

# *Statement of Purpose*

*for the*

## **Gender Studies Unit**

September 2001

## *Preface*

This Statement of Purpose fulfills the double purpose of describing the present and the future of Gender Studies at CEU.

**As to the present**, the Statement presents the scholarly profile of the *Program on Gender and Culture* at CEU and an outline of its MA degree program in Gender Studies.

**As to the future**, it documents the current engagement of the *Program on Gender and Culture* with developing Gender Studies at CEU, namely the endeavor to establish a PhD Program in Comparative Gender Studies and to transform the *Program on Gender and Culture* into a full-fledged department.

# *Contents*

## *Summary Statement*

### **1. Of principles**

*Gender Studies in Perspective*

*Gender Studies as a Subject Field*

### **2. “Points of Juncture”**

*How to Construct Gender Studies: Women - Core - Periphery*

*Production and Reproduction: Social Systems, Social Grouping, Social Change*

*The Practices of Power: Discourse and Culture Materialized*

### **3. Institutionalizing and Developing Gender Studies**

*The PhD Degree in Gender Studies - Of Principles*

*The Gender Studies Unit*

### **4. General Outline and Curricula of the MA and PhD Programs**

*MA Program in Gender Studies*

*PhD Degree Program in Comparative Gender Studies*

### **5. Research**

*On Strategies*

*Selected Research Foci Summaries*

## *Summary Statement*

The Gender Studies Unit at CEU is a postgraduate program in Gender Studies which will offer an MA and a PhD degree. In addition, the Gender Studies Unit serves as an organizational base for non-degree studies in various forms, as well as for research and other activities<sup>2</sup> in the field.

The Gender Studies Unit seeks to interrelate and to bring together Women's and Gender Studies emerging from a wide range of disciplines in the social sciences and humanities<sup>3</sup>. The Unit is built with reference to the large and growing body of high quality research and critical theory being developed internationally in Women's and Gender Studies in the last three decades. It seeks to contribute to the process of developing Gender Studies as a full scale subject field in its own right which is oriented towards the production of socially relevant knowledge on the basis of epistemologies allowing for diversity *and* integration. Teaching and scholarship in the Gender Studies Unit are built on strong disciplinary roots, genuine interdisciplinarity, and on integrative and comparative perspectives allowing for the unfolding of Gender Studies as an inclusive subject field. The critique of dominant patterns and global hierarchies in the construction of knowledge(s), social critique, and the development of an interrelated variety of perspectives on gender and in Gender Studies are of crucial importance in the endeavor to produce insights of regional and global relevance. With Central and Eastern Europe as its focal point, Gender Studies at CEU goes beyond looking at the region as something "backward" in comparison to the "West" or alternatively as something "specific" stemming from "indigenous" factors. The complexity of gender is therefore understood as a product of the often unequal entangling of global and local forces in the region. Developing integrative perspectives in Gender Studies also means investigating the complex relations between the symbolic and the social order, the entangled relations between gender, race, and class, and the dynamics combining the (re-)production of social persons and societies. Finally, focusing on gender in all of these senses implies developing self-reflective perspectives in Gender Studies.

## **1. Of Principles**

### *Gender Studies in Perspective*

Gender Studies throughout the last decades has undoubtedly unfolded as one of the most innovative and dynamically developing subject fields in the humanities and social sciences. The emergence of Women's and Gender Studies in itself discloses one of the hidden agendas of modern academy, namely the fact that the production of knowledge and the development of academy in modernity is to be read not only as an intellectual history but also as a historical societal process. Gender Studies is but one element in a far-reaching process of change characterizing academy and society today. In recent decades, the interest in understanding the humanities and social sciences as a historical phenomenon, i.e. in understanding the very key categories and modes of narration of both as being based on conventionally overlooked presuppositions and being historically constructed and situated has grown remarkably. In inquiring into the influence and the status of gender in all stages and on all levels of the production of knowledge, Women's and Gender Studies have overtly and

consciously contributed to these processes of destabilization (as they are often called in the jargon within the field) and reshaping of academy today.

Women's and Gender Studies basically are intended to contribute to a better understanding of the construction, the meaning and the consequences of gender and of the practices of engendering in society, culture and systems of knowledge over time and space. Focusing on gender means to challenge the seemingly universal and objective dichotomy between the male and the female. In thus favoring inclusive perspectives, Women's and Gender Studies also aim to deconstruct and overcome the, in various ways related, historical, societal, discursive and theoretical dichotomies of nature/biology versus culture/society, production versus reproduction, public versus private, and equality versus difference. In deconstructing the male-female dualism, Gender Studies also paves the way for a systematic historical and theoretical inquiry into relations and differentiation amongst women and amongst men, as well as into the social and cultural construction of womanhood and manhood. Gender is thus understood as a basic category of analysis relevant to all forms and systems of human organization and social life.

Gender Studies does not presuppose a fixed set of possible forms or ways of constructing gender in society and culture which would be accompanied by a fixed set of possible consequences. Gender Studies is thus defined as a subject field (see below) relevant in the inquiry into society, culture and human life over time and space. Gender Studies does not base the production of (seemingly universal) knowledge as such on historically and geographically unique patterns of gender relations, i.e. patterns characteristic for specific social and cultural systems. They do not, for example, presuppose a straightforward separation of "politics" and "economics", which informs most of the mainstream in the more traditional disciplines, thus hindering scholarly adequate analysis of a wide range of historical systems and cultures.

From the very outset therefore, Gender Studies allows for the integrative – and also truly comparative, i.e. relational and flexible *as well as* category-based – analysis of capitalist and non-capitalist, European and non-European societies and cultures. In order to realize this potential and thus engage in the production of socially relevant knowledge Gender Studies is epistemologically and theoretically built on various levels of self-reflection informing its scholarly endeavors. The unfolding of Women's and Gender Studies as a variety of modes of inquiry into the (re-)production of social persons, societies, and cultures understood as historically variable ones is closely related to the destabilization of classical fixed categories in the humanities and social sciences. The unfolding of Gender Studies is therefore accompanied by asking for the very societal roots of successfully introducing these and related approaches into academy today and by analyzing the very impact of these changing perspectives in academy on the social world. This integration of a reflective juncture with regard to its societal roots enables Gender Studies to integrate diversified experience and knowledge on a equal basis and thus to foster the overcoming of hierarchy and asymmetry in the dialogue among group- and region-specific perspectives. A second layer of self-reflection in Gender Studies comes to the forefront in the process of producing gender-relevant knowledge in the ways described above and implies the readiness to develop perspectives overcoming the focus (be it in affirmation and/or critical distance) on the "West" as a pre-given point of reference for all scholarly perspective. At the same time Gender Studies is making efforts to develop alternative, consciously negotiated value-judgements, as their critique of male-centered "universalism" and "objectivism" will not acquiesce in serving as a fragmentary mosaic of particularistic group interest and experience.

Major scholarly strategies for negotiating partial knowledge include – on the epistemological level – endeavors of consequently integrating "standpoint" and "value" into scholarship itself (instead of accounting for their existence and influence on the production of knowledge as an external, non-scholarly factor). These strategies also include – on a theoretical and methodological level – interdisciplinarity and comparativism once Women's and Gender Studies takes seriously the

endeavor to combine the critique of androcentrism and eurocentrism within an analytical framework allowing for diversity and integration. Comparativism as a (by definition) theoretically loaded, but at the same time very practically oriented and pragmatic research strategy allows for a combination of deconstructing unreflected norms informing scholarship *and* developing inclusive perspectives built on the understanding and analysis of similarities, differences and relations between the compared “cases”. Comparativism allows for a negotiated balance between context and the particular on the one hand, and integrative theoretical perspectives on the other. Comparativism demands caution against hasty generalization and enables to focus on the typical in the particular and on the particular in the seemingly general. Interdisciplinarity is of pivotal importance in Women’s and Gender Studies, as many issues critical to feminist scholars fall to the margins or borderlands of any given discipline’s subject of study. Themes and problems investigated in Gender Studies have not neatly conformed to disciplinary parameters. In constructing their subject of study and in pursuing research, Women’s and Gender Studies therefore have not only been creating new organizing concepts and skills, they have also been developing ways and forms of integrating subject fields and disciplines formerly strictly divided from each other and thus have established new basic metaphors and paradigms. By making visible important “missing linkages” among aspects of human life, social structures, and motivations Gender Studies has been rebuilding the prevailing structures of the construction of knowledge based on the exclusion of important dimensions of human experience from the body of knowledge accumulated in the diverse disciplines.

### ***Gender Studies as a subject field***

Any review of the literature discussing the inter?trans?cross?disciplinary? status of Gender Studies and any analysis of the manifold ways in which units in (graduate) Gender Studies are defined, institutionalized, organized, and critically reviewed today must arrive at the conclusion that for the time being we are confronted with a situation in which there are *as many programs, as many strategies – and critics*. What is obvious, is that Gender Studies on the one hand has been very dynamically stimulating the development of new questions and perspectives within the more traditional disciplines. On the other hand, in transgressing and deconstructing the dividing lines between the more traditional disciplines, Gender Studies has emerged and been institutionalized as a dynamically developing subject field in its own right. Gender Studies today is locatable in international academy as a lively, integrative field of teaching and research rooted in a new type of critical, reflexive social theory. Institutionally, Gender Studies is taking the shape of Departments, Programs, Centers and other types of units offering majors and minors at the undergraduate level, and specializations in Gender Studies as well as independent MA and PhD degrees at the graduate level. While some universities in the US and partly Britain have been the forerunners in institutionalizing Gender Studies, the development by now has become an ubiquitous and global one. On the one hand, the establishment of strong, independent units in Gender Studies reaches such traditionalist and highly prestigious places like (to mention a most recent example) Harvard University and a whole range of universities in otherwise rigid academic surroundings like (for example) Germany. On the other hand, we are witnessing amazing progress in the establishment and unfolding of Gender Studies Programs in internationally much less or barely known universities all over the globe, including Africa, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe, and Latin America.

