

## Gender, Colonialism, and Feminist Collaboration

*Antoinette Burton and Jean Allman*

The graduate seminar “Gender and Colonialism” that we have offered at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (UIUC), both jointly and individually, over the course of the past six years is very much the product of a long-term process—a feminist collaborative that is difficult to capture with a single syllabus. The syllabus we present here is a freeze-framed version of that process, the 2003 iteration of the course as we first taught it collaboratively. What follows is an account of how we came to develop a relationship with each other, with our respective fields and intellectual commitments, and with the limits and possibilities of the transnational as a historical concept and a feminist analytical tool in the context of thinking through what the combination—via collision and collusion—of gender with colonialism might mean.

Burton developed this course in the spring of 2001 in response to curricular imperatives in the graduate field we call “comparative women’s and gender history” at UIUC. At the time “Gender and Colonialism” was itself a comparatively new rubric. While the concept of transnationalism had scarcely come into view as an analytical approach, let alone as a methodological procedure, Burton can see now that she was trying to combine questions of empire and colonialism with a transnational approach. She did this by taking what she had identified as major conceptual questions at the heart of imperial studies and colonial scholarship—domesticity, sexualities, subalternity, citizenship, medicine, commodity capitalism, race, and the

*Radical History Review*

Issue 101 (Spring 2008) DOI 10.1215/01636545-2007-046

© 2008 by MARHO: The Radical Historians’ Organization, Inc.

nation itself—and routing them through varied physical geographies that might be considered part of the (mostly modern) colonial world.

In part because it was a new course and in part because there was what turned out to be a generation of graduate students at UIUC in a variety of disciplines who were hungry for feminist perspectives on these questions, the course ended up being chock full of historians, kinesiologists, literary folks, and anthropologists. The diversity reflected student curiosity about feminist history and colonialism and was also the product of humanities and social science disciplines struggling to come to terms with gender and postcoloniality. The 2001 iteration of the class ranged from Cuba to Shanghai, from British Columbia to the black Atlantic.

Looking back, it was probably more diffuse, both geographically and methodologically, than it was genuinely *transnational*—in part because there were no mechanisms for comparison built into the syllabus and very little self-conscious reflection on Burton's part about what the grounds of such comparison might be. In this sense, “gender” and “colonialism” served as heuristic devices designed to produce examples of parallel play across a host of diverse and sometimes incommensurate spaces. This is arguably one example of how transnationalism operates as an analytical method, though of course this does not exhaust its interpretive potential; historiographically it is indebted to comparative history, but in the context of colonialism, at any rate, it entails webs or connective tissues that allow us to read gender difference across linked domains (domesticity, labor, citizenship). The result was a series of useful provocations: How does gender act? What are the limits of imperial power? How do women act as agents in the context of colonial regimes? And what does it mean to think transimperially, that is, across differently gendered regimes of colonial power? An equally consequential result was that at the end of the course, Burton was ultimately left with unsatisfying questions: If colonialism is everywhere—one effect of her ham-handed attempts at transnationalizing the syllabus—is it nowhere? Or, what are the historical and cultural specificities of its gendered power?

One response to Burton's experience was to produce a more distilled version of the course, one that sought perhaps to cover less geographical territory while refining the questions we put to the readings and ourselves. After Allman joined the UIUC faculty in January 2001, we began to think about a number of ways to collaborate. Coteaching this course seemed like a good place to begin. When we began our collaboration in 2003, we used the 2001 syllabus as a template but foregrounded our own areas of expertise and interests both geographically and thematically. This meant, in the first instance, a greater focus on African history in the revised syllabus and more point-counterpoint between area-studies work and empire-centered scholarship. We have since realized that by narrowing our territorial coverage, we have not only been able to successfully bring greater thematic coherence to the syllabus but also to provide students—many of whom had no expertise in British, Indian, or African history—with at least some security in terms of locational footing.

As the course unfolded over the weeks, two related metanarrative debates fueled and focused our discussion. The first pitted the literature on gender and colonialism generated by scholars of empire, who have focused primarily on the power and hegemony of the imperial state including in realms of the intimate, against that developed by area-based scholars, who have tended to foreground local, subaltern agency and the episodic, uneven nature of imperial rule. The second metanarrative debate demanded that we bring two historiographies of two very different parts of the British colonial world—South Asia and Africa—onto the same page. These are historiographies that, despite their shared concern for understanding the ways in which colonialism impacted gendered systems of power, have very little in common. South Asian gender history is focused primarily (though not exclusively) on elite women, questions of the nation, and the domain of the social, while African gender history has largely engaged questions of economy and polity, especially women's marginalization by the colonial state in alliance with male elites. While the question of women's rights is implicit in both bodies of scholarship, it is rarely named as such; more common is a concern about agency, its conditions of production, and its limits and possibilities.

