

WORKING PAPER 27

**CONTEXTUALISING FEMINIST GEOGRAPHY:
INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES**

Janice Monk, Joos Droogleever Fortuijn,
Hae Un Rii, Linda McDowell and Melissa Gilbert

Contextualising Feminist Geography: International Perspectives

Editor's Introduction

Janice Monk
Southwest Institute for Research on Women
University of Arizona

This Working Paper was initiated as a panel discussion on the theme "Place Matters" at the 1993 Annual Meeting of the Association of American Geographers. The premise of the panel was that geographers should examine the role of place, not only time, in accounting for the emergence and orientations of feminist work in the discipline. It is ironic that we have not paid much attention to this theme, since feminist scholars in other disciplines so often use geographic metaphors to discuss the "situated" character of knowledge and the "positionality" of scholars.

The contributors provide examples of the very different levels of production and institutionalization of feminist geography that exist in different world regions, and also across institutions within individual countries. But they also reveal that the bases of these differences are not simple--not merely between "East" and "West" or "developed" and "Third World" countries, for example. Why is feminist geography in Britain oriented towards theory but towards empirical, policy-oriented work in the Netherlands? What has inhibited the development of feminist geography in Korea compared with Taiwan? How does the strength of feminist geography vary across regions and departments within the United States? The authors suggest ways in which political economies, demography, cultural values, and the role of the state are all important to consider in seeking answers to these questions. So too are the traditions and orientations of the discipline, the

composition of scholarly networks, and the roles of individuals in promoting the development of the field. At a time when questions of difference and a search for direction are increasingly evident in feminist geographical research, especially in the Anglo American literatures. The three papers presented here--by Joos Droogleever Fortuijn, Hae Un Rii, and Linda McDowell, together with the reflections by Melissa Gilbert help us to think about alternative routes and about the benefits of dialogue and collaboration to feminist geographers in different locations.

I. The Netherlands

Joos Droogleever Fortuijn
University of Amsterdam

The Scope of Feminist Geography in the Netherlands

The history of feminist geography in the Netherlands starts in 1978 with the publication of a (stencilled) bundle of papers by a group of women students in human geography at the University of Amsterdam with the title (in translation) "Women's Studies and Human Geography." Before that time, a few articles on the position of women had been written by women geographers, and some geographers were active feminists, for example, Hedy D'AnCona, the current Minister of Culture and Health, who was a lecturer in geography in the 1960s and, at that time, one of the leaders of the feminist movement. But these women, even D'Ancona, did not explicitly connect feminism and geography. Thus the student group in 1978 was the first collectivity to link feminism and geography in the Netherlands.

Three stages can be distinguished in the development of Dutch feminist geography, first, a period of struggle between 1978 and 1983; second, a period of growth between 1983 and 1989; and third, a period of consolidation since 1989. In contrast to some of the early efforts in feminist geography in the United States (e.g., Monk and Hanson, 1982), the first stage in the development of feminist geography was not characterized by "making women visible." Rather, it was the most radical (socialist and radical feminist) and the most theory-oriented period, as a consequence of and as a critique of the Marxist revolution of the 1970s. Inspiration originated from women's studies

in the social sciences which had started ten years earlier. There were strong ties to the feminist movement, and methodologically, action research was emphasized.

This first period was the most turbulent one, with struggle for recognition of a feminist perspective. Students struggled with staff, radicals struggled with the mainstream, feminists struggled with Marxist geographers. And the students and feminists won. The students made a coalition with the female staff and feminist geography gained some recognition and access to resources. Since then, it is impossible to imagine geography without feminist geography.

The struggle was followed by growth. The first formal publication on feminist geography in the Netherlands appeared in 1982--a reader with translations of British, French, and German articles together with some Dutch papers. The following year, the first faculty appointment was made for women's studies in geography in the Department of Human Geography at the University of Amsterdam, though it was a part-time, temporary position. A few years later appointments followed in the Department of Urban and Regional Planning and Demography in the same university and others were made at Utrecht, Nijmegen, and in the Free University of Amsterdam. In 1984, a course in feminist geography was initiated at the University of Amsterdam followed by courses at Utrecht and Nijmegen. Students participated in projects and wrote MA theses in feminist geography. Geography departments cooperated with national, provincial, and municipal planning departments in feminist research projects. In the process, feminist geography became more and more empirical and policy oriented. Most research projects made use of both quantitative and qualitative methods.