The varieties, and sometimes ambivalent or even contradictory tendencies in conceptualizing and institutionalizing Gender Studies as an inclusive subject field are by no means due to the problematic or undefined character and mission of Gender Studies in general. On the contrary, the openness of Gender Studies as a field is clearly to be understood as a byproduct of its dynamic development in academy and as an element and a reflection of an ongoing process of fundamental restructuring of

the production of knowledge on a global scale. In this process, inherited boundaries in academy and between academy and society are becoming destabilized and permeable. Academy as such is undergoing a process of fragmentation and destabilization, which is reflected in parochialism, repetitiveness, and shallowness in much scholarly production and debate unaware of its own historical roots and ties to societal change. Looking at the same process the other way around, it appears as an opening up of academy, involving the emergence of new interstitial areas of theoretical reflection and scholarly inquiry with strong potentials for the development of new types of (socially relevant and irrelevant) knowledge and new epistemologies. On an institutional as well as on a theoretical and methodological level, these processes are reflected in an increased blurring of the very understanding(s) of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. It still can be claimed and is claimed today, that disciplines are defined by sharing a common subject of study (say: the human psyche, or else: society) and some basic rules and categories of inquiry. But it can also be claimed, that methods once closely related to one or more specific disciplines have long invaded other disciplines to an extent that cross-disciplinary relations have become very close, while intradisciplinary conformity has virtually disappeared. Also, within disciplines, fragmentation in terms of subject of study, theory and methodology have reached such a dimension, that dialogue between representatives of the same discipline often appears to be a dialogue between those who are hard of hearing. These processes have been accompanied by and entangled with the emergence of new subjects of study, new methodologies and even new epistemologies which in some cases claim to be new disciplines and form new institutional units and their own degrees, too (examples being media studies, criminology, cultural studies ...).

In the history of modern academy, growing complexity and openness have always characterized periods of substantial reorientation, reorganization and the emergence of new disciplines. Academic disciplines, their emergence, development, and change have always been rooted in historically and geographically specific conditions, and the related processes have always been engaging power relations within and beyond academy. At the same time, the dynamics of these developments have never been purely academic or institutional but always reflected societal roots *and* inner-academic dynamics of the production of knowledge. The development in the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries of academic disciplines today perceived as “classical” ones was the result of a process of cutting the world and the view of the world into pieces, which cannot be put together in a way, that allows for the development of a range of partial perspectives *of global relevance*. In “classical” academy, disciplines have been built on the assumption that their subject fields are independent from one another. It thus became difficult – for example – to ask how economy, politics, and society (in the “West”) were interwoven with each other, how the subject fields mentioned were related to history and shaped by history, how the social world was constructed in the non-Western parts of the globe, and how the ascent of modernity (in the “West”) was bound to global developments and relations. Most of the “classical” disciplines also presupposed man, or else: the subject as a fixed and universal category, while at the same time denying the subject status to those, who did not fit into its very model of the individual as a universal unit of scholarly analysis. On an institutional level too, modern academy as it emerged since the 18<sup>th</sup> century was built on ensuring separation – separation from other systems and cultures of scholarship, separation from the social world, and drawing demarcation lines between subject fields in order to be safe from intruders from outside. As a consequence of these and other layers and dynamics of partialization and separation scholars were in the past and are in the present confronted with a massive scholarly and institutionalized resistance of the academic establishment against “putting the pieces together” and developing self-reflective views on one’s own (partial) perspective.

Developed in a carefully considered and adequate way, Gender Studies take an important place in the very heart of endeavors of overcoming this resistance and developing new, integrative

perspectives. If the production of knowledge is a socially and historically rooted and embedded process and if the production of more socially relevant knowledge is intended, then transgressing the borders between the traditional academic disciplines *and* creating institutional space for developing critical, reflexive social theory, scholarship and education are of utmost importance. Institutionally, theoretically, and methodologically Gender Studies is located exactly at the cross-roads of these ongoing, complex processes and may claim – with all qualifications which need to be made – the status of an inclusive subject field on its own right. They negotiate diversified perspectives and constructions of (wo)men, and by analyzing gender as (mis)represented, marginalized or ignored in all “classical” disciplines create a new subject field consciously built on integration and consciously being constructed at cross purposes to all “classical” disciplines. Apart from other emerging interdisciplinary fields of study, Gender Studies does not focus on social and cultural phenomena which have been restricted to a specific historical period or to a specific geographic area. As far as academic and non-academic knowledge reaches, there was no society or culture in history, which was not shaped by systems of gender relations and specific forms of constructing and deconstructing gender. In this sense, Gender Studies is a truly universal subject field.

Any university supportive, in principle, of the current processes of scholarly and institutional reshaping of academy and intending to contribute to substantial reorientation of academy rather than to its fragmentation and the loss of relevance of the knowledge it produces, should take advantage of the attractive and important opportunity to build a safe and stable institutional foundation for the dynamic development of Gender Studies. Gender Studies does not call for disciplineless knowledge, but it recognizes that the essentially one-sided and selective nature of disciplinary knowledge has to be complemented by a critical dialogue that draws on a wide range of disciplinary skills and selectively mobilizes its tools in reference to specific problem areas. The academic challenge provided by Gender Studies (and other, comparable new fields of critical inquiry) can be met by developing an institutional structure based on a balance between more “traditional” disciplines and more open units, in which an integrated approach is constructed in the process of research and teaching. Such balance can be reached by creating institutional equality between the more “traditional” disciplines and the more open units and by developing high-quality scholarship in the latter through the introduction of the highest level of postgraduate degree studies.

## 2. “Points of Juncture”

The Gender Studies Unit gives space for the presence and development of a whole range of diverging and overlapping, specific and general scholarly and teaching interests. At the same time and beyond this, scholarship, research, and some of the teaching is organized loosely and not exclusively around broadly defined, overarching *foci*, the “points of juncture”. These “points of juncture” academically and *taken together* serve as a one possible mode of scholarly translation of the basic purposes of the Gender Studies Unit into more concrete research and teaching perspectives, which in turn ensure the unique and characteristic scholarly coloring of the Unit. Institutionally the “points of juncture” serve as a means of creating a common identity of the Gender Studies Unit with its otherwise manifold and interdisciplinary academic life, of representing the Gender Studies Unit in a coherent and productive way towards the CEU community, academics and society, and of creating clear-cut points of reference for the development of various forms of academic cooperation.

Manifold courses and research projects may translate the “points of juncture” into researchable



topics and well-designed courses, make them their starting point and/or one of their self-reflective concerns and/or their major focus. The Gender Studies Unit develops a priority research agenda in correspondence with the “points of juncture” (*see below* for Research). Additional research projects may be introduced at any time and are warmly welcomed.

The „points of juncture” may change over the years (for example in response to successful completion of related research projects, to the interest of new faculty, or new developments in Gender Studies in general), but *together* they always underpin the basic purpose of the Gender Studies Unit. The “points of juncture” or *foci* allow the development of partial and dialogically interrelated perspectives on the whole field of Women’s and Gender Studies corresponding to the experience, academic background, and interests of faculty and students, and thus facilitate putting interdisciplinarity into practice. In view of the present trends *and* shortcomings in Gender Studies (international and regional) on the one hand, and the societal and scholarly relevance of Gender Studies mainly with regard to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe on the other hand, three initial “points of juncture” as outlined in the following are being developed.

### ***How to Construct Gender Studies: Women - Core - Periphery***

If Gender Studies is being defined as integrative in its scholarly perspectives on local and global, dominant and non-dominant structures, cultures and interests, it is of decisive importance to reflect global asymmetries and hierarchies in the process of the production of knowledge. What is usually perceived as “global” and “universal” must be reconstructed as knowledge built on androcentric and eurocentric perspectives and epistemologies, i.e. as one or more dominant scholarly discourses closely related to social, cultural, and intellectual traditions and perspectives rooted in the experience and interest of dominant social groups in the core countries and in varying articulations in the peripheral regions of this globe. Gender Studies gives equal rights to different experiences and interests when constructing knowledge. It thus makes itself an advocate of a growing influence of scholarly discourse and perspectives rooted in experience from the inner and outer peripheries, i.e. in non-dominant interests articulated within and outside “Western” contexts on the production and construction of knowledge all over the world. This is reflected for example in a new understanding of how important the complex relations and dynamic interactions between gender, race and ethnicity, and class have been on the local and transnational levels. The growing body of scholarship and theory focusing on various dimensions of this problem has also deepened our understanding of how the historically constructed concepts of femininity and masculinity have been shaping not only gender relations within societies. They have been of tremendous importance in the unfolding and shaping of concepts such as nation and nationalism, empires, progress, and development and related societal, cultural and political practices.

These and related new approaches in Gender Studies are genuinely transnational and integrative in perspective. To be sure: they do not intend to establish a perspective on “the whole” which can show it “as it is”. Every choice of a perspective is rooted in social and cultural experience and in specific interests, and every perspective implies specific types and ways of shedding light on “the whole”, which therefore appears in specific colors and does not show everything “as it is”. We cannot avoid these “specific” characteristics of our perspectives, but can at best account for our reasons to choose those perspectives over others. Such interrelated endeavors to acknowledge different experiences and different interests as an essential starting point of and factor in negotiating and shaping the production of knowledge need not end up in the total fragmentation of knowledge. Instead, they can and should shape Gender Studies as one of the crucial bases for developing new, non-hierarchical, relational and non-marginalizing perspectives on the (re-)production of hierarchical and asymmetrical differentiation along the lines of race, gender, and class in the single global system

of today and the more confined social and cultural systems of the past.

