes.

Hooks, Bell
(1981). *Ain't I a Woman. Black women and feminism,* Pluto, London, 1996.

Hooks, Bell
(1989). *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black,* South End Press, Boston, MA.

Hooks, Bell
(1990). *Yearning: Race, Gender and Cultural Politics.* Boston, MA, South End Press.

IIAV and ATHENA. 'The life-line of Dutch Women's Studies as a national initiative. An annotated bibliography by the ATHENA Central Coordination and the International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement', in: Braidotti, Rosi and Esther

Vonk, *The Making of European Women's Studies. A work in progress report on curriculum development and related issues*, ATHENA/Utrecht University, Utrecht, 2000.

Lenning, Alkeline van et al.
(1995). *Vrouwenstudies en beleid*, Special issue of *Op gelijke voet*, 16 no. 3.

Lenning, Alkeline van, Margo Brouns and Jeanne de Bruijn
(1995). *Inzichten uit Vrouwenstudies: uitdagingen voor beleidsmakers*, Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid and Vuga, Den Haag.

Loewenthal, Troetje and Marjolein Verboom
(1997). *Kleur in het curriculum: perspectieven voor multicultureel Vrouwenstudiesonderwijs*, Nederlands Genootschap Vrouwenstudies, Utrecht.

Mak, Geertje and Marjolein Verboom
(1998). *Meer kleur in het Vrouwenstudiesonderwijs*, Universiteit Utrecht, Utrecht.

Orobio de Castro, Ines
(1993). Made to order. Sex/gender in transsexual perspective, Spinhuis, Amsterdam.

Radicalesbians
(1970). *The Woman-identified Woman*, Know Inc., Pittsburgh.

Rich, Adrienne
(1980). 'Compulsory heterosexuality and lesbian existence', in: *Signs*, no.5, vol. 4.

Smith, Valerie
(1998). N*ot just race, not just gender*, New York, Routledge.

Tijdschrift voor Vrouwenstudies
SUN, Nijmegen, no. 1, 1980.

Wekker, Gloria and Helma Lutz
'Een hoogvlakte met koude winden. De geschiedenis van het gender- en etniciteitsdenken in Nederland', in: Botman, Maayke, Nancy Jouwe and Gloria

Wekker (Eds.)
(2001). *Caleidoscopische visies. De zwarte, migranten- en vluchtelingen- vrouwenbeweging in Nederland*, KIT Publishers, Amsterdam.

Websites

Netherlands Research School of Women's Studies
http://www.let.uu.nl/nov

Centre of Expertise for Gender, Ethnicity and Multiculturality in Education
http://www.let.uu.nl/gem

National Association of Women's Studies
http://www.fss.uu.nl/ngv/

International Information Centre and Archives for the Women's Movement http://www.iiav.nl/

E-Quality, Experts in gender and Ethnicity
http://www.e-quality.nl

Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment
http://home.szw.nl/

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science
http://www2.minocw.nl

Sex/Gender Distinction, Uses and Abuses in South Slavic Languages in the Multilingual Balkan Region: Serbian/Croatian/Bosnian in their Comparative Setting

Jelena Petrovic and Svetlana Slapšak

The new sex/gender distribution in the Balkan languages, reflecting the changes in ideology, social relations, political arrangements, national mapping and cultural negotiations, some of which were rather violent, especially in the case of former Yugoslavia, fostered some hesitant academic reflection. Consider the implied political/national pressure on the academic population, and the (until recently) prevailing mentality of accepting ideological and political recommendations without much debate. We should add, of course, the obvious zone of interest being opened in the national setting, concerning academics who are ready to express acceptable views and are subsequently granted media attention, privileges inside the state apparatus, and possible non-transparent gain. Those who would be stubborn enough to present views (or even research results) that do not coincide with the national criteria risk being labelled "traitors" or just being silenced in the vast process of forming "national science". Therefore, the topic of changes in sex/gender in linguistics is still very sensitive and could be considered a high-risk for the local academia.

The topic was tackled, however, by a few feminists, and also attracted attention by some traditionally oriented linguists, mostly as a reaction to views expressed or expected concerning the new context of constructing gender in the post-socialist transitional period. Three main fields of Balkan linguistics were involved: socio-linguistics, psycholinguistics, and pragmatics. Several women in academia, both linguists and feminists, wrote about the problem from different perspectives: philosophical, considering questions about sexual distinction as it is constructed in most of the South Slavic and other Balkan languages, especially around the terms "man" and "men", which not only indicated gender, but also acquired the generic determination of "human"; social, addressing the problem of exclusion from the public sphere in which only the masculine defines public discourse in grammar, semantics and context; psychological, addressing imposed sexist attitudes in the language used for the identification of a speaker; pragmatic, making recommendations for appropriate use of terms for women in different discourses, private as well as public; and linguistic, providing structural and grammatical models as tools for reconstructing women' language.

The minimal agreement between feminist views of gender construct in language and the few traditional linguists who are ready to accept at least the possibility of such debate, is the acceptance of certain terminology in the private sphere, which can be identified as genderlect(1): that is, a portion of the "man's language" or universal language that has been adapted by women for their socially limited, crypto-ludic communication. Sexist use of language in the Balkans, which can be observed both in the context of sexual grammar(2) and in its specific socio-linguistic context produced by the recent political situation in the region, still has not been accepted by the majority of the academic (linguistic) population, and it remains unremarked upon in the meagre local production, dissemination and publication of linguistic articles, not to mention the almost non-existent institutional interest in the matter.

The most stunning change to linguistics in the Balkans is the political separation of languages, which are gaining a new national feature, as a symbolic screen of identification and identity primarily defined as different, superior, and "better" than other languages. The question of the politics of power distribution based on language is well known to linguists. Dialects become languages, and vice versa, with political power backing the changes. In the case of former Yugoslavia, the situation is unique, because several "languages" have been generated by the political decomposition of the linguistic area, dominated by the *lingua franca* - the Serbo-Croat of the recent past. It is important to stress that Serbo-Croat, although it has had a central position in a rich and complicated multilingual area certainly reflecting some colonizing political and cultural features, was not the sole official language of former Yugoslavia, except in the Army, where it was the language of command. Yugoslavia had 16 equally official languages, and the normal linguistic situation, or the normal everyday acoustic dominant in the country's media and in the streets (not to mention obligatory institutional use), was multilingual. The official name of the language normally used by the majority and as a second language by most minorities was Serbo-Croat or Croato-Serb.

On the linguistic and communicational level there was one language, Serbo-Croat or Croato-Serb, which, during the Yugoslav war, split into three on the political and symbolical level: Serbian, Croatian, Bosnian (with two names: *bosanski* and *bošnjački*)(3) with a fourth language probably preparing to appear, complete with an array of possible political changes: Montenegran.

The sex/gender aspect of these changes must be observed in the discourses about them. They are firmly rooted in patriarchal narratives of "founding fathers" languages, with the words "mother tongue" considered a less valuable, secondary concept, sometimes even with an undertone of depreciation when nationally mixed families are involved. Establishing and reaffirming the differences that were "repressed" by the old regime became a highly praised patriotic endeavour, materialized in specialized dictionaries of difference, published mainly to introduce the new rules in the media. The new situation opened new business and communication possibilities. Official translators expanded their services to three new languages without expending serious effort in acquiring them. Common people suddenly became polyglots:

"That is how Serbo-Croat in all its varieties, as a *lingua franca* of some Yugoslav nations, joined "dead" languages like Ancient Greek, Latin, or Church Slavonic. The citizens of the new states created from former Yugoslavia are amazed: they speak a "dead" language, and they became polyglots overnight. They can easily communicate in four languages: Serbian, Croat, Bosnian, Montenegran."(4)

This new language cluster, usually referred to today as SCB (Serbian-Croat-Bosnian), was generated during the first years of war and the first years of independency in Croatia, with the Bosnian development lagging behind because of the war situation, and the Serbian situation oriented mainly toward the promotion of the Cyrillic alphabet, believed to be more "Serbian" than the Latin alphabet. At the same time, dialectical diversity inside the new states was also the victim of unification on one side, and inevitable closing-in and localization on the other. Except for the obvious devaluation of the "mother tongue" concept, changes in sex/gender distinction can be observed in more specific areas, like gendered professional terms, sexist terms (some recycled, some innovative), semantic changes in re-establishing (or inventing) patriarchal and national values, and new grammatical rules invented in new SCB languages.

Linguistic research of language sexism and gendered professional terms is scarce, but experiences are many, and can be found in publications not usually referred to when linguistic problems are discussed. This presents an additional difficulty for researchers. We can trace the very first institutional dealing with the problem of gender in official speech back to the 1950s, when the Communist Party initiated debates on gender equality in terms of social reality, as opposed to politically declared equality of genders. Political aspects of the problem were usually solved on the level of political recommendations, not on the level of clearly established rules based on methodological concepts and normative (grammatical) rules. However, there are clear differences within the Yugoslav space; there has been a tendency of respecting gender distinction in Croatia since that time, while in Serbia the Communist Party backs up the growing "neutralization" of the masculine gender and does not protest when feminine terms with the same meaning are assigned negative connotations in everyday use (like the media and culture). For instance, the use of terms like chauffeuress, ministress, or authoress would be interpreted as ironical. It should be said, as a reminder, that in Slavic and South Slavic languages, as well as in other Balkan languages, grammatical distinctions of gender are quite clear, allowing little or no ambiguity concerning gender and that possibilities for forming and using (gendered) neologisms are much wider than in Roman, Anglo-Saxon, or even German languages. Later, in the '80s, when former Yugoslavia had its first experience of and contact with contemporary Western feminism, some feminist linguists introduced the sex/gender distinction into the academia. A paradigmatic case is the *Psycholinguistic Research* project, organized by Svenka Savić at the University of Novi Sad. The focal topic of the project was the codification and normativization of non-sexist language, with the aim of applying gender symmetry to terms for professions, titular and official terminology, and the neutralization of the dominant patterns of use in everyday language, in which only one gender (the masculine) has a marked presence. Unfortunately, the public discourse continued to pay respect both to institutional rules and to the non-written rules of the patriarchal order, so projects like this one not only remained isolated, they were denounced as "non-desirable" in the academia. Some relevant conclusions concerning the sexist use of language remain to be gained from this kind of research. The sexist use of language in SCB languages is the result of spontaneous speech practice, and depends mostly on the level of consciousness about matters like gender distinction in a given speech community. The verbal discrimination and verbal sexism do not depend on the structure of the language, but on the use of language (social grammar) and language politics. Eugenija Barić therefore concludes that the language is not inert, but the speakers are (5), while Svenka Savić warns that we should not speak about the stereotypal speech of women, but of stereotypal professions that the speech reflects (6).

Definitions of women's language usually stress differences in relation to men's language, and most often construct these differences on the level of vocabulary: women supposedly use more emotional phrases and deliver expressive discourses, while men are oriented more toward the informational discourse, which fosters straightforward communication (7). While women tend to cultivate communication with a stronger flux of

information, aimed at a more pleasant communicational atmosphere, men tend to achieve consensus, usually in a hierarchical form. In contemporary virtual communication (the Internet), it seems that women are more inclined to conceal their identity in chat-rooms and in forums (8). That would mean that the virtual discourse is reflecting the real gender/power situation and the general social perception of sex/gender distinction. However, it seems that linguistically arguable differences in the use of language can be noted only in phonetic difference (women generally pronounce more correctly and show more diversity in accents and tone), while other differences quoted above belong to the contextual realization of the language, i.e. to the domain of the analysis of discourse. Grammars of SCB languages commonly propose rules to form feminine nouns (for professions), which consist of adding productive suffixes (-ka, -ca, -ica) to nouns in the masculine gender. The same rule applies when nationality, titles, and similar notions have to be expressed in the feminine. These rules confirm the possibility of realizing feminine nouns from masculine nouns, but many possible feminine nouns remain unrealised lexemes. The authorities in grammars, even the authors of manuals on the subject, often propose the sole use of masculine nouns, because "profession does not have a gender", or because they assume that the use of the masculine gender effectively negates the need for a generic neutral gender, which they consider justified by a predominant grammatical tolerance toward irregular congruence, as in the case of "Mrs Professor" (clear gender irregularity in South-Slavic languages, as mentioned above). This "tolerance of language" or support of syntactic irregularity is not in harmony with the social situation or grammatical tradition. Internationally known Serbian linguist Milka Ivić believes that this problem of grammatical order will be solved when women "invade" certain professions in sufficiently large numbers. If this happens, Milka Ivić believes that linguists should back up efforts to introduce the feminine nouns for reasons of congruence, not feminism (9). In her opinion, practical considerations would threaten "the exception that confirms the rule" and with it, the grammatical rules of the Serbian language, therefore necessitating change.

In her recent research and in her popular articles, Svenka Savić has seriously undermined this traditional and women-unfriendly position. She stressed that the feminine nouns for professions often bear an "inferiority connotation", a negative gender marker, as in the case of "TV anchor(ess)", so consequently the feminine is avoided, because it "does not sound right" (10). Savić thinks that this is a case of subjective treatment of a problem, which hints at objectively dysfunctional stress on gender/feminine. When the feminine gender is unavoidable, the negative connotation disappears, like in this example: "The radio acnhoresses are as brilliant as the radio anchors". Savić' analyses of the media show the extent to which the negative feminine gender connotation is present. She argues that there is a need for the neutralization of such use of feminine terms: not to exclude the feminine from language use, but somehow to avoid sexist misuse. According to Savić, higher political and social functions are much more susceptible to sexist misuse than "ordinary" professions and titles. Interestingly enough, Savić reminds us that in rural settings all professional titles in SCB languages are gender distinctive, and often used as such to ridicule the rural use of language.

