

Cultural Studies and Feminism

Some Notes on the Present Situation

Gisela Ecker (Paderborn)

1. Histories & Narratives

This seems to be a favourable moment in the histories of both cultural studies and feminism to speak of common aims and configurations that bring them together. First of all, it has to be said that today there is a common understanding on both sides that cultural studies and feminism can pursue similar goals, that gender as a category and feminist politics are part of the range of issues addressed by cultural studies, and vice versa that a lot of problems considered in feminism coincide with the current self-definition of cultural studies. This is only a fairly recent development which has to do with the separate histories of both fields: the processes through which this rapprochement came about have been different. I believe it is necessary to outline them roughly before going into detail about the present state of things.

In its formative period in the late sixties feminism was quite unified in its political goals, addressing on many levels of inquiry the existing asymmetrical relations between the sexes and the respective power structures. Gender was the main category considered in all inquiry. It has to be remembered that opposition was not only directed against traditional mainstream politics and disciplines. One of the main narratives of origin tells and retells the story of disappointment with the men in their hitherto united group of intellectuals who believed in left-wing politics. According to this story the break was necessary because of the persistence of patriarchal attitudes and gender-blindness despite the common utopia of a just society. The work done in cultural studies during that time clearly proves that gender was considered a minor negligible category in the range of themes that were considered important. The insertion of gender into the field (see Women's Studies Group 1978) as done for example by Angela McRobbie by insisting on the acknowledgment of the specific situation of girls in studies of youth culture provided a challenge to the existing homogenizing views. In the course of the eighties feminist scholars in all fields became aware that the protagonists of feminism in the seventies had been predominantly white, middle-class, heterosexual, an insight which was due to a considerable challenge from women "of colour"¹ who did not fit into this description. Many cultural analyses developed a heightened awareness of the ways in which gender was written into the discourses of nation, of colonialism or of class, for example, even if it was not explicitly addressed at all. Thus other categories of difference entered the scope of interest,

i.e. the question in which ways ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, age, identity, etc. can be related to gender. Many feminists developed a critical consciousness of women's participation in hegemonic discourses. No doubt this development can be seen as the precondition for projects common to cultural studies and feminist analysis.

With regard to processes that took place in the field of cultural studies through which feminist issues gained admittance, I would like to quote from an account by Stuart Hall. In one of his narratives about the history of the Birmingham institute we find an interesting linguistic detail which is quite telling: Feminism, he says, has proved to be an "interruption" (Hall 1992: 282) to cultural studies. The term he chooses stands in stark contrast to the term both feminism and cultural studies normally use to define their respective practices, that is *intervention*. In the feminist context intervention has been a key term; it is used for the practice of introducing gender as a category into fields which had been blind to it, and the politics of intervention never means just the addition of another term but a challenge to the overall framework of a discipline. In this respect Stuart Hall's choice of words seems precise, because he speaks from the inside of the field the intervention was aiming at. Feminism, according to his account, "broke in": "As the thief in the night, it broke in; interrupted, made an unseemly noise, seized the time, crapped on the table of cultural studies". (Hall 1992: 282) For him the specific challenge lies in a new notion of politics which included the personal, a notion of power in relation to sexuality and in different concepts of gender. Then he goes on to describe the resistances which still appeared after feminist thoughts had already been accepted, yet which emerged in the actual practices when it came to the redistribution of power and of tasks.

This kind of historical overview and tracing of developments tends to overlook the fact that neither cultural studies nor feminism draws upon coherent theoretical assumptions, that neither relies on one single comprehensible set of methodological steps or critical tools. The question of whether cultural studies can see itself as a discipline is answered in the negative most times, and in the case of feminism it does not arise at all, for the term should only be used in the plural anyway. The diversity of feminist scholarship and of cultural studies projects is considerable. Both derive their energy and critical interest from the critique and analysis of cultural and political formations, and, even if the object of studies is a historical one, the impetus of research is related to the present state of affairs. Thus it would be very limiting, if not impossible, to discuss in an abstract and generalizing way the relationship between both or to determine programmatically the tasks in advance. For this reason I will now discuss some of the recent publications that show the scope of the field of cultural studies and which we can question as to the kind of feminist contribution.