Of course, no one will be surprised to learn, given the dialectics built into the course (dialectics that we only came to fully appreciate as the weeks wore on) that we would each end up occupying one side in these metanarrative debates (sometimes in a staged way, other times not), as we "represented" the literatures we separately brought to the course. And it was through that process of enacting and then battling through the historiographical binaries that the course discussions began to move from empire versus area, through South Asia versus Africa, to ultimately translocal and transnational insights about power and difference and the ways in which they are daily constituted, reproduced, challenged, and remembered—from the hearts of empire to their margins. As important, the dissolution of our original binaries generated important and lively discussions about method that were easily portable to the various geographical and temporal fields of interest among our students—the role of audience in historical writing, the power of language and of naming, the ambiguities of translation, the constitution of an archive. The possibility of mediation across a multiplicity of geographical contexts and spaces, in other words, became a standard for measuring the transnational capacity of specific intellectual projects and of a feminist history of gender and colonialism.

In addition to bringing our own expertise to bear more fully on the content of the syllabus, we also decided that it would be useful if students wrote their ways through these disparate literatures during the entire semester and not just attempt to pull them all together in one big historiographical essay at the end. We therefore asked students to write and present one book review (a process that brought another source or two to the table each week), as well as compose weekly reflection papers, a midterm essay, and a final essay. In the first essay, we asked students to think

about the ways in which the scholarship we had read up to that point challenged the binary of colonizer and colonized. In the final essay, we asked students to imagine that they were assembling an edited volume of ten essays on gender and colonialism and to develop a book prospectus for the collection that set out its main themes and explained its intellectual architecture and coherence. In other words, we asked students to contemplate new and/or different ways of organizing and thinking through gendered colonialisms across time and space.

The collaborative process that took root in the classroom in 2003 forced us both to reflect very carefully on the politics of location, our different training and academic experiences, and the distinct audiences we hoped to engage with our work. It also encouraged us to contemplate in new ways the challenges of speaking across areas and boundaries without fetishizing the specificities of the local or subsuming everything under an empire, the global, or the transnational—and to begin to fashion more interpretively responsible definitions for all those categories. Those kinds of conversations have continued in a number of guises, including in the special issue of the *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* that we coedited and introduced with an essay entitled “Destination Globalization: Women, Gender, and Comparative Colonial Histories in the New Millennium.” These conversations have also sustained and animated our coeditorship of the *Journal of Women’s History* since 2004 and our American Historical Association (AHA) roundtable “Transnationalizing Women’s, Gender, and Sexuality History: The View from the Journals,” at the 2008 AHA in Washington, DC.

But little did we realize how precious the opportunity was in 2003 to engage these questions in a pedagogical context. By 2004, we were both swept into administrative work, editing the journal, and upholding our area teaching duties. Sadly, we have not had the opportunity to co-teach “Gender and Colonialism” again and have had to fly solo. Allman taught the course in 2005 with only a few alterations, the main one being the incorporation of readings that placed U. S. gender history in colonial and transnational contexts. While students have come to the course from a range of disciplines and areas, we have increasingly been seeing students with U.S. history expertise and have wanted to ensure that they could see the ways in which critical debates about gender in the contexts of area/empire and local/global/transnational did not exclude the United States. Burton taught the course the following year, with an emphasis on the body, the archive, and a self-conscious focus on the question of scales of hierarchy and value entailed by what counts as the local and the global in a newly aggressive age of Anglo-American imperialism.

The point-counterpoint, or the dialectical fuel, that brought so much energy to the course in 2003 was very difficult to replicate when teaching alone. In many ways, our scholarly work and our intellectual locations embodied the thematic debates we were trying to move students through. Without both of us in the classroom, discussions never moved quite so provocatively. When we taught together, we

were able to generate an open free space in which students could speak. It seemed that our dialogues diffused the tendency (of even very pedagogically savvy students) to say something to please the teacher. As two rather than one, we occupied very different locations in the debate and from those positions were able to recognize and to interrogate the binary quagmire of empire versus area studies and to identify some of the possibilities of the transnational, even as we were determined to remain alive to the ways in which the latter has inherited some of the methodological presumptions and operations of both fields.