The use of the possessive form of the family name is another sexist misuse of language, but the absence of the possessive particle is equally offensive, because that is identified as "masculine": this was clear in the case of much-hated Madeleine Albright ("Olbrajtova-Obrajt"), and in the case of Nadežda Mićić, temporary Prime Minister of Serbia after unsuccessful presidential elections ("Mićićeva-Mićić"). The same happened to Florence Hartmann, Carla del Ponte's public relations officer, but not to Carla del Ponte, because of the grammatical impossibility of using her name in this way. The "gap" was filled with epithets, "bitch" being the most internationally translatable. The linguist Egon Fekete points to this phenomenon, but not without a hint of sexist irony: "...this manner of naming feminine persons (should we say - ladies?) is at least tasteless" (11). The Serbian media, even the former anti-Milošević opposition, often use the masculine form of women's names when those women are publicly attacked for being politically engaged and/or suspected of being feminists, and add the masculine form of the verb to stress the ironic use ("Kandić in Biserko su rekli" - Kandić and Biserko said) (12). It should be added that in the current discursive use of sex-gender distinction, the masculine is prevalent in SCB languages, and that it is almost exclusively used in religious discourse.

References

1. Svenka Savić, *Jezik i pol I: istraživanja u svetu*, Ženske studije, Beograd 1/1995 (pp.197-209).

2. Rada Iveković, Spol maternjeg jezika, seksualna gramtika, Kruh i ruže, br. 5/6, Ženska infoteka, Zagreb 1995/1996

3. The difference is mostly contextual, and linked to the question of the new national identity: Bosnian linguists relate the term Bosnian to the territory in which the language is spoken, while the term "bošnjački" is predominantly used by Croatian and Serbian linguists who stress the national/religious identity - "bošnjački" would be the language of Bosnian Muslims.

4. Božidar Jakšić, *Nacionalizam i jezik, Jedno balkansko iskustvo*,
http:/www.komunikacija.org.yu/komunikacija/casopisi/fid/XI/D4/document

5. Svenka Savić, Jezik i pol II: *istraživanja kod nas*, Ženske studije, Beograd 2-3/1995 (228-244).

6. Eugenija Barić in: Svenka Savić, *Jezik i pol II: istraživanja kod nas*, Ženske studije, Beograd 2-3/1995 (228-244).

7. Svenka Savić, Jezik i pol II: *istraživanja kod nas*, Ženske studije, Beograd 2-3/1995 (228-244).

8. Tadej Praprotnik, *Kompjutorski posredovana komunikacija i problem spolnog identiteta*,
http://filozof.ffzg.hr/kssd/casopis/2br/radovi/praprotnik.html.

9. Milka Ivić, *O zelenom konju, Novi lingvisticki ogledi*, Beograd 1995, 155.

10. **Živojin Stanojčić, Ljubomir Popović**
(2000). *Gramatika srpskog jezika za I, II, III i IV razred srednje škole*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Beograd.

11. Egon Fekete, *Zanimanja i titule ženskih osoba* u: *Slovo o jeziku, Jezicki poucnik*, Partenon, 1996 (57-65).

12. **Sonja Biserko**
(2002). *Tačka razlaza*, Helsinški odbor Srbije, Beograd.

The Use of Sex/Gender in the Croatian language

Rada Boric

Before addressing the issue of sex/gender use in the Croatian language, in order to give the reader a taste of the well-preserved, well-kept and long-perpetuated language distinctions between the sexes in the Croatian language, I would like to use the definition of the words for "woman" and "man" in the very first dictionary of the Croatian language (Anić, 1991) that might throw light on the connotation of these words and their concepts in the given cultural context, and therefore on the language consciousness concerning this issue.

Although recent years have seen much effort expended in the creation of a standardization of norms and rules for Croatian grammar, orthography, and lexicon(1). Obviously none of this has gone into the development of rules against linguistic discrimination in the field of gender. Thus, the word *žena* [woman] is defined as follows: "1. compared to man, person of sex opposite to man; female", and only second to this: "adult person of the female sex", followed by the woman's social role: "2. female spouse, wife". (This is perhaps not so surprising, as it is exactly the same definition that was given in 1967 in the "common" *Rečnik srpsko-hrvatskoga književnog jezika* (Dictionary of the Serbo-Croatian language), published jointly by Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska (1967:26) and it appears that nothing at all has been changed). On the other hand, *muškarac* [man] is simply defined as an "adult person of the male sex". While there are no single negative idiomatic expressions for men listed, for women there are expressions such as *javna žena* [lit. "public" woman], explained only as *prostitutka* [prostitute], or *laka žena* [lit. "easy" woman], defined as "an easily conquered woman, who is not selective concerning her male partners". Although the expression *javna žena* [public woman] could also denote female politicians, ministers, actors and activists, the dictionary does not take this into consideration, and in the revised edition of the dictionary (edited in 1998), there is no change. The dictionary published in 2000 by two known Croatian publishers (*Rječnik hrvatskoga jezika*, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža i Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 2000) spread, along with this "definition", what I would dare to call questionable politics. "Woman" is defined as: "1. human being by sex opposite to man, who can bear children and take on main concern for upbringing and education of the children, 2. married female person, marital spouse; wife". *Javna žena* here, even after 10 years, is also uniquely defined as *prostitutka*!

This short introduction into the pure naming of the two sexes has the aim of giving an idea of how difficult it is for feminists (feminist activists and scholars) to introduce and develop feminist approaches not only to the different theories and practices, but to the language itself.

In Croatia, as well as in Yugoslavia before its fall (in the 1990s), gender differences were seen as sexual differences and sex [spol] covered the whole domain of sex and gender issues.
The term *spol* [sex](2) has also predominantly been used in feminist theory in Croatia, but when one reads feminist texts from that period (feminist authors gathered around the group Žena i Društvo [Woman and Society] of the Croatian Sociological Association), one may notice that there was some understanding of the sex/gender difference.

With the influence of the '80s (mainly from American feminist theory), *rod* [gender] and its derivates (*oroden* [gendered], *rodna politika* [gender politics], *rodna jednakost* [gender equality], etc.) entered the world through feminist writing in Croatia trying to promote and affirm the difference between sex and gender. New theoretical discussions opened up later on (for example, Judith Butler) that tried to "erase" the strict sex/gender barriers found in the "cemented" sex/gender distinction in Croatia. However, since it took a great deal of effort to inaugurate the term *rod* [gender](3), feminists agreed, for practical reasons, to use the following "conventional" distinction: *spol* [sex] would be used for biological fact, and *rod* [gender] for its social construct.

At a recent meeting of experts from the Centre for Women's Studies with experts from the Faculty of Law in Zagreb, specific sex/gender terminology was discussed(4) that would be used in the book (see footnote) and which might be the "lodestone" for the future use of such terminology. The discussion lasted four hours and could very well be a reflection of the struggle to keep, on the one hand, already adopted terms and, on the other, to introduce new ones. The meeting between the law experts and feminists proved that a common language could be found if both parties were willing to listen to each other and to respect the arguments offered.
As an example: during the period of socialism, *ravnopravnost spolova* [equality of sexes] was used, and its 50 years of usage deserved respect. Although feminists use *rodna jednakopravnost* (*rodna jednakost*, *rodna ravnopravnost*) for gender equality, they agreed to respect the term currently in use, resolving to use every

opportunity to promote "the differences" and an understanding of the terms. Also, additional arguments were accepted: the already existing Saborski odbor za jednakost spolova [Parliamentary Committee on the Equality of the Sexes] (earlier, it had, rather unspecifically, been called the Committee on Equality) and *Zakon o ravnopravnosti spolova* [Gender Equality Law(5)] and it was agreed not to overburden the issue linguistically. As many of the terms were "imported" and belonged to the new European legislative language (not necessarily feminist!), it was important to "unify" them. Here is how the terms were resolved:

- ➢ gender equality: *ravnopravnost spolova* [equality of the sexes];
- ➢ gender opportunities: *jednake mogucnosti* [equal opportunities];
- ➢ gender mainstreaming: *rodna usmjerenost*, *rodno osjetljiva politika* (already used at the CWS);
- ➢ sexual harassment: *seksualno uznemiravanje* (also proposed and occasionally used was *seksualno ucjenjivanje* [sexual blackmail], officially left for specific cases).

As is evident from these three terms using gender in English, there is little consistency in their translation to Croatian. One (gender equality) preserves the older naming: sex (*ravnopravnost spolova*), the other (gender opportunities) circumvents sex/gender opposition completely, translating gender as "equal" (*jednak*), while the third term (gender mainstreaming) promotes gender (*rodna usmjerenost* or *rodno osjetljiva politika*). It is clearly easier to adopt gender (*rod*) into the newest terms (gender mainstreaming) than into pre-existing ones (gender equality)(6).

In conclusion, this brief elaboration of sex/gender use in Croatian language has opened up many questions, among them how to combat deeply rooted and daily perpetuated gender discrimination in the language itself and how to adopt, translate and promote (new) feminist terminology to be appropriate, understandable and useful.

References

1. Anić, Vladimir
(1991): *Rječnik hrvatskog jezika*. Zagreb: Novi Liber

2. *Rječnik hrvatskog jezika*
(2000). Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža & Školska knjiga

3. *Rečnik srpskohrvatskog jezika*
(1967). Novi Sad-Zagreb: Matica Srpska - Matica Hrvatska

4. *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika* (part XIV, 1955) (part XVI, 1956-58). Zagreb: JAZU

Footnotes

(1) Two socio-political changes in the countries of former Eastern Europe accelerated the creation of new Slavic languages. The official language in former Yugoslavia was called Serbo-Croatian. It comprised in its (composite) name the standard languages of the two largest national groups: Serbs and Croats. The two other federal standard languages were Slovenian and Macedonian, but it was Serbo-Croatian that represented us as citizens of Yugoslavia. Language is conventionally recognized as an entity with internally and externally unclear boundaries. While it is easier to detect structural and genetic components, socio-linguistic components are more complicated due to the social nature of language (cultural, historical, ethnical, socio-psychological, political and state aspects being the most obvious). It turns out that the socio-linguistic aspect is stronger and more relevant (at least to its speakers, and more to the "owners of the power") than the linguistic aspect. I will speak only about the Croatian language, because the usage of terms sex and gender might overlap in the other languages of former Yugoslavia.

(2) Spol [sex] carries the old Slavic meaning of "half" and "cut in half" [*polb*], from the Indo-European *(s)phal *(s)phel - cut, split; immediately showing its binary distinction. The *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, JAZU, Zagreb, 1956-58 [Dictionary of the Croatian or Serbian language] defines *pol* [sex] (the Serbian variant): "the same as *spol* (Croatian variant); because man and woman, each of them individually, are considered to be half of human. I.e. neither man nor woman are the full human being *per se*. Church Slavic and Russian *polb*." (1956-8:577) In Anić's dictionary it is defined as the "totality of physiological and psychological characteristics by which man and woman are different…" With additional expressions such as: *jaki spol* [strong sex], *muškarci* [men],

lijepi /ljepši, nježniji, slabiji, krasni/ [beautiful, more beautiful, gentler, weaker] *žene* (women), see Anić (1991:868)

(3) *Rod* [gender] carries an old Slavic meaning: to be born, to give birth (rooted in Indo-European "to grow, tall"), and means "1. a. That which is born; born ones; b. Family, family ties; c. (blood) relatives", but under 3. "(coll.) all beings of one kind; race, gender", under 5. "(coll.) sex of humans and animals" and under 6. "a. *gram* formal gender of words in specific languages; b. belonging to one of the natural genders, in fact sexes (male/female gender)", see Anić (1991:627). At least Anić's dictionary gives attributions to *spol* and *rod* that cover usage of sex and gender, while the *Dictionary of the Croatian Language*, published by the Leksikografski zavod and Školska knjiga offers a purely biological distinction under *spol*: "biol. Set of anatomic and psychological characteristics that makes a man and woman, as well as male and female animals belonging to the same kind" (2000:1163) (except that the expression is: *ljepši spol - žene* [the more beautiful sex - women] and *rod* [gender] has no idea that it could have anything to do with human sex (gender) (2000:1083). The authors (of which nine are women! The editor-in-chief was the only male working in the team!) could have looked in the older JAZU dictionary (JAZU: *Rječnik hrvatskog ili srpskog jezika*, part XIV, Zagreb, 1955:84) which acknowledges the possibility of using *rod* [gender] as *spol* [sex].
In the Bosnian language, it is used as *džender*, and in the Slovenian language as *družbeni spol*.

(4) On December 30, 2002, at the Centre for Women's Studies in Zagreb, the team from the Faculty of Law in Zagreb, along with feminist scholars from the Centre, discussed the "gender-mainstreaming" policy from a linguistic perspective in order to find out the most appropriate translations for gender-related notions that would be of use in the book *Equality Between Men and Women, Lay and Politics in European Union and Croatia*.

(5) This is the official translation, although in the Croatian language it is the "Law on the Equality of Sexes."

(6) It would be good to re-examine the meaning (and the danger) of the shift in naming. For example, many Women's studies institutions changed their name into Gender studies, and then many Offices for Gender Equality changed their names into Offices for Equal Opportunities. Women, and the notion of their sex and gender are slipping away.

Categories of "sex" and "gender" in Latvian language: developing terminology in gender studies.