The development of integrative Gender Studies with an interest in questions of comparison, and in conceptualizing difference and conflicting perspectives on the global and regional levels has not been uncontested. Not much attention has been given to these types of questions in Gender Studies related to Central and Eastern Europe. In other regions as well, only a minority of the scholarship in the expanding field of Women's and Gender Studies makes the often hierarchical entangling of the global and the local an integral part or indeed a focus of analysis. There is also a more or less implicit tendency, nourished by scholarly development in core and non-core regions alike, of simply "adding" studies from and about the inner and outer peripheries in the global system to the mainstream(s) in Gender Studies. This tendency is – for example – reflected with striking clearness in the "geographic" and thematic diversification of the tables of contents of journals, or else in the acceptance and representation of "difference" and "cultural diversity" between women in the social world and in scholarship. These forms of diversification run the risk of not meeting the challenge of further developing integrative epistemologies, theories and methodologies in Gender Studies in response to the growing international presence of the new type of integrative scholarship. In the past decade, we have witnessed the unfolding of conscious strategies of internationalizing Gender Studies. Yet within this scholarship, the awareness in principle of the problem of non-reflective universalisms in Women's and Gender Studies, is not always translated into concrete, conscious rethinking of theories and methods integrating unity and diversity by giving equal right to divergent (and entangled) experience and history in an asymmetrically and hierarchically integrated world. Rather, some of the new international and transnational Gender Studies tend to "forget" about the problem and/or tend to rely unreflexively, implicitly or explicitly on worn out notions of backwardness and of the catching-up development of regional, national, and local women's movements, women's history, and Gender Studies.

None of these tendencies, i.e. neither particularization and fragmentation per se nor the simple addition of the "other" (region, part of the globe, women with divergent histories and interests etc.) into predefined frameworks will help solve the crucial epistemological, theoretical and practical questions to be faced when developing a range of new, more adequate integrative perspectives. An effort to "mainstream" Central and East-European women's interests and perspectives, or any attempt to abandon the knowledge(s) of the core in favor of some "distinctly" East-European patterns of assumptions and knowledge(s) would amount to Gender Studies' acceptance of the determination of its place within the larger/global structure of a still androcentric and eurocentric world. Scholarship, research, and teaching corresponding to *How to Construct Gender Studies: Women - Core – Periphery* as a "point of juncture" in the Gender Studies Unit at CEU takes as its task the systematic development of perspectives leading beyond these and related analytical frameworks. The Unit thus makes an important contribution to the development of scholarly frameworks in which reflection of the problems of Central Eastern Europe leads to a critical rethinking of disciplinary models and problematics which is important for CEU as a whole.

### ***Production and Reproduction: Social Systems, Social Grouping, Social Change***

Human activity in all historical social systems (large or small; defined as societies, as communities, as based on family networks or "tribes", as constituting regional and global networks, etc.) has been preoccupied with the production of goods, services (and needs) and with the reproduction of individuals, households, and other communal units involved. Some social systems have been favoring interests related to production, and/or created hierarchy and conflict between productive activities and needs related to reproduction. Others have been favoring reproductive needs, and/or created limits to growth and expansion. Productive and reproductive activities have by no means

always been clearly separated from each other. Instead, they have been imbedded into each other and related to each other in varied ways being subject to and creating a great variety of organizing human life, functioning of social systems, and patterns of social change.

The relationship between production and reproduction has been organized through and within systems of a societal division of labor and human activity. These systems have been regulating the ways of dividing and intertwining human activity; forms and rules of exchange of goods, services and activities, and the patterns of relationships among the members of the respective social system (the basic units this system was built from). The societal divisions of labor were fundamentally sexual(ized), and these gendered divisions of labor have had pivotal implications with regard to the status and power relations of men and women in social systems as a whole. Economic as well as political actors (including various authorities, entrepreneurs, agencies, and the male and female producers themselves) have explicitly and/or implicitly used gender as well as related concepts of masculinity and femininity and of sexuality as an important tool for shaping division(s) of labor as well as social and cultural systems.

We do not know any system of division of labor, for and in which gender (defined in this context as including productive and reproductive capacities of both sexes) has not played a crucial role. All social systems have ascribed at least a connotation of being male or female to certain types, fields, spheres of work (defined as including human activity in both the societal spheres related to production and to reproduction) – however flexible, indefinite and transgressive these gendered divisions of labor may have been in some systems or under specific circumstances (at least for some men and women and/or in terms of constructing gender as not inescapably bound to bodily sex). Not only labor markets and family work in our modern period are organized along dividing lines between the two sexes and concepts of masculinity and femininity. Systems of dividing labor within agrarian households have always made – in a great variety of forms – distinctions between “women’s work” and “men’s work”.

At the same time, the way the division of labor is organized and works in a given society is of importance not only for the relative positions of men and women and consequent power structures in the world of work as such. The position of men and women within the systems of division of labor had crucial implications for the cultural and political status of both sexes, for their relation to state, authorities, and power, and for agency in all of these realms. In the early 19<sup>th</sup> century, the ideological and/or actual confinement of women to a newly constructed sphere of reproduction proper in the leading industrializing zones of the world was translated in the most immediate terms into their exclusion from emerging individual citizenship rights. The emergence of straightforward dividing lines between production and reproduction and the subordination of the latter to the former in the process of industrialization resulted in a dramatic devaluation of inherited sources of cultural and social esteem for women.

On the other hand, many agents and actors in the process of social change have made gender a key element in their endeavors to shape and change social systems, making strategic use of and calling into question the existing gender division of labor, or restructuring it. Proto-industrial entrepreneurs of the 18<sup>th</sup> century used pre-existing gender relations in agrarian households to put into practice their production strategies. Bismarck-type social policy consciously operated to pacify the male working class by constructing a male bread winner family based on fostering material social integration and introducing a specific type of hierarchical gender relation into the working class. Early state socialism consciously built its accumulation strategy on the forced incorporation of as large a female workforce as possible into the labor market by making households dependent on double income. The structural adjustment policies of our days are dependent on forcing women to increase their income generating activities on the labor market, while at the same time utilizing the elasticity of women’s unpaid labor by pushing reproductive activities back into the household.

All of these insights are products of the questioning of pre-existing categories of analysis by Women's and Gender Studies, which have challenged and historicized categories formerly taken for granted, such as the dichotomies of production versus reproduction, work versus family, work versus leisure, working men and supported wives. Building on women's and men's different (and multiple) experience in the social world and introducing gender as an important focus for analysis, Women's and Gender Studies engage in replacing the previous categories by establishing new perspectives on the systems of production and reproduction. They focus for example on relations and combinations of paid and unpaid work, underpaid and decently paid work, superior and inferior value of men's and women's work respectively. They also focus on how "male" and "female" persons are being socially constructed in their divergent attachment to work, family, and sexuality and to their hetero-normative relations. Gender Studies focusing on production and reproduction in all of these senses raise academically highly relevant theoretical questions *and* pave the way for social action in the very core of the worlds of production and reproduction based on practical and theoretical insight alike. In other words, a (academic/research) position that foregrounds the social relation of gender radically displaces the theoretical discourses which marginalize the question of gender.

### ***The Practices of Power: Discourse and Culture Materialized***

In the last two decades, scholarship with a focus on gender has performed a key role in bringing about a landslide in the social sciences and humanities, usually being labelled as the "linguistic turn". The most basic implications of the paradigmatic change related to this landslide lie in the deconstruction of the opposition(s) between materialist and idealist approaches, and between objectivity and subjectivity in the social sciences and humanities. Language, discourse, culture and other symbolic systems, through which meaning is constructed and through which people perceive and represent the world, are no longer understood as either the reflection of objective, material reality, nor are they perceived as the single decisive force in shaping history, social change and political systems. Instead, discourse and culture have been established as one in a range of, in principle, equally valued, inter-dependent elements to be taken into consideration in all scholarly endeavor to interpret or analyze the past and present of human life on both local and global levels. This, in turn, implies that there is no stable and pre-defined relationship between any form, type or system of representations on the one hand, and a pre-existing reality on the other. The dialectical relationship between discourse and other dimensions of social practices has been understood to be realized by various degrees of (partial) internalization with neither the symbolic nor the social being reducible to one another. What follows from such a position is that scholarship cannot assume to have access to an unmediated world of objective things and processes. Knowledge and meaning are not discoveries but constructions. Social life as we know it comes to be discursively mediated for us.

The role of Gender Studies in the evolvment of these key notions in the current paradigmatic change in academy was and is twofold. By focusing on the experience and actions of women as (possibly) different from those of men, Gender Studies produced a torrent of scholarship concluding, on various levels, in a radical critique and challenging of a whole range of seemingly fixed categories, such as sexuality, the public and the private, citizenship, nationalism, race, and class, to name but a few. In doing so, Gender Studies contributed to the deconstruction of the androcentrism of more traditional epistemologies, to making visible how this androcentrism has functioned to legitimize sexism and gendered hierarchy within and outside academy, and to revealing social and cultural regulatory practices in the construction and the ideals of knowledges.