As we face the prospect of continuing to teach the course solo (we are now in different institutional locations), we realize that ideally a course like this should move among a cohort of teachers as an ongoing experiment in what teaching gender and colonialism, whether in comparative or transnational perspective, can look like. In this sense the course will, we hope, continue to be a living archive of the field itself.

#### **HISTORY 493A:**

##### **PROBLEMS IN COMPARATIVE WOMEN'S HISTORY: GENDER AND COLONIALISM**

**Description:** This course provides a thematic overview of the intellectual questions, methodological challenges, and historiographical innovations that arise when gender as a category of historical analysis is brought to bear on colonialism as a world-historical phenomenon. The first half of the semester is devoted to exploring the multiple and conflicting sources through which historians have sought to reconstruct gendered colonial pasts. In the second half of the course, we examine a series of recent historical works that address conceptual problems entailed by attempts to historicize the relationship between gender and colonialism as analytical categories. Among the specific subjects under consideration are the civilizing mission; the subaltern subject; domesticities; sexuality and intimate colonialisms; racialized pathologies; gender, citizenship, and nation.

We will be operating from the assumption that colonial regimes are never self-evidently hegemonic but are always in process, subject to disruption and contest, and therefore never fully or finally accomplished. As we shall see, the gendered and sexualized social orders produced by such regimes are equally precarious, and hence they offer us unique opportunities to see the incompleteness of colonial modernities. In this sense the course is not simply about gender and sexuality as self-evident categories but also about their capacity to interrupt, thwart, and sometimes reconfirm modernizing colonial regimes—in part because they are not simply dimensions of the sociopolitical domain but represent its productive and uneven effects.

**Format:** This is a participation-intensive seminar that meets once per week. Seminar sessions are devoted to discussions of our readings and the broader issues, theoretical and comparative, raised by those sources. One or two members of the seminar are responsible for leading the discussion each session. In addition to discussing shared readings, we will hear short reviews of books prepared by seminar participants. Book reviews and discussion roles will be assigned during our first meeting.

**REQUIRED READINGS:**

- Allman, Jean, Susan Geiger, and Nakanyike Musisi, eds. *Women in African Colonial Histories*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002.
- Mani, Lata. *Contentious Traditions: The Debate on Sati in Colonial India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.
- McCord, Margaret. *The Calling of Katie Makanyina: A Memoir of South Africa*. New York: Wiley, 1995.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Thompson, Elizabeth. *Colonial Citizens: Republican Rights, Paternal Privilege, and Gender in French Syria and Lebanon*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2000.
- Vaughan, Megan. *Curing Their Ills: Colonial Power and African Illness*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.
- Wexler, Laura. *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- White, Luise. *Speaking with Vampires: Rumor and History in Colonial Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

**Course Requirements:** Each seminar participant must come to class prepared to discuss the session's required readings. Part of that preparation will include writing a brief (1/2–1 page) reaction paper on those readings. Reaction papers will be turned in at the end of each session, but they will not be graded. (They will count toward your attendance and participation, which constitute 20 percent of your final grade.) Additional requirements are as follows:

1. *Lead Discussion:* Lead discussion once during the semester. *The week before* you lead discussion, you should bring to class a set of discussion questions to distribute to the seminar. The questions should help us draw out important theoretical, comparative, and historiographical issues as we read and during our discussion the following week. (10 percent of final grade)
2. *Book Review:* Write one 3–4 page review of a book (or of a collection of 4–5 articles) only you have read and make copies of that review for all the participants in the seminar. (Readings available for review are listed under “Recommended” on the schedule of meetings.) You must provide enough information so that those who have not read the book or collection will have some basis for participating. Your review should include: a summary of the author's thesis; a synopsis of the book's/ articles' content; a consideration of the author's point of view, location, or theoretical groundings; a critique of the book's/articles' weaknesses; and an evaluation of its/their contribution to an understanding of the theme under consideration. In class, you will offer a brief (5 minutes) discussion of the work, highlighting its connections with and contributions toward the themes we are discussing at that particular session. (10 percent of final grade)

3. *Two Questions/Topics* will be distributed during the semester well in advance of essay due dates. They will require you (in 8–10 typed pages) to explore one of the themes we have encountered in our readings. The essays each constitute 30 percent of your final grade.