Elizabete Picukane

Latvia, like many other post-Soviet states, is in a peculiar situation in terms of developing terminology in Gender Studies. Gender Studies was introduced into university curricula in the beginning of the nineties, and in most cases, students of gender struggled with texts, mostly in English but also in other languages, trying to translate and use concepts that came with these new texts and new approaches. The end of the 1990s and the beginning of 2000s were marked by the appearance of several significant publications – both translations and collections of articles. The Centre for Gender Studies at the University of Latvia, published a volume of translated texts entitled *Contemporary feminist theories: an anthology* (Novikova, 2001). The centre "Feministica Lettica" (University of Latvia) published a collection of articles *Feminism and literature* (Cimdina, 1997a) and has also issued three almanacs under the same title. The United Nations Development Program published a translation of the handbook *Gender Mainstreaming in Practice* (Neimanis, 2003).

The term "gender", a basic term in gender studies and research, has been translated and used in several ways in contrast to "sex", which is considered to be a rather unproblematic concept, commonly translated as *dzimums* ("biological sex"). It is important to note the way in which the term "gender" is tied to particular institutions and implies a certain positioning within feminist theories in terms of values and affiliations. Thus, I would argue that the usage of "gender" is not "only a matter of language", but that it has been influenced by certain background conceptions and that it influences a space of discussion of sex/gender by excluding or including certain aspects and allowing or disallowing certain interpretations.

By participating as a translator for some of the abovementioned publications, writing in Latvian, and teaching several lecture courses, I had the opportunity to write and speak "through" the developing terminology of feminist theories. I also took part in two discussions where a decision was taken about which particular translation of "gender" to use in Latvian. One was organised in the process of translating "Contemporary feminist theories," and the other to discuss the translation of this term in the handbook "Gender Mainstreaming in Practice". In addition, some publications of the centre "Feministica Lettica" include explicit discussions of the term and offer their position.

There are five positions that can be delineated in using "gender" in Latvia: 1) "gender" as *dzimums* ("sex"), preferred by state institutions and the UNDP; 2) "gender" as *socialais dzimums* ("social sex"); 3) "gender" as *dzimte* ("gender", borrowed from grammar) preferred by the Centre for Gender Studies and myself; 4) "gender" as *dzimumsocialitate* ("gender sociality") used mainly by "Feministica Lettica"; and 5) *gender* used as a foreign word, preferred by a few authors (Kule and Kulis, 1996).

I. Dzimums

The first way of using "gender" is to include it in the category of "sex" - *dzimums*, or using "sex" to mean both biological and social aspects. Such usage is perhaps most widespread, and there are several arguments that can be (and are) employed to support it. First of all, there is no word in Latvian that could stand alone to signify social aspects of sex. The grammatical category *dzimte* (gender) refers only to the gender of nouns in most contexts. It has often been argued that the usage of "sex" to describe both its biological and social components would be the most appropriate when creating publications for a wide audience. This argument is sometimes used when opposing the usage of *dzimte* (gender), emphasising that there is no need for another word, since it would sound artificial and unintelligible when referring to the social construct. This statement was used when discussing the translation of "Gender Mainstreaming in Practice". A. Cimdina, a leader of the centre "Feministica Lettica," argued in their first collection of articles that "if sex can be rather safely translated as *dzimums*, the basic meaning of *gender* "gramatiska dzimte" [grammatical gender] does not create corresponding associations in Latvian" (Cimdina, 1997b: 7). Also, on the basis of an article translated by a Norwegian researcher Karin Viderberga, who draws on the discussion of "sex" and "gender" initiated by Judith Butler, an argument is offered that *dzimums* ("sex") is perhaps the most appropriate, since the meaning would be clear from the context (Viderberga, 2001; see also Cimdina, 2001). In those cases where "sex" is used cautiously, it can be explained to the reader that the term *dzimums* includes both biological and social aspects (see notes in Neimanis, 2003).

On the other hand, I think that, in many contexts, the usage of *dzimums* as including both social and biological components hides the social aspect of the term. Since *dzimums* primarily signifies biological sex, its consistent usage in gender-related contexts may create the impression that its social aspects are either

rooted in biological sex or based on it. It then becomes very difficult to argue that gender is sometimes unrelated to sex. When gender is not delineated conceptually, it becomes more complicated to conceptualise the "sex" of transsexuals or the "sex" of a woman who may be of either gender (marked as "feminine" or "masculine"). In addition, since it is accepted that there are two sexes, it may imply that there are two parallel genders.

II. Socialais dzimums

The second way of using gender does not imply the "social" aspect, but literally adds it to "sex", thereby creating a sort of descriptive translation of "gender" – "social sex" (*socialais dzimums*). A version of *socialais dzimums* is employed in the following case: the term "Gender Studies" is translated as *sociali noteiktu dzimumu studijas* (the studies of socially-determined gender) in the textbook *Philosophy* (Kule and Kulis, 1996). In a collection of articles translated from Finnish, *dzimums* ("sex")*, dzimte* ("gender") and *socialais dzimums* ("social sex") are all used to express the term "gender" (Koivunena and Liljestrema, 2002). Sometimes *socialais dzimums* is used to describe *dzimte* (gender), as in an anarchist magazine *Pretspars* [*Counteraction*] (in the article "Against Homophobia", available online). Currently, it is not a widely used term in publications, conferences and events; in academic discourse either *dzimte* (gender), or *dzimumsocialitate* ("sex sociality", explained below) or just the English word *gender* is used. However, I have often used it myself and overheard it being used by someone trying to explain briefly what "gender" means. There are several arguments for using *socialais dzimums*. Firstly, it is better than just *dzimums* because it emphasises the social aspects of "sex". Secondly, it is easy to understand the term since both of the words comprising the phrase are widely used. Therefore translating "gender" in this way makes its semantic content easier to grasp.

There are some other implications to using *socialais dzimums*. Even if it widens the scope of "sex" by adding a social side to it and emphasising that side, still, the inevitable association with the biological "basis" of gender implies that "social sex" (i.e. gender) is an extension of biological sex, or at least closely tied to it. This is the same problem inherent in extending the use of the word "sex" to include "gender". It is also more probable that "social sex" would be thought of in dichotomous terms, parallel to biological sex. I do believe, however, that it allows one to conceptualise with greater ease and clarity the previously mentioned case of transsexuals and, for instance, "feminine" men. One can ask why the term is not widely used either in Gender Studies or in discussions related to gender issues. I hypothesise that perhaps a cumbersome, two-word descriptive phrase has less of a chance to "survive" as a term. Another answer might be that in academic discourse, a one-word term seems to be handier (cf. Vejs, 2001). In addition, a distinction from another "tradition" of usage of the term in Latvian is maintained.

III. Dzimte

The third version of translating and using "gender" is *dzimte.* Originally, it was a grammatical category that was borrowed for Gender Studies, as was done in the United States in the 1960s (Scott, 1999; Cimdina, 1997b; Viderberga, 2001). In 1998, the term was used for the title of the Centre for Gender Studies in the University of Latvia. After a long discussion, it was agreed to use the term *dzimte*, and from then on, that term was used exclusively in all the publications by the Centre for Gender Studies (see Novikova, 2001; Novikova and Picukane, 2001; Centre for Gender Studies, 2004). This term was also chosen for a series of publications in the journal *Communication*, issued by the Department of Communication of the University of Latvia; most of the authors mention *dzimte* among the keywords of their articles (*Komunikacija*, 2003). The term has also been accepted in the title for a Gender Studies workshop organised for the past three years in the framework of the annual conference of the University of Latvia. In addition, *dzimte* appears in titles of courses offered by the Centre for Gender Studies. These have been approved by the University.

There are several arguments for using this term. First, it is a Latvian word and even though it has no direct relation to gender as a social category, it is comparatively easy to make that link: there is a feminine and masculine gender in grammar, and we can conceptualise social differences among men and women in the same way. Second, the term *dzimte* does not have any direct relation to "sex". As a third argument, a similar situation in English-speaking countries can be mentioned where the category of gender was taken from grammar and then became accepted by the wider public as a part of Gender Studies terminology. Joan Scott, in her article "Gender: A Useful Category for Historical Analysis" (not translated into Latvian), succinctly makes an argument for widening the semantic field of the grammatical category of gender: "The connection to grammar is both explicit and full of unexamined possibilities. Explicit because the grammatical usage involves formal rules that follow from the masculine or feminine designation; full of unexamined

possibilities because in many Indo-European languages there is a third category – unsexed or neuter" (Scott, 1999: 28-29).

There are several disadvantages to using this term, all related to situations where the category itself and this term are in the process of being "spoken", appropriated and accepted. Some people confuse the term with *dzimta* (kin). In addition, the term needs to be explained when introduced to a new audience. Also, since it is related to the grammatical category of gender, it may retain its dual character, since there are only two grammatical genders in Latvian. But then, because other languages have three possible genders, using the grammatical term may, in some cases, facilitate moving the discussion onto the possibility of multiple genders. Another critique against translating "gender" using the grammatical term is expressed by K. Viderberga in relation to Scandinavian languages: she criticizes the dominance of American feminist analysis, and argues that this way of translating the term masks nuances that are possible in other languages and conceptualisations (Viderberga, 2001). She also argues that when adopted literally, the term "gender" hides rather than expresses the idea of social construction (Cimdina, 2001)

IV. Dzimumsocialitat

The fourth way of using "gender", *dzimumsocialitat*, was suggested by a philosopher J. Vejs, and was appropriated in their recent publications by the centre "Feministica Lettica." It can be translated into English as "the sociality of sex" or "the social side of sex", perhaps tied to the socialisation of sex. There is no word *socialise* in the Latvian language, and the meaning of the word is unclear at first glance. If it is explained by using the word *socials* (social) and tied to "sex", its meaning intuitively becomes clearer. Vejs bases his arguments on the ideas of Viderberga, who opposes the literal translation of the term "gender" and suggests using only "sex", which is a term with a wider semantic field in Latvian than in English. However, in my view, Vejs falls into the same trap; He, too, creates two distinct categories. Arguing that *dzimumsocialitate* is a better term that could be used to translate "gender" (and it is used like that in translations published in *Feministica Lettica*, 2001), Vejs states: "This term, in my view, sufficiently shows the connection of *dzimumsocialitate* with (biological) sex and adequately accentuates the social – i.e., acquired, inculcated etc. – character of this kind of sex" (Vejs, 2001: 163). He believes that the creation of a new term would be more productive than using *dzimte* or any other version of "gender".

V. Gender

The fifth and rarest way of expressing "gender" is transliteration of the term: simply using the English word. The last way of employing the term is preferred by the authors of the textbook *Philosophy* (Kule and Kulis, 1996); one of the authors of this book, M. Kule, also uses the term in this way in her conference presentations (Bebre, 2001). In my view, this is a very unclear usage of the term, especially when one takes into account the other, abovementioned options. It may be appropriate, but probably only in the narrowest of academic contexts.

Conclusion

In this article, I reviewed current usage of the terms "sex" and "gender" in Latvian. "Sex" appears to be a rather unproblematic term, since it already exists in Latvian with the definition of "biological sex". However, there are five approaches to translating and using "gender" currently employed in publications and debates. I discussed the main arguments used to support or criticise each position. I also tried to show the implications of each of these usages. In addition, I demonstrated the reasons for using the term *dzimte*, which I prefer.

References

"Against Homophobia", *Pretspars* [*Counteraction*], online:
http://pretspars.hardcore.lt/pretspars2/prethomofobiju.htm (15.11.04.)

Bebre, D.
    (2001). 'Par Sievieti ar Lielo un Parasto Burtu' (About a Woman with Capital and Common Letter) *Latvijas Vestnesis*, 59, 12.04.

Centre for Gender Studies
(2004). '*Masu Mediju Loma Varas Pardale'* (*The Role of Mass Media in Redistribution of Power*), Riga: the Ministry of Welfare of Latvia, 2004.

Cimdina, A. (Ed.)
(1997a). ' Feminisms un Literatura' *(Feminism and Literature*) Riga: Zinatne.

Cimdina, A.
(1997b). 'Feminisms un Literatura' (Feminism and Literature). In Cimdina, A. (Ed), *Feminisms un Literatura [Feminism and Literature]* (pp. 5-19), Riga: Zinatne.

Cimdina, A.
(2001). 'Sieviete Musdienu Latvijas Zinatne' (A Woman in Contemporary Science of Latvia) *Latvijas Vestnesis*, 120, 18.08.

Koivunena, A. And Liljestrema, M. (Eds.)
(2002). Atslegvardi: Desmit Soli Feminisma Petnieciba (*Keywords: Ten Steps in Feminist Studies*) Riga: Center for Gender Studies, University of Latvia. *Komunikacija* [*Communication*] (2003), 655.

Kule, M., Kulis, R.
(1996). *Filosofija* (*Philosophy*), Riga: Burtnieks.

Neimanis, A.
(2003). *Dzimumu Lidztiesibas Principa Integresana Prakse* [*Gender Mainstreaming in Practice*], Riga: UNDP.

Novikova, I. (Ed.)
(2001). *Musdienu Feministiskas Teorijas: Antologija* [*Contemporary Feminist Theories: an Anthology*], Riga: Jumava.

Novikova, I. and Picukane, E. (Eds.)
(2001). *Par Agru? Par Velu? Feministiskas Idejas, Konteksti, Pieejas* (*Too Early? Too Late?) Feminist Ideas, Contexts, Approaches*], Riga: Center for Gender Studies, University of Latvia.