By the same token, the (de-)constructivist and (con-)textual approaches emerging from these perspectives and achievements in Gender Studies (and other fields) leave unanswered important

questions linked to the problem of developing new, more inclusive and less hierarchic scholarly perspectives and of the construction of social theory in general. By turning away from causal and unilinear modes and models of analysis, the new perspectives leave uncertain the relation of discourse and culture to the past and present structures they purport to represent and their relation to other elements that are for any social theory. Arguing that neither the social nor the symbolic is dominant in a traditional causal sense or introducing metaphors like the intertwining of the two does not resolve the problem. The crucial question here is whether and how it is possible to develop systematic understandings of the relationship between the social and the symbolic and to integrate scholarly reflection on this question into social theorizing or meta-narratives. This question must be addressed from both “sides”, i.e. by analyzing practices of representation as well as social processes and patterns of social experience.

A feminist position in producing knowledge cannot undermine its normative ground given that it presupposes women’s oppression and that its political project is to make the world better for women. This is a demand that puts limits on the process of an unconditioned valorization of postmodern theories. Gender Studies, however, is not necessarily committed to women as a unitary epistemological category even if it *is* committed to women as a political collective. This also raises questions of agency, identity, and conceptualizations of self and personhood. Agency is not to be theorized on the basis of a voluntaristic and pre-defined concept of the self on the one hand, or a concept of the self as being a thoroughly contingent cultural/discursive construction on the other. Instead, we need to explore the social conditions and psychoanalytic dynamics of “intelligibility” and interpellation, i.e. the network of particular political, economic and cultural practices within which individuals come to assume a (gendered) identity. Theorizing this process is one of the key elements in developing our understanding of how the access to power and resources is being hierarchically structured and gendered, and hence of conceptualizing agency and identity as a resource for change.

Gender Studies is particularly well equipped to play a key role in related endeavors not only because of its contributions to the (de-)constructivist turn in general. Gender Studies has long been making power and gender differences in power one of its crucial *foci*. Whereas this has often been done via focusing on conflict and consent over meaning as an important field of constructing, perpetuating and deconstructing power, Gender Studies could make very productive use of its insights into power and scholarly conceptualizations of power by explicitly problematizing the relation of symbolic and social fields and dimensions of power to gender differences in power. Questioning the practices of power might, for example, mean problematizing the relation between gender differentiation and marginalization of interests and experience of women in the discourse of social movements on the one hand, and the conflict over change or stabilization of given gender relations on the other. In this sense, *materializing* culture and discourse as part of a program for Gender Studies means to promote new and self-reflective methodologies and types of social theory and to seek to establish paradigms in Gender Studies which are integrative on a scholarly level and dedicated to social critique and change on a more practical level. More specifically, in the CEU context, it implies reflecting on the limits of the provinces of analysis carved out by the traditionally recognized social science disciplines, and the relations of these disciplinary fields to aspects of culture represented (selectively) in the academy under the aegis of the humanities.

Thus all three (exemplary) perspectives in teaching and research outlined here as starting points for Gender Studies’ agenda at CEU are crucial to the CEU enterprise as a whole, if CEU is to serve as a center for producing new research and knowledge relevant to regional and local problems, critically aware citizens capable of relating local experience to global processes and structures, and robust intellectual foundations for a critical democratic discourse. Better integration of Gender Studies into the CEU core is therefore in the first line a question of intellectual productivity.

### 3. Institutionalizing and Developing Gender Studies

Academic interest and scholarly perspective have always needed and need institutionalization. Since the ascent of modern science, no subject field and no scholarly perspective has ever succeeded in firmly establishing itself without becoming an independent institutional unit and developing independent research and teaching capacities in academy. As diverse as the forms and ways of institutionalizing Women's and Gender Studies in academy are today, it can clearly be observed that those units in Women's and Gender Studies which are flourishing are those which are based on offering programs of independent graduate studies at the highest possible level and which have acquired institutional equality with the more "traditional" disciplines.

The commitment to substantially develop (upgrade) Gender Studies at Central European University must be translated into clear-cut institutional politics (which, of course, always involve academic leanings). While continuing education on the MA level as currently developed (i.e. providing a substantial post graduate education in Gender Studies which is unique in Central and Eastern Europe as well as guaranteeing a viable size of faculty and scope of teaching and research indispensable for a multi-disciplinary unit) the two most important steps in upgrading Gender Studies at CEU are the introduction of an independent PhD degree program and the development of the Program on Gender and Culture into an institutionally equal Gender Studies Unit.

#### *The PhD Degree in Gender Studies – Of Principles*

The establishment of an independent PhD Program in Gender Studies is a substantial prerequisite of institutionalizing and developing Gender Studies into an integral element in teaching, scholarship and research at CEU. The future of Gender Studies as a dynamically developing subject field depends critically upon the establishment of transdisciplinary doctoral degree programs. Gender Studies today suffers from the scarcity of sufficiently educated faculty combining both, solid knowledge in one of the more "classical" disciplines in the social sciences and humanities and truly transdisciplinary expertise and education, research experience and perspective in Gender Studies. The "production" of this new type of scholar is to be realized in carefully developed doctoral degree programs in Gender Studies. This type of education is a necessary prerequisite for

- A. Avoiding a fall-back into the old distinctions by disciplinary background while processes of specialization *within* the multi-faceted field of Gender Studies gain momentum.
- B. Developing inclusive and integrative curricula and courses in Gender Studies while at the same time allowing for the necessary specialization of topics and research fields.
- C. Supporting in-depth research and scholarship based on the appropriation and development by the PhD candidates of a set of methodological, analytical, and theoretical skills crucial for putting basic purposes of Gender Studies in scholarly practice.
- D. Supporting scholarly breakthrough(s) in Gender Studies based on substantial research and knowledge.
- E. In addition, broadening the body of truly transdisciplinary basic research, study, and publishing in Women's and Gender Studies is a high priority need for present and future Gender Studies; one of the most important bases for supporting such a development are independent, research-oriented educational programs at the highest possible, i.e. PhD level.

The new generation of scholars holding graduate degrees at PhD level in Women's and Gender Studies (and undergraduate degrees in more traditional disciplines) will be hired not only by undergraduate and graduate Gender Studies units. They will also be welcome for full appointments

or joint appointments in other units and departments wishing to cope with or to serve as driving forces in the academic and social dynamics responsible for the current processes of reshaping academy and redefining its relation to the social world. Genuinely transdisciplinary education on the PhD level will meet with growing demands for specialists in Women's and Gender Studies at undergraduate and graduate teaching level.

### *The Gender Studies Unit*

If Gender Studies is to be developed into a substantial element in teaching, scholarship and research at CEU it must have substantial institutional backing and independence. The most influential institution in shaping perspectives and development of the social sciences and humanities has long been the university with the academic departments as its core units, serving as a substantial basis for the production and transmission of knowledge, for shaping the direction and dynamics of the development of knowledge production, for the affiliation of faculty and the distribution of resources, for academic power and influence, and for conveying important symbolic messages related to the academic and social value of scholarship and teaching.

The decision to upgrade Gender Studies to the status of a unit institutionally equal with academic departments should *not* be based on considerations on the viability of Gender Studies as a discipline, however it is defined. Rather it is to be based, on the one hand, on a conscious decision of building the institutional structure of CEU on the combination and equal footing of units focusing on the more classical forms of disciplinary scholarship and teaching with units of a more open and interstitial character, in which scholarship and teaching is transgressing classical disciplinary boundaries. Establishing an institutional equal Gender Studies Unit does imply that Women's and Gender Studies are an integral element of the given institutional structure of academy (i.e. a non-marginalized, equally valued, and academically sufficiently developed field of knowledge, teaching, and research). At the same time, such a decision does support the ongoing changes in scholarly paradigms and institutional outlook of academy. (See also above: *Gender Studies as a Subject Field*) Developing an institutional equal Gender Studies Unit thus does not mean taking sides in any of the "classical" debates on better or worse ways of institutionalizing Gender Studies. One of the notions in these debates supported by many scholars in Women's and Gender Studies has long been that their subject field is intended to make a substantial contribution to and thereby change many disciplines and fields in the humanities and social sciences. Consequently, Gender Studies was always meant to be academically present "everywhere". The Gender Studies Unit may nicely serve this purpose insofar as the more classical departments are inclined to integrate what is being thought and taught in Gender Studies and related to their disciplinary knowledge into their curricula. A second "classical" concern in Gender Studies has been the intention to change academy by moving to its very institutional core and thus bringing about more self-reflection into the academy as well as bringing the academy closer to the social world by producing socially relevant knowledge. Building Gender Studies as an institutionally equal unit and keeping its openness and focus on reflexive social theory is a highly reasonable way of meeting this demand.

On the other hand, the decision to upgrade Gender Studies is to be based on a series of pragmatic considerations and arguments, focusing on the productive solution of factual problems and benefiting CEU as a whole. On this level, an institutional equal Gender Studies Unit appears as an essential base especially for

A. The development of a full scale curriculum and research agenda in Gender Studies, as that type of unit will have the right to make appointments according to *its own needs*. As long as appointments depend on the departmental structure of the university and on the cooperation with existing

departments, there is no guarantee that the academic needs of Gender Studies as a subject field will be met in a proper way (a typical case: “In which department to put the literary scholar we would like to appoint?”)

B. *Providing other units* at CEU with scholars and scholarly insight from disciplines and subject fields not (or not sufficiently) represented in the institutional structure and within the existing units of the university. The Gender Studies Unit in its appointment policy will essentially take into consideration the interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary needs of other departments. On the one hand, the Gender Studies Unit will draw extensively from the expertise available in other disciplines and subject fields already fully represented at CEU. On the other hand at least some of the appointments in Gender Studies will naturally focus on scholars based or rooted in those disciplines missing from or underrepresented at CEU and thus will be in the position to offer this expertise to other units and departments.

C. Attracting true specialists in Gender Studies as a subject field at a senior and junior level and based on a long-term commitment to CEU.

