

logocentric coherency you seek. I can only say that reality is more uneven and its (mis)representations more untrustworthy than we have time here to explore'. Any more questions? No, then pass the cheese and crackers.

---

---

## Response: On Postmodernism

PATRICK DUREL \*

Professor Katz's article on 'How to speak and write postmodernism' cleverly stigmatises one of the perceived particularities of postmodern discourse: its ability to write and speak in a somewhat foreign language. But after all, every social group tends to develop its own style and mannerisms—rap artists talk the talk and walk the walk, so do surfers and cybernauts—so I guess postmodern academic dudes might as well do the same ... in their own postmodern ways.

If Usbek, one of Montesquieu's characters in *Les Lettres Persanes*, were to be reincarnated as an observer of the contemporary intelligentsia scene, he would certainly be fascinated by the whole debate over postmodernism which has agitated our little academic world and cultural markets for the past twenty years. This modern outsider would no doubt be able to observe in the salons and in print, the linguistic gulf that Stephen Katz talks about. A gulf which, as anyone can observe, separates 'postmodern native speakers' on the one side from those who do not speak the 'language' and have no intention ever to get acquainted with it on the other. However, my feeling is that this modern Persian would not fail to imagine that the different languages and the inherent difficulties in communicating across the two linguistic communities also reflect a difference in culture.

\* *Patrick Durel teaches French Studies at the University of Sydney.*

The way postmodern speakers and speakers of the other language (those who don't understand the postmodern idiom) talk about and relate to each other, would remind Usbek of some of his fellow citizens' attitude to Greeks and other cultures on the Western side of the Mediterranean. Of course, these fellow Persians, while mocking the style and garb of their Western counterparts and rejecting outright the trans-Mediterranean culture, conveniently failed to remember the benefits *translatio studii* brought to their culture around the sixth century when explorers started to bring back more and more manuscripts from Syria, Egypt and Greece.

Usbek, after spending quite sometime attending seminars, flipping through our most respected journals, and browsing through the shelves of our most avant-garde bookshops, would not be able to miss the fact that in our cultural market many a publication—implicitly or otherwise—refers to postmodernism. While some apply the postmodern paradigm to new areas of investigation, others reject it as a bastion of obscure and fashionable conceptual acrobatics, while here and there (a more recent tendency) some try to put evaluation back on the agenda, assessing where their own (post)disciplines or values now stand. While getting better acquainted with our academic world, Usbek would not fail to realise that some of our most distinguished *lectores* spend a lot of energy defending what they commonly refer to as a 'humanist culture', a culture which, as far as our Persian would be able to work out, appears to be built around a notion of modernity and which has the tendency to claim its legitimacy in a form of ethnocentric dialectic of Enlightenment revolving around the question of the subject and a particular regime of truth and knowledge. On the other hand, Usbek would probably notice that other distinguished *lectores* have pledged allegiance to an 'anti-humanist' culture, and set themselves to pull apart every concept and notion of the 'humanist culture', debunking its most revered texts and figures, pinpointing its failures and generally indicting assumptions about truth and knowledge with a kind of jubilant nihilism while thundering along against all Western values they can lay their hands on.

At this point I would like to imagine that Mirza or Roxane, some of Usbek's penpals back in Ispahan's harem (excuse the lack of political correctness), would grow quite interested in the the tussle and bustle of the academic and cultural Western seraglio. Surely, they would not have failed by now to establish a parallel between some of the philosophico-academic melodramas reported by Usbek and some of the power struggles which constituted their daily routine. In fact, like our Persian friends, couldn't we try to see whether these epic battles fought over postmodernism also reflect some kind of struggle in our self-proclaimed civilised field of academia? Hence, the proposed vision of academia is one of a sphere of power, a site of struggle where people fight over who has a legitimate mandate to tell the truth about our world, in whichever language they may see fit. After all, isn't language more than a means of communication? Isn't it also a medium of power through which people, as social agents, assert their statutory ability?

Although I have no intention to present, in these few pages, a full-fledged analysis of linguistic exchanges and symbolic power in academia, I would like to offer some remarks that may contribute to viewing the whole issue of postmodernism from a somewhat different angle. In fact, I find it difficult not to be amazed at the intensity of the debate over postmodernism and the tack it has occasionally taken and I am sure that an outside observer of our intellectual life like Usbek couldn't help but wonder at the way the academic world has repeatedly been polarised around the issue for the past twenty years or so.

Firstly, it seems that when one looks at postmodernism from a somewhat ethnological point of view, one cannot help but notice that a kind of postmodern microcosm has developed throughout the years, finding anchors in some departments, manifesting itself in journals and conferences, leading to the emergence of new domains of inquiry and ultimately provoking, in some disciplines, forms of rethinking about what constitutes their subject and what they are meant to offer as teaching programmes. However, in

order to build a serious argument, one would need to analyse how this microcosm came about and developed. One would also need to examine its various manifestations and how these are articulated across academic worlds. In fact, I suspect that in order to understand this phenomenon, it is necessary to look at the interactions between centres of postmodernity and their respective agents, such as the connections between the European spheres and the Northern American and Australian ones, as well as the movements of their respective figures. Analysing the logic behind such peregrinations by looking at the structure of the various academic fields concerned and their relation to the evolution of the market of cultural production, would no doubt help us to understand some of the stakes behind the debate and cast some light on the reasons why some French thinkers (e.g. Foucault, Lacan, Lyotard, Baudrillard, Deleuze, Derrida) have found such a particular resonance across the Atlantic and 'Down Under'. Regarding these transatlantic movements I have also always had the feeling that the traffic was mainly from Paris to a number of Ivy League universities in the U.S.A. and that very little was happening in terms of reciprocity. However, I might be mistaken and serious data collection would need to be done.

