Women's Studies: Are We "Broad" Enough

Victoria Bromley, Ph.D., is an Assistant Professor in the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies at Carleton University. She teaches and researches in the areas of feminist activism, gendered violence, critical identity studies, feminist theory, human security, and transnational feminist issues.

Aalya Ahmad, Ph.D., is a Contract Instructor in the Pauline Jewett Institute of Women's and Gender Studies at Carleton University. She is a well-respected activist and union organizer. She teaches and researches in the areas of feminist activism, popular culture, and international literature.

Abstract
The authors consider the "naming debate" in Women's Studies and the implications of the current tendency to broaden the scope of Women's Studies by including terms such as "gender" or "feminist" in the name. To this debate, they contribute an analysis of how neoliberal ideology attempts to contain Women's Studies within the policies and discourses of the corporatization of universities. This paper calls for renewed connections between feminist academics and social justice and women's movements in order to sustain the transformative politics that have always been part of the feminist project.

Résumé
Les auteurs prennent en considération le «débat sur le nom» en études sur les femmes, ainsi que les implications de la tendance actuelle d'élargir l'envergure des études sur les femmes, en incluant des termes tels que « genre » et «féministe» dans le nom. Ils contribuent à ce débat une analyse sur les essais de l'idéologie néolibérale de contenir les études sur les femmes au sein des politiques, et des discours sur les tentatives de transformer les universités en corporations. Cet article appelle au renouvellement des connexions entre les universitaires féministes et les mouvements de justice sociale et féministes, pour maintenir les politiques transformatives qui ont toujours fait partie du projet féministe.

Women's Studies programs in Canada have long been engaged in a debate over the names by which they should be known. Since the 1970s, when "Women's Studies" emerged as an academic discipline, its naming has been contested (Messer-Davidow 2002; Groag Bell and Schwartz Rosenhan 1981; Salzman-Webb 1972; Sapler 1972). In the 1980s, debates arose around the use of the term "gender" in Women's Studies, resulting over time in changes to departmental and program titles. Gender Equality and Social Justice, for example, replaced Women's Studies at Nipissing University (2001); Simon Fraser University renamed its Women's Studies Department the Department of Gender, Sexuality, and Women's Studies (2009); and Queen's University's has become the Department of Gender Studies (2009). McGill University's Centre for Research and Teaching on Women has been reconstituted under the Institute for Gender, Sexuality and Feminist Studies (2009). Carleton University too has added "gender" to the more than a quarter-century-old Pauline Jewett Institute (2008). These changes are not confined to departments and programs: the Canadian Women's Studies Association became Women's and Gender Studies et Recherches Féministes in 2012.

The concern with renaming departments and programs arises at a time when universities are facing tighter budget constraints and looking for ways to make cuts. In this context, Women's Studies programs have undergone relentless and escalating attacks as Canadian universities move to "trim the fat" in economically tougher times defined by a politics of neoliberalism and corporatism. Our central concern in this paper is to link this political and economic context to the naming debate, even as we support the

broadening of Women's Studies as a field.[1] We are specifically concerned with the depoliticization and dehistoricization of the concept of gender through an overly broad rendition of gender as a catch-all term. As we see it, gender is an analytic concept that challenges and disrupts the binaries of gendered-sexed-raced-classed-aged-abled bodies. Defining gender as a complex social construction opens up a discursive space to examine both the normative and transformative practices of power, bringing renewed vigour, value, and inclusivity to feminist work. In this sense, many scholars in Women's Studies were already "doing gender"; including "gender" in department or program names formally recognizes this work. As such, we aim here to reclaim the broad scope of the discipline by reframing the naming debate.

Adding gender is necessary to amend the overwhelming (and not necessarily accurate) perception that Women's Studies programs are overly narrow in scope and that Women's Studies is solely about women. But we caution here that Gender Studies, as a replacement for a "not-broad-enough" Women's Studies, may undermine women's political power and women's movements, subsume feminist scholarship, erase women, obscure women's heterogeneous histories, and bolster the neoliberal agenda in constructing a "marketable" degree. In this sense, Gender Studies becomes a less threatening, more "disciplined" discipline, which then replaces the "undisciplined" discipline of Women's Studies.