#### SCHEDULE OF SEMINAR MEETINGS:

##### January 22: Introduction to the Course

Required: None

Recommended:

Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," in *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia, 1988), 28–52; Edward Said, "Introduction" and "Knowing the Oriental," in *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage, 1978), 1–28, 31–49.

##### January 29: Points of Departure: Gender and Conquest

Required:

Holly Hanson, "Queen Mothers and Good Government in Buganda," in Allman, Geiger, and Musisi, *Women in African Colonial Histories*, 219–37; Julie C. Wells, "Eva's Men: Gender and Power in the Establishment of the Cape of Good Hope, 1652–74," *Journal of African History* 39 (1998): 417–37; Adele Perry, "The State of Empire: Reproducing Colonialism in British Columbia, 1849–1871," *Journal of Colonialism and Colonial History* 2 (2001): 1–39; Mire Koikari, "Rethinking Gender and Power in the US Occupation of Japan, 1945–1952," *Gender and History* 11 (1999): 313–35.

Recommended:

Richard C. Trexler, *Sex and Conquest: Gendered Violence, Political Order, and the European Conquest of the Americas* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995); Kathleen Brown, "Native Americans and Early Modern Concepts of Race," in *Empire and Others: British Encounters with Indigenous Peoples, 1600–1850*, ed. Martin Daunton and Rick Halpern (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1999), 79–100; Stuart Schartz, ed., *Implicit Understandings* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992); James Muldoon, *Empire and Order: The Concept of Empire, 800–1800* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1999); Ramon Gutierrez, *When Jesus Came, the Corn Mothers Went Away: Marriage, Sexuality, and Power in New Mexico, 1500–1846* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991); Jennifer Morgan, "'Some Could Suckle over Their Shoulder': Male Travelers, Female Bodies, and the Gendering of Racial Ideology, 1500–1770," *William and Mary Quarterly*, no. 54, 3rd ser. (1997): 167–92; Rebecca Overmeyer-Velazquez, "Christian Morality in New Spain: The Inimical Nahua Woman in Book Ten of the Florentine Codex," *Journal of Women's History* 10 (1998): 9–37; Martha Abreu, "Slave Mothers and Freed Children: Emancipation and Female Space in Debates on the 'Free Womb' Law, Rio de Janeiro, 1871," *Journal of Latin American Studies* 28 (1996): 567–80; Kelvin A. Santiago-Valles, "'Higher Womanhood' among the 'Lower Races': Julia McNair

Henry in Puerto Rico and the ‘Burdens’ of 1898” *Radical History Review*, no. 73 (1999): 47–73; Patricia Grimshaw, “Settler Anxieties, Indigenous Peoples, and Women’s Suffrage in the Colonies of Australia, New Zealand, and Hawai’i, 1889 to 1902,” *Pacific Historical Review* 69 (2000): 553–72; Catherine Hall, ed. *Cultures of Empire: A Reader* (New York: Routledge, 2000).

### February 5: Gender and the Colonial Archive: The Story of Sara Baartman

Film: *The Life and Times of Sara Baartman*, dir. Zola Maseko, 1998

Required:

Zine Magubane, “Which Bodies Matter? Feminism, Poststructuralism, Race, and the Curious Theoretical Odyssey of the ‘Hottentot Venus,’” *Gender and Society* 15 (2001): 816–34; Sander Gilman, “Black Bodies, White Bodies: Towards and Iconography of Female Sexuality,” *Critical Inquiry* 12 (1985): 204–42; Nakanyike Musisi, “The Politics of Perception or Perception as Politics,” in Allman, Geiger, and Musisi, *Women in African Colonial Histories*, 95–115.

Recommended:

T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting, *The Black Venus* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Ania Loomba, *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (New York: Routledge, 2005); D. Arnold, *Colonizing the Body* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); Jean Comaroff, “The Diseased Heart of Africa: Medicine, Colonialism, and the Black Body,” in *Knowledge, Power, and Practice*, ed. Margaret Lock and Shirley Lindenbaum (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 305–29; Annie Coombes, *Reinventing Africa: Museums, Material Culture, and Popular Imagination* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1994); Jan Pieterse, *White on Black: Images of Africa and Blacks in Western Popular Culture* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1995); Gayatri Spivak, “The Rani of Sirmur: An Essay in Reading the Archives,” *History and Theory* 24 (1985): 247–72; Tony Ballantyne, “Archive, Discipline, State: Power and Knowledge in South Asian Historiography,” *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies* 3 (2001): 87–105; Natalie Zemon Davis, *Fiction in the Archives: Pardon Tales and Their Tellers in Sixteenth-Century France* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1990); Alan Sekula, “The Body and the Archive,” *October* 39 (1986): 3–64; Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home, and History in Late-Colonial India* (Oxford University Press, 2003).