D. Creating equal forms of exchange and cooperation with other units at the university at all levels. Equal status in all regards provides important support here.

E. Giving the highest possible credibility to Gender Studies as one of the important new (and interstitial) subject fields. A decision of CEU as a highly valued, international institution of higher education in Central-Eastern Europe to build a truly independent Gender Studies Unit will send an academic signal of utmost relevance for/in Central-Eastern Europe and beyond. CEU thus may fulfil its mission of being a pivotal institution in shaping academy of the future.

## **4. General Outline and Curricula of the MA and PhD Programs**

Graduate Studies at the Gender Studies Unit of CEU consist of

A. the Masters of Arts degree in Gender Studies (MA), accredited by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York (US), and including special emphasis on interdisciplinarity.

B. the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Comparative Gender Studies (PhD), to be accredited by the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York (US), and built on a special emphasis upon integrative perspectives and comparative approaches.

### ***The MA Degree in Gender Studies***

#### Purpose

The MA degree program in Gender Studies offers a basic and comprehensive graduate education in Gender Studies with a focus on interdisciplinarity. It aims at the development of integrative perspectives on gender as an important element in and constituting the social and symbolic order on the local and the global levels. These missions are pursued by introducing basic theoretical approaches; diversified and intertwined methods, and research topics in Gender Studies developed or emerging in dialogue with disciplines (mainly) in the social sciences and humanities; by developing a range of *foci* on basic “points of juncture” in Women’s and Gender Studies, where truly



interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary scholarship is developed and/or needed. The MA degree program builds on disciplinary knowledge and interdisciplinarity in order to promote the further development of Gender Studies as subject field in its own right. The program focuses on combining the broadening and deepening of student's insight into Gender Studies emerging from various disciplines and developing their awareness of chances and fallacies of efforts to integrate these perspectives into a new ensemble of methods, theories and epistemologies.

The MA degree program educates a new generation of intellectuals who (after having acquired disciplinary specialization on the undergraduate level) combine knowledge on a whole range of perspectives in Gender Studies in the social sciences and humanities with a truly interdisciplinary focus. At present, the CEU MA degree program in Gender Studies is the only independent graduate program in Central Eastern Europe. In producing a substantial cohort of young intellectuals who's postgraduate education meets the highest international standards in academy and who enter a variety of fields and institutions year by year, the program fulfills a crucial mission in the whole region. The graduates of the MA Program are important in developing Gender Studies into a acknowledged and academically fully recognized field of studies all over the region. This, in turn, is a substantial prerequisite for meeting the challenge of adequately representing scholarship with a focus on gender in Central and Eastern Europe in international academy.

### Admissions Policy

The MA degree program in Gender Studies is a 10 month graduate degree program for individuals holding an undergraduate degree in one of the disciplines in the social sciences or humanities. Individuals with undergraduate training largely or exclusively in Gender, Women's and Men's Studies are advised to apply for the MA Program in one of the more traditional disciplinary departments at CEU. (CEU is likely to have very few or no applicants of this kind for the time being; these applicants might be advised to return to the Gender Studies Unit for their PhD studies.)

### Educational Goals and Career Opportunities

Students in the MA degree program are required to develop their scholarly perspectives substantially beyond their "home disciplines" and their immediate fields of interest. Students will develop into independently thinking, well-educated young scholars and intellectuals, combining interest in problem-oriented approaches with interdisciplinary and integrative perspectives in Gender Studies. These educational goals are to be reached through substantial education in theory, topics, and methodology emerging in dialogue with all of the more "classical" disciplines in the social sciences and humanities and converging to genuine interdisciplinarity (interdisciplinarity).

The MA degree in Gender Studies with special emphasis on interdisciplinarity qualifies students for:

- A. Professional careers in all societal and institutional fields, where gender is or is to become the focal point or one of the focal points of attention. It qualifies students to design, implement and evaluate professional and societal endeavors, programs etc. that should to be based on multi-focal attention to and critique of gender asymmetries and hierarchies in relation to other elements or indicators of social and cultural inequality and injustice.
- B. Further education and career in a wide range of academic institutions where, within units focusing on one of the more traditional disciplines or one of the new, more open interstitial subject fields, a specialization in the disciplinary and interdisciplinary elements of Gender Studies is required.

## Curriculum

The MA Program in Gender Studies with special emphasis on interdisciplinarity is built on 28 class room credits to be taught in two semesters (14 plus 14 credits in the fall and winter terms respectively; plus 4 mandatory credits in Academic Writing), a Thesis Writing/Research Colloquium and the writing and defense of the MA thesis. The purpose and educational goals of the MA Program in Gender Studies are translated into the system of classroom teaching by offering a bifocal curriculum. It is focusing on substantial building of basic knowledge in and on Gender Studies on the one hand, and on developing interdisciplinary and integrative perspectives and knowledge in a wide range of fields within Gender Studies on the other.

A. Core Curriculum I (semester I and II): Courses developing knowledge emerging in dialogue with selected disciplines or fields and together introducing substantial bases of Women's and Gender Studies in the social sciences and humanities. In fulfilling their mandatory participation in the Core Curriculum, students take 6 credits, consisting of:

a) The class on *Introduction into the Epistemologies of Gender Studies* (2 credits)

b) The class on *History and Theory of Women's Movements and Feminism. Global and Local perspectives* (4 credits)

B. Elective Classes (semester I and II): Courses together developing knowledge and problem-orientation in the integrative field of interdisciplinary Women's and Gender Studies. This goal is being reached by three basic means. The elective curriculum favors classes focusing on perspectives and problem zones of interdisciplinarity at a theoretical and methodological level as well as in general on interdisciplinary approaches as put into scholarly practice (for example courses related to the "points of juncture"). Co-teaching of courses, namely by lecturers with divergent disciplinary backgrounds, are welcome and institutionally supported in all cases. Courses in the elective curriculum are divided into three groups (namely classes with their major focus on the symbolic; the social; and theory). Students have to take a minimum of four credits from each group over the year (classes with an integrative perspective transcending the three *foci* may be assigned to more than one group).

## ***The PhD Degree Program in Comparative Gender Studies***

### Purposes, Goals, Objectives

The Doctor of Philosophy degree in Comparative Gender Studies (PhD) is to be registered with the Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York (US). It is built on a special emphasis upon integrative perspectives and comparative approaches. The purpose of the PhD Program in Comparative Gender Studies is to offer doctoral-level education matching the highest international standards in Women's and Gender Studies for prospective scholars and teachers who seek to specialize in Gender Studies as a subject field in its own right. This corresponds to the mission of the Gender Studies Unit at CEU, to promote new forms of knowledge in the social sciences and humanities. The program qualifies young scholars for an academic career with an institutional standing in one of the new core institutions of Gender Studies and alternatively and/or additionally in one of the more traditional academic disciplines. The degree also qualifies for leadership positions in other fields and institutions where gender is or is to become the focal point or one of the focal points of attention.

The particular features of the Gender Studies doctoral program are the foci on integrative perspectives and on comparison in Gender Studies, both mutually strengthening and supporting

each other. The guiding idea is to intertwine theoretical and empirical inquiry into gender as a problem formerly marginalized in academy with inquiry into diversified patterns of social and cultural change (namely in Central-Eastern Europe) as a problem marginalized in most of academy internationally. This will result in developing integrative comparative perspectives in Gender Studies of global and local relevance. The rationale behind building the program on this guiding idea is theoretical, methodological and practical.

### **Theoretical Rationale.**

Women's and Gender Studies have been taking part in fundamental changes in the production of knowledge in past and recent decades. The central point of their critique has been to point out how gender has shaped the social and cultural roots and implications of scholarly perspectives in all disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. This critique is of fundamental importance to our understanding of the relation between knowledge and society, challenging both traditional concepts of the objectivity of academic knowledge and of the relation between the social and the symbolic order. This raises new questions about the fabric and dynamics of social formations both present and past. While thus deconstructing grand master theories and master narratives, Gender Studies, with a focus on diversified patterns of social and cultural change in general and on Central-Eastern Europe in particular, face the challenge of integrating their critique of androcentrism with a critique of eurocentric perspectives and epistemologies. Whereas the former has presupposed the male subject and the latter "the West" as "universal" norms, both have ignored or misconceived the relation between distance and involvement of the subject in the process of producing knowledge. Gender Studies have concentrated on the analysis of the concealing of asymmetric and hierarchical gender relations in academy, society and culture under the guise of the postulated universality of the (male) subject shaping much of the social sciences and humanities. The critique of eurocentrism has concentrated on replacing the assumed universality of rationalization and modernization with diversified views on social and cultural relations and developments in space and time. Gender Studies at CEU, by wishing to understand the complexity of gender especially in Central-Eastern Europe and consequently combining both of these strategies, understands society and culture in the region as a product of the often unequal entangling, intertwining, and transfer between global and local forces. In the final analysis the proposed program seeks to contribute to the overcoming of tendencies of studying gender in a seemingly a-historical and endlessly fragmented manner, with insufficient grounding in analyzes of institutions, social processes, and the material conditions of life.