The idea that Women's Studies is a narrow field unworthy of disciplinary status has plagued the work of feminists who struggled to establish it as the academic arm of the women's movement in the 1970s (Robbins et al. 2008, Messer-Davidow 2002). According to Guy-Sheftall and Heath (1995), the objectives of Women's Studies can be generally described as deconstructing patriarchy, reconstructing knowledge to include feminist theories, and engaging in social change that empowers marginalized people (17). Patriarchy here must also be understood as inextricably entwined with capitalism, white supremacy, heterosexism, and imperialism. This ambitious project is obviously far from narrow and has always included a particular understanding of "gender" as a social construction. "Gender" thus functions as a modifier, not some stand-alone notion, broadening understandings and challenging the power relationships that characterize gendered-sexed-raced-classed-aged-abled bodies. Moreover, the politics of these transformations inform and are informed by women's and social justice movements beyond the academy. The link between academe and women's movements has thus been central to many Women's Studies programs (Messer-Davidow 2002, 87). Moreover, critical questions about the "subject" of study, how to "know," who speaks, from which positions of knowledge and authority, and for what purpose, all create strong connections between the discipline and broader economic and socio-political changes.

Programs dedicated to the development of such critical thinking are experiencing an unprecedented assault from the mainstream media, occurring via a variety of both "traditional" and new media technologies. This assault further legitimizes anti-feminist academic enterprises. For instance, Susan Cole (2010) observes that January 2010 was a bleak month for Women's Studies, women's movements, and feminism in Canada. In this month, the *National Post,* the *Toronto Star*, and CBC Radio's *The Current* all participated in the attack, featuring anti-feminists as objective evaluators of the state of Women's Studies scholarship, without bothering to consult any Women's Studies scholars. In this broader political context, "What's in a name?" becomes more clearly linked to the very existence of Women's Studies programs and the literal, figurative, and symbolic containment of feminisms. So, then, why add gender to the mix and why now?

Emerging out of second-wave feminism, the establishment of Women's Studies programs in universities was widely acknowledged as one of the major triumphs of women's movements, linked to the broader struggle for women's equality (Rupp 2006, 59). Women's movements helped feminist academics to uncover "patriarchal biases in scholarship, to create new concepts and approaches, and to suggest alternative ways

forward for change" (Christiansen-Ruffman 2008, 114). Women's Studies, therefore, has involved a politics of naming women, listening to women, and hearing women's voices. However, this politics also included and continues to include counter-hegemonic challenges by women of colour, feminists from the Global South, indigenous women, disability, queer, and trans activists, and scholars and students who have strongly critiqued the erasures of difference, the exclusions and the complicity with imperialism, the ableism and heteronormativity that underlie simplistic or monolithic denunciations of patriarchy. It has been well documented that such voices were largely absent in university curricula, regardless of the discipline, prior to the push to establish Women's Studies programs (Robbins et al. 2008; Messer-Davidow 2002; Groag Bell and Schwartz Rosenhan 1981; Salzman-Webb 1972; Sapler 1972). Another goal of this transformative politics was to establish a feminist community that opened up possibilities for collectivity, collegiality, and collaboration. In contrast to the myth of the lone (privileged male) scholar, Women's Studies cultivated the potential for more feminist activism within the academy and the possibility for activism through and with social justice movements. Feminist scholarship within Women's Studies, therefore, has both defined and produced empowered subjects and networks of/for feminists. These empowered voices represented a significant change from the isolation often experienced by feminist academics confined within traditional disciplinary boundaries.

By assembling feminist academics at the centre of a critical and self-conscious discipline, Women's Studies created a space to hone intersectional analyses and interdisciplinary work. Intersectionality, now a core analytical framework in Women's Studies, is too often understood only in contemporary terms as a recently accepted/acceptable practice. As Wendy Kolmar (2012) points out, this "presentism" or intersectionality's "already" status tends to obscure the historical practices and struggles of black, Latina, and indigenous women's activism and writings, and their theorizing about the interdependence, interconnections, and multiple sites of oppression that constitute the very premises of intersectionality (May 2012; Guy-Sheftall and Heath 1995). Women's Studies also both revealed and commemorated the struggles, successes, and challenges of feminism, rather than allowing feminist achievements, such as access to reproductive choice, to be complacently accepted as already existing, "natural" realities. In so doing, a very real link was—and is—maintained between social justice movements and feminist scholarship. Women's Studies scholarship, with its feminist focus on intersectionality, not only exposes the underlying realities of systemic discrimination, but works to transform those realities.