The most recent period, of consolidation, involves integration, institutionalization, and internationalization. Gender studies in geography form part of the mainstream research programs, with many Ph.D. research projects being undertaken. The first Ph.D. dissertation in feminist geography appeared in 1988. Some specific courses in feminist geography are being offered, but, at the same time, gender studies are more and more integrated into mainstream courses.

In 1989, the first permanent position for gender studies in human geography was created in Amsterdam, though it remains a part-time appointment. The first special issue on women's studies was published in the Geografisch Tijdschrift in 1991, and both the Koninklijk Nederlands Aardrijkskundig Genootschap (Royal Dutch Geographical Association) and the Nederlands Instituut voor Ruimtelijke Ordening en Volkhuysvesting (Dutch National Institute for Planning and Housing) have commissions on women's issues.

International cooperation was initiated in 1986 when the Women and Geography Study Group of the Institute for British Geographers was invited by the University of Amsterdam for a successful joint seminar on geography and gender. The international cooperation has continued through the participation of the University of Amsterdam in the Erasmus Program of the European Community which supports collaborative intensive courses by a consortium including the Universities of Amsterdam, Durham (UK), Sheffield (UK), Autonomous of Barcelona (Spain), National Polytechnical University of Athens (Greece), and Roskilde University Centre (Denmark). Courses have been held in

Amsterdam (1990), Durham (1991), and Barcelona (1993). Staff and students from the network universities and many others participate in the courses.

Themes, Philosophies, and Methodologies

Feminist geography in the Netherlands has centered on the study of women's daily problems, particularly around issues of labor. Studies dealing with Western women emphasize the urban and suburban contexts, focusing on such themes as the gender division of labor, household strategies, travel behavior, daily activities (paid and unpaid labor and leisure). In research and teaching on Third World geography also emphasize labor issues, with particular attention to survival strategies and migration. These themes are the traditional ones of the socialist feminist perspective, however, they have been pursued within diverse theoretical frameworks, in particular time geography and, more recently, structuration theory.

A second important theme has been women's access to public space in which such topics as the gender struggle for public space, public safety, female participation in public decision making, women's informal networks, women's domains, and gay and lesbian domains have been the subject of research. These themes are linked with the radical feminist perspective: patriarchal gender relations, male dominance, heterosexual norms, and sexual intimidation. This work has been associated with important changes in public opinion and policy in the Netherlands. Ten years ago, the theme of public safety originated in the agenda of the feminist movement but, outside the movement, it was regarded as a non-issue, or worse, as indecent and ridiculous. At the same time, criminality became one of the main issues in the political debate. Within five years public

safety was at the top of the public agenda. National and municipal procedures for the improvement of public safety have been introduced, with municipal inspection committees, regulations created in urban planning, and prizes awarded by the Ministry of Justice for safety programs.

At the moment, some reorientation is taking place in the themes being pursued in Dutch feminist geography. Issues such as gender identities, the gendering and degendering of spaces, gender and ethnicity, and local specificity are attracting attention.

The Demographic, Political, Economic, and Ideological Context

Like most Western European countries, the Netherlands can be characterized as a modern society in terms of its economic level and personal well-being having a high standard of living, moderate income differences, high productivity, high educational level, a generous social security system, and good medical care for rich and poor alike. In contrast to other Western European countries, however, the Netherlands presents one paradox. It combines a liberal, progressive ideology and a traditional praxis. Dutch society is tolerant with respect to abortion, birth control, homosexuality, divorce, lone parents, illegitimate births, drugs, and so on, but traditional with respect to the participation of women in public life, especially in paid labor. The labor force participation of women is extremely low when measured in full-time equivalents. The female participation rate used to be one of the lowest in the countries of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Only recently is the rate of participation comparable with other Western European countries (25% in 1971 and 56% in 1991). The percentage of women working part-time is the highest in the OECD (61% in 1991) as is the percentage of men

working part-time (16% in 1991) (OECD, 1991: 26-27). More than in other countries, female employment is confined to just a few sectors: low paid, low status, low security, no prospects, no continuity. Women advancing in technical professions or in management are scarce.