2. Anthologies & Critical Debates

The voluminous reader *Cultural Studies* (Grossberg/Nelson/Treichler 1992) presents itself as the result of a large international conference on cultural studies which took place at the University of Illinois. The volume contains 40 articles, revised versions of the contributors' conference papers. A large number of papers are followed by interesting discussions, many of which focus beyond the contents of the respective paper on the idea of cultural studies in general. The arrangement of articles is interesting in itself: the names of the authors are in alphabetical order, and a user's guide is added which rearranges the papers according to 16 topics ranging from "The History of Cultural Studies" to "Gender and Sexuality", "Postcolonialism", "Nationhood and National Identity", "Race and Ethnicity", etc. Quite a few of the articles are listed in several groups. This user's guide can itself be read in many ways. It is certainly a document of transdisciplinarity, it lists most of the current interests, and, more specifically, in respect to my topic, in each of the single groups there is more than one feminist inquiry.

Simon During's anthology, *The Cultural Studies Reader* (During 1993), follows a different strategy. The most striking difference from that mentioned above is its view of cultural studies as a discipline. On the jacket the book presents itself as an introduction for students "to this exciting discipline", and both the introduction and the choice of material are in pursuit of this goal. For the purpose of constructing a discipline, the editor chooses a set of forefathers (and it is mostly fathers) who range from Adorno/Horkheimer via Stuart Hall to the early Barthes, Edward Soja, Michel de Certeau and Lyotard. Doubtlessly some of the positions of the latter, like Soja's and de Certeau's ideas of space and Lyotard's notion of the postmodern have influenced some work being done in cultural studies, yet they cannot be claimed in such a direct way as being the most influential figures for cultural studies. Apart from this, During's choices are very interesting with similar terms of interest like nation, race and ethnicity, sexuality, consumption, leisure, media. Again, as in Grossberg's volume, there are many feminist pieces by authors which keep occurring in cultural studies contexts.

The same can be said about the special issue on "Cultural Studies. Crossing Boundaries" of *Critical Studies* (1991) and about a volume in which younger scholars re-read formative cultural studies texts: *Reading into Cultural Studies* (Barker/Beezer 1992). Then there are surveys of cultural studies by Antony Easthope (1991), Patrick Brantlinger (1990), Ben Agger (1992) and Graeme Turner (1990) all of which contain chapters on feminist research.² These volumes can serve as convincing illustrations of the explosive development of cultural studies. Only one of its reasons may be seen, I believe, in the transatlantic expansion of cultural studies, many more are discussed controversially in the texts.

One of the most vexing questions which keep turning up in view of this expansion and which certainly involves feminist authors is "who belongs"? Can it be those whose work is retrospectively described as of a truly cultural studies

type, or is it those who define themselves and their work as cultural studies today although they started off under different conditions and with different labels or those who have been there from the beginning, ideally having been affiliated with the centre at Birmingham or one of the associated institutes? This question cannot be answered in an overall way, yet it is obvious that presently cultural studies serves as an attractive label for individual scholars, that there are trends in European and North American academic institutions that further the institutionalisation of transdisciplinary research, and it is also obvious that we have a situation of co-presence of ideas and critiques that have come up in view of the problems posed by multicultural societies.³ The issues of nation, of gender and sexuality, of race and ethnicity, of global survival, of the media, of multiculturalism, of postcolonial criticism have turned up in many disciplines, altered their scopes, fractured their disciplinary boundaries, and led to the present situation of the convergence of pressing issues and common aims. Ideally, it would not make a great difference whether cultural studies serves only as a retrospective label for some scholars or a name for a lively committed practice that cuts across disciplines and is concerned with problems of imminent importance, although this demands an intensified discussion of what it really is that distinguishes cultural studies from other fields of inquiry. Precisely this is done in the volumes I have looked at.