When Women's Studies emerged in academia in the 1970s, feminist theory and praxis became firmly rooted in women's lived experiences and material conditions. Along with the linking of the personal and the political, gender was adapted as a useful concept to explore the nature/nurture debate whereby sex came to be understood as biological and gender was used to explain the social. In the 1980s, "gender" and "sex" became increasingly interchangeable, so that the established division between the two began to blur, particularly in American scholarship, as Christiansen-Ruffman (2008) points out. For Christiansen-Ruffman, the concept of sex roles is preferable in that it retains a sense of the real world where sex roles are embodied and enacted. For feminists and the discipline of Women's Studies, then, the "task was recognizing, naming and creating conceptually autonomous spaces for diverse women …to act for effective change" (Christiansen-Ruffman 2008, 120). Hence, the "concept of sex roles was being used by women academics as a bridge to the women's movement" (Christiansen-Ruffman 2008, 118) rather than elaborating an abstract theoretical understanding of gender that might not register in feminism as an everyday practice. During the 1980s and 1990s, Canadian Women's Studies research by, for, about, and with women continued to use "gender" interchangeably with "women," but this interchangeability denoted the feminist politics of transformation of the real world; gender had yet to enter into the naming debate for academic programs.

Another concept of gender also emerged outside Women's Studies in the 1980s meaning both more and less than women and the social characteristics of their sexed bodies (i.e., sexuality, paid and unpaid labour, reproduction). As a response to feminist challenges and as a token of inclusivity, governments, in Canada and elsewhere, adopted "gender" as a category in surveys, in data collection, and on official forms. Thus, the concept of gender as it has developed outside Women's Studies and feminist scholarship has been strategically deployed to placate and appease authorities and decision-makers, becoming depoliticized and dehistoricized in the process.

What did this mean for Women's Studies? The subversive feminist intent in using "gender" as a political and analytic tool can fall into Kolmar's "presentist" trap and can therefore be too easily erased in the shift from "woman" to "gender" in, for example, public policy and international development. For instance, in international development discourse, a transition occurred from WID to WAD to GAD—Women in Development to Women and Development to Gender and Development. These policies, while well-intentioned, created the faulty perception that women were at the centre of issues in development (Sen 1987; Moghadam 1990), without concomitant transformation of the existing international financial structures and organizations. Gender, in this context, becomes a gesture intended to signify progress from the past practices of "adding women and stirring." Such tokenism, we contend, depoliticizes women's lived experiences of poverty, limited access to health care, and suffering under the export-oriented production policies and structural adjustment programs forwarded by the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. As the current status of women globally illustrates, urgent transformations are needed.

Following the "lost decade" of international development in the 1980s, renewed interest in funding for development ensued and, with it, a new focus on gender mainstreaming. Gender mainstreaming—the inclusion of gender analysis in every public policy decision—became the catchword not only in international development discourse targeting the Global South, but also on the policy agendas in the Global North, creating a whole new career path for "gender professionals." Rather than a visionary feminist politics of transformation, however, gender mainstreaming runs the risk of diffusing the revolutionary power of feminism through a politics of tinkering with the status quo. Equality in the context of gender mainstreaming is based on the idea that the presence of a gender component in policy constitutes a "magic" pill that will bring about equality, reinforcing the idea that women want to be the same as men and that women and men are undifferentiated or constitute the only categories of analysis. These notions stand in stark contrast to equity policy initiatives that seek to redress historical and systemic power imbalances (Jhappan 2002). Under gender mainstreaming, women remain in the policy picture as objects of equality, but not as knowing subjects actively seeking equity. Gender, therefore, as a substitute for "women" tends to obscure complicated issues of power, identity, and knowledge.