Several demographic, economic, and institutional factors can explain this exceptional situation. First, in the Netherlands, the birth rate was high from 1945-1965. During that period, families with 7, 10 or more children were not exceptional, especially in the Catholic and some orthodox Protestant parts of the nation. In 1960, only 7% of all women with children had a paid job. Second, in the Netherlands, a high income level goes hand in hand with relatively low housing costs and low second car ownership. The situation contrasts with most countries where two incomes are indispensable for families with children because of low wages and/or high costs of living. Third, the continuous participation of the Christian Democratic Parties in the national government since the Second World War has provided an institutional context favoring traditional, one-earner families with (many) children: minimum wages used to be set as family wages, while taxation, social security, and housing subsidies favor one-earner families. The statutory opening times of shops, school hours, and the lack of child care facilities discourage mothers from looking for a job.

Geography in the Netherlands

The academic world in the Netherlands is characterized by a high level of state intervention. Most universities are state institutions and the few private (denominational) universities are state financed. All Dutch students pay fixed tuition fees which form a small

part of the actual costs. All grammar school graduates have access to all universities which cannot select their own students. There is state inspection of teaching and research.

An M.A. degree in geography involves a four-year education in a geography department (in practice, 5- 6 years) with almost all courses taught in the same department. At the moment, three universities (Amsterdam, Groningen, and Utrecht) offer a full four-year program in geography. Geography departments in the Netherlands are large, with many students and staff. The University of Amsterdam, for example, has about 500 full-time students in human geography (half of them female), about 4000 in urban and regional planning (Half of them female), and about 100 in physical geography (most of them male). The Department of Human Geography has five full professors (all male), 8 associate professors (all male), 27 assistant professors (4 females, all women and some men in part-time positions), a temporary staff of 16 research coordinators and research assistants (half of them female) and 15 Ph.D. students (10 female).

Until 15 - 20 years ago, most M.A. graduates left the university to become geography teachers in secondary schools, but now, for demographic reasons and because of cuts in expenditures on education, only a few enter teaching each year. About ten years ago, most M.A. graduates gained appointments in research or policy-making in civil service (national, provincial, municipal). But for economic and political reasons (cuts in government expenditures, privatization), the jobs of current graduates are more diversified in governmental and private (profit and non-profit) organizations.

In principal, universities have autonomy with respect to their research policy. But the interconnection between geography departments in the universities and civil service has always been strong. Research in Western, urban and rural geography is frequently subsidized by national, provincial, and municipal departments of planning, housing, or social affairs. For example, three of the four dissertations on feminist geography are being funded by national and provincial planning departments. Most research in development studies is financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as part of the development aid program. During the 1980s the national government also stimulated women's studies with special funds. So, in practice, state intervention in geography is quite strong.

Conclusion: Place Matters

The political and economic context in Dutch society and the praxis in Dutch geography shaped the development of feminist geography. Themes and methodology can be explained by the specific position of women in Dutch society and by the interconnections between academic geography and policy on all state levels.

In the first period, feminist geography was stimulated by developments in the social sciences. This period was characterized by hot theoretical and ideological debates, but soon, feminist geography went her own way. Following the tradition in Dutch geography, it became more and more empirical, policy oriented, and linked with governmental institutions. This orientation has been of vital importance for the survival and recognition of Dutch feminist geography.

References

Monk, J. and S. Hanson (1982), "On Not Excluding Half of the Human in Human Geography," The Professional Geographer, 34, 11-23.

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (1991), Employment Outlook, July.