Gayatri Spivak may be quoted in respect of the issue of inclusion and exclusion. Participant in at least two cultures, Indian and US-American, with much work invested in poststructuralism (the translation of Derrida's *Grammatology*, among other works), feminism and postcolonial criticism (Spivak 1987 and 1990), temporary director of the cultural studies programme at Pittsburgh, she comments about her relation to cultural studies: "Well, I came to Cultural Studies; I do not belong to its mainstream. I find myself in Cultural Studies now because suddenly in the last five years, it has become an extremely important movement in the United States." (Spivak 1991: 65) Her work, like that of many feminists, such as Meaghan Morris, bell hooks or Donna Haraway, for example, is in accordance with most of the definitions of cultural studies since its beginning, although the authors have only recently been named in its context.

3. Concepts

The very generalized concern in feminist scholarship which overlaps with cultural studies concerns is the introduction of gender as a category into all fields of inquiry. This implies a consciousness of the fact that gender difference is a *hierarchically organised* difference with the consequence that it is bound up with the unequal distribution of power which has led to the omission of women's cultural products from the disciplinary canons and from the range of subjects which are to be researched. Gender difference is a *constructed* difference which varies from culture to culture. Furthermore, and this is considered of increasing importance as there is never just one set of *asymmetrically conceived* differences operating in a

given culture, the relations to other differentiations have to be analysed as well. This implies that we have to go beyond the analysis of power systems and symbolical codes that oppress women or operate in representations of women that portray them, to use Ben Agger's list, "as sexual objects for men", as "primarily responsible for domesticity", as "the weaker sex". (Agger 1992: 120) It is interesting to observe that presentations of feminist research by non-feminists favour work which is in accordance with a simple oppressor/oppressed dichotomy. This fits into present expectations of what feminists are supposed to do and, on a quite unconscious level, it prevents feminist intervention from reaching into the power struggles over theoretical discourses. As a matter of fact, although this focus, with a perspective on change, underlies many of the current investigations by feminists, it is overlaid by a reading of positionality as shifting and ambiguous, and there is a strong preoccupation with theoretical questions. "[I]t is no longer possible, living within postmodernism, to talk about unambiguously negative or positive images. But this need not be seen as the end of the social, or the end of meaning, or for that matter the beginning of the new nihilism." writes Angela McRobbie (1993, 177-178). Although this undercuts simplified notions of woman as victim, it would still call for notions of situational agency, the simultaneous possibility of belonging to an oppressed group in one respect and to a hegemonic group in another, as we can well see in the case of white Western women who act in a context of colonial oppression.

The main contributions to cultural studies by feminism can be characterised thus: 1. Feminist work has insisted on the inclusion of women's cultural production in the general canons and on the inclusion of those parts of culture which have more to do with women's lives in the scope of research, such as women's subcultures, shopping centers, soap opera (Curti 1992), fashion (Wilson 1985), romance, women-related ritual practices (Mani 1992); 2. Feminist analysis has exposed the gender bias in the very concepts that have been used in traditional scholarship and yet also in cultural studies research; 3. In engaging with psychoanalytical approaches⁴ and their subsequent altered notions of subjectivity (Rose 1986), feminist work has focussed on alternative forms of commitment with the material analysed and opened up new perspectives on the subject/object division as well as on the gender dichotomy itself;⁵ 4. Since the mid-eighties feminism has decisively shaped the heated debate around the politics of postmodernism (Nicholson 1990, Young 1990, Spivak 1987, 1990, Weedon 1987). These characteristic aspects interrelate in the contributions which I will use as examples in the following.

4. Projects

Rosalind Brunt in her article "Engaging with the Popular" (1992) challenges the methods of audience research developed in the context of British cultural studies. In her project which "aimed to examine the processes of political opinion forma-

tion in relation to the media's coverage of politics" during a local parliamentary election in a specific town, she encountered the limitations of attempts to do research into groups which are meant to be "typical" and in fact chosen according to a preconception of what researchers thought would be typical. Alternative ways of studying audience can be found predominantly in the feminist context, for good reasons, as she says. Ien Ang's unusual ways of addressing watchers of *Dallas* (1985), Helen Taylor's analysis of women's interest in *Gone with the Wind* (1989), Jacqueline Bobo's study of black women's reactions to the film version of *The Color Purple* (1988) can be quoted along with Janice Radway's *Reading the Romance* (1984). Their strengths lie in the unusual questions they ask, in the fact that they do not make an attempt to study "Mrs. Normal" and in their specific involvement:

Their interest in the text is by definition extreme or extra-ordinary: they are fans, they are experts, they have special knowledges, competences, enthusiasms, which they themselves want to reflect on and analyze. In this sense they are far more than just 'informants', 'respondents', or 'receivers' of research procedures. [...] The best kind of cultural studies has always taken an explicitly partisan position, developing the work of clarification, codification, and analysis in order not only to interpret, but to change things – as all the feminist researchers I've just mentioned clearly state. (Brunt 1992: 75)

Similarly, in her feminist analysis of the Book-of-the-Month Club debate Janice Radway demonstrates that the criticism of mass culture as a dispute over the exercise of cultural authority is profoundly gendered: "the dominant discourse on consumption is intimately bound up with this predication of the individuated male subject as the fundamental cultural norm" (Radway 1992: 525). She raises the suspicion that quite generally the criticism/consumption dichotomy is unconsciously gender-biased even before it comes to the actual study of mass culture.

In her work on shopping centres Meaghan Morris rejects "the discursive position of externalized visitor/observer, or ethnographer/celebrant" (Morris 1993: 307) and points out the copresence of the "dream of plenitude and of a paradoxically absolute yet expansive self-sufficiency", "the motherland dream of staying home" (317) and the locus of "a practice of modernity by women for which it is most important not to begin by identifying heroines and victims [...], but a profound ambivalence about shifting roles" (316). Only if this indeterminacy is taken into account and carried beyond the designer/user dichotomy (which in this context is usually set up as a male/female dichotomy), and moreover, only if the researcher admits to her own investment in the locale, is it possible to study the value of shopping centres for local communities of women and to develop notions of agency that cut across the usual politically informed critiques of consumer attitudes.

Seen from the outside and at this stage of generalization, these declarations of partisanship do not seem new to cultural studies nor can they be reserved for

feminism. As a matter of fact, however, it is mostly feminist work which actually puts into practice what is declared as partisanship, and frequently we can even find somewhat envious remarks about academic feminism's "clear sense of a public beyond the academy which it both addresses and represents" (Brantlinger 1990: 129). The actual practice then – this can be shown in many articles in the volumes I have looked at – makes new demands on a reformulation of the underlying theories.

In several of the discussions at the Illinois conference the speakers regret that all too often references to "gender, race and class" have degenerated into a mere litany which has to turn up in academic work as a sign of belonging to a supposedly progressive group. In view of this apprehension, it will be especially necessary in the future to analyse the interrelation of these categories. Most radically and convincingly this is done in black women's feminist work, such as in bell hooks' *Talking Back* and *Yearning* (hooks 1989; 1990) or in Michele Wallace's contribution to both the Grossberg and the During anthologies. There she demonstrates how difficult it is to talk about double discrimination which does not necessarily employ parallel strategies of oppression and, moreover, how difficult it is to discuss possibilities of change. Neither success stories of black women writers nor new stereotypical media images of the strong black woman, nor the addition of black women's text to the traditional canon can make a considerable change as long as the hegemonic culture believes that these developments include and are made in behalf of black women "most of whom are poor and 'silenced' by inadequate education, health care, housing, and lack of public access" (Wallace 1992: 663). In addition, Michele Wallace's intervention is aiming at white feminism for "it is important to remember that black feminists have never spoken for (white) feminism. Rather it has always been the other way around – white feminism speaking for black feminism" (667). Without the challenge by non-white women (see also Trin Minh-ha 1989; 1991, and Anzaldúa/Morago 1982) present-day feminism would have an entirely different shape.

bell hooks' criticism in the Grossberg volume is directed against the travelogue of white anthropologists including James Clifford's cultural studies approach. Her starting point is that there is little research on representations of whiteness in black writing, and that altogether the black "other" is not perceived as having a gaze of his/her own. This corresponds with the reductive gaze of whites on black people which renders them invisible except for the services they are employed to do. The images bell hooks has encountered and the experience she has personally gone through evoke associations of "whiteness with the terrible, the terrifying, the terrorizing" (hooks 1992: 341). Against the travelogues of white representatives of cultural studies she claims that her travel story is entirely different, it is not playful, it is not driven by curiosity but rather a story of avoidance of certain places, of fear and of flight.