The appropriation of feminist concern for women in the Global South by global financial capital, repackaged as a desire to rescue "those poor women over there," allows gender mainstreaming to invade domestic policy agendas and can lead to accusations that women are themselves complicit in paternalistic and exclusionary practices. For example, the neoliberal Harper Conservative government proclaimed women equal in 2006, slashing funding to Status of Women Canada, while simultaneously waging war against Afghanistan, and invoking feminist concerns by using the status of women "over there" as justification for war. One of the excuses given for cutting funding to Status of Women Canada by then Minister Bev Oda was that gender ought to be integrated into every government department. This example shows that the effectiveness of gender mainstreaming depends on who defines the term. Gender mainstreaming thus can be used to create and foster the myth that everybody is "doing it" and everybody cares about women's equality. Feminists should therefore be pacified by the inclusion of gender and, in

the words of Conservative Senator Nancy Ruth, "Shut the fuck up" (Roman 2010). These examples show us how gender can be used to divide, dehistoricize, and depoliticize women's struggles.

The problems with gender mainstreaming we have just discussed can be compared to the ongoing debate over whether feminist scholarship should be an autonomous discipline in the academy or whether it is best integrated as a specialization within male-dominated disciplines such as History, Literature, or Political Science. Jill Vickers' argument for Women's Studies as an autonomous discipline cites the frequent marginalization of feminist scholarship within the aforementioned disciplines (2008). Concern about the marginalization of Women's Studies as a stand-alone discipline must be weighed against the replacement of Women's Studies with "women and…[insert discipline/issue/subject]" that commonly occurs in the mainstreaming process. Since feminist scholarship does not necessarily equal women, the formulation "women and…" is not necessarily feminist and risks depoliticization. At the same time, the existence of a "women and…" component serves to weaken the case for an autonomous Women's Studies, diverting feminist scholarship away from the work of systemic and collective change. This is done not only in the very real sense that funding and resources are allocated elsewhere, but also in the media attacks cited above on Women's Studies as hopelessly *passé*. Following the logic of neoliberalism, which is engaged in restructuring publicly funded universities into corporate enterprises, women no longer require the discipline of Women's Studies. The integration of "women and…" reinforces the power of disciplines to discipline unruly feminists, which complies with the neoliberal agenda of corporate universities.

Like many of our sister programs in the United States (Slagter and Forbes 2009), Women's Studies programs in Canada are under intense scrutiny. Our value, contribution, and productivity are increasingly measured by enrolments, the popularity of our classes, and the number of majors and minors we can claim. This micromanagement that is solely in the interests of "the bottom line," in turn, affects research, curriculum development, and academic direction. The business model that increasingly governs our education systems demands particular tangible and measurable results that do not necessarily align with the demonstrable benefits of a feminist politics of social transformation. The feminist politics of Women's Studies within the academy, and its historically transformative agenda and connection to women's movements, is therefore in jeopardy.

Indeed, Women's Studies programs are among the leanest and smallest of university units, taking up little space and consuming only a few per cent of most university budgets. It seems that this has always been the case. As contributors to an anthology on the emergence of Women's Studies in Canada note, much of the initial labour in developing programs and teaching courses was voluntary (Robbins et al. 2008). It is absurd that universities would focus on these programs as places to cut; yet, this is exactly what is happening. In the wake of the University of Guelph axing its Women's Studies program in 2008, most Women's/Gender/Sexuality/Feminist programs in Canada are feeling an increased level of vulnerability. Across the US and the UK, feminist scholars have noted the ambiguous position of Women's Studies in the academy, being both on the "cutting edge" of subversive theory and praxis and on the "cutting edge" of university budgets (Davey and Schippers 2002). The realities of chronic underfunding of feminist research and the under-resourcing of Women's Studies programs in Canada are evident (Campbell and Patterson 2007). The ongoing controversies over the absence of women in the awarding of Canada Research Chairs again raises the issue of the marginalization of feminist scholarship (Side and Robbins 2007).[2] Women's Studies is not the only discipline to face such attacks. Humanities programs—notably Comparative Literature—have faced similar pressures. These liberal arts programs share with Women's Studies a commitment to critical, counter-hegemonic thought and education.[3]