II. Asia: Focus on Taiwan, India and Korea

Hae Un Rii

The Scope of Feminist Geography in Asia

Feminist geography first appeared in Asian countries in the early 1980s as a result of the efforts of international and local scholars. In the case of Taiwan, it was introduced by international scholars through lectures, publications, and newsletters. The first research by a local scholar, Nora Chiang, was published in 1983 based on her U.S. doctoral dissertation on rural to urban migration of Taiwanese women (Chiang, 1983). In India, although some geographic research on women had been published in the 1960s, authored by local scholars, work from a feminist perspective did not appear till the early 1980s, written by Saraswati Raju (1981) at that time a post-doctoral scholar in the United States. I introduced feminist geography to Korea through publishing an article on geographical approaches to research on women in 1984 (Rii, 1984). Since then, a number of articles have been published in both Taiwan and India but only one in Korea, on the spatial distribution of women workers (Choe, 1986).

The themes treated by the scholars have varied slightly from country to country but studies generally focus on gender differences in socio-economic behavior such as migration, labor force participation, fertility, literacy, and so on. The work is usually seen as part of other geographical subfields such as social, population, cultural, urban, or economic-industrial geography, rather than constituting a sub-field of feminist geography. In Taiwan, it has been particularly linked with population and social geography and treatment of gender roles is also included in the population and social courses taught by

Nora Chiang. The Indian work is mainly connected with social geography also, whereas in Korea, the limited research has been linked to economic/industrial geography though the teaching occurs in cultural geography.

Geographers (especially women geographers) have also made efforts to develop feminist geography in other Asian countries (Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Singapore, Japan etc.) but feminist geography is still largely in its embryonic stages in Asia. Overall, Taiwan and India might be regarded as the countries in which feminist geography has an advanced status, comparatively, in Asia.

The Context

Because Asian countries have different social, historical, and cultural backgrounds, the research context differs among countries, although there are some similar trends. Most research is concerned with socio-economic issues because the goal of feminist geography is to change people's ways of thinking in male-dominated societies. China, Korea, and Japan each have their own long-established indigenous traditions in geography, dating back to the 11th century in the case of Korea, for example, but the roots of modern geography in Asia can be found in the Western influence through scholars trained in the United States and Europe. The status of geography also differs among the countries, but, for the most part, it is an independent discipline with a relatively good standing. In India, there are 46 departments, though they do not offer undergraduate degrees. In China, research is carried out in 15 research institutes with teaching in 38 departments. In Korea, 28 departments are largely involved with teacher training. There

are exceptions to this status, however, notably in the Philippines where geography is not a well-known discipline and its status is very low.

Within geography, the situation of subfields also differs. Physical geography is strong in Taiwan, China, and India while in Korea and Japan human geography is more important. In Singapore, following a British model, both are equally strong. These differences in the context present different challenges for the introduction of feminist geography, but all countries share an androcentric perspective, so that geography is a male-dominated field and women or gender are not recognized as research subjects. This has been a serious obstacle for increasing the number of female geographers and establishing feminist geography as a separate field.

The Institutional Position of Feminist Geography and Women Geographers

Given the above conditions, the institutional position of feminist geography is relatively weak in Asia, and is not even recognized in some countries. A few male geographers do deal with gender (for example, Professor Ota in Japan and Professor Choe in Korea), but in general the work is dependent on the efforts of the few women. Nevertheless, there has been some institutional support. Feminist geography is directly or indirectly supported in Taiwan by the Department of Geography and the Women's Research Program at National Taiwan University and has received support from the National Science Council in Taiwan. In India, A Commission on Gender has been established by the National Association of Geographers and some indirect support has come from the Center for the Study of Regional Development at Jawarhalal Nehru University in New Delhi and the Indian Council for Social Science Research.

Women geographers in Asia are also mostly very active professionally and are hard working scholars. Thus they are regarded as important geographers, as feminist geographers and in their own subfields. For example, Professor Nora Chiang, a feminist geographer and a population geographer, is the Chair of the Department of Geography at National Taiwan University, as well as being co-ordinator of the Women's Research Program. She is one of the most active feminist geographers and tries very hard to improve the position of the field. In Korea, most women geographers are interested in feminist geography, but have not yet done research on women in their own subfields¹. Thus feminist geography is not yet established as a separate field. Nonetheless, they are very active professionally and serve professional organizations in a number of capacities, for example, as editorial board members, executive members, as general secretary, and as vice president (Rii, 1992).