### February 12: Speaking Subjects?

Required: Mani, *Contentious Traditions*

Recommended:

Gayatri Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (New York: Macmillan 1988), 271–313; Partha Chatterjee, “The Nationalist Resolution of the Woman Question,” in *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History*, ed. Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid (Delhi: Kali for Women, 1989), 233–53; Kamala Visweswaran, “Small Speeches, Subaltern Gender: Nationalist Ideology and Its Historiography,” in *Subaltern Studies IX*, ed. Shahid Amin and Dipesh Chakrabarty (Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1996), 88–125; Carolyn Martin Shaw, “The



Production of Women” and “Kikuyu Women and Sexuality,” in *Colonial Inscriptions: Race, Sex, and Class in Kenya* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995), 28–59, 60–94; Susan Pederson, “National Bodies, Unspeakable Acts: The Sexual Politics of Colonial Policy-Making,” *Journal of Modern History* 63 (1991): 647–80; Antoinette Burton, “Tongues Untied: Lord Salisbury’s ‘Black Man’ and the Boundaries of Imperial Democracy,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 43 (2000): 632–59.

### **February 19: “Capturing Voices?”**

Required: McCord, *The Calling*

Recommended:

Luise White, Stephan Miescher, and David Cohen, eds., *African Words, African Voices* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001); Sherna Berger Gluck and Daphne Patai, *Women’s Words: The Feminist Practice of Oral History* (New York: Routledge, 1991); I, Rigoberta Menchú: *An Indian Woman in Guatemala* (London: Verso, 1984); Robert Carr, “Crossing the First World/Third World Divides: Testimonial, Transnational Feminisms, and the Postmodern Condition,” in *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices*, ed. Inderpal Grewal and Caren Caplan (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994), 153–72; Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter, eds., *Feminist Epistemologies* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Gayatri Spivak, “Can the Subaltern Speak?”; Megan Vaughan, “Reported Speech and Other Kinds of Testimony,” *Journal of Historical Sociology* 13 (2000): 237–63; Isabel Hofmeyer, *We Spend Our Years as a Tale That Is Told* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1994); Susan Geiger, *TANU Women* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997); Susan Geiger, “What’s So Feminist about Women’s Oral History?” *Journal of Women’s History* 2 (1990): 169–80; Harold Scheub, *The Tongue Is Fire: South African Storytellers and Apartheid* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1996); Allman and Tashjian, *“I Will Not Eat Stone”: A Women’s History of Colonial Asante* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2000); Elizabeth Tonkin, *Narrating Our Pasts: The Social Construction of Oral History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992); Belinda Bozzoli, *Women of Phokeng* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1991); Charles van Onselen, *The Seed Is Mine* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1996).

### **February 26: From Source to Narrative to Analysis: Toward a Practice of Gendered Colonial History**

Required:

Heidi Gengenbach, “‘What My Heart Wanted,’” 19–47; Teresa Barnes, “Virgin Territory?” 164–90; Lynette Jackson, “When in the White Man’s Town,” 191–218; Misty Bastian, “Vultures of the Marketplace,” 260–81; Tanya Lyons, “Guerrilla Girls and Women,” 305–26; Hawkins, “‘The Woman in Question,’” 116–43; and Wendy Urban-Mead, “Dynastic Daughters,” in Allman, Geiger, and Musisi, *Women in African Colonial Histories*, 48–70.

Recommended:

Margot Badran, ed., *Harem Years: The Memoirs of an Egyptian Feminist*, by Huda Shaarawi (New York: Feminist Press, 1987); Susan Mann, *Precious Records: Women in China’s Long Eighteenth Century* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press, 1997);

Bonnie Smith, *The Gender of History: Men, Women, and Historical Practice* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2000); Ann Stoler and Karen Strassler, "Castings for the Colonial: Memory Work in 'New Order' Java," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 42 (2000): 4–48; Nwando Achebe, "Getting to the Source," *Journal of Women's History* 14 (2002): 9–32; Barbara Harlow, "Looked Class, Talked Red," *Meridians* 3 (2002): 226–51.