Catherine Hall's study of 19th century missionary stories is another example of how, in her own words, race, class and gender operate on "each axis of power in

relation to the others" (Hall 1992: 270). She illustrates that "progressive" on one axis can mean "oppressive" on the other. As "messengers of mercy", as righteous colonial oppressors and oppressed and isolated at the same time, the men operated in a number of ambiguous positions, and for their wives these positions were even more complicated: "If gender hierarchy was inscribed at the heart of the missionary enterprise so was that of race" (Hall 1992: 259), and so was class, for the rise on the social scale was guaranteed for the missionaries in Jamaica in contrast to the middle class clergy back in England.

A specific concern with the modes of construction of the subject runs through the majority of feminist cultural studies pieces. As in this work the (female) subject is not denied her own pleasure, she cannot be simply observed from a preconceived position, but this pleasure, of reading, of consuming music, fashion, films, if analysed and acknowledged, in many cases cuts across fixed positions. Alison Light's book *Forever England*, for example, an analysis of female conservatism in the fifties, arrives at a far more scattered and heterogeneous notion of middle class femininity than the author had at the outset of the book. She describes how she had to let go some of the current, reassuring categories of class, yet this also "opened up too, new possibilities of writing about that 'working-class' past without the righteous anger which always threatens to make the daughters of uneducated men into martyrs or saints". (Light 1991: 221) This kind of personal investment in her own work is predominantly described and made theoretically productive in feminist scholarship, for it is embedded in a culture of political practice which is interested in change and learning and it can look back on a long feminist training of locating change both in the personal and "out there". Similar tendencies can be found in the pieces about pornography by Constance Penley (1992) and Laura Kipnis (1992).

Much of the present feminist interest in subjectivity is informed by postmodern theories. The readiness to accept shifting positions, instabilities in self-definition, goes back to a long history which is marked by the inclusion of poststructuralist and psychoanalytic theories. Within feminism this has created a heated debate around essentialism and anti-essentialism, about political agency in view of and despite the notion of fragmentation of the subject. It is an ongoing debate which has by no means been decided among feminists. In conjunction with the engagement of cultural studies this debate about the forms of agency is foregrounded in much feminist cultural studies work. Angela McRobbie is one of the most committed and lucid contributors. Her observation of the "messy" state of cultural studies and her view of it as an always "contested terrain of study", its resistance to "disciplinary purity" (McRobbie 1992: 722), points towards an acceptance of ideas that at first sight unsettle clear-cut notions of class, of gender, of socialisation. She heavily criticises the kind of deconstructionist work that is done for the sake of mere play and elegance of expression, yet, like Spivak and others, she also sees an enabling potential in "the move away from binary oppositions, including those of absolute beginnings and absolute endings" which would open up "a new way

of conceptualizing the political field and creating a new set of methods for cultural studies" (721). "Incompleteness, fragmentation, and the pluralities of emergent identities need not mean loss of political capacity". (723) In combination with a "sense of political urgency", deconstructive practice would bring to cultural studies "a mode of study which is engaged and which seeks not the truth, but knowledge and understanding as a practical and material means of communicating with and helping to empower subordinate social groups and movements" (721). About the actual work which is done in this sense McRobbie is rather sceptical and criticises in her "Post-Script" to the Grossberg volume the "absence of reference to real existing identities in the ethnographic sense", and she makes a "plea for carrying out interactive research on groups and individuals who are more than just audiences for texts" (730).