Scott, J.W.
(1999). 'Gender; A Useful Category of Historical Analysis'. In Scott, J.W., *Gender and the Politics of History*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Vejs, J.
(2001). 'Tulkotaja Piezime"'(A Note of a Translator). *Feministica Lettica*, 2.

Viderberga, K.
(2001). 'Tulkojot *Gender*' (Translating *Gender*). *Feministica Lettica*, 2.

The Sex/Gender distinction in Lithuania

Audronė Žukauskaitė

After 1990, the Open Society Fund Lithuania started a series of discussions on different topics. Feminism was prevalent among them, and the translators were confronted with the problem of how to translate different terms. The question concerning sex/gender distinction remains open even now, because there is no strict Lithuanian equivalent for the term "gender". The term "sex" is translated as *lytis* in Lithuanian and means: 1) one of two genders of living beings (masculine or feminine); 2) form or appearance(1). This means that the definition of the term "sex" already refers to the term "gender", which is translated as *giminė*.

From my personal point of view, this term is the best equivalent for the term "gender", but the problem is that its sexual connotations are not evident in Lithuanian.
Before beginning my argumentation, I would like to give some historical background. The first attempt to cope with the sex/gender distinction was to invent a new word for the term "sex" – in Lithuanian it is *gimtis*, a noun constructed from the verb *gimti*, "to be born". The term "gender" was thereafter translated as *lytis* ("sex")(2). I am not sure if this attempt was successful. First of all, the new word *gimtis* does not function properly in the language system. The second and most important point is that the word *lytis* ("sex") still covers both meanings: "sex" as well as "gender". So now we have some confusion: by saying *lytis* ("sex") we mean to express the concept of "gender", but we use the same word to speak about "sex" in the literal sense.

I propose that we translate "sex" as *lytis* (there is a direct correspondence in the English-Lithuanian dictionary), and "gender" - as *giminė*. The English-Lithuanian dictionary offers the following definitions of the term "gender": 1) grammatical gender; 2) "sex", for example, *female sex* (in spoken language). So in relation to English, the sexual connotations of the word *giminė* ("gender") seem clear. However, if we study the word *giminė* in the Lithuanian language system, the word means: 1) several generations sharing a common ancestor; 2) relative; 3) human race *žmonių giminė*; 4) grammatical gender – masculine, feminine, or neutral gender *(vyriškoji, moteriškoji, bevardė giminė)*(3).
This means that the Lithuanian *giminė* functions very similarly to the word "rod" in Russian. The term *giminė* also functions as a biological term, meaning "genus" as opposed to "species" (division of a genus).

To sum up, we can say that the term *giminė* is very suitable to cover the term "gender", bearing in mind Judith Butler's description of the term gender as a social and cultural construct, a set of discursive practices which performatively enact gendered identities. The argument for this is that we have three layers of meaning, all of which function in the Lithuanian language system: 1) *giminė* meaning grammatical gender; 2) *giminė* meaning the logical term for a group, a class, a category; 3) *giminė* meaning one of two genders of the human race. Here we find that the word *giminė* has the same status that Teresa de Lauretis and Joan Scott ascribe to the term "gender": "the term *gender* is, actually, the representation of a relation, that of belonging to a class, a group, a category. Gender is the representation of a relation, or (...) gender constructs a relation between one entity and other entities, which are previously constituted as a class. So gender represents not an individual, but a relation, and a social relation; in other words, it represents an individual for a class."(4)

The main obstacle to establishing the term *giminė* to describe "gender" is its surplus of meanings, one of which is particularly undesirable is this context. In everyday consciousness, the word *giminė* is associated with the meaning "relative", which, in turn, has very specific connotations in the post-Soviet context. Post-Soviet society is often described as the "Republic of relatives." Of course, this definition, with its implication of nepotism, refers to the high rates of corruption in our society. The word *giminė* would then be associated with corruption. To reclaim the term, we need some enlightenment on gender issues.

Footnotes

1: *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (2000). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

2: *Feminizmo ekskursai. Moters samprata nuo Antikos iki postmodernizmo* (1995). Antologija, sud. Karla Gruodis. Vilnius: Pradai.

3: *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas* (2000). Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas.

4: De Lauretis, Teresa
(1987). *Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film, and Fiction* Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, p. 4-5. Scott, Joan (1986). "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91, No. 5.

Implications of the Terms "Sexe" [Sex] and "Gènere" [Gender] for Policy Definitions in Catalonia

Anna Cabó and Kontxi Odriozola

The terms sex and gender are sometimes confused and used incorrectly, even among people who work in the field of social issues and equality.

The purpose of this article is not to carry out a semantic and etymological dissection of the two terms, but to consider their meaning and complexity in relation to the equality policies that are being carried out by public institutions, in our case by Barcelona Provincial Council.

Sex and gender as concepts

Feminist theory distinguishes between 'sex' and 'gender'. Sex refers to the biophysiological characteristics that differentiate women from men, whereas gender refers to the set of expectations that society establishes in relation to the patterns of social and cultural behaviour of women and men.

The term gender is used in the fields of psychology and clinical medicine. John Money (1995) introduced the concept of gender roles in psychology. It refers to the public expression of being a man or a woman. In his book Sex and Gender (1968), Robert Stoller defined the concept of gender identity as the private experience of belonging to a sex. On the basis of research on boys and girls who, because of congenital anatomical problems, had been educated in a sex that did not correspond to their anatomical sex, he realised that their previous education was more decisive than biology.

Today, gender is considered to have several dimensions, including the following:
- ✓ Gender roles, which, for example, assign the role of carers and housewives and the private sphere to women and the role of productive work and the public sphere to men.
- ✓ Gender rules, which determine expected behaviour according to gender roles.
- ✓ Gender characteristics, which are the psychological characteristics that adapt to the gender rules.
- ✓ Gender behaviour, defined as female or male behaviour in different contexts.
- ✓ Gender identity, which can be objective or subjective, and refers to the ways in which people are identified by others. This may differ from the way in which they identify themselves.

Due to their polysemantic and academic nature, the terms sex and gender are increasingly used interchangeably outside academic and specialised circles.

Traditionally, many of the differences in behaviour between women and men were perceived as determined by biology, i.e., by sex rather than gender. Currently, the definition of gender as a holistic concept includes different social and cultural parameters, enabling an integral analysis of social attitudes and behaviours. This reasoning influences public gender policies, which aim to achieve gender equity: the recognition, acceptance and equal evaluation of differences between women and men and their respective needs.

Sex and gender in language

Though it is not the purpose of this article to consider linguistic issues, it is worth recalling, as Eulàlia Lledó states, that Catalan is a gendered language. The confusion of the terms we use is partly related to this characteristic.

As a Romance language, Catalan has genders, i.e., the nouns, adjectives, articles and pronouns vary according to the masculine or feminine gender. This is not the case for English for instance. Eulàlia Lledó points out that gender is "a grammatical category in reference to words (sabata (shoe) is a feminine word in Catalan, whereas zapato (shoe) is a masculine word

in Spanish) and sex refers to living beings that can be divided into male or female, according to their set of biochemical, physiological and organic features". [1]

The incorporation of women in employment and the public sphere has changed the Catalan language, i.e. certain trades, qualifications, professions and posts that until recently were considered masculine and given masculine names have been feminised. Thus, new words with the feminine gender, such as metgessa (female doctor) and advocada (female lawyer), have been created in Catalan.

Implications of the terms sex and gender for public policies
Equality policies - intentions and decisions by public authorities with regard to the equality of women and men - have evolved from policies of non-sex discrimination seeking equal treatment, through positive action, and finally to gender mainstreaming policies. In other words, policies have moved from the viewpoint of equal rights and opportunities towards the consideration of the structural and social factors that lead to gender inequalities and their inclusion in the public political agendas.

This evolution has been marked by many factors, such as the influence and capacity of the feminist movement. Women in different social and cultural areas have put questions of inequality between women and men on the political agenda. However, it has also been marked by an academic evolution which has transferred ideas into regulations and legislation, and has developed new concepts.

Understanding inequality between women and men as an integral and structural aspect of our societies also involves finding new forms of explanation that are not reductionist with regard to the dissymmetries between the sexes.

Biological determinism adopts a reductionist viewpoint, whereas gender allows for a far broader vision of the world and of the social and historic context of social and political phenomena. Gender enables a better analysis of the structural and temporal causes of inequality. However, for this very reason, the concept of gender is subject to abuse and confusion, which often does not help the social transformation of relations between women and men.

Since the middle of the twentieth century, feminism has developed two main lines of thought that have given rise to distinct ways of naming and carrying out policies. The first is the philosophy of sexual difference, whose main exponent is Luce Irigaray. This line of thinking is based on the idea that there are two different sexes in society and that women are seen as 'the other'. What is different is female. For supporters of this line of thought, women's struggle does not involve the achievement of equality but rather the introduction of women's policies.
The second line of thought is equality feminism, which emphasises what the sexes have in common instead of their differences, and which makes gender inequalities visible. Mary Wollstonecraft is a key figure of this type of feminism, among many others who have played a leading role in gender equality policies.

In Catalonia, some political sectors defend and put into practice women's policies, whereas others defend gender equality policies. Examples of the commitment to gender equality are the Gender Violence Law and the Equality Law[2] introduced by the Spanish Government, which are advanced and pioneering legislative measures within Europe in their application of gender equality policies.

Thus, the terms sex and gender also take on a political meaning because the expressions "politiques de dones" (women's policies) or "politiques d'igualtat de gènere" (gender equality policies) are used depending on the school of feminist thought and political ideology that is adopted.

The definition of equality policies at Barcelona Provincial Council
Barcelona Provincial Council implements gender equality policies and is therefore committed to the feminist equality school. As a second-tier local authority, it has been visibly involved in gender equality policies since the creation of the Technical Office for the Equality Plan in 1997. It has worked to apply gender equality policies within its sphere of action, the province of Barcelona, where it provides support to 311 municipalities with a population of over 4 million people. The creation of the Francesca Bonnemaison Centre in 2003 was a further move in this direction, as it is a centre for the promotion of gender equality policies and a key tool for eradicating gender inequalities.

References

[1] **Lledo, Eulàlia**
> (2005). *Marcar les diferències: la representació de dones i homes a la llengua*. p. 7. ICD, Barcelona

[2] **Organic Law 3/2007**, of 22 March, for the effective equality between women and men: http://www.mtas.es/mujer/politicas/Ley_Igualdad.pdf

Organic Law 1/2004, of 29 December, on integral protection measures against gender violence: http://www.mtas.es/mujer/violencia/docs/A42166-42197.pdf

(Ab)uses of "Gender" as a Concept in Spanish

Karina Valle Olsen and Gloria Arenas Fernández

In the following article we will briefly explain how we perceive the practical use of the concept of 'gender' (in Spanish translated as 'género') in Spain.[1] We would like to start by claiming that the word 'género' is inseparable from feminist theories. There is a trend in Spain to reject feminists and feminisms and many women who wish to do gender studies simultaneously declare that they are no feminists (which is a remarkable thing to say).

We are going to think about the issue of 'gender' from our position as critical feminist women, academics and activists, without limiting ourselves to one concrete frame of knowledge. We prefer to take from different theories and existing fields what we consider adequate to the struggle against social injustice.[2] In this sense, we see the writing of this text as an opportunity to organise our ideas about our institutional and social work context. These ideas are based on theoretical and practical situations. In our conclusion we will explain how we understand the use of the sex/gender distinction.

According to the Spanish Language Real Academy Dictionary, the first meaning of 'gender' (from the Latin *genus*) refers to the common characteristics of a group of beings. It does not mention any kind of division between men and women. Grammatically, 'gender' does refer to the order established between masculine, feminine and neutral substantives (RAE, 2001). It should be mentioned that neutral substantives do not exist in Spanish. There are no specific neutral forms in the inflexion of the adjective, which means that Spanish is almost entirely divided into masculine or feminine grammatical forms. As for gender discrimination within the language, "the most known and recognized aspect is the use of the masculine as generic in Latin languages, which embraces hundreds of millions of speakers in the world" (Victoria Sau, 2001, p.158).[3] This forces us, for example, to use masculine grammatical forms when referring to a group composed of twenty women and one man. This is just one example of the multiple manifestations of sexism in the Spanish language.

The term 'sex' refers to the biological and genetic characteristics of every human being.[4] 'Sexo' (from the Latin *sexus*), in the Spanish Language Real Academy refers to a 'venereal pleasure' (e.g. "he is obsessed by sex") and the sexual organs (masculine and feminine). It also refers to 'the totality of women' as the 'weak sex' and the 'beautiful sex' and 'the totality of men' as the 'strong sex' and the 'ugly sex'.[5]

At the same time, the critical feminist literature uses the word 'gender' to distinguish between women and men in the context of culture. It is a direct translation of the English term which, in contrast to the Spanish one ('género'), does refer to the differences between women and men. Here 'género', as the translation of 'gender', does refer to the cultural characteristics of our socialization as men and women, to the roles that are imposed upon us by the social group to which we belong from birth, according to our sex.[6] It is important to our understanding of the historical and social experience of the meaning of 'the masculine' and 'the feminine' through history. Moreover, it also points to what is considered 'natural' within society (through conscious

---

[1] We think that this could be a European tendency, especially related to the political application of the concept.

[2] We believe that social justice should refer to the guarantee of equal rights to everybody, which are necessary to full citizenship. The groups that are deprived of such rights ought to be recognized and power redistributed (structural, cultural, economic, institutional, etc.)