In Canada, the corporatization of the university began in the 1980s with the transi-

tion from public funding for higher education toward "shifting university resources to meet commercial ends and moving government funding to matched-funding targeted at specific research programs" (Reimer 2004, 119). This corporate restructuring of universities is defined by Chandra Mohanty (2003) as the combination of "a market ideology with a set of material practices drawn from the world of business" (171). Many universities have followed this market-driven agenda by restructuring their faculties, cutting programs, and courting private-sector partnerships. Research shows the incursion of market-driven discourses into the voices of students entering Women's Studies and other Humanities and Social Sciences programs, who express concern about the lack of legitimacy and value of their degrees (Hughes 2005; Webber 2005). The consequences for higher education are grim. Professors become mere service providers and revenue producers. Students are constructed as consumers who are no longer expected to value knowledge for knowledge's sake, but rather seek only knowledge that can be applied to their individual employment possibilities in the "new" economy.[4]

Indeed, one of the most important events in many Humanities and Social Sciences departments is the annual "What to do with a ____ degree?" panels, workshops, and job fairs. Under the strictures of neoliberalism, many of us now work closely with career services programs to make visible the many post-graduation possibilities for Women's Studies students. While many students remain committed to transformative politics, they are constantly bombarded by propaganda and assumptions about marketability that are rooted in neoliberal ideologies. While the tired old slurs about man-hating feminists are ridiculous, they continue to resonate among students, reflecting the deep fear of the transformative politics that feminism offers (Webber 2005). Indeed, the fraught, contested aspects of women's movements are often deleted from Women's Studies curricula (Kolmar 2012); this enhances the contemporary marketability of programs, but erases valuable histories and struggles in the process. The obsession with marketability can result in narrowing the scope of knowledge production even as it implies that Women's Studies programs are risky places in which to invest.

The Corporate U curriculum emphasizes "marketable skills" rather than critical thinking, using business-speak such as "the new economy," "accountability," "innovation," "efficiency," "benchmarking," "standardized measures," "performance indicators," and "deliverables." For consumer-students, "Corporate U" is all about the marketability of course materials, the factory model of education where knowledge is transferred from provider to client, and the question of "what to do with" (how to profit financially from) their degrees. For service-provider-professors, "Corporate U" is all about producing workers who will do more for less, resulting in fewer tenured faculty positions. While public education has ostensibly always existed to create a malleable working class with greater knowledge and skills (Salzman-Webb 1972, 70), this process has intensified under the "Corporate U" model. Project funding and research agendas are directly tied to consumption, markets, and perceived values. Neoliberalism conditions both students and professors to accept this environment and to regard it as natural and normal.

Jennie Hornosty (2004) warns that, "the primary danger of corporatization is the subtle intrusion of a corporate ideology, which works to redefine the university's priorities" (48), where "disciplines that further corporate interests…are granted more faculty positions and given larger amounts of the university's operating budget" (52). No longer is the production and dissemination of knowledge open to exploring unknown possibilities. When research and knowledge are reconfigured as marketable commodities, the question becomes: What corporate/ market value does the discipline of Women's Studies possess? According to Hornosty, "students who are concerned only with getting practical, skill-related courses to enhance their job opportunities will have little or no interest in Women's Studies or feminist scholarship" (51). "What to do with a Women's Studies degree?" becomes "How can *you* 'market' your Women's Studies degree?" Obviously,

the answer will not be "Transform the system!"

We have argued elsewhere that neoliberalism constructs a marketable type of professional feminism that is reformist rather than revolutionary (Bromley and Ahmad 2006). Professional feminists can be critical, but not too critical so as to not jeopardize their privileged, precarious positions within hegemonic power structures. Limited in number, starved for funding, and huddled defensively in think tanks, NGOs, and other institutions, professional feminists are forced to constantly justify their existence and render their arguments palatable to neoliberal forces. As we further argued, their lack of support among the broader populace is exacerbated by the inaccessibility of the knowledge they produce. They are susceptible to the popular myth that further change is unnecessary or, worse, that (some) women's movements have gone too far. The broader political territory of women's activism is then taken over by anti-feminists, post-feminists, and "backlash" agents who distort and silence feminist voices.