Whereas McRobbie's work deals with gendered expressions of popular culture, fashion, youth culture, and the media, the main focus of inquiry of Gayatri Spivak, another feminist scholar who favours postmodernist views, lies in the analysis of postcolonialism. The project she is presently pursuing is "a book which will deal with the question of feminism and decolonialization in a way different from our usual notions of first world and third world, which are basically formed out of problems of migrant or ethnic populations in metropolitan space and then projected onto the world at large" (Spivak 1991: 69). Again, she is concerned with subjectivity, "the question of how to code sexual differences into the capital *I* that makes the ethical decision" (69). The gendered subject of this kind is both the *subject* of ethical decisions but also *subjected* to a multitude of cultural norms that operate within symbolical orders and institutionalised power systems. All of these – this is the tenor of much contemporary feminist cultural studies work – their histories, their values and patterns of thought and discursive and organizational practices have to be scrutinized and the possibilities for ethical decisions under postmodern conditions explored and negotiated.⁶

5. Feminist Studies of (British) Cultures in Germany

As to the "German perspective", the focus of this issue, it is certainly difficult to provide a survey "from within", and I would like my remarks to be regarded as just one voice which cannot represent the chorus of existing voices. – For various reasons feminist work has hardly been encouraged within German *Anglistik*, the main area on university level in which the study of British cultures is pursued. Unlike American Studies whose politics of encouragement has enhanced much feminist work in this country, the institutional politics of English studies failed to include younger scholars by admitting only members after the stage of the *Habilitation* until recently, a fact which was particularly disadvantageous for women's studies and feminist inquiry which has been mainly carried forward by younger women. The journal may be a welcome forum to alter this situation. Alliances were found in the groups of women doing German studies, whose

conferences in the eighties in the Federal Republic had special "English" sections (see Berger 1985 and Pelz 1988) and whose *Rundbrief*, the periodical which distributes information about feminist publications and conferences, also covered English studies. The sparse encounters between GDR and West German feminist scholars before unification also incorporated work about British culture. (Stephan/Weigel/Wilhelms 1991, Schilling *et al.* 1994) There is still a lot to be done towards an exchange among women from these separately developed intellectual and political cultures. Again, the journal will certainly provide a chance to further this goal. Altogether, feminist British studies has not had much room up to now;⁷ it has rather tended towards the images-of-women type of investigation⁸ and to a far lesser degree taken up the postmodernism/feminism or the psychoanalysis/feminism discussion.

Apart from this there have been developments in German academia which suggest an overlapping of interests with feminist British cultural studies. In this respect the journal can give encouragement and suggestions, provide links. For a number of years there has been a growing preoccupation with issues of multiculturalism which has taken a new turn and been intensified by the present rise of right-wing activities. In *Farbe bekennen* (Oguntoye/Opitz/Schulz 1986) African-German women speak about their complicated status. The discussion of the situation of Turkish women in Germany is taking place in journals like *Feministische Studien*, in the *Rundbrief* and in various other publications. Terms like "Ausländerliteratur" have come under attack alongside with the critique of the lack of immigration laws in Germany. There has been an inestimable number of symposia, conferences, workshops about the issues of immigrants, asylum seekers, so-called guest workers, about the notions of self and other, many of which have been initiated by feminists.⁹

Parallel with this we can observe that in some places there is an increasing interest in cultural studies in general, an interest which is formulated explicitly as an alternative to the structures of our universities which set up particularly rigid disciplinary boundaries. There are new "kulturwissenschaftliche" courses of study in different stages of development, for example at the Humboldt Universität or at Paderborn. There is the Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut in Essen, an independent Advanced Studies Institute which has as one of its goals not to reproduce the extreme underrepresentation of women at German universities (cf. Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut 1990: 21); there is the Zentrum für Kulturwissenschaften at Paderborn with its present focus on notions of alterity, and there is the Renaissance Institute in Frankfurt which, based on the explanatory needs of the present strives to trace the contemporary problems back to the time of the European Renaissance, with its peculiar inscriptions of national, cultural, gender and social identities and differences (cf. Renaissance-Institut 1993: 11). At the crossroads of all this we hope that a discussion will be possible that matters beyond the world of the universities.