### **Methodological Rationale.**

In deconstructing the traditional universalizing conception of the cognitive subject, feminist epistemology and theory have foreclosed the possibility of replacing the "classical" master narratives by "a" new feminist master narrative pretending to offer a single, comprehensive feminist truth. Instead, Gender Studies, seeking a better understanding of the patterns and shifts in the symbolic and social order, at best engage in producing evident steps and systems of argumentation. The introduction of comparative and integrative perspectives and research strategies into Gender Studies is one important, if pragmatic, tool in developing this type of scholarship. The comparative turn in Gender Studies with a focus on Central-Eastern Europe at CEU is intended to develop a methodological rationale to go beyond particularization and fragmentation or the simple integration of the "other" into predefined frameworks. Comparativism as a (by definition) theoretically loaded, but at the same time very practically-oriented and pragmatic research strategy, allows for a combination of deconstructing unreflected normatives informing scholarship *and* developing integrative perspectives built on the understanding and analysis of similarities, differences and

relations between the compared “cases” and the elements constitutive for building and defining them. Comparativism allows for a negotiated balance between context and the particular on the one hand, and integrative theoretical perspectives on the other. Integrative comparativism demands caution against hasty generalization and enables a focus on the typical in the particular and on the particular in the seemingly general.

The rationale for the comparative-integrative approach in CEU Gender Studies is to produce students who combine competence in traditional disciplinary skills – archival research, statistical analysis, participant observation, interviewing, etc., as appropriate to their research design – with the ability to formulate new questions arising from hitherto marginalized perspectives and areas of study. Together, the comparative and integrative approaches (with their *foci* on inter-relation and inclusion), essential to a new field of study such as Gender Studies, are intended similarly to broaden the range of data to be considered and questions to be asked, without sacrificing standards of scholarly rigour.

The study of gender in the doctoral program at CEU seeks to pursue its comparative-integrative agenda in several ways. The program advocates comparative approaches involving the construction of “cases” defined by geographic, historical, social, and cultural distance and relations. PhD projects focusing on Central and Eastern Europe or with relevance for the eastern half of the European continent as well as beyond the region and combining material from the region with perspectives reaching beyond the region are especially welcomed. Students will be encouraged to construct PhD projects that include either a comparative or a transdisciplinary perspective.

While acknowledging the relevance of a broad range of methodological designs and compositions of PhD studies in the Gender Studies Unit at CEU, these studies in general are based on a relational understanding of comparison and integration. This implies research designs giving equal weight to the characteristics and peculiarities of all analyzed “cases” instead of presupposing a fixed norm as a basis for comparison. In turn, the aim of comparison is not to arrive at universally valid generalizations, but to disrupt and replace taken-for-granted categorizations by the introduction of unexpected sidelights. Secondly, the comparative-integrative perspective, broadly defined and global in outlook, does not presuppose or define the “cases” chosen as being research units independent from each other. While not excluding independence as a possibility, the comparative-integrative perspective focuses on exploring the possible relatedness of the “cases” (as for example for transfer processes; mutual, one-sided or asymmetric patterns of influence and dependency; and path dependency, to name just a few). Thirdly, students are encouraged to understand their research as part of a collaborative enterprise looking for common patterns in social processes, drawing insight from each others research projects, and sharpening through dialogue their critical, reflexive awareness of the complex interaction between scholarly work and data. The comparative-integrative approach basically focuses on a better understanding of the way in which the interaction of local, regional, and global forces and actors shape gender in the chosen “cases” through the lens of comparison.

### **Practical Rationale.**

The design of the PhD Degree Program in Comparative Gender Studies translates peculiarities of the outlook and mission of CEU as an institution of higher education into specific strengths of perspective and organization of doctoral degree studies. The student body of CEU is recruited from all countries of Central Eastern Europe and increasingly from other “non-Western” regions. The faculty is even more international in outlook. CEU is located geographically and intellectually on the edge between divergent scholarly traditions and perspectives, contrasting experiences and patterns of social and cultural change. This makes the development of a doctoral degree program in Gender

Studies, which is promoting comparison and integration while insisting on equal rights for different experiences and perspectives, highly promising and reasonable.

### ***Organization of Studies, Requirements, Curriculum***

The PhD Degree Program in Comparative Gender Studies is a 36-month graduate program. The student who successfully completes the program will be awarded a *Doctorate in Comparative Gender Studies* (if chosen: *Disciplinary Specialization added*). The degree will be registered with the New York State Board of Regents of the State of New York (U.S.) and will include, as all CEU PhD programs, an MPhil option.

#### **Admission.**

Students who have an internationally recognized MA or comparable degree, including those from CEU, are eligible to apply to the PhD Program in Comparative Gender Studies at Central European University. All candidates must submit a full application, including a preliminary research proposal.

#### **Requirements – Summary.**

PhD requirements of the Gender Studies Unit consist of

- the accumulation of 56 credits over three years of studies
- a minimum GPA (calculated from course grades) of 3.33
- the passing of the comprehensive exam at the end of the first year of studies
- the defense of the doctoral dissertation.

Credits for PhD students of all years are to be accumulated as follows:

#### ***First year: 20 credits***

Fall: 6 credits course work; 2 credits tutorial

Winter: 6 credits course work; 2 credits tutorial

Spring: 4 credit PhD Preparation Seminar

#### ***Second Year: 18 credits***

Fall: 4 credits research; 2 credits consultation

Winter: 4 credits research; 2 credits consultation

Spring: 4 credits research; 2 credits consultation

#### ***Third Year: 18 credits***

Fall: 4 credits Dissertation writing

2 credits Teaching Assistance

Winter: 4 credits Dissertation writing

4 credits PhD Research Seminar

Spring: 4 credits Dissertation writing

---

***Total 56 credits***

#### **Curriculum. General Outline.**

Students entering the doctoral program will follow a well-structured course of study. They are expected to designate the areas in which to concentrate their comparative-integrative studies and have the opportunity to choose a specialization on one of the more traditional disciplines (implying co-operation with the respective department and selective participation in its PhD curriculum)

within the PhD Program in Comparative Gender Studies.

With regard to the comparative component of their studies (mandatory in the first year of studies), students choose to construct two basic fields/areas defined by geographic, historical, social, and cultural distance and relationship. If the topic of the planned PhD thesis is comparative (non-mandatory), these broadly defined areas should correspond to the “cases” to be compared in the thesis. If the PhD thesis is not planned to be comparative, one of the chosen, broadly defined areas of comparison should correspond to (include) the focus of the thesis, whereas the other is to be designed in dialogue with the supervisor and the Program Director in a suitable and adequate way.

Comparative studies should be designed in dialogue with pre-existing internal and external representations of the chosen fields/areas in scholarship in the social sciences and humanities. In no case should huge regions (like for example Central-Eastern Europe as a whole), entire civilizations, cultures, social systems etc. be compared with other entities of similar or smaller scale. Instead, the “cases” to be compared are to be developed around and concretely related to the topical focus of the thesis. The design of comparative studies requires the approval of the Program Director and the supervisor in all cases.

The specialization within the program (not mandatory) refers to the roots of the chosen PhD topic in one of the more traditional disciplines in the social sciences or humanities and may, but need not correspond to the undergraduate and/or graduate degrees of the student. It is to be approved by the Program Director.

First Year of Doctoral Study: The first year of doctoral study, the probationary year, is devoted to course work and intensive reading in preparation for a two-hour oral examination in comparative Gender Studies, focusing on the two areas/fields chosen by the student and agreed upon by the supervisor and Program Director.

In the first year each student takes 6 credits and one 2-credit tutorial in both the fall and winter terms. The course on *Comparative Gender Studies* (4 credits) given in the fall term and co-taught by at least two teachers with divergent disciplinary backgrounds, is mandatory for all students. The course on *Research Methods* (2 credits) given in the winter term and taught in co-operation of faculty is also mandatory. The remaining class room credits are two to be acquired through selection from a range of elective courses which are built on integrative perspectives in terms of methods and themes.

Especially in preparing the classes for the Winter Term students are encouraged to cooperate with faculty in organizing courses and their seminar work so that these are closely related to their broadly defined fields of interests. Doctoral students may enroll in one MA course each term but only with the written permission of the PhD Supervisor and the approval of the Program Director. If the MA course is a 2-credit course, the instructor will be responsible for assigning specific additional work to the PhD student, which may take the form of a longer paper or other specific assignment. A 4-credit MA course is worth 2 credits if taken as a PhD course. The same procedures of permission and approval apply to courses outside the Gender Studies Unit. Courses from outside the Gender Studies Unit shall be reasonably chosen with regard to their disciplinary relevance and their relevance for the student’s field of interest and thesis topic. Students who have chosen a specialization in one of the more traditional disciplines in the social sciences and humanities are required to take at least 4 class room credits from courses given within the other departments or programs corresponding to this specialization (or cross-listed by these units and Gender Studies). The decision must be approved by the supervisor and the Program Director.

During the fall term students are expected to choose a PhD Supervisor, consult with him or her on their course selection, and begin to assemble the faculty committee for their Comprehensive Examination. The PhD Supervisor will be the chair of the Comprehensive Examination committee and direct the PhD dissertation and must be regularly teaching in the Gender Studies Unit. The other members of the examining committee will be a CEU faculty member (in cases of

specialization: with a substantial background in the chosen discipline) and a scholar external to CEU. Cross-disciplinary assembling of the committee is required.

In consultation with their PhD Supervisor, the Program Director, and members of the faculty, doctoral candidates are expected to follow a tutorial program. In the fall term the student will be expected to submit a dissertation prospectus, which will be discussed with the PhD Supervisor and Head Tutor. In the spring term all first-year PhD students will participate in the PhD preparation seminar.

Students normally sit their Comprehensive Examination at the end of the spring term but no later than the fall term of the second year. The student is examined on the basis of a set of specific topics within the bi-focal comparative framework. These topics are to be agreed upon in consultation with the PhD Supervisor and members of the committee and represented by a written bibliography submitted to the committee prior to the exam. In addition, the student must be prepared to answer questions on the dissertation prospectus. Satisfactory completion of all requirements in the probationary year will formally admit the student to PhD candidacy in Gender Studies.