National and International Connections

In most Asian countries, research on women has already been, or is becoming a popular subject in other disciplines such as sociology, education, law, history and so on, and many organizations support women's studies. Most scholars involved in such research have connections with foreign scholars. For example, although there is almost no women's studies from a geographical perspective in Korea, there are several research institutes run by women's universities, a professional organization, and the Korean Women's Development Institute supported by the government for doing research on

¹ Women geographers have, however, met twice annually for the last two years to present their research to each other, and they have discussed the feminist literature.

women from other perspectives. Two Korean women geographers (myself and one other) belong to the Geographical Perspectives on Women Specialty Group of the Association of American Geographers, though I am the only feminist geographer to have personal connections with international scholars and also to be a member of the Korean Association of Women's Studies.

Taiwanese scholars have good connections with international scholars through inviting them to give lectures at the university, doing co-researches, and distributing their publications. Japanese geographers also have some connections to international scholars through inviting feminist geographers to give special lectures. Feminist geographers in India actively cooperate in research with other scholars. And feminist geographers in each one of the above countries are full members of the International Geographical Union Commission on Gender and Geography. Further, feminist geographers from other parts of the world have conducted research on women in southeast Asian countries (for example, in Indonesia, Thailand, and Malaysia) and in south Asia (for example, in Nepal, Bangladesh, and Sri Lanka). To improve the status of feminist geography in South Asian countries, feminist geographers should do more local research either themselves or in collaboration with international scholars in geography or other disciplines. This is the only way to help future development of the field in the region.

References

- Chiang, Nora (1989), "Feminist Geography in Taiwan," Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 13 (1), 94-96.
- Chiang, Nora (1993), "Feminist Geography in Taiwan and Hong Kong," in Janet Momsen and Vivian Kinnaird (eds), Different Places, Different Voices: Gender and Development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. London and New York: Routledge.
- Choe, Woun Sik (1986), "A Geographical study of the Distribution of Women's Secondary economic Activities in Korea," Women's Studies Review 3, 58-62.
- Lee, Ki-Suk and Hae Un Rii (1985) "Geography in Korea," The Professional Geographer 37 (3), 344-45.
- Momsen, Janet and Nancy Davis Lewis (1993), "Gender and Geography in Southeast Asia and Oceania: A Regional Overview," in Janet Momsen and Vivian Kinnaird (eds), Different Places, Different Voices: Gender and Development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. London and New York: Routledge.
- Raju, Saraswati and M. Satish (1989), "Geography and Gender: An Overview from India," Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 13 (1), 102-04.
- Raju, Saraswati (1993), "Women and Gender in Geography: An Overview from South Asia," in Janet Momsen and Vivian Kinnaird (eds), Different Places, Different Voices: Gender and Development in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. London and New York: Routledge.
- Rii, Hae Un (1984), "Geographical Approach for Research on Women," Women's Studies Review 1, 92-110.
- Rii, Hae Un (1989), "Feminist Geography in Korea," Journal of Geography in Higher Education, 13 (1), 101-102.
- Rii, Hae Un (1992), "Women Geographers in Korea," paper presented at the Women in International Development Speaker Series, Michigan State University.
- Teo, Peggy and P.P. Wong (1990), "Geography in Singapore," The Professional Geographer, 42 (3), 383-386.