Notes

- 1 This is a rather unhappy term which has come under attack, for the term itself implies that "white" is positioned outside its frame of meaning.
- 2 Routledge is the publisher of five of these volumes; there is a considerable market value in the label of cultural studies.
- 3 A volume like *Out There*, edited by Trinh Minh-ha and others, (Ferguson 1990) is quite symptomatic in this respect, for it nowhere uses cultural studies as a label, yet it might just as well belong to the field, and in fact many of the contributors also appear in the volumes named above.
- 4 Stuart Hall, for example speaks of "irritable tensions": "The interrelations between feminism, psychoanalysis, and cultural studies defines a completely and permanently unsettled terrain for me." (Hall 1992: 290)
- 5 Most post-Freudian and post-Lacanian cultural analysis is undertaken by women scholars.
- 6 In contrast to feminist scholarship what has been called gender studies is rarely defined from a political perspective and with a view on change.
- 7 Unfortunately, the journal *Englisch Amerikanische Studien* which published special feminist issues was discontinued after 1989.
- 8 see for example Fischer-Seidel (1991) and Würzbach (1993).
- 9 see e.g. "Die türkische Frauenbewegung. Probleme und Entwicklungen in Deutschland und in der Türkei", a Symposium at the University of Karlsruhe in 1992 or "Fremdes oder Eigenes? Rassismus, Antisemitismus, Kolonialismus aus Frauensicht", Symposium at the University of Dortmund, to give only two examples.

Bibliography

- Agger, Ben (1992), *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory*, London – Washington: The Falmer Press.
- Ang, Ien (1985), *Watching Dallas: Soap Opera and the Melodramatic Imagination*, London: Methuen.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria & C. Moraga, eds. (1982), *This Bridge Is Called My Back. Writings of Radical Women of Color*, New York: Kitchen Table, Women of Color Press.
- Barker, Martin & Anne Beezer, eds. (1992), *Reading into Cultural Studies*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Berger, Renate et al., eds. (1985), *Frauen – Weiblichkeit – Schrift*, Berlin: Argument-Verlag.
- Bobo, Jacqueline (1988), "The Color Purple": Black Women as Cultural Readers", in E. Deirdre Pribam, ed., *Female Spectators: Looking at Film and Television*, London: Verso.
- Brantlinger, Patrick (1990), *Crusoe's Footprints. Cultural Studies in Britain and America*, New York – London: Routledge.
- Brunt, Rosalind (1992), "Engaging with the Popular: Audience for Mass Culture and What to Say about Them", in Grossberg et al., 69–80.
- Critical Studies* (1991), (special issue) "Cultural Studies. Crossing Boundaries", ed. by Roberta L. Salper, 3/1.
- Curti, Lidia (1992), "What is Real and What is Not: Female Fabulations in Cultural Analysis", in Grossberg et al., 134–153.
- During, Simon, ed. (1993), *The Cultural Studies Reader*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Easthope, Antony (1991), *Literary into Cultural Studies*, London – New York: Routledge.