Research period (Second Year of Doctoral Study): Normally, following formal doctoral candidacy, the next period will be devoted to research. Students have a number of options in carrying out their research, depending upon their special requirements. The student will be expected to return to the CEU once each term in order to consult with his/her PhD Supervisor and make a report on work in progress. The student receives 4 credits in each three terms for research and 2 credits each term for consultation for a total of 18 credits.

CEU has additional funds to support studies abroad at a highly regarded university of international standing. Students may seek funding for studies abroad from other sources and may participate with their PhD project in international research groups affiliated or not affiliated to CEU. The Gender Studies Unit supports students in applying for these sources and prolonging the research period.

Third year of Doctoral Study: In their third year doctoral students return to the CEU and devote themselves to writing their PhD dissertation. During the winter term all students participate in the mandatory PhD Research Seminar. At this seminar, each student formally presents his/her dissertation and preliminary results to the Program Director, who organizes the seminar, and the PhD Supervisor who is expected to attend the seminar of his or her advisee.

Also during the third year of study, students are required to serve as teaching assistants in a master's level course in order to acquire teaching experience. Each PhD candidate will be assigned to a specific course according to the shared or overlapping interests between the PhD dissertation topic and the topic of the course. Teaching assistance consists of regular participation in the course, independent teaching of at least one unit of the course in accordance with the professor or leading discussion or discussion groups within the course. Teaching assistants may be asked to present aspects of their own work that is relevant to the course, to help students with first drafts of class papers or the class work in general, or other variations depending upon the needs of the course, the PhD candidate and the professor.

In the third year, students receive 4 credits for each of three terms for dissertation writing, 2 credits for teaching one term and 4 credits for the PhD Research Seminar. The total for the third year is 18.

Over the course of three years the program requires a total of 56 credits.

### **Classroom Credits.**

Classroom credits (except of tutorials) to be acquired by the students in the first and the third year of studies are designed as follows:

First year:

Mandatory Classes (6 credits):

Fall: **Comparative Gender Studies** – 4 credits.

The course is intended to develop the students' understanding of the use, range, implications, as well as the perspectives and problems of developing and applying comparative perspectives in the social sciences and humanities. The first part of the course is devoted to the introduction and critical debate of theoretical approaches to comparison. It includes a general reflection on: the uses of comparative perspectives (as developed in "classical" and less classical texts); typologies of comparisons and their relation to each other; possible designs of comparative scholarship, theoretical and methodological questions related to the definition of units and scopes of comparison in space and time, the relative advantages and shortcomings of divergent designs; the relation between comparative and integrative scholarly perspectives; epistemological implications of comparative approaches and approaches with a focus on gender studies. The second part of the course is devoted to the analysis of examples of scholarship in which comparative and integrative perspectives are developed in the social sciences and humanities with a focus on gender studies. Students are required to engage (orally and in writing) in critical debate of texts to be chosen by the instructors and by themselves and to develop critical readings of their own field of studies through the lens of comparative and integrative approaches.

Winter: **Research Methods** – 2 credits (instructors: combined faculty).

The course is intended to develop the methodological skills of students in a cross-disciplinary setting and in relation to the PhD projects of individual students. With reference to the specific problem areas central for the PhD projects of the present body of students and in critical dialogue with a wide range of disciplinary skills, the course gives substantial support for developing and enhancing the methodological skills of students' PhD projects. The course helps students to develop their individual research design by combining (a range of) established methods in the humanities and social sciences with more innovative research methods suitable for their specific PhD projects. The course enables students to translate the basic idea(s) informing their PhD project into a concrete research design.

Spring: **PhD Preparation Seminar** – 4 credits.

The course is designed to prepare students thoroughly for the comprehensive exam on the basis of extensive reading and discussion in class. The course is intended to: develop the knowledge of students related to the themes of their comprehensive exam; develop their skills of analyzing, summarizing, and critically debating substantial scholarly arguments and perspectives as well as locating these arguments and perspectives in a broader scholarly universe; develop their skills of building, locating, presenting, and defending their own scholarly perspectives and intellectual horizons in an international academic setting.

Elective Classes (students acquire 6 credits from this category over the year):

Elective classes are designed to: deepen students' knowledge in major themes and approaches in gender studies as developed in the humanities and social sciences; exemplify the relations and relatedness of disciplinary traditions with the constitution of Gender Studies as an interstitial area of knowledge by combining and integrating variety of approaches and methods; develop and critically discuss comparative and integrative approaches as applied to specific problem areas and translated into specific topics in Gender Studies. The Gender Studies Unit supports cross-listing of all possible relevant PhD courses given in other units as well as cross-listing of all PhD courses with relevant disciplinary leanings and components from the Gender Studies Unit to other units.



*Examples of elective courses taught in the Academic Year 2001-2002:*

**Paths to Citizenship: Europe from the 18<sup>th</sup> to 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries** – 2 credits (instructor: Gisela Bock) (*cross-listed to History and Political Science*).

The long path to modern citizenship began with the French and American Revolutions, passed through the age of nation-states and led up to the age of globalization. It was far from linear and clear-cut and differed significantly for women and men, for ethnic majorities and minorities, and along the boundaries of social class and nationality. Concepts and practices of citizenship were shaped by peace and war, by visions of national sovereignty and of human rights, by needs and interests, and by gender relations. Whereas in many European countries the path to citizenship of most men was one that led from civil liberties to political participation and to social citizenship in the context of the nation-state, women had to struggle for admission to these three forms of citizenship simultaneously. This course deals with crucial turning points of this long and ongoing process of negotiation, discursive construction and practices of citizenship.

**White Genders, White Cultures: Exploring “Whiteness” in Humanities** – 2 credits (instructor: Hanna Hacker).

Whiteness is a “coloured,” yet often invisible position in social structures, interactions and discourses. Recent debates in humanities confront different aspects of the historical construction, the cultural representation, the gendering – and the possible subversion – of hegemonic whiteness. The course will introduce to the notion of “whiteness” in cultural and gender studies and aims at motivating participants to reflect upon “white” dimensions in their own research approaches.

*Third year:*

Winter: **PhD Research Seminar** – 4 credits.

The course is intended to improve advanced PhD students’ skills in developing and structuring their PhD draft. Students are required to give a major presentation of their PhD project in class and to distribute in advance a (provisional) table of contents, a detailed rationale explaining the planned structure of the thesis, and the draft of one substantial chapter. The respective supervisor has to be present in class. The scheme of this class is based on the idea, that the skills of individual students are to be developed through the discussion of their own material by more than one faculty and fellow students, and through their own involvement in evaluating and debating the work of their fellow students.

## 5. Research

### *On Strategies*

Research being institutionally affiliated to the Gender Studies Unit at CEU is preferably based on the involvement of more than one scholar and more than one academic (and funding) institution. The Unit thus seeks to foster interdisciplinarity and transdisciplinarity as well as comparative perspectives, both decisive tools for fulfilling the mission of the Gender Studies Unit at CEU. Visiting faculty and research fellows (HESP, DSP, and others) to the Unit – these groups in the past have amounted to a considerable number of scholars every academic year, but have rarely been integrated into common research efforts essential to the Program on Gender and Culture – should be invited/chosen with the strategic intention to follow/build a variety of cooperative research

projects. This strategy shall not exclude, but on the contrary integrate and support excellent individual scholars and research groups short of substantial institutional backing.

Research projects, for which the Gender Studies Unit institutionally plays a key role may preferably (but do not have to) be related to the “points of juncture” or serve as a starting point and basis for developing new *foci* in the Gender Studies Unit or involving the Unit. A number of researchable topics related to the proposed “points of juncture” are enumerated below. All potential priority research projects involving the Gender Studies Unit are to be developed and evaluated with regard to three basic criteria:

1. Relevance for the elaboration of root paradigms, theories and epistemologies in Gender Studies aiming at integrative and transdisciplinary approaches.
2. Relevance for the development of knowledge focusing on non-dominant patterns of change in the global system and other social and cultural systems and on the question of (non-)hierarchical and (a-)symmetric relations in these systems
3. Societal relevance in terms of translating social critique into scholarly inquiry and producing knowledge intended to serve the indivisible dignity, security and basic needs of humankind in a world of limited resources

### ***Selected Research Foci Summaries***

In the following two outlines of research *foci* related to the “points of juncture” are shortly summarized. Both of them will be based on cooperative efforts. These descriptions serve here as examples for researchable topics and for projects to be run by/in the Gender Studies Unit at CEU.

#### **Conflict On The ‘Woman Question’: A Global-Local Perspective on Central and Eastern Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century** (corresponding to *How to Construct Gender Studies: Women - Core – Periphery*)

##### *Summary:*

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, women, on a more or less organized level, more or less outspokenly, with reference to diverse symbolic systems and cultural backgrounds, took efforts to represent, defend, and realize their needs and interests. Gender relations in society and culture developed into a matter of debate, and often confrontation, on many levels. While in this sense the “woman question” evolved as a truly global issue, this issue itself was far from being defined and understood in a similar, universal way over space and time. Even those who, in principle, (might) have agreed that “something is wrong” with the status of women and the way gender relations have been working in and shaping society and culture, deeply disagreed concerning their views of the roots of what came to be labeled the “woman question” in the beginning, in how to define the problem, and on methods, perspectives, and visions for change regarding “gender” as the problem came to be named more recently.