### March 5: Rumors and True Stories

Required: White, *Speaking with Vampires*

Recommended:

Jane Hill and Judith Irvine, *Responsibility and Evidence in Oral Discourse* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Bozzoli, *Women of Phokeng*; David Cohen and A. Odhiambo, *Burying SM: The Politics of Knowledge and the Sociology of Power in Africa* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1992); Gyan Prakash, *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995); Heidi Gengenbach, "Truth-Telling and the Life Narrative of African Women: A Reply to Kirk Hoppe," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26 (1994): 619–27; Kirk Hoppe, "Whose Life Is It Anyway? Issues of Representation in Life Narrative Texts of African Women," *International Journal of African Historical Studies* 26 (1993): 623–36; Ann Laura Stoler, "'In Cold Blood': Hierarchies of Credibility and the Politics of Colonial Narratives," *Representation*, no. 37 (1992): 151–89; Joyce Appleby, Lynn Hunt, and Margaret Jacob, *Telling the Truth about History* (New York: Norton, 1994).

### March 12: Reading, Writing, and Consultation Week

March 19: Seminar Roundtable: Practicing Gender and Colonial History

This is a week to take stock. Our previous weeks dealt, implicitly and explicitly, with the craft of writing—the troubled nature of sources, the limits of traditional disciplinary conventions, and the problem of silences that face those wishing to take an historical approach to gender and colonialism. In this roundtable we want you to think about the relevance of the work so far to your interests in history and, ideally, to your dissertations/works-in-progress.

### March 26: Spring Break

### April 2: Colonialism, Race, and the Intimate

Required: Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge*

Recommended:

McClintock, *Imperial Leather*; Kumari Jayawardena and Malathi de Alwis, *Embodied Violence: Communalising Women's Sexuality in South Asia* (London: Zed, 1997); Laura Mulvey, *Visual and Other Pleasures* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989); Lynn Thomas, "Imperial Concerns and 'Women's Affairs': State Efforts to Regulate Clitoridectomy and Eradicate Abortion in Meru, Kenya, c. 1910–1950," *Journal of African History* 39 (1998): 121–46; Diana Jeater, *Marriage, Perversion, and Power: The Construction of Moral Discourse in Southern Rhodesia, 1894–1930* (Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 1993); Pederson, "National Bodies, Unspeakable Acts"; Lisa Bloom, ed., *With Other Eyes: Looking at Race and Gender in Visual Culture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999); Timothy Mitchell, *Colonising Egypt* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988); Ruth Bernard Yeazell, *Harems of the Mind* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000); Reina Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism: Race, Femininity, and Representation* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Carol Summers, "Intimate Colonialism: The Imperial Production of Reproduction in Uganda, 1907–1925." *Signs* 16 (1991): 787–807; Malek Alloula, *The Colonial Harem* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986); Vera Kutzinski, *Sugar's Secrets: Race and the Erotics of Cuban Nationalism* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 1993).

#### **April 9: Pathologizing Colonialism**

Required: Vaughan, *Curing Their Ills*

Recommended:

David Arnold, *Colonizing the Body* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993); David Arnold, *Imperial Medicine and Indigenous Societies* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 1988); Dagmar Engels and Shula Marks, eds., *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: State and Society in India and Africa* (London: Tauris, 1994); Roy Macleod and M. Lewis, *Disease, Medicine, and Empire* (New York: Routledge, 1988); Jeater, *Marriage, Perversion, and Power*; Marinez Lyons, *The Colonial Disease: A Social History of Sleeping Sickness in Northern Zaire, 1900–1940* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988); Sean Hawkins, "To Pray or Not to Pray: Politics, Medicine, and Conversion among the LoDagaa of Northern Ghana, 1929–39," *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 31 (1997): 50–85; Luise White, "'They Could Make Their Victims Dull': Genders and Genres, Fantasies and Cures in Colonial Southern Uganda," *American Historical Review* 100 (1995): 1379–402; Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, "Beyond the Hysterectomies Scandal: Women, the Institution, the Family, and State in India," in *The Preoccupation of Postcolonial Studies*, ed. Fawzia Afzal-Khan and Kalpana Seshadri-Crooks (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 200–33; Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks*, trans. Charles Lam Markmann (New York: Grove, 1991); Jonathan Sadovsky, *Imperial Bedlam: Institutions of Madness in Colonial Southwest Nigeria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999); James H. Mills, *Madness, Cannabis, and Colonialism: The "Native-Only" Lunatic Asylum of British India, 1857–1900* (New York: Macmillan, 2000); Michael Bourdagh, "The Disease of Nationalism, the Empire of Hygiene," *positions* 6 (1998): 637–73; Nancy Rose Hunt, *A Colonial Lexicon of Birth Ritual, Medicalization, and Mobility in the Congo* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Waltraud Ernst, *Mad Tales from the Raj: The European Insane in British India, 1800–1858* (New York: Routledge, 1991); Warwick Anderson, "Excremental Colonialism: Public Health and the Poetics of Pollution," *Critical Inquiry* 21 (1995): 640–69; Sean Quinlan, "Colonial Bodies, Hygiene, and Abolitionist Politics in Eighteenth-Century France," *History Workshop* 42 (1996): 107–25.