[3] For an explanation of the discrimination of women in the Spanish language see p.157-168.

[4] For more information about the definitions of the concepts of "Sex" ("Sexo") and "Gender" ("Género") in the Spanish language, and another point of view about the introduction of 'gender' in Spain, see Pereira Rolle, Sandra (2000): *The Making of European Women's Studies*. Volume II. ATHENA. Utrecht. This clearly shows that the Spanish language has not been changed in the RAE (from the 1992 to the 2001 version) to introduce a more extensive meaning of the word 'género' coming from the feminist movement.

[5] Definition of the word "sex" in the Real Academy of the Spanish Language Official Web site: www.rae.es

[6] For an analysis on the difficulties of translating 'gender' into 'género', see TUBERT, Silvia: "La crisis del concepto de género", en Tubert, Silvia (ed) (2003): *Del Sexo al Género. Los equívocos de un concepto*. Ediciones Cátedra. Madrid. p.7-38. And for an extensive analysis of the socialization of Spanish women see ARENAS, Gloria (2006): *Triunfantes Perdedoras. La vida de las niñas en la escuela*. GRAÓ. Barcelona.

or unconscious acculturation). In this sense, many feminists use gender as an analytic tool to understand and change the world we are living in.

So in Spanish there is an enormous dissociation between the feminist use and meaning of 'gender' and the word 'género' that already existed in our language and is more easily accessible to the rest of society.[7] Also, as Luisa Accati notices, the notion of gender "as it comes from the Anglo-Saxon countries, corresponds to the definition requirements in relation to a hierarchically monolithic model and to a language without genders". Thus, it does not mean the same in different contexts.[8] Consequently, this provokes serious misunderstandings, and the use of 'gender' in the practice of gender politics is being questioned by the feminist movement for several reasons.

One of these practical uses is the uncritical acceptance of the concept by Spanish society in general as an essentially political label in project titles, names of Departments, publicity labels, etc. We observe that the use of the word 'género' has become a political fashion. Because of this indiscriminate abuse of the term, it becomes an empty concept that suits a politically correct game. Unfortunately, there are too many documents, seminars, projects, courses, and masters that use "gender" as a banner. The worst is that sometimes they are not devoted to the analytical process and deconstruction of society. Moreover, some of them obviously reproduce patriarchy and androcentrism.[9] There are times when 'gender' incorrectly substitutes 'sex', exemplifying the confusion surrounding the terms.[10] Authors such as Silvia Tubert notice that in many cases the term 'género' is used to hide women, making them invisible again:

> "*The problem is that in this way, power relations between sexes, among other things, are concealed. As it happens when it is talked about gender violence instead of violence of men against women: a neutral category hides the masculine domination*" (Tubert, Silvia, 2003, p.8).[11]

The institutionalisation of the so-called 'gender perspective' ('perspectiva de género') in the Spanish academic atmosphere has not been a problem. It is very important that we keep in mind that Spanish women began to analyse their position within the academic disciplines while at the same time entering these disciplines. The gender work done by feminists in different areas of knowledge has been deemed relevant in history, philosophy, education, sociology, anthropology, i.e. social sciences in general.[12] Also in sciences, but more recently in Business Management and Technical Studies. According to feminist scholars, women have only begun to use 'gender' as a category of historiographic analysis in Business Management and Technical Studies in the 1990s.

As mentioned above, we can even find the abuse of the concept of 'gender' in the academic world, specially in training or educational seminars, courses, masters etc. Some university departments bearing the name of 'gender' are clearly perpetuating the patriarchal system or are not really adopting a gender perspective. This fraud is not only conceptual but also practical. The problem is caused by the limitation of 'gender' as a masculine-feminine binomial (and, in this respect, the gender perspective has been inflexible in incorporating current feminist thought) and the practical negation of the original feminist meaning of the term.

So this conceptual fraud originates from the use of 'género' as part of an occidental heterosexual patriarchal dichotomy. A feminist postmodernist critique of the term, especially from the perspective of Queer Theories, warns us against the reductionism of explaining everything from the masculine-feminine, man-woman duality. They break with 'gender

---

[7] See also Marta Lamas: "Usos, dificultades y posibilidades de la categoría de género", where she speaks about the idiom differences, analogies and conceptual confusions of 'gender'.

[8] In Tubert, Silvia, opus cit., p.12.

[9] We understand that 'gender' as a concept should be used as an analytical category dedicated to the studies of gender contents and as a fundamental element of investigation within critical feminist theories.

[10] "The use of the word 'sexo' for referring to women has passed by different changes and has turned on to be substituted by 'gender'". Neus Campillo: "Ontología y diferencia de los sexos" in TUBERT, opus cit., p.86.

[11] All the translations are ours.

[12] Although it is the case that the different disciplines point out doubts and reflections about using the word 'gender' as an analytical tool, instead of 'sex' and 'differences between sexes'. See: TUBERT, opus cit.

binarism'.[13] Judith Butler maintains that, like 'gender', the category of 'sex' is a cultural construction. Beatriz Preciado constructs a transgressor society that subverts the established order in her book "Contra-Sexual Manifesto: Subversive Practices of Sexual Identity". She argues that:

> "*The Contra-Sexuality entails that sex and sexuality (and not only gender) have to be understood as complex socio-political technologies (…) Sex, as an organ and a practice, is not a precise biological place nor a natural pulse. Sex is a heterosexual technology of domination that reduces the body into erogenous zones in order to create an asymmetric distribution of power between genders (feminine/masculine), making some feelings coincide with specific organs, some sensations with specific anatomic reactions (…) The sexual organs, as such, do not exist*" (Preciado, 2002, p.21-26).

According to Silvia Tubert, the problem of the sex/gender distinction is that "this polarity just reproduces the opposition nature-culture and the body-mind duality that has determined the occidental way of thinking since its origins" (2003, p.8).

Finally, one of the reasons of the popularisation of the word 'género' - used to represent studies and actions aimed at equality between women and men in contemporary society- is that its confused and often ambiguous introduction gives a neutral appearance to what has been seen as a troublesome concept in Spanish society: feminism. In this sense, the use of the word 'género' is a politically correct one. To use the word 'feminism' is a rash. The latter has great historical and emotional consequences (feminism in Spain is accused of generating conflict within a hegemonic society). Most Spanish people are very negative about feminism and women who declare themselves feminists.

Sometimes it seems as if the foreign term 'gender' has been used as a trampoline to get the recognition that otherwise would have been more complicated to achieve. The 'gender perspective' seems to be the easiest road to action in contemporary Spanish society, but is it the best way? Is it not a fake way of doing things, one which will not work out in the end? Will 'gender' provide us with real solutions, or is it just a patch?

Conclusions
We would like to conclude by saying that the use of 'gender' as a political term has not only resulted in its abuse by the patriarchal system, but also in a perversion of the reason that would have justified the use of the word 'gender'. The word 'gender' is taken as an aseptic and neutral concept, the meaning of which is misunderstood by the majority of people.

In the practices we discussed, the use of 'gender' concepts becomes banal to such an extent that it looses the original content it had in feminist theories. It becomes superficial and is used against its own driving force, as many of the events organized in its name are clearly anti-feminist(s). The word 'feminism' is reviled and brutally denied.

Though 'gender' initially appeared as a useful analytical tool, because it permitted a more inclusive perspective on the experiences of both men and women in social relations, today its disadvantages are evident. Whether or not we believe in the use of the 'gender' concept as a representative word for the equality that feminists demand, social reality asks for a moral standpoint on the matter. Nowadays, the word 'género' is present in different Spanish social layers (the laws, research, intervention programmes, institutional figures and departments…). Therefore, it is important that its meaning is questioned. But only in so far as it will help to improve its practical application.[14] The attention given to 'gender' does show a strong social preoccupation with the situation of women, opening the doors to action. However, it is important to campaign for a massive awareness of the way in which feminism has been demonized and to

---

[13] Cfr.: Cristina Molina: "Género y poder desde sus metáforas. Apuntes para una topografía del patriarcado" in TUBERT, opus cit., p.130.
[14] As an example, we would like to refer to a quantitative and qualitative study conducted in Málaga about gender mainstreaming application within the official government institution. See: MEDINA GUERRA, Antonia M. (coord..) (2002): Manual de Lenguaje Administrativo No Sexista. AEHM/UMA. Málaga; VV.AA. (2005): La transversalidad de género en el Ayuntamiento de Málaga. AEHM/UMA. Málaga.

explain how feminist theories have conceptualised 'gender'. Likewise, we think that qualified people (that means, feminists within gender studies) should be implicated in the acquisition of public financing for events of this kind. Moreover, in order to protect the 'public' and 'consumers', abuses of the term should be denounced (the laws of our country support these actions; although legal processes and the practical application of the law are slow).

On a linguistic level, different studies have highlighted the importance of language in the construction of thought and identity, such as the system of representation in society. It is urgent and necessary that the Spanish language changes for it is male chauvinist and patriarchal. Linguistic institutions are paralysed 'into tradition', which is rotten at the core. The content of the language ought to be more flexible, based on scientific research criteria and linguistic changes in the daily use of language (and also, for example, at the political level). It is evident that language has been created by men. Now feminist women have to contribute to the task of rethinking language and redistributing its power.

Finally, we are advocating a more effective form of Public Pedagogy when introducing new knowledge into the theoretical-practical scope of European and national norms. Public institutions still lack basic knowledge of the ways in which critical feminists have reconceptualised 'gender'. This is the key to a fruitful development of strategies and political steps. We do understand that we need 'gender' as an analytical tool, because society is still ruled by the socially constructed parameters that it represents. At the same time, our ideal is to deconstruct such a dichotomy since it is simplistic and reductionist in the face of the enormous diversity of preferences of people, their ways of being in the world, etc. We think that closed gender behaviour, racism and poverty should disappear since they exclude those who do not fit the mold. Thus, gender may enable people to invent themselves on the basis of equal opportunity, independent of their sex and gender role (as each individual is immensely different from other individuals). However, such a deconstruction will require us to think long and hard about who and what we are nowadays, about why we are like this and how we want to be.

References

Pereira Rolle, Sandra
> (2000): *The Making of European Women's Studies*. Volume II. ATHENA. Utrecht.
Preciado, Beatriz
> (2002): Manifiesto Contra-Sexual. Opera Prima. Madrid.
Real Academia de la Lengua Española (RAE)
> La 22ª Edición (2001).
Sau, Victoria
> (2001): Diccionario Ideológico Feminista. Volumen II. Icaria. Barcelona.
Tubert, Silvia (ed)
> (2003): *Del Sexo al Género. Los equívocos de un concepto*. Ediciones Cátedra. Madrid. p.7-38.

Annex 1

SYNTHESIS REPORT: WOMEN'S STUDIES IN EUROPE

Final report of the evaluation of Women's Studies activities in Europe, for the SIGMA Network and Directorate General DG XXII (Education, Training and Youth) of the Commission of the European Union.

Prof. dr. Rosi Braidotti
Drs. Ellen de Dreu
Drs. Christine Rammrath

CONTENTS

Introduction

1. Development of Women's Studies

2. Relevance of Women's Studies to European integration

3. Joint curriculum development

4. Teachers

5. Students

6. Research on education

7. Virtual mobility

8. Information

INTRODUCTION

Aims of this report

On June 16th and 17th 1995, more than 200 European experts gathered in Coimbra for a conference which marked the high point in the process of evaluation of Women's Studies in Europe. This evaluation was held for the Commission of the European Union (DG XXII Education, Training and Youth) and was commissioned to the Women's Studies department of Utrecht University by the European SIGMA inter-university network.

The evaluation of Women's Studies in Europe consisted of two preliminary steps: one is the National Reports on the state of the field of Women's Studies within each Member State of the European Union plus Norway, Switzerland and the Baltic countries. These National Reports were drafted by the members of the Scientific Committee, which was especially appointed for this purpose within the SIGMA network.[1] The second step was the evaluation of all existing ERASMUS Inter-university Cooperation Programmes in the field of Women's Studies, which was carried out by a researcher - Ellen de Dreu - under the supervision of Prof. Braidotti, chair of the Scientific Committee.[2]

The aims of the evaluation are three-fold: firstly, to provide an adequate description of the education systems in the European Member States, in relation to the development of Women's Studies within these education systems; secondly to identify new needs in education, training and research for Women's Studies in Europe, thirdly to suggest new concrete measures to implement new policies.

The National Reports and the ERASMUS Report were distributed among the participants of the conference in Coimbra. They were welcomed by the Rector of the University of Coimbra and by Prof. Maria Irene Ramalho Santos, the Portuguese member of the Scientific Committee and organiser of the conference. There were speeches by Prof. Braidotti, Prof. Jalna Hanmer and Prof. Ní Chártaigh respectively on the structure of Women's Studies in Europe today; on Women's Studies in relation to the process of European integration and on the role of Women's Studies in the education of women. In the afternoon, the public participated in policy-related workshops on the following issues: I) Extending the European Credit Transfer System (ECTS) to Women's Studies; II) Construction of European teaching material; III) Joint European courses; IV) Students' involvement in Women's Studies; V) The link of Women's Studies to professional opportunities; VI) Staff exchanges and VII) Student Mobility; VIII) Gender, Ethnicity, Racism. Women's International Studies Europe (WISE) also held an information stand.