III: Locating British Feminist Geography

Linda McDowell

British feminist thought has, until recently, been a history of a generation of predominantly white, middle-class intellectuals working initially in a socialist feminist framework. From the late 1970s throughout most of the 1980s, there has been an enormous proliferation of feminist intellectual work in Britain ranging across the disciplines whose boundaries it challenges: social theory, history, psychology, culture studies, literature, as well as geography. And, of course, recently all these disciplines have had an increasing influence on geography. (It is an important question why the influence is not yet reciprocal, the given the increasing preponderance of geographic metaphors in the humanities and cultural studies literature. for example.) Influential feminist scholarship has been published since the 1970s in a number of significant journals in Britain--in Feminist Review in particular, but also in History Workshop Journal, Screen, Cultural Studies, and later in New Formations. In geography, feminist papers appeared from an early date in Area, Antipode, and Society and Space, and, after a while in Transactions of the Institute British Geographers. 1994 will see the publication of a multinational specifically geographical feminist journal in English, Gender, Place, and Culture.

The initial feminist work in Britain expressed the concerns and interests of a particular group of predominantly metropolitan-based intellectuals who emerged out of the 1960s Women's Movement and who had benefitted from the opportunities created by the post war expansion of higher education and the foundation of the new universities in the late 1960s with their commitment to interdisciplinary studies and curriculum innovation.

Thus a space opened up in these universities in which feminist scholarship was able to flower, relatively unchallenged. The contribution of scholars at the new universities to the growing stream of feminist-inspired articles and papers was noticeable. Thus key feminist scholars were working at Kent (Clare Ungerson and Mary Evans--the latter awarded the first British chair in Women's Studies in 1963), York (Mary Maynard), Essex (Leonore Davidoff and Mary MacIntosh), and Lancaster (Sylvia Walby). All were in sociology/social policy or history. (Significantly, many of the new universities failed to establish departments of geography). These women were important names in the history of British feminist scholarship, and influenced the first generation of British feminist geographers such as Sophie Bowlby, Jo Foord, Jane Lewis, and Linda McDowell.

There is no need to dwell on the details of the original foci of these feminist scholars, as there are numerous reviews of the early work, whether within or outside geography (Bondi, 1990, 1992; McDowell, 1993a, 1993b; Rose, 1993). The early emphasis on "women's experience" has been replaced by a focus on "gender" and then more latterly on the terms "identity" and "difference." The story of the challenge to the ethnocentricity of the earlier work has also been well-aired (see, for example, issues 20, 22, and 26 of Feminist Studies). Instead, I want to pursue a number of observations about the place of British feminist scholarship at present and in the near future.

As well as scholarship primarily created by a group of intellectuals now in their mid 40s, metropolitan or urban-based, what else is significant about the location of feminist scholarship within the British academy? Most important is its marginality, which has been and continues to be the distinguishing element, to a degree that often surprises US

feminists where academic recognition has been greater. Despite the initial openness of the new universities, there are an extremely small number of posts in British universities dedicated to women's studies. However in Britain (and here I draw on the paper by Jenny Bourne Taylor in Terry Lovell's useful edited collection British Feminist Thought (1990)), the marginality of feminism, its opposition to the mainstream canon, has now become part of its success because in the late 1980s and 1990s, the margins are perceived as the important places to be, the places where it is happening. In a post-colonialist, post-structuralist, but hopefully not post-feminist worlds, the borderlands are on the cutting edge of scholarship. And so, paradoxically, feminists recently have gained considerable influence. This leads me to raise several questions: First, although our marginality now places us centrally in the contemporary changes in geography--in the challenges to the disciplinary subdivisions, for example, the "cultural shift," the emphases on deconstruction, on narrative, on representation, the construction of positional knowledge-- what will this mean for the construction of a specifically feminist scholarship in the academy? Will we be taken over, swallowed up, and remarginalised in the new marginal discourses. I have to confess to considerable anxiety--indeed, to the stronger emotion of anger--at the ways in which post-modern currents of thought have engulfed feminist critiques of the social construction of knowledge. Further, I must confess to the unease I feel when individual white male scholars enhance their reputations through their familiarity with a small number of favored feminist texts. It would be invidious to name these individuals, but several spring to mind.