**April 16: Domesticating Gender**Required: Wexler, *Tender Violence*

Recommended:

J. Hunter, *Gospel of Gentility* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984); K. T. Hansen, *African Encounters with Domesticity* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press); Jean Allman, "Making Mothers: Missionaries, Medical Officers, and Women's Work in Colonial Asante," *History Workshop Journal* 38 (1994): 23–47; Deborah Gaitskell, "Devout Domesticity? A Century of Women's Christianity in South Africa," in *Women and Gender in Southern Africa to 1945*, ed. Cheryl Walker (London: Currey, 1990), 251–72; Deborah Gaitskell, "At Home with Hegemony? Coercion and Consent in the Education of African Girls for Domesticity in South Africa before 1910," in Marks and Engels, *Contesting Colonial Hegemony: State and Society in Africa and India*, 110–28; Shula Marks, *Not Either an Experimental Doll* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984); Pam Scully, *Liberating the Family? Gender and British Slave Emancipation in the Rural Western Cape, South Africa, 1823–1853* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997); Maila Stevens, "Modernizing the Malay Mother," in *Maternities and Modernities: Colonial and Postcolonial Experiences in Asia and the Pacific*, ed. Kalpana Ram and Margaret Jolly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 50–80; Elisabeth Locher-Scholten, "Marriage, Morality, and Modernity: The 1837 Debate on Monogamy," in *Women and the Colonial State* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2000), 187–218; Vincente Rafael, "Colonial Domesticity: White Women and United States Rule in the Philippines," *American Literature* 67 (1995): 639–66; Elizabeth Schmidt, *Peasants, Traders, and Wives: Shona Women in the History of Zimbabwe, 1870–1939* (Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 1997); David Barry Gaspar and Darlene Clark Hine, eds., *More Than Chattel: Black Women and Slavery in the Americas* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996); Susanne Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany, 1770–1870* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Julia Clancy-Smith and Frances Gouda, eds., *Domesticating the Empire: Race, Gender, and Family Life in French and Dutch Colonialism* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1999).

**April 23: Gender, Citizenship, and the Nation**Required: Thompson, *Colonial Citizens*

Recommended:

Scully, *Liberating the Family*; Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1998); Aiwha Ong, *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Tani Barlow, ed., *Formations of Colonial Modernity in East Asia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1997); Caren Caplan, Norma Alarcon, and Mino Moallem, eds., *Between Woman and Nation: Nationalisms, Transnational Feminisms, and the State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Paul Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1992); Antoinette Burton, "Who Needs the Nation? Interrogating 'British' History," *Journal of Historical Sociology* 10 (1997): 227–48; Elizabeth Povinelli, "Sex Acts and Sovereignty: Race and Sexuality

in the Construction of the Australian Nation,” *Diacritics* 24 (1994): 122–50; Kenneth M. Wells, “The Price of Legitimacy: Women and the Kûnuhoe Movement, 1927–1931,” in *Colonial Modernity in Korea*, ed. Gi-Wook Shin and Michael Robinson (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 191–220; Geiger, *TANU Women*; Renata Salecl, “The Fantasy Structure of Nationalist Discourse,” *Praxis International* 13 (1993): 213–23; Mrinalini Sinha, ed., *Mother India* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1999); Prasenjit Duara, *Rescuing History from the Nation: Questioning Narratives of Modern China* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995); Etienne Balibar, “Is European Citizenship Possible?” *Public Culture* 8 (1996): 355–76.

**April 30: Reading, Writing and Consultation Week**

**May 7: Final Seminar Roundtable on Gender and Colonialism**