In each workshop, recommendations were formulated for specific action on the institutional, national, and European level, which were presented in a plenary session on the second day of the conference. This session was preceded by a speech by Mrs. Ogden - representative of DG XXII of the European Commission - on the new SOCRATES programme. Further information on this new programme was given by Mr. Peltier (DG XXII). Prof. Grementieri, the representative of the SIGMA inter-university network, closed the conference.

---

[1] The members of the Scientific Committee are: Dr. Roberta Maierhofer (Karl-Franzens Universität Graz - Austria), Prof. Magda Michielsen (Universitaire Instelling Antwerpen - Belgium), Prof. Kirsten Gomard (Aarhus University - Denmark), Prof. Ursula Müller (Universität Bielefeld - Germany), Prof. Margarita Birriel Salcedo (University of Granada - Spain), Prof. Nicky le Feuvre (Université Toulouse le Mirail - France), Prof. Liana-Evangelia Sakelliou (University of Athens - Greece), Prof. Chiara Saraceno (University of Turin - Italy), Prof. Dearbhal Ní Chártaigh (University of Limerick - Ireland), Dr. Kjell Soleim (Universiteit i Bergen - Norway), Prof. Willy Jansen (Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen - the Netherlands), Prof. Maria Irene Ramalho Santos (University of Coimbra - Portugal), Prof. Eva Ericsson (University of Lund - Sweden), Prof. Kirsi Saarikangas (University of Helsinki - Finland), Prof. Elizabeth Bird (University of Bristol - Great Britain). Chair of the Scientific Committee is Prof. Rosi Braidotti, and the project-coordinator is Christine Rammrath (Utrecht University - the Netherlands).

[2] See: Rosi Braidotti, Ellen de Dreu, Christine Rammrath, ERASMUS Report: Women's Studies in Europe, European Commission, DG XXII Training, Education and Youth, Brussels: 1995.

This SYNTHESIS Report forms the final stage in the evaluation of Women's Studies in Europe. It draws from the recommendations for specific actions that were made by the following sources: the National Reports; the ERASMUS Report; the speeches during the conference; the workshops; written statements by participants of the conference. All the recommendations are organised thematically and sub-divided according to the levels of implementation (institutional, National, European and Women's Studies community levels).

Towards a working definition of the field.

Women's Studies have developed over the last twenty five years as the academic extension of the political, cultural, economic and intellectual concerns of the women's movement, which is a social organization aimed at the advancement of women. Women's Studies aim at the transformation of education and university curricula in such a way as to reflect and further the social changes in the status of women. In the process of becoming an academic subject, Women's Studies have engaged in a constructive dialogue with the established academic disciplines, rising issues of multi-disciplinarity and curriculum revision, preferably in a cross-cultural and trans-national perspective.[3]

In the process of European evaluation of this field, we are working with an open definition of Women's Studies, which respects the great diversity of formats and structures of Women's Studies education in the different university structures of European countries.

Dearbhal Ní Chárthaigh[4] quotes Farber and Henninger's[5] three models for the development of Women's Studies institutions and notes that there are not only significant national differences in the development of these models but also distinct institutional paths of development:
1) Women's Studies centres as a central service institution for the university which does not have a teaching role; 2) Women's Studies as a separate course of study leading to an academic award; 3) Women's Studies research centre with research projects and research schools. Parallel with these Women's Studies structures there exists in most universities equal opportunities centres which do not always have effective links to Women's Studies.

The same diversity can be noticed in the political agenda and intellectual perspective of each programme, which is reflected in the differences names for the programmes: either Women's Studies, Gender Studies or Feminist Studies. Despite these differences, a remarkable coalition has emerged between Women's Studies, Gender Studies and Feminist Studies during the Coimbra conference, although for the sake of this report we have systematically adopted "Women's Studies".

This coalition was possible because - in spite of their different names - there is a consensus on the definition of this field of study as a process of making explicit the lives of women and the gendering of social relations in the widest sense among individuals and collectivities. This definition was formulated by a group of experts in European Women's Studies who drafted a report on Women's Studies and European integration.[6]

---

[3] See for example: The Development of a European Curriculum in Women's Studies from a Multicultural Perspective, Report of the NOI_SE Working Conference by Rosi Braidotti & Christine Rammrath, Utrecht, NOI_SE Coordination, 1993. (tel: +31-30-536013 / fax: +31-30-536695).

[4] Dearbhal Ní Chárthaigh, "Facing the Future: Issues and Perspectives in Women's Studies", paper delivered at the plenary session at the Coimbra conference on Women's Studies in Europe, June 16-17 1995.

[5] Christine Färber & Annette Henninger (eds), Equal Opportunities for Women at European Universities, Freie Universität Berlin, Zentrale Universitätsdruckerei, Berlin, 1995.

[6] See: Jalna Hanmer, Rosi Braidotti, Dearbhal Ní Chártaigh et al, Women's Studies and European Integration, with Reference to Current and Future Action programmes for Equal Opportunities between Women and Men, Commission of the European Union DG V Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs, Equal Opportunities Unit, Brussels, 1995. V/5760/95-EN.

This report points out that Women's Studies is being developed in all disciplines: the Humanities, Social Sciences, Biological and, to a lesser extent, Physical Sciences and Technology[7], although it is beginning in Bio-technology.[8] Women's Studies scholars challenge the male domination of these academic disciplines; they provide methodological and theoretical tools to study the visible and invisible power mechanisms that influence women's access to posts of responsibility in social, economic, political, religious, intellectual and cultural life. They emphasize issues such as culture, sexuality, family, gender-identity and the power of representation and language. They give high priority to women's health issues, and to reproductive rights. They contribute to an understanding of the conflicts between paid and unpaid labour, segregation in the labour market, poverty and unemployment, and the participation of women in the decision-making process. They favour harmonisation and economic cohesion. They aim at revealing the full extent of women's lives, which has been hidden because men were the predominant subjects and objects of knowledge, and, most important, they aim at improving the status of women in society.[9]

Women's Studies deals with how to study and remedy the oppression of women in society. It is concerned with issues of commonality and diversity and with equality and difference and, in terms of organisational structures, with autonomy and integration. It is about teaching, research and activism, not as compartmentalised activities, but as flexible and integrated approaches to the analysis of and the response to the social position of women. Women's Studies is therefore in a position to make a valuable contribution to questions and issues arising from the process of European integration. Women's Studies has a contribution to make to the economic and social integration of Europe through analysing and responding to the dynamics that result in women's social exclusion, marginalisation and subordination. These responses include the processes of diffusion and development of Women's Studies expertise on issues such as equal opportunities and multiculturalism through formal education. Even though it is unevenly developed throughout the different European countries, Women's Studies is now sufficiently advanced to be given a European-wide brief to promote, monitor and evaluate progress in achieving equality for women through research, education, including training, demonstration projects and other forms of action research and women's participation. For instance, Women's Studies scholars recently developed a so-called "Gender Impact Assessment", a policy evaluation instrument which aims to analyze potential effects of new policy from an emancipatory angle before these plans are implemented.[10] This instrument should be applied to assess the policy of the European Union.

This evaluation has proved beyond the trace of a doubt the high quality of the academic work accomplished by the Women's Studies community in Europe. It is equally clear, however, that the main reason for the success and the academic quality of Women's Studies still remains unpaid or under-subsidized female labour. A great deal of extra time and volunteer work by women has gone into the making of Women's Studies programmes. In this respect, the different aspects of the evaluation of the field in Europe today converge on one single point: we need more resources at the institutional, national and European levels. The need has also emerged for stronger European co-ordination and sharing of

---

[7] H.A. Logue & L.M. Talapessy (eds), Women in Scientific and Technological Research in the European Community, International Workshop organised by the Commission of the European Communities DG XII Science, Research and Development, 15th to 16th February 1993, Brussel, 1993. See also: Ursula Mättig & Brigitte Mühlenbruch (eds), Promotion of Women in Higher Education / Universities in European Comparison, Documentation of an international workshop in the course of the Women's Technology Day, Koordinationsprojekt der Bundeskonferenz der Frauen- und Gleichstellungsbeauftragten an Hochschulen, Universität Bonn, 1994.

[8] Jalna Hanmer & Ineke van Wingerden, Women's Perspectives on the Ethical, Social and Legal Applications and Implications of the Human Genome Analysis, a report commissioned by and submitted to the Biology Directorate, Medical Research Division of the European Commission DG XII Science, Research and Development (contractnr. PL-910-1016), Nr. GENO-0036-GB (EASE).

[9] Jalna Hanmer, "Women's Studies Education and European Integration", plenary session at the Coimbra conference on Women's Studies in Europe, June 16-17, 1995.

[10] Mieke Verloo & Conny Roggeband, Emancipatie-Effect Rapportage: Theoretisch Kader, Methodiek en Voortgangsrapportage, Den Haag: VUGA, 1994.

information about women's studies research and education in the European Union.[11]

Furthermore, we need to develop the new dimensions of knowledge that are opened by Women's Studies in its distinctive features: inter-disciplinarity, social relevance, emphasizing women's contribution to scholarship and science, the respect for diversity, the critique of ethnocentrism and the effort to develop multi-cultural curricula and perspectives for research, while doing justice to local, regional and national specificity.[12]

This evaluation proves that the field of Women's Studies has the expertise, the ability and the willingness to play a leading role in transforming European education in such a way as to enhance the dignity and the advancement of women. Thus, the continuing growth of Women's Studies in the Member States of the European Union has a crucial role to play in the achievement of European citizenship for women.

We would like to thank the following persons for their invaluable contribution to the evaluation of Women's Studies in Europe:
- the members of the Scientific Committee and their respective institutions;
- Prof. Jalna Hanmer, University of Bradford;
- Liz Ogden and Jean-Marc Peltier of the European Commission DG XXII Education, Training and Youth;
- Prof. Grementieri and Cecilia Costa of the SIGMA network;
- Jeroen Torenbeek and Bettina Nelemans of the Utrecht Network;
- the ERASMUS Bureau;
- Maria Irene Ramalho Santos, Filomena Marques de Carvalho, Isabel Gomes and Teresa Pratas of the University of Coimbra;
- all the participants of the Coimbra conference;
- the Women's Studies department at Utrecht University, especially Anneke van der Meulen.

---

[11]. An early attempt to record researchers and courses in the European Union was the GRACE project, located in a Belgian women's organisation, les Cahiers du Grif, and funded by DG V. There were seminars and occasional publications. An on-going initiative is the European Women's Studies Guide, organised by the association Women's Studies International Europe (WISE) and funded by the Dutch Ministery of Education and Science, the Erasmus Bureau and DG V. (WISE, Utrecht University, Heidelberglaan 2, 3584 CS Utrecht, the Netherlands).

[12] Helma Lutz, Obstacles to Equal Opportunities in Society by Immigrant Women, with Particular Reference to the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, Germany and the Nordic Countries, European Committee on Migration, Steering Committee for Equality between Women and Men, October 1994, EG/MG (94) 8. And: The European Women's Lobby, Confronting the Fortress, Black and Migrant Women in the European Union, European Parliament Directorate General for Research, Working Papers, Women's Rights Series E-2, European Parliament: 1995 (tel: +352-43.00.1 or +32-2-284.21.11).

1. DEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN'S STUDIES

1.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

1.1.1 *More efforts should be made to strengthen and expand existing programmes in Women's Studies within the Member States of the European Union and associated countries.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.1.1.1 Both autonomous Women's Studies and Women's Studies programmes integrated within other departments should be supported; this open approach is especially important considering the interdisciplinary nature of Women's Studies.

1.1.1.2 Given that Women's Studies is a new and interdisciplinary subject area it is important to stress the need for flexible education systems in the European institutions of higher education, especially in institutions where Women's Studies does not have an autonomous structure. Thus, more modular degrees and flexible 'pathways' should be organised so as to break the subject-discipline-based approach that is still prevalent in European universities.

1.1.1.3 Institutions should be encouraged to establish professorships within the field of Women's Studies in order to achieve full academic recognition of the field and to ensure the quality of the programmes.

1.1.1.4 Funding for research in Women's Studies should be increased and more efforts made to hire research staff on a permanent basis.

1.1.1.5 Scholars from Women's Studies should have their teaching and research work assessed by people with sufficient expertise in this field, so as to avoid bias born of ignorance.

1.1.1.6 The integration of a European multicultural dimension into teaching and research activities should be supported, including issues such as ethnicity, racism and nationalism, class and sexual orientation and their intersection with gender.

1.1.1.7 More efforts should be made to encourage and to fund Women's Studies courses at post-graduate level.

1.1.1.8 Institutions are recommended to secure the position of national academic coordinators for Women's Studies and to establish such positions in cases where they do not yet exist.

1.1.1.9 Institutions are encouraged to expand Women's Studies in the fields where Women's Studies have not yet had a large impact, such as Natural and Medical sciences; Technology; Engineering and other sciences.

1.1.2 *Institutions should support the European cooperation programmes in the subject area of Women's Studies.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.1.2.1 Financial support from the institutions for the administrative, organisational and educational work by the coordinators and their partners should be increased in order to consolidate the achievements of the Women's Studies Inter-University Cooperation Programmes under the ERASMUS scheme.

1.1.2.2 Institutions should help in the process of professionalisation of the work of coordinators by providing training and management courses.

1.1.2.3 Institutions are asked to provide and promote education courses on European languages for Women's Studies academics and students.

1.1.2.4 Support from the European institutions is needed in bringing the aims and achievements of Women's Studies to the attention of the Standing Conference of Rectors, Presidents and Vice-Chancellors of the European Universities (CRE).