A second question is about the place of a second generation of feminist scholars in the academy. In Britain there has been some well-deserved success by younger women in their achievement of permanent academic jobs in geography departments. But yet, they remain in the main token women in their departments. It is hard to list departments where there are more than three women with teaching positions--and certainly no more than three or four feminists. Who was it who once said, two's company, three's a plot as far as women colleagues are concerned. So how will feminist scholarship develop in British geography departments? Will we at last see the expansion of specifically feminist options within the undergraduate degree and of gender-based masters and doctoral degrees? I am pessimistic about the outcome in the present climate and somewhat pessimistic about the response to such proposals from students and colleagues alike. In Britain cuts, and the obsession with research rankings does not seem to lead easily to teaching innovations.

A third question is about the nature and preoccupations of feminist geography/geographers. It is quite clear that the intellectual and political climate that led to the emergence of feminist geography two decades ago is quite different now. There is a different agenda, a different set of cultural and political tensions. I mentioned earlier the refocus of feminist theory on to questions of identity and difference which has led, at the very least, to a huge questioning of the purpose of feminism, of the significance of the category of gender, even a denial of the communalities of sisterhood, that has "destabilised theory" to take the title of a recent collection by British feminists Michelle Barret and Anne Phillips (1992)--themselves prime examples of the forty-something

metropolitan feminists who were so influential in what we might term the first wave of second wave feminism.

And should it be, or indeed is it even, these same theorists who ought to be redefining the project? Is it time for the 40-something generation to step aside and leave the project to a new generation of women: indeed, rather than step aside, will we be pushed? These remarks are somewhat tongue in cheek but are also meant to raise a serious questions about the social control of knowledge that perhaps oppositional scholars pay too little attention to (we may be feminists but we are still in jobs and most of us with at least nominal power in the universities are white). More seriously, our project has changed enormously over a decade and a half, in such ways that it is indeed no longer possible to talk about the project, but rather projects. We now recognize that gender identity is never pure but is shaped by, and shapes, class, ethnicity, sexuality, age, and last, but by no means least, geographic location. This recognition has epistemological as well as political implications. It means that it is impossible for a particular positioned group, whether the aforementioned white, metropolitan intellectuals, or any other group of women, to speak as/for woman, to represent all women whether politically or theoretically. The belief in progressive, radical social change based on a coherent identity now ceases to unite women as a group, and, of course our theoretical discourse has become equally fractured, fragmented, and context-dependent.

So, what is the way forward? Should we even try to map out an agenda for feminist geography--in Britain or elsewhere? Is this position paper essentially and inevitably retrospective? Is there a path through the shifting sands of identity and difference? Is it

still an appropriate aim for feminist scholarship to seek one? My hope and belief is that we may continue to find some common ground as feminists, particularly in the political sphere. I am anxious to reassert the significance of the material inequalities of women's lives across the globe, of the necessity for theoretical analyses and political action to redress these inequalities. I suggest that we must continue to hold on to our original notion of progressive social change to improve women's lot, while not denying the local and historical conditions that create the specificity and variations in women's lives and gendered relations of power and inequality. I hesitate to outline an academic agenda--a feminist shopping list of topics--although current political changes reinforce the need to examine the implications for women of the rise of nationalist movements and fundamentalist religious revivals, both of which so often involve "traditional" (for which read oppressive), visions of women's place. A related political change with important implications for women is the breakup of the former socialist bloc and the consequent dismantling of full employment policies and, too often, welfare provisions that diminish women's control over their own bodies. These changes have clear implications for gender-based inequalities.

In the "West," the revival of racism and fascism demand our attention as feminist geographers: the tragic deaths of Turkish women and children in Germany in March, 1993 being but a single example of what nationalist policies may mean in Fortress Europe. Nearer home--for my own research interests at least--questions about economic restructuring and what I've termed elsewhere in the new gender order of post-Fordism (McDowell 1991) seem important to investigate, as do analyses of migration between the

"core" and "peripheral" countries, questions about citizenship rights, housing policy and homelessness, and household coping strategies for the myriad of "Third World" women who must survive in the metropolitan centers of the so-called advanced world.