- Feministische Studien* (1991), 9: "Kulturelle und sexuelle Differenzen".
- Ferguson, Russell et al., eds. (1990), *Out There. Marginalization and Contemporary Culture*, New York – London: MIT Press.
- Fischer-Seidel, Therese, ed. (1991), *Frauen und Frauendarstellung in der englischen und amerikanischen Literatur*, Tübingen: Narr.
- Grossberg, Lawrence, Cary Nelson & Paula Treichler, eds. (1992), *Cultural Studies*. London – New York: Routledge.
- Hall, Catherine (1992), "Missionary Stories: Gender and Ethnicity in England in the 1830s and 1840s", in Grossberg et al., 240–276.
- Hall, Stuart (1992), "Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies", in Grossberg et al., 277–294.
- hooks, bell (1989), *Talking Back. Thinking Feminist. Thinking Black*, Boston: South End Press.
- (1990), *Yearning. Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*, Boston: South End Press.
- (1992), "Representing Whiteness in the Black Imagination", in Grossberg et al., 338–346.
- Kipnis, Laura (1992), "(Male) Desire and (Female) Disgust: Reading *Hustler*", in Grossberg et al., 373–391.
- Kulturwissenschaftliches Institut, Wissenschaftszentrum Nordrhein-Westfalen (1990), *Das Gründungsjahr*.
- Light, Alison (1991), *Forever England. Femininity, Literature and Conservatism between the Wars*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Mani, Lata (1992), "Cultural Theory, Colonial Texts: Reading Eyewitness Accounts of Widow Burning", in Grossberg et al., 392–405.
- McRobbie, Angela (1980), "Settling Accounts with Subcultures", *Screen Education*, 34, 37–49.
- & M. Nava, eds. (1984), *Gender and Generation*, London: Macmillan.
- (1992), "Post-Marxism and Cultural Studies: A Post-script", in Grossberg et al., 719–730.
- (1993), "Postmodernism and Popular Culture", in Lisa Appignanesi, ed. (1993), *Postmodernism. ICA Documents*, London: Free Association Books, 165–179.
- Minh-ha, Trinh (1989), *Woman, Native, Other. Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- (1991), *When the Moon Waxes Red. Representation, Gender and Cultural Politics*, London – New York: Routledge.
- Morris, Meaghan (1993), "Things to do with Shopping Centres", in During, 295–319.
- Nicholson, Linda J., ed. (1990), *Feminism/Postmodernism*, New York: Routledge.
- Ogunteye, Katharina, May Opitz & Dagmar Schulz, eds. (1986), *Farbe bekennen: Afro-deutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte*, Berlin: Orlanda.
- Pelz, Annegret et al., ed. (1988), *Frauen – Literatur – Politik*, Hamburg: Argument-Verlag.
- Penley, Constance (1992), "Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Study of Popular Culture", in Grossberg et al., 479–494.
- Radway, Janice (1984), *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Popular Literature*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- (1992), "Mail-Order Culture and its Critics: The Book-of-the-Month-Club, Commodification and Consumption, and the Problem of Cultural Authority", in Grossberg et al., 512–527.
- (1993), "The Institutional Matrix of Romance", in During, 438–454.
- Renaissance-Institut (1993), *Mitteilungen des Zentrums zur Erforschung der frühen Neuzeit*, 1, Universität Frankfurt.
- Rose, Jacqueline (1986), *Sexuality in the Field of Vision*, London: Verso.
- Rundbrief "Frauen in der Literaturwissenschaft" (1992), 34.
- Schilling, Sabine et al., eds. (1993), *Jüdische Kultur und Weiblichkeit in der Moderne*, Köln: Böhlau.

- Spivak, Gayatri (1987), *In Other Worlds. Essays in Cultural Politics*, New York – London: Methuen.
- (1990), *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, ed. by Sarah Harasym, London: Routledge.
 - (1991), "Reflections on Cultural Studies in the Post-Colonial Conjuncture. An Interview", *Critical Studies*, 3/1, 63–78.
- Stephan, Inge, Sigrid Weigel & Kerstin Wilhelms, eds. (1991), "Wen kümmert's wer spricht?" Zur Literatur- und Kulturgeschichte von Frauen aus Ost und West, Köln: Böhlau.
- Taylor, Helen (1989), *Scarlett's Women*, London: Virago.
- Turner, Graeme (1990), *British Cultural Studies* (Media and Popular Culture 7), Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Wallace, Michele (1992 and 1993), "Negative Images: Towards a Black Feminist Cultural Criticism", in Grossberg et al., 654–671 and During, 118–131.
- Weedon, Chris (1987), *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Wilson, Elizabeth (1985), *Adorned in Dreams. Fashion and Modernity*, London: Virago.
- Women's Studies Group, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (1978), *Women Take Issue: Aspects of Women's Subordination*, London: Hutchinson.
- Würzbach, Natascha (1993), "Frauen machen Theater. Der Beitrag von Frauen zum englischen Theaterleben der letzten zwanzig Jahre", in Klaus Peter Müller, ed., *Englisches Theater der Gegenwart. Geschichte(n) und Strukturen*, Tübingen: Narr, 73–95.
- Young, Iris Marion (1990), "The Ideal of Community and the Politics of Difference", in Nicholson, 300–323.