The ways and modes, how these tensions and conflicts on the “woman question” have been articulated and suppressed, regularly gave priority to a range of dominant (but at the same time contested) perspectives. These dominant perspectives – themselves subject to change – have been articulated by women and men, within and outside women’s movements and feminisms as defined in various ways by the protagonists and their opponents. While interacting with these discourses and practices, the articulation of non-dominant perspectives has been shaped, integrated, marginalized or suppressed in various and ambiguous ways. In a comparative and global perspective, Central Eastern European developments have long been shaped by the combination of specifically close relations to dominant knowledges and various forms of drastic marginalization. The “other half of Europe” has long been very closely intertwined with but at the same time definitely excluded from the “better

half of Europe”. This particular ambivalence has been crucial in shaping discourses and practices related to the “women question” in the region.

In a global perspective, the unequal relationships and patterns of dominance shaping the articulation and suppression of conflict over the “woman question” have long been mirrored in the explicit or implicit preference given in scholarship to perspectives defining the “woman question” as an element of an exclusively homogenizing modernization process. This process has been interpreted as simply delaying or hindering the true or fair political and social, cultural and economic integration of women as being defined in terms of equality and/or difference. In analyzing gender within theoretical frameworks built on this preference, Women’s and Gender Studies have sometimes participated in the perpetuation these patterns of dominance. To meet the scholarly challenges emerging from this problem, major theoretical rethinking for example of our understanding of the “woman question” as based on concrete research and collective scholarly effort is necessary. What has been usually perceived as “global” and “universal” must be reconstructed as knowledge built on Eurocentric and falsely homogenizing perspectives and epistemologies, i.e. as one or more dominant scholarly discourses closely related to social, cultural, and intellectual traditions and perspectives rooted in the experience and interest of more or less privileged and partly privileged social strata in the core regions and to some extent the non-core regions of this globe. Only by giving equal right to different experience and interest when constructing knowledge, Women’s and Gender Studies make themselves an advocate of a growing influence of scholarly discourse and perspective rooted in experience from less or non-privileged social strata in all societies on the production and construction of knowledge all over the world.

Inquiry into the shaping, expression and suppression of conflict concerning the “woman question” as developed into a carefully designed research topic and encompassing empirical, historical, and theoretical levels is intended not only to expand our knowledge on gender in Eastern and Central Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is also intended to make a contribution to developing new and more inclusive understandings of the “woman question” and to explicitly engage in the rethinking and reshaping of theoretical frameworks in Women’s and Gender Studies. To make conflict visible, means to develop scholarly “space” for analyzing and understanding the voices of all parties in an integrative framework, in which processes of homogenization and differentiation on global and local levels find their place. Exploring conflict over the “woman question” on various levels means focusing on the very heart of practices of inclusion and exclusion; on power relations between women as well as between women and men; on different interests and experiences rooted in different dynamics of social and cultural change; on modes of silencing and manifesting hierarchy and asymmetry in society, culture, and politics.

Conflict concerning the “woman question” in this sense will be explored and discussed in the research project through a variety and combination of approaches – such as post-colonial (feminist) studies, world system theory, post-structuralist studies (with a focus on the relation between “the social” and “the symbolic”), conflict theories, and (feminist) theories of social change in modernity – and with a focus on a range of concrete topics. In general, the inquiry is devoted to analyzing social and cultural strategies of creating boundaries and defining the “woman question” in various circumstances and with regard to various perspectives and aspirations of women and men. These strategies and their results become visible and are analyzed by focusing on “empty spaces”, inclusions and exclusions in discourse and social practice with regard to feminism, women’s movements, the “woman question”, and “gender” and to its transnational, regional, national, or local stipulations and regulations as entangled with each other. While the general focus of interest is Central and Eastern Europe in the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the research project makes use of intra-regional and wider comparative perspectives.

Among the most important objectives of the research project are:

Developing integrative perspectives in Gender Studies by focusing on non-dominant and multiple perceptions and patterns of the “woman question” as expressed in conflicts and tensions in Central and Eastern Europe in past and present;

Reflecting historical, theoretical, and epistemological relations and tensions between local and non-dominant perceptions of the “woman question” on the one hand, and global and/or universalizing perspectives on the other;

Putting developments in and research on Central and Eastern Europe into perspective by making use of global-local and comparative frameworks and approaches; overcoming unproductive paradigms such as “East” versus “West”, Central and/or Eastern European “uniqueness” or “backwardness” etc. by exploring processes of transfer and resistance, relatedness and difference.

### **Social Roots and Consequences of “Gender Mainstreaming”. The World of Work and Welfare** (corresponding to Production and Reproduction: Social Systems and Social Change)

#### *Summary:*

In Europe today, “gender mainstreaming” is one of the most influential concepts and tools of shaping gender relations in the world of work and welfare. In the countries of the European Union (EU), “gender mainstreaming” is official government policy. It is based on a institutional union-wide commitment to the principle of “incorporating equal opportunities for women and men into all Community policies and activities”, which was established and ratified in the years 1995/1997. For the time being the most important fields of implementing the “mainstreaming” principle are the labor market, welfare policies, and some fields of legal policy. In the countries of Central-Eastern Europe, which are yearning and preparing for accession to the EU, efforts to take over and developing “mainstreaming” policies along the same lines as pursued in the EU are perceived as a *must* by a growing number of governments as well as local and international organizations. Consequently, related political activities are gaining momentum so to speak day by day, and are already stimulating a large body of mostly policy-related research.

This research initiative takes a step back and explores origins, implications, and consequences of “gender mainstreaming” in a broad and inclusive context, or else in an integrative analytical framework. It inquires into the role of gender in and for current changes in the spheres of production and reproduction as a whole, and it is based on relating the critique of recent developments in the world of work and welfare to the problem of “gender mainstreaming”. This perspective is developed in a comparative and interdisciplinary framework, built on case studies on (stemming from) selected countries in Eastern and Western Europe and investigating four major topics:

A. Social roots of “gender mainstreaming”. “Gender mainstreaming” is being implemented as a key tool of labor and welfare related politics in a period of fundamental restructuring of the relationship between gainful labor and reproduction as well as the role of individuals of both sexes in both spheres. Reproduction is currently being put under pressure by the dismantling of the welfare state and the dissolution of the model of the “male bread winner” family in the West and the “double bread winner” family in the East. While a growing number of individuals are seeking gainful employment on the labor market, wage differentials and the number of informal and/or low-paid jobs are growing everywhere. The research initiative is asking the basic question of how the introduction of “gender mainstreaming” as one of the key tools of the labor market and related politics to be explained in this context? What are the social and political forces and actors pushing for the implementation of “gender mainstreaming” policies? What are the decisive elements of change in the gender division of labor in production and reproduction corresponding to this policy development? In short: What are the social roots and driving forces of the implementation of “gender mainstreaming” in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries in the context of a dramatic

changeover in the gender division of labor in society?

B. “Gender mainstreaming” and the politics of deregulation: contradictory or supplementary? The politics of “gender mainstreaming” are implemented in the context of deregulation in the world of work and welfare. Equal opportunity measures are often characterized by a neo-liberal thrill, and resulting in cutting social rights of women and/or specific groups and strata of the labor force. The research initiative focuses on analyzing the relation between the implementation of “gender mainstreaming” policies and the changing patterns of labor and welfare related benefits and entitlements by (comparatively) evaluating the possible deregulative implications of “gender mainstreaming” (the research initiative uses a selected sample of basic cases of “gender mainstreaming” in Western and Eastern European countries); by analyzing the interests and intentions of important actors involved in “gender mainstreaming” policies in selected cases; by analyzing the relation between policy intentions and social consequences of “gender mainstreaming”; by developing a detailed catalogue of criteria for controlling the interaction between “gender mainstreaming” policies and its economic and welfare context.

C. Equal opportunities and labor market mobility and segmentation. “Gender mainstreaming” frequently focuses on the advancement of women towards more equal representation in higher valued segments of the labor market where formerly they tended to be underrepresented. On the other hand there are cases of equal opportunity politics paving the way for women to enter low paid segments of the labor market from which they formerly had been excluded (a example being the gender-specific prohibition of night-work). The research initiative analyses how “gender mainstreaming” influences and changes the patterns of labor market mobility and the structures and significance of the segmentation of labor markets for women and men.

D. Equality and difference in the politics of work and welfare: entangled relationships. “Gender mainstreaming” is currently developing into one of the important tools for shaping and reshaping the relation between equality and difference in society. On the one hand, true gender equality in the world of work and welfare is not being reached through formal equality before the law, as legal interventions are confronted with unequal gender relations and roles in the social world. On the other hand, once “gender mainstreaming” takes into consideration gender difference characteristic for/in the social world while focusing on the creation of gender equality in the world of work and welfare, tends to contribute to the prolongation and even deepening of asymmetry and hierarchy in the social world. This research initiative focuses on evaluating the functioning of “gender mainstreaming” policies with regard to stabilizing and changing the relation of difference and equality between men and women in society (using again selected examples of “gender mainstreaming” policies in Western and Eastern European countries). It develops a systematic approach on to avoiding undesirable consequences of “gender mainstreaming” in this context.

*September 2001, Susan Zimmermann*

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to my colleagues in the Program on Gender and Culture and to the members of the **Gender International Committee** who discussed the draft version of this Statement of Purpose and the strategies of upgrading Gender Studies at CEU for their highly valuable comments and input. I have made extensive use of the writings and written suggestions of some members of the International Committee and consulted a lot of other studies reflecting on Gender Studies as well as a great number of presentations of existing units in Gender Studies all over the world. I am also grateful to Henriett Griecs-Kámán who did the basic work in compiling the appendices to follow.

<sup>2</sup> Not outlined in this document.

<sup>3</sup> At present the institutional structure of CEU as a university does not allow for a substantial focus on the arts and sciences in the Gender Studies Unit, which relies on close transdisciplinary co-operation in unfolding its potential of high quality education and research.