While this agenda may reveal my own materialist biases, I do not want to ignore the exciting work that is currently being undertaken by a number of geographers, and many other feminists, in attempting to develop psychoanalytic insights into gendered identities and their relationship to place. Indeed, the combination of materialist and psychoanalytic perspectives seems to offer new ways forward and I am attempting to work on this boundary myself. It seems important that feminist geographers should contribute to recent work within feminism, psychoanalysis, and cultural studies, given their interest in questions about globalization and cultural change within localities (Featherstone, 1992). We might add to our more conventional geographic research agenda sets of questions about representation and discourse, about the role of fantasy in the acquisition of feminine identities. As I ponder the recent shifts a slight doubt assails me, one that I never imagined I would give voice to--is it geography? Just where are the boundaries of our discipline? Our remit is wide and widening, are there no limits? In general, a strongly affirmative denial makes me thrilled to call myself by the name of geographer.

Finally, least this reflection seems to uncertain, I want to reaffirm and emphasize the enormous achievement of a mere fifteen years (or so) of feminist scholarship by British geographers. I want to celebrate our current central marginality, to affirm the difference that it has made: certainly to my own life and work, and I know to many other

British geographers who call themselves feminists. Being able to draw on, contribute to, and rely on a network of feminist geographers around the world, who will, with remarkable hospitality and generosity, supply food, drink, accommodation, good talk, and fine company has made an enormous difference to the sense of community that is so vibrant among feminist geographers. We have come a long way in a short time: it is important to remember that the current deconstructive turn would not have been possible without the feminist critiques of conventional notions from the late 1960s onwards. So let us loudly praise ourselves, rather than famous men.

References

- Barratt M. and Phillips, A. (1992), Destabilising Theory. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bondi, L. (1990), "Progress in Geography and Gender: Feminism and Difference," Progress in Human Geography, 14, 438-45.
- Bondi, L. (1992), "Gender and Dichotomy," Progress in Human Geography, 16, 98-104.
- Featherstone, M. (1993), "Global and Local Cultures" in J. Bird, B. Curtis, T. Putnam, G. Robertson and L. Tickner (eds) Mapping the Futures. London: Routledge.
- Lovell, T. (ed.) (1990), British Feminist Thought, Oxford: Blackwell.
- McDowell, L. (1991), "Life Without Father and Ford: The New Gender Order of Post-Fordism," Transactions, Institute of British Geographers, 16, 400-19.
- McDowell, L. (1993a), "Space, Place and Gender Relations, Part I: Feminist Empiricism and the Geography of Social Relations," Progress in Human Geography 17, 157-70.
- McDowell, L. (1993b), "Space, Place and Gender Relations, Part II: Identity, Difference, Feminist Geometries and Geographies," Progress in Human Geography, 17 (forthcoming).
- Rose, G. Feminism and Geography. Cambridge: Polity.

IV. Reflections from the United States

Melissa Gilbert

It is hard to separate feminist geography in the United States, Britain, and Canada from each other because of the cross-fertilization and publication in the same journals. It is evident that feminist geography in the United States has come a long way. It is represented in the major journals and visible at academic meetings. Still, there are only a few places where feminist geography is readily available for graduate study or where there is more than one feminist, let alone more than one woman geographer on the faculty.

Like the Netherlands, the central theme in U.S. feminist geography has related to women and work--to employment, child care, and women's daily activity patterns. These are clearly issues germane to the lives of many U.S. women today. Feminist geography has dealt with the "double day," with the so-called feminization of poverty, with occupational segregation, and with differential wages. But it has not been especially powerful within the public realm. Feminist geographers are not using this information as consultants or publishing in policy-oriented arenas.

The issues of diversity, of difference, postmodernism and poststructuralism have emerged, but they are largely in the realm of theory, and there is not much empirical work. Some has appeared around the life cycle, some on class, but less on race. The challenge is to bring diversity down to ground.

Also notable is the uneven geography of feminist geography within the United States, and the challenges of developing appropriate approaches in differing institutions.

In a south-eastern metropolitan university, for example, where many of the students are mature aged, employed African-American women, it is difficult to develop appropriate ways of taking elite theory about difference into the classroom or to decide on strategies to bring to debates about the place of multiculturalism in departmental or university curricula.