In "Corporate U," the professionalization of feminism, even as a strategic response, forces a break between activism and many academic feminists. "It is no longer possible to assume a direct relationship between academic women's studies and grassroots feminist activism or to assume agreement on what kinds of activism are best suited to feminist pursuits" (Campbell and Patterson 2007, 129). Indeed, the historic and constant struggle to retain a foothold as a feminist activist in the academy continues, while faculty workload, combined with lack of institutional support for the work of directing and administrating programs, already places an enormous strain upon feminist academics. Moreover, for those of us who do engage in activism, participating in women's movements or community development is not rewarded and may even be punished. There is no recognition for such work in most tenure formulas or criteria for promotion where "what is needed for promotion is an academic record uninterrupted by activism or creative program development" (Campbell and Patterson 2007, 127). Coupled with the expectation that faculty will garner research funding from private/corporate sources opposed to transformative feminism, feminist scholars are forced to consider revising their research agendas to placate institutional agendas. The neoliberalism of "Corporate U" therefore polices, controls, and contains feminist scholars and their knowledge production.[5] Thus, Women's Studies scholarship gets set up to fail. It is too radical for the conservatives, too threatening for the neoliberals, and not allowed to be radical or inspiring enough to ensure real social change.

Gender, as we have seen, can be used as a way to talk about feminism that is not overly threatening and does not antagonize decision makers in the sense that the word can be adopted as a replacement term for women, once emptied of historical and political context. When such a dehistoricized and depoliticized concept of "gender" is preferred over "woman," thereby claiming "objectivity and neutrality," gender becomes both ambiguous and insidious, meaning everything and nothing. It is thus used against women in political ways, as Christiansen-Ruffman (2008) points out. It undermines women-centred political work, makes the power imbalances between men and women invisible, and normalizes "patricentrism, the culture and stand-point of men" (124). A feminist analysis, on the other hand, encompasses a subversive concept of gender that envisions the need to engage in transformational politics.

While the analysis of gender has long been integral to feminist scholarship, placing gender front-and-centre should not put Women's Studies in the back seat. The move to eliminate the term "women" altogether from program titles, course codes, descriptions, and academic discourse fails to recognize the feminist politics of placing women at the centre. As Christiansen-Ruffman (2008) asks, how could anyone "become inspired by a 'gender movement?'" (123). If we abandon the women in Women's Studies, we are left with a non-threatening "disciplined and commodified" discipline. To the question of what to do with a Women's Studies degree, the answer becomes take a Gender Studies degree, where the corporate *you* can find

employment drafting gender mainstreaming policy in a think tank.

In considering the name changes of Canadian programs, it might be argued that replacing "women" with "gender" could both broaden and balance Women's Studies. This implies that Women's Studies has a narrow focus, whereas Gender Studies is seen as more inclusive, bringing men and masculinities under the rubric of feminist scholarship. As we defined the concept earlier, "gender" functions best as a modifier, challenging the power relationships that characterize gendered-sexed-raced-classed-aged-abled bodies. Masculinities scholars such as Jeff Hearn and Michael Kimmel (2006) agree with this concept of gender, insisting "Women's Studies made both women and gender visible" (54). For these scholars, the gendering of men intersects with "racial, ethnic, class, occupational, national, global, and other socially constructed and defined statuses" (Hearn and Kimmel 2006, 58). Subversive concepts of gender can therefore indeed be transformative, and the institutionalization of Gender Studies may be a positive development in that gender can be more inclusive of feminist men who bring new insights to feminist scholarship. When paired with Women's Studies, Gender Studies concretizes existing intersectional and interdisciplinary analyses. It calls for more—more on masculinity, more on sexuality, and more on transgenders, to name but a few possibilities. As such, Gender Studies can stand in solidarity with, not in competition with, Women's Studies. And thus, we call for a politics of sharing rather than displacing, thereby retaining the historical-political context of the field by retaining "women" in program names, rather than simply assuming that gender can be uncoupled from the feminist scholarship that has defined Women's Studies. Gender Studies as a stand-alone concept should not be uncritically allowed to mask and trivialize ongoing systemic discrimination against women. What is needed to keep Women's Studies relevant is acknowledgement of and support for the broad scope that has historically characterized the discipline, with its ongoing links to activism.