1.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
1.2.1 *The Member States of the European Union and its associated countries should support the development of Women's Studies in Europe.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.2.1.1 The needs of Women's Studies should be brought to the attention of the national delegates to the European Parliament so that they can promote Women's Studies in the various European institutions.

1.2.1.2 Women's Studies and research on gender issues in a European perspective could be given a higher priority than it now has in National Research Councils and research grants commissions.

1.2.1.3 The creation of Visiting Professorships (Chairs) in European Women's Studies is recommended to enable the geographical mobility of leading academics in this field.

1.2.1.4 Age limits for research grants and (visiting) professorships in the field of Women's Studies should be abolished.

1.2.2 *Member States should support Women's Studies activities within the ERASMUS, LINGUA, TEMPUS, COMETT and SOCRATES programmes of the European Commission.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.2.2.1 European Member States should give extra funds to institutions that actively pursue and follow up on their European commitments within the programmes of the European Union.

1.2.2.2 The Member States and associated countries should be encouraged to provide extra staff capacity for the development of courses and modules on multiculturality, social inequalities and sexual orientation seen from a European Women's Studies perspective.

1.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
1.3.1 *Support for the development of Women's Studies should be given a higher priority.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.3.1.1 Direct funds for special initiatives through the European Directorates are the most feasible form of support. If even a small amount of the funds usually awarded to the Natural Sciences were available for collaborative research in Women's Studies it would have a significant impact.

1.3.1.2 Resources have to be allocated to make Women's Studies activities more permanent. The European Commission could design a programme that rewards Member States which engage themselves in this process.

1.3.1.3 The specific inclusion of Women's Studies as a qualifying field in the appointment of Jean Monnet Professorships is a way to underline the importance of Women's Studies to European integration.

1.3.1.4 One important step toward effective growth of Women's Studies at the European level is a quality assessment of the different structures of Women's Studies courses in the different countries, in order to work toward a common methodology that would improve the European dimension of the programmes, while facilitating the harmonization of Women's Studies education in the European Union. Comprehensive and sustained research is needed to reach an effective methodological comparison across Europe.

1.3.1.5 The organisation of a pan-European forum to work on the definition of specific evaluation methods that are appropriate to the objectives of Women's Studies is recommended. It should cover issues such as: the role of Women's Studies for underrepresented groups; student satisfaction evaluation and the role of Women's Studies in promoting equal opportunities in employment. They should also include evaluation of the access to Higher Education by women and should not be restricted to a narrow definition of professional opportunities as a criterion for positive assessment.

1.3.2 *It is recommended to safeguard the interest of Women's Studies within the new institutional structures of SOCRATES and the inclusion of Women's Studies as a priority area for European exchange projects.*

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.3.2.1 As a follow-up to this evaluation, it is recommended that the Commission assists in the establishment of a European Women's Studies organisation linking universities active in the subject area with the purpose of dealing with issues of common European interest, including the activities within a thematic network for Women's Studies.

1.3.2.2 The European Union should introduce experts in the field of Women's Studies on the negotiation committees for the preparation and consultation preceding the final draft of the SOCRATES programme.

1.3.2.3 Every university participating in SOCRATES should be encouraged to develop an interest in Women's Studies.

1.3.2.4 Systematic monitoring and evaluation should be carried out by experts in the field of all activities and actions under SOCRATES with regard to equality of access and participation for underrepresented groups.

1.3.2.5 Special support should be given to activities and programmes which fully reflect cultural diversity in respect of student membership, design, content and management, and delivery and assessment.

1.3.2.6 Women's Studies needs its own subject area code under the new SOCRATES programme so as to increase its visibility and facilitate future evaluations.

1.3.2.7 The European Commission is asked to help solve the financial problems of the Women's Studies coordinators in the management of the ERASMUS programmes by increasing the proportion of the budget currently allocated for administrative expenses (20% of the total ERASMUS grant).

1.3.2.8 In European countries without professors of Women's Studies, there should be possibilities for Student and Staff Mobility Programmes, Joint Curriculum and Intensive Programmes run by other senior staff.

1.3.2.9 The award of European diplomas and joint degrees in Women's Studies should be investigated seriously and a task-force set up to this effect.

1.3.2.10 The mobility of non-academic staff such as librarians and information specialists should be supported.

1.3.2.11 PhD students exchange grants (possibly limited to 1-3 months) should be explored.

1.3.2.12 The European Union should encourage existing Women's Studies networks to extend to the European level. To achieve this aim, special efforts need to be made to ensure the flow of information and the sharing of expertise from the Commission.

1.3.2.13 A special effort should be made to promote the cooperation between Women's Studies in the European Union and Women's Studies centres in Eastern and Central European countries. Immediate possibilities should be offered for their affiliation within the Women's Studies thematic network and staff exchanges.

1.3.2.14 Applications from Women's Studies in TEMPUS need to be given more support than they currently receive.

1.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
The Women's Studies community should take SOCRATES and its facilities for thematic networks as a starting point to upgrade existing European projects, to encourage cooperation between networks and at the same time to create more specialized networks in Women's Studies.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

1.4.1 The Women's Studies community should ensure that openness and the sharing of information characterise the efforts in networking.

1.4.2 It is recommended that issues of gender, race, class and sexual orientation be prioritised within the SOCRATES Women's Studies Network.

1.4.3 Women's Studies should continue ERASMUS-, LINGUA-, COMETT- and other international programmes of Women's Studies under SOCRATES; and should demand mutual and official recognition of credits acquired within Women's Studies courses.

1.4.4 The European Credit Transfer System should be introduced in European cooperation programmes in the field of Women's Studies.

1.4.5 More attention should be given to representing issues and perspectives related to Gay and Lesbian studies and perspectives in European Women's Studies curricula.

1.4.6 Support is requested to coordinate the institutionalization and professionalisation of Women's Studies within the European Expertise Centre on Women's Studies, which was established in 1995 by DG V.

2. RELEVANCE OF WOMEN'S STUDIES TO EUROPEAN INTEGRATION
In the light of the role it has played and can continue to play in issues related to European integration, it is recommended that Women's Studies be identified at the European, national and institutional levels as an important vehicle for: a) the promotion of European policies in the area of equal opportunities in higher education; b) the promotion of gender equality in European social policy and in areas of training related to this; c) the promotion of a European multi-cultural dimension in teaching and research.

2.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
The findings of this evaluation should be disseminated among universities participating in Women's Studies ERASMUS programmes and other interested institutions and efforts should be made to implement them.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

2.1.1 The institutions are asked to provide for the introduction of a gendered perspective in research and teaching by upgrading studies in Women's Studies.

2.1.2. Gender-sensitivity training courses for all university staff and university policy makers are highly recommended. This training could help fulfil the aim of equal opportunities for women at the institutions of higher education.

2.2 NATIONAL LEVEL

Gender sensitivity should be encouraged at all levels of educational planning in order to create a broader awareness of women's issues in Europe among students and professionals. An increased awareness of women's issues might help to forward an appreciation, and preservation, of diversity in Europe. It might also help to break down inequality and injustice.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

2.2.1 Gender-sensitivity training should be provided for teachers and administrators at all levels of education. This kind of training for teachers at secondary schools is a necessary condition for creating a favourable atmosphere for the implementation of equal opportunities in employment. Women's Studies has a vast experience in research on women's issues and can therefore be of major support in providing for these gender trainings to teachers at all levels of education.

2.2.2 Historical perspectives on women's emancipation should be introduced in curricula at first and second level schools.

2.2.3 In order to transfer Women's Studies knowledge to vocational education a proper 'translation' would have to take place from academic fundamental knowledge to applied sciences, providing students with the knowledge and skills they need in their specific professions. In order to try out such a translation, a pilot project should be funded which aims to develop course material and teacher-trainings, possibly in the framework of the LEONARDO scheme.

2.2.4 Member States are asked to enforce the EUROSTAT recommendations for the systematic collection and analysis of data on education (including Women's Studies) and employment by gender.

2.2.5 Member States are required to evaluate the demand by public and private sector employers for the inclusion of a Women's Studies component in continuing education and personnel training programmes.

2.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
Considering the relevance of Women's Studies to the achievement of European integration, it is recommended that Women's Studies be recognised by the European Commission as a field of strategic importance. Women's Studies should be identified as a vehicle for the critical exploration of European social policy given the strength of its interdisciplinary and multicultural approach.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

2.3.1 It is recommended that Women's Studies be given a European-wide brief to promote, monitor and evaluate progress in achieving equality for women through academic research, education, professional training and action research.

2.3.2 Women's studies should be identified as a vehicle for the promotion of European Union equality policies in promoting economic growth, international competitiveness and in reducing unemployment through exploring and responding to the economic, social and political dynamics that result in women's exclusion, marginalization and subordination.

2.3.3 Women's Studies expertise should be used more extensively by the European Commission in the planning and implementation of activities. Specifically, DG V is requested to continue to recognise the value of Women's Studies in its Action Programmes. Furthermore, it is recommended that DG V and DG XXII cooperate more extensively with each other and with the Women's Studies community on equal opportunities and other issues relevant to the position of women in a united Europe.

2.3.4 The Gender Impact Assessment instrument (see footnote 9) should be applied to assess European Union policy. As a starting point a pilot study could be set up in which the policy of the European Union on Eastern Europe would be assessed for its impact on gender relations.

2.3.5 The European Union is recommended to provide European Women's Studies with the resources to devise and carry out gender training in education at all levels. Steps should be taken to implement the Resolution of the Ministers of Education within the European Council, approved on May 31, 1990, on the enhanced treatment of equality of educational opportunity for girls and boys in the initial and inservice training of teachers (90/C, 162/05). The text reads as follows: "the development of Women's Studies and research on gender issues in appropriate research institutions, in particular in higher education institutions, in the Member States should be encouraged and the links between those involved in such studies and research and those responsible for the training of teachers should be strengthened."

2.3.6 The European Union is recommended to ensure effective feedback mechanisms from the teaching programs in Women's Studies into policy-making. The process of European Integration can benefit from the expertise of Women's Studies with this harmonisation process because Women's Studies is working with concepts that are central to the process of European integration, such as equality and difference, diversity and multiculturalism. Furthermore, Women's Studies has the means to help fulfil the aim, described in the Maastricht Treaty, of reaching equality between the sexes.

2.3.7 The use of transnational partnerships in FORCE, NOW, and HORIZON has been effective in disseminating good practice in women's training. Similar schemes should be set up for disseminating good practice and teaching material in Women's Studies. Special attention should be paid to securing the participation of countries in the former Eastern block as Women's Studies are going through rapid changes in those countries.

2.3.8 It is recommended that a Women's Studies perspective inform the development of curricular materials on the European Dimension for use in schools and in teacher education.

2.3.9 More efforts should be made to finance fundamental research on Women's Studies.

2.3.10 More attention should be given to studies and research projects on migrant and minority women in Europe today. Research proposals could be made under the Fifth Framework Programme Targeted Socio-Economic Research Programme of DG XII, Area III on Social Integration and Social Exclusion in Europe.

2.3.11 The European Union is required to finance a comparative cross-European study of the professional outlets available to Women's Studies graduates in the context of global participation of women in both university education and the labour market.

2.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
The Women's Studies community should continue and strengthen its contribution to the process of European integration.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

2.4.1 The findings of this evaluation should be made known and forms of implementation be enacted in the short term.

2.4.2 A pilot study should be set up in which course material and teacher-trainings are developed that aim to transfer academic Women's Studies to higher vocational education.

3. JOINT CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT
Higher priority should be given to the development of joint curricula, especially in a multi-cultural perspective, which includes the preparation of new teaching material in this perspective.

3.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
More efforts should be made to integrate European Joint Curricula into existing activities, especially in the form of intensive programmes and summer schools as a way of enriching ongoing programmes.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

3.1.1 Institutions are asked to introduce women's and gender issues into curricula that are already dealing with the study of Europe, be it language and culture or history, politics, economics and law. This would enhance a comparative European perspective. Audio-visual material should be added to support the written teaching material.

3.1.2 Priority should be given to the development of teaching materials and European modules which highlight the relationships between gender, ethnicity and racism.

3.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
Education Ministries should take steps to facilitate the integration into existing curricula and the academic recognition of European Joint Curricula, so as to improve comparative perspectives and work towards the harmonisation of different programmes.

3.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
Increased support should be given, under the ERASMUS programmes, to Joint Curriculum development activities, intensive courses and summer schools.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

3.3.1 Joint Curriculum Development needs to be stimulated and funded in the subject area of Women's Studies so as to harmonise Women's Studies in Europe and to put into practice a truly collective and comparative European education in the subject area of Women's Studies.

3.3.2 Women's Studies need more opportunities to organise Intensive Programmes, so as to provide the opportunity for women - often working in isolation within the 'traditional' disciplines - to meet with other European colleagues from a range of disciplinary backgrounds and to share expertise and learn from each other. Intensive Programmes, such as summerschools, provide them with comparative and cross-cultural knowledge of Women's Studies theories, literature and curricula. Furthermore, Intensive Programmes are a necessary complement to regular programmes in training teachers and students to bring new gender perspectives into these programmes.

3.3.3 Women's Studies ERASMUS programmes should get access to the translation services of the European Union. In order to insure the input of literature and teaching material from all European countries, it is necessary that these materials are translated into other languages. These translations are costly; for Women's Studies this poses an acute problem, because the discipline is relatively new and funding by national institutions is limited.