Secondly, in relation to the development of a postmodern microcosm across continents, we should also look at some of the paradigmatic turbulence which has rocked some disciplines, in the Humanities in particular, to the point of implosion. In French Studies, for instance, what Colin Nettelbeck refers to as the supersession of literature as the main medium of cultural expression,<sup>1</sup> has been accompanied by the emergence of a broader range of areas of inquiry which has started to challenge dominant practices and their domination of the curriculum. As a consequence, people in the discipline have started to ask themselves what it means to teach 'French'; a reflective process which has seen diverse answers from diverse agents in this disciplinary field, according to their position within the field.

Witnesses to this reflecting mood where agents speak from

their own position in the field and according to their own dispositions, are for instance the successive Sonia Marks Memorial Lectures organised by the Department of French Studies at the University of Sydney, where Ross Chambers (1992), Ivan Bako (1993) and Anne Freadman (1994),<sup>2</sup> presented their own views about what constitutes their discipline and the direction it should take. Symptomatic of the same process and offering further reflections on the current state of French Studies, the direction it should take and the place it should hold, at least in Australia, in a rapidly evolving higher education market is the recent volume edited by Philippe Lane and John West-Sooby appropriately entitled *Traditions and Mutations in French Studies—the Australian Scene*.<sup>3</sup> However, one might argue that while it is clear that postmodernism has had a significant impact on French Studies in the United States, it has not really caught on in Australia apart from a few individual exceptions, a significant number of them located at the University of Queensland. In this regard, Ivan Bako<sup>4</sup> remarks interestingly that the postmodern microcosm seems instead to have found anchors among colleagues in philosophy departments, fine arts and English among others, without, as he notes, the ability to master the language in which the original works were written. But, despite the particularities of the Australian case, it seems to me that globally, postmodernism in its various manifestations (post-structuralism, postcolonial critique, French feminism) has nevertheless had an impact in one way or another on French Studies curricula.

Thirdly, whilst I may agree with Ross Chambers to describe a discipline (at least in the Humanities) at any particular point in time as presenting various practices, some occupying a residual position, some in a dominant position and some others as being emergent,<sup>5</sup> I would, however, like to argue that we need to look into the structure of the disciplinary field, the positions and dispositions of its various protagonists in order to reveal the principles and stakes behind what I have called the 'paradigmatic turbulence'. If, as far as French Studies are concerned, the postmodern paradigm has been contained to a few individual exceptions in Australia, couldn't it be that the agents holding the

dominant positions have managed, by means that remain to be analysed, to hold onto their powers better than their Northern American counterparts?

In French Studies, as in many disciplines, the formation of what I have called a 'postmodern microcosm' seems to have contributed to the emergence of new areas of inquiry, thus representing a form of challenge to the traditionally dominant areas of inquiry directly implicated in the reproduction of academic power structure and dominant culture. In the same manner that post-colonial studies, Francophone studies, or Feminist studies emerged in the disciplinary field, Cultural Studies is another area of inquiry which has started to emerge over the last 10–15 years in the academic field in general and in French Studies in particular. I discuss this phenomenon at length as it illustrates the type of impact the emergence of postmodernism has had on the structure of the academic field.

Ross Chambers' article aptly titled 'Cultural Studies as a Challenge to French Studies', which discusses whether French Studies might evolve in the direction of Cultural Studies and what the consequences would be for French Studies as a discipline, is a good example of what I mean by the turbulence caused by the postmodern microcosm and its impact on the disciplines. On the one hand Chambers argues, in a very postmodern fashion including the use of the appropriate idiom, that Anglo-Australo-American Cultural Studies represent a radical challenge to the very ideological foundations and practices of French Studies, while on the other hand we have Petrey in an article titled 'French Studies/Cultural Studies: Reciprocal Invigoration or Mutual Destruction'<sup>6</sup> arguing in a very modern and readable way that French Studies and Cultural Studies are incompatible, thus refusing to leave the French Studies' flank open to deconstruction and the lay-off tactics of postmodern colleagues. I will not go into the details of the argument developed by both protagonists but I am sure Usbek would not be able to resist writing back to his friends in Ispahan with a fresh example of a new turn taken by the debate.

I just can imagine him announcing to his friends embroiled in harem politics that Chambers' article is in fact calling for the foundation of what is referred to as a 'postdiscipline'. At the core of this notion is the proposal to explore the possibility of an emerging area of inquiry which would question the ideologemes on which French Studies is grounded; an emergence of a form of French Cultural Studies that would be there to question French Studies' own disciplinary practices and assumptions; a form of 'postdisciplinary French Studies'.<sup>7</sup>

Coming back to the specificity of the postmodern idiom, it is true to remark, as Professor Katz did, that agents within the microcosm communicate and exchange their research using a specific language which, as a result, leaves them open to parody and criticism. In relation to this particular point, the postmodern discourse can also be characterised not only by the way and the facility with which it uses and creates concepts and notions, but also by its ability to borrow these from a large spectrum of disciplines. I am convinced that an examination of the relationship between the specificity of postmodern morpho-syntax, together with the postmodern marked propensity to coin, borrow and use imported concepts and notions, would cast some light on the epistemological underpinnings of postmodern discourse. We could even amuse ourselves by trying to see whether the postmodern discourse in its various manifestations, has its own characteristic 'hedges' and 'filler phrases'. If we accept that these elements in the bourgeois usage, also constitute elements of a practical metalanguage and characterise the bourgeois relation to the social world,<sup>8</sup> the cataloguing of similar expressions in the postmodern idiom is likely to provide interesting data to characterise the relation of postmodern agents to language and their social