The danger of uncritically adopting Gender Studies as "the new Women's Studies" is the risk of depoliticization within "Corporate U." This would entail the abandonment of the transformative politics that has historically wed Women's Studies to social movements. Some scholars contend that Gender Studies merely builds on existing research and theory. But assertions that "gender studies, more so than women's studies, has focused on the way the organization and structure of society itself and its cultural and knowledge productions are gendered" (Davis et al. 2006, 2) are not only false, but erase centuries of women's struggle and theorizing. As such, Gender Studies depoliticizes and dehistoricizes feminist work. The attempt to stake out a new, broader area of study is understandable in the context of "Corporate U." However, such projects should not be undertaken at the expense of Women's Studies. Indeed, Gender Studies as defined above is well-trodden territory for Women's Studies scholars. Critical analysis of the relations of power, masculinity, patriarchy, sexuality, and gender remain central to feminist Women's Studies frameworks.

In the debate over gender *in* Women's Studies, Gender *or* Women's Studies, or Women's *and* Gender Studies, we side with the third option. By coupling the two, the politics of transformation becomes visible. After (re)naming the discipline, however, the problem becomes one of ensuring that Women's and Gender Studies retains its activist focus under neoliberal academic restructuring. How can feminist theory and praxis be embedded in our practicums? As Ann Braithwaite (2004) suggests, the discipline must remain "open-ended, complicated, situated, and always changing" (136).

In conclusion, we suggest that practitioners in Women's and Gender Studies must reclaim responsibility for broadening their outreach to women's movements and social justice groups. This cannot be accomplished from behind "Corporate U"'s desks or classrooms. We must both embody and share our knowledge. As such, the debate over naming the discipline should never overshadow the importance of what we do. Such a debate reminds us, however, that it is always about

power—Who has it? Who wants it? Who doesn't have it? And what will you do with it if you get it? By maintaining a focus on interdisciplinary projects, critical self-reflection, and feminist praxis, Women's and Gender Studies still retains possibilities for transformative action. It also encourages broader participation in feminist work. In being clear about what is good about Gender Studies, we are better prepared to fight neoliberal ideologies that dominate academia today.

Endnotes

1. We would like to thank the reviewers and editors for their insightful comments.

2. As noted by Slagter and Forbes (2009), in the United States, the less tangible contributions that Women's Studies scholars make to the creation of a feminist academic collective, to the intellectual climate and function of the university, and to our students' lives tend to go unacknowledged and unrewarded.

3. As Michael Apple (2005) notes in his analysis of neoliberal education reforms in the UK and the US, democracy is threatened by the shift from the production of collective knowledge to a consumer-driven production of individualized and marketable knowledge for clients.

4. In this climate, it is not surprising that the management of the University of Windsor attempted to establish a private partnership for program delivery. The Study Group multinational corporation proposed (unsuccessfully) to challenge public funding as the core of higher education in Canada by setting up a private, for-profit education college on the University of Windsor campus (CAUT 2010). Other Canadian universities are considering partnerships with another corporation, Navitas, to contract out teaching language courses, university preparation courses, and other academic work. Labour issues arise related to women's relegation to lower-paid and precarious contract work.

5. This knowledge is routinely trivialized, devalued, and dismissed. Campbell and Patterson (2007) write about a hostile environment where students are mocked for taking "easy" Women's Studies courses and where self-censorship is routinely practised.

References

Apple, M. "Education, Markets, and Audit Culture," *Critical Quarterly.* 47.1/2 (2005): 11–29.

Braithwaite, A. "'Where We've Been' and 'Where We're Going': Reflecting on Reflections of Women's Studies and 'The Women's Movement,'" *Troubling Women's Studies: Pasts, Presents and Possibilities,* A. Braithwaite, S. Heald, and S. Luhmann, eds. Toronto: Sumach Press. 2004. pp. 91–146.

Bromley, V. and A. Ahmad. "Wa(i)ving Solidarity: Feminist Activists Confronting Backlash," *Canadian Woman Studies.* 25.3/4 (2006): 61–72.

Campbell, L. and N. Patterson. "'FOR IMPROPER OBJECTS': Thinking about the Past, Present, and Future of Women's Studies," *BC Studies.* 154 (2007): 121–130.

Canadian Association of University Teachers. "Windsor: Private for-Profit Plan Withdrawn," *CAUT Bulletin.* 4 (2010).

Christiansen-Ruffman, L. "Women, Knowledge and Change: Gender Is Not Enough," *Resources for Feminist Research.* 32.1/2 (2008): 114–138.

Cole, S. "Women's Studies Under Attack," *Herizons.* 23.4 (2010): 15.