3.3.4 It is necessary to train language specialists in the European institutions and in the European Commission in the terminology and major theories of Women's Studies. The field of Women's Studies has its particular translation problems. Different concepts in the various European languages all have their own specific meaning and imply different perspectives on Women's Studies. Training language specialists in gender terminology is therefore of major importance in the process of harmonising Women's Studies in Europe.

3.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
Women's Studies should be encouraged to develop broader cross-European - especially multicultural - perspectives, while doing justice to specific local situations.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

3.4.1 The input of Central and East European countries in the European Women's Studies Curriculum should be secured and supported.

3.4.2 Special efforts should be made to increase the awareness of ethnocentrism in Women's Studies education and to develop multicultural curricula.

3.4.3 Instead of relying solely on the available North American teaching material in Women's Studies, more efforts should be made to write teaching manuals from a European perspective, to translate significant material from a variety of European languages and to respect the diversity of intellectual historical traditions in Women's Studies.

3.4.4 A network of researchers in the different European universities should be encouraged and financed, to produce a descriptive dictionary of feminist theoretical terms. Reliable translations of key concepts, based on careful analysis and assessment of the state of the art and taking into account the tradition of European feminism is urgently needed.

3.4.5 Efforts could be made to produce a European Women's Studies thesaurus as a continuation of the Dutch Women's Studies thesaurus.

4. TEACHERS
More efforts should be made to improve the status of Women's Studies teachers by promoting tenured positions and providing adequate funding.

4.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
Too many Women's Studies teachers are on a temporary basis and spend too much time negotiating to secure continuation of their own positions. This situation should be improved.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

4.1.1 Financial help from the universities is needed for securing the position of Women's Studies teachers.

4.1.2 Institutions should be more generous in giving permission for lecturers to teach abroad. Women's Studies teachers are often employed only part-time and therefore are involved in more than one discipline. Furthermore, Women's Studies teachers are usually found at junior academic level. Consequently, they are only able to teach abroad with the permission from the senior staff of the faculties.

4.1.3 Teachers should get academic recognition and financial support from their own institutions for their teaching activities in other European countries within the ERASMUS programmes.

4.1.4 Because Women's Studies is community oriented many Women's Studies teachers are often involved in activities outside the university. Financial incentives from the institutions can strengthen the implementation of Women's Studies courses in the community; more efforts should be made to provide academic recognition for extra-curricular teaching.

4.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
Better links should be established between people involved in Women's Studies and those responsible for the training of teachers, in accordance with resolution 90/c, 162/05 (see recommendation 2.5.3).

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

4.2.1 Concrete efforts should be made to introduce a Women's Studies perspective in national teachers training programmes.

4.2.2 Better contacts should be established between Women's Studies programmes and the Open Universities system.

4.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
The harmonisation process in European Women's Studies programmes should be supported by the European Commission.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

4.3.1 Family commitments should be taken seriously both in terms of funding, housing and day-care in the planning and funding of Teacher Staff Mobility programmes.

4.3.2 Priority has to be given to the organisation and funding of staff meetings in Women's Studies ERASMUS programmes.

4.3.3 Attention should be given to the language training of teachers. This is important, firstly, in view of the aim of achieving reciprocity in exchanges across Europe. Secondly, in countering the problem of the unevenness in the development of Women's Studies by securing the input of Women's Studies programmes from all European countries in European cooperation programmes.

4.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
***More concrete efforts should be devoted to improving the status and tenure of Women's Studies teachers at all levels of the education system.* Furthermore, teachers should be encouraged to travel to other European countries as guest lecturers.**

5. STUDENTS
Official recognition should be given to the role students have played in the development of Women's Studies and more efforts be made to include them in policy-making decisions in this field.

5.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
Special account needs to be taken of the difficulties of mature women students with child care responsibilities in participating in mobility schemes.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

5.1.1 Additional allowances need to be paid or provisions made for children to accompany students.

5.1.2 Institutions should facilitate contacts between local and visiting teachers and studies, for example by implementing a system of personal tutors.

5.1.3 Comprehensive facilities need to be provided by the institutions (adequate housing, child care, disabled people's housing etc.)

5.1.4 Institutions should be more flexible in giving credits for study of Women's Studies abroad.

5.1.5 Institutions should support the language preparation of students in view of the high costs for language courses, which threatens the continuation of many Women's Studies ERASMUS programmes.

5.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
Member States should put pressure, through parliamentary delegations, on the European Commission to sustain student demand, in face of graduate employment; reduction of financial grants to students in the different states of the European Union; budgets cuts in the Humanities and the Social Sciences.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

5.2.1 Efforts should be made to find more money for students' study abroad.

5.2.2 Special efforts need to be made to abolish age limits for student loans, student grants and research grants at post-doctoral and advance levels.

5.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
Student input in policy-making in Women's Studies education at European level should be increased.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

5.3.1 Attention should be given to the building and funding of a European Women's Studies students network in order to secure the input of students at the policy-making level, in advising on new directions for education in Women's Studies.

5.3.2 Funding is asked for students to participate in conferences relevant to Women's Studies in Europe.

5.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
It is recommended that student representation be ensured in all national Women's Studies association and networks.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

5.4.1 In the interest of students, Women's Studies programmes should be strategic in choosing partners; in avoiding unbalanced exchanges; and in starting in small networks.

6. RESEARCH ON EDUCATION

6.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
It is recommended that every effort should be made at university level to support and facilitate the research activities funded by the European Commission under SOCRATES (DG XXII Education, Training and Youth), the Fifth Action programme (DG XII Science, Research and Development) as well as within the Fourth Community Action Programme on Equal Opportunities Between Men and Women (DG V Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs).

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

6.1.1 To encourage European perspectives in research projects concerning university education.

6.1.2 Comparative perspectives with non-European countries, such as North-America, Africa and Asia are necessary to the development of an effective gender-policy in higher education.

6.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
That national science foundations and research-grant institutions should give a higher priority to research activities funded by the European Commission and grant extra support to the institutions which undertake them.

6.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
The European Commission is recommended to support proposals on Research on Education and Training in the field of Women's Studies.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

6.3.1 Effective links should be established between Women's Studies education activities under SOCRATES (DG XXII Education, Training and Youth) and research activities within the Fifth Framework Programme (DG XII Science, Research and Development), as well as within the Fourth Community Action Programme on Equal Opportunities Between Women and Men (DG V Employment, Industrial Relations and Social Affairs) in order to re-integrate education and research activities into European action programmes.

6.3.2 Women's Studies networks focusing on research questions linked to gender inequality in education should be supported within the Fifth Framework Programme. Research projects studying questions on education and training could be proposed under the Targeted Socio-Economic Research Programme of DG XII on Research on Education and Training.

6.3.3 It is recommended to support comparative work on teaching methodologies in order to achieve the aim of sharing expertise and knowledge between Women's Studies programmes in the different European Member States. These methodologies include, among others, academic styles and pedagogical traditions, and rely on the sensitivity to the different cultural and academic traditions of gender studies in each Member State.

6.3.4 The European Commission is encouraged to take note and implement the report on Women and Science (see footnote 7) and to take steps to ensure that Women's Studies research on Science and Technology receives adequate funding from DG XII and DG V.

6.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
Women's Studies should strengthen an international cross-European perspective both in research and teaching.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

6.4.1 Efforts should be made to develop European perspectives in Women's Studies, which could lead to:
a) An enrichment of cross-European scholarship in the field;
b) The development of a much needed sensitivity to the impact on women and on gender relationships of the process of European unification and of the internationalisation of the economy as well as an awareness of intra-European Union differences in these matters;
c) Make Women's Studies more visible, accepted, prestigious, both at national and the European level.

7. VIRTUAL MOBILITY
The development of long-distance learning projects in the field of Women's Studies should be stimulated and funded.

7.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL
Universities should ensure that Women's Studies departments are equipped with adequate computer and electronic facilities, including access to Internet.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

7.1.1 Training courses on computer technology and new information technology should be made accessible to Women's Studies staff and to minority women working in the area of Women's Studies.

7.1.2 Information specialists at university level should gain knowledge of all the available bibliographic and information resources for Women's Studies on Internet and make them accessible to Women's Studies staff and students.

7.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
Education ministries should assist and fund the efforts conducted by the universities to provide adequate and competent electronic assistance to the field of Women's Studies.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

7.2.1 Extra funding should be made available for the purchase of electronic equipment to universities that are involved in European activities.

7.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL
Considering the fact that students in the subject area of Women's Studies are often part-time or re-entry students with child-care responsibilities; considering also a general complaint about the low student grants that are available within ERASMUS and TEMPUS, strong support should be given to the 'virtual mobility' of students. This means that high priority should be given to issues around distance education and curriculum development in the subject area of Women's Studies. The support for distance learning is one way of increasing the European dimension in the Women's Studies curricula, on the one hand, and decreasing the level of unevenness in the development of Women's Studies in the European Member States, on the other. Distance learning consisting of multi-media products and open learning and is a valuable and cheap instrument to share knowledge. Distance learning is furthermore a good instrument for the transmission of Women's Studies knowledge to people outside the institutions.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

7.3.1 Pilot-studies should be encouraged to explore non-traditional pedagogical means, including audio-visual material and video documentaries; cd-roms and other 'electronic books', on areas of relevance to European Women's Studies.

7.3.2 The establishment of video conferencing and computerised conference systems as a means of implementing 'virtual mobility' programs and to supplement, but not replace, student and staff exchanges.

7.3.3 The use of computerised information systems to strengthen international participation in local programs, both in teaching and in areas of research on education.

7.3.4 To explore ways of using the new information technologies to further continuing and adult Women's Studies education programmes in an international perspective.

7.3.5 To ensure effective networking of all the Women's Studies programmes in the World Wide Web (Internet) and to facilitate access to as wide a range of Women's Studies participants as possible, especially to women from minority groups.

7.3.6 Special attention should be paid to issues of intellectual property and fair access to the information technologies.

7.3.7 To prevent users of Internet getting lost in their searches for Women's Studies topics a "road map" is developed and put on the Antwerp University server (the World Wide Web address is: http://women-www.uia.ac.be/women, to be used with Netscape, Mosaic, or any other graphical browser). The road map points to the sites on Internet that are relevant for women and Women's Studies. Support is needed for the regular updating of the 'road map'.

7.3.8 The European Union is asked to fund a pilot study to intensively train young female researchers to use the new information technologies because Internet, at the moment, is dominated by male users. Furthermore, it has a mostly American presence. The pilot study could be fruitful ground for joint efforts and comparative studies on a European level.

7.3.9 A pilot research project should be set up, in cooperation with DG XXII, on how the new information technologies can be put to work for education in Women's Studies.

7.4. WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL
The Women's Studies community should make an effort to extend their use of the information channels about European activities both in general and specifically related to Women's Studies.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

7.4.1 Computer training courses should be made available at grass-root level, especially among minority women.

7.4.2 Stronger ties should be established with the Open University system, with a view to developing joint activities in the field of long-distance education.

8. INFORMATION
More efforts should be made to ensure transparency and widespread distribution of information to the Women's Studies community about European activities of relevance to the field.

8.1 INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL

8.1.1 More efforts should be made by rectors of higher education institutions concerning the distribution of information on European programmes to Women's Studies departments.

8.1.2 A European exchange bureau at the universities has to be established that can distribute the information about Women's Studies in other countries.

8.2 NATIONAL LEVEL
The national office of information concerning the European Union should make sure that Women's Studies programmes and institutes are on their mailing list and regularly receive all information concerning teaching and research activities organised by the European Commission.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

8.2.1 The national ministries of education should make more efforts to distribute information about Women's Studies.

8.2.2 A special provision of documentation funds for the purchase of Women's Studies journals and publications from other European Member States for university libraries is called for.

8.2.3 Member States are asked to support and promote European publications in the field of Women's Studies.

8.3 EUROPEAN LEVEL

A strong appeal is issued to the Commission to ensure that Women's Studies groups and organisations are entered in the mailing lists for the activities in the field of teaching and research and that these groups be kept adequately informed of developments in these areas. This is especially important considering the uneven level of institutional and national support that Women's Studies programmes receive throughout the European Community.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

8.3.1 The whole process of application for funding under the ERASMUS, TEMPUS, LINGUA, COMETT and SOCRATES programmes should be clearly explained and should be made more transparent.

8.3.2 There is a need for comprehensive information packages to disseminate information on and encourage use of ECTS.

8.3.3 Women's Studies should be included in discipline-index of ERASMUS/LINGUA Directory in order to increase its visibility.

8.3.4 The European Union is asked to ensure that all the major publications of the European Commission in areas related to Women's Studies, emancipation and equal opportunities - including this SYNTHESIS report, the ERASMUS Report and the National Reports - are available on Internet.

8.3.5 The annual update of National Reports on Women's Studies in each country should be funded, coordinated and distributed by the European Union.

8.3.6 The series "Women of Europe" should be taken up again even in a revised or telematic form.

8.4 WOMEN'S STUDIES COMMUNITY LEVEL

Women's Studies organizations should give a higher priority to spreading information on European activities. WISE can play an important role in this effort (see note 10).

SPECIFIC ACTIONS RECOMMENDED ARE:

8.4.1 The information about Women's Studies in European universities should be centralised, by the setting up of a European data-base of Women's Studies courses, research and publications. This should go beyond the mere collection of data and favour an interactive approach, long-distance learning and ensure wide access for students and teachers via Internet. This could be placed within a Women's Studies Centre, which might also develop a strategy for promotion of Women's Studies and related activities.

8.4.2 There should be a European Women's Studies Network newsletter several times a year to ensure all new groupings and activities are published. This newsletter should also be available on Internet.