Davey, C. and B. Schippers. "Women's Studies: The Cut(ting) edge of Contemporary Critical Theory and Practice?" *International Feminist Journal of Politics.* 4.2 (2002): 278–283.

Davis, K., M. Evans and J. Lorber. "Introduction," *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies.* London: Sage Publications, 2006, pp. 1–10.

Groag Bell, S. and M. Schwartz Rosenhan. "A Problem in Naming: Women Studies-

Women's Studies?" *Signs.* 6.3 (1981): 540–542.

Guy-Sheftall, B. and S. Heath. W*omen's Studies: A Retrospective.* New York: Ford Foundation, 1995.

Hearn, J. and M. Kimmel. "Changing Studies on Men and Masculinity," *Handbook of Gender and Women's Studies,* K. Davis, M. Evans, and J. Lorber, eds. London: Sage Publications, 2006, pp. 53–70.

Hornosty, J. "Corporate Challenges to Academic Freedom and Gender Equity," *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out,* M. Reimer, ed. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2004, pp. 43–46.

Hughes, K. "'I've Been Pondering Whether You Can Be a Part-feminist': Young Australian Women's Studies Students Discuss Gender," *Women's Studies International Forum.* 28.1 (2005): 37–50.

Jhappan, R. "The Equality Pit or the Rehabilitation of Justice?" *Women's Legal Strategies in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002, pp. 175–236.

Kolmar, W. "History," *Rethinking Women's and Gender Studies*, C. Orr, A. Braithwaite, and D. Lichtenstein, eds. New York: Routledge, 2012, pp. 225–239.

May, V. M. "Intersectionality," *Rethinking Women's and Gender Studies*, C. Orr, A. Braithwaite, and D. Lichtenstein, eds. New York: Routledge, 2012, pp. 155–172.

Messer-Davidow, E. *Disciplining Feminism.* London: Duke University Press, 2002.

Moghadam, V. *Gender, Development, and Policy: Toward Equity and Empowerment.* WIDER: World Institute for Development Economics Research of the United Nations University, 1990.

Mohanty, C. *Feminism Without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity.* London: Duke University Press, 2003.

Reimer, M. "Will Women's Studies Programs Survive the Corporate University?" *Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out,* M. Reimer, ed. Toronto: Sumach Press, 2004, pp. 118–137.

Robbins, W., M. Luxton, M. Eichler, and F. Descarries, eds. *Minds of Our Own: Inventing Feminist Scholarship and Women's Studies in Canada and Quebec, 1966–76*. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008.

Roman, K. "Tory Senator to Women's Groups." Retrieved May 15, 2010, from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2010/05/03/abortion-maternal.html>

Rupp, L. "When Women's Studies Aren't about Women: Writing about Drag Queens," *Exploring Women's Studies: Looking Forward, Looking Back,* C. Berkin, J. Pinch and C. Appel, eds. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2006, pp. 57–67.

Salzman-Webb, M. "Feminist Studies: Frill Or Necessity?" *Female Studies.* V (1972): 64–76.

Sapler, R. "Women's Studies," *Female Studies.* V (1972): 100–105.

Sen, G. *Development, Crises, and Alternative Visions: Third World Women's Perspectives*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1987.

Side, K. and W. Robbins. "Institutionalizing Inequalities in Canadian Universities: The Canada Research Chairs Program," *NWSA Journal.* 19. 3 (2007): 163–181.

Slagter, J. and K. Forbes. "With/In the Academy: Sexual Harassment Policy, Bureaucratic Audit Culture, and Women's Studies," *NWSA Journal.* 21.2 (2009): 144–170.

Tremonti, A. CBC Radio One. *The Current*. <http://www.cbc.ca/thecurrent/2010/01/january-12-2010.html>

Vickers, J. "Surviving Political Science…and Loving It," *Minds of Our Own: Inventing Feminist Scholarship and Women's Studies*

in Canada and Quebec, 1966–76, W. Robbins, M. Luxton, M. Eichler, and F. Descarries, eds. Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2008, pp. 217–225.

Webber, M. "'Don't Be So Feminist': Exploring Student Resistance to Feminist Approaches in a Canadian University," *Women's Studies International Forum.* 28.2/3 (2005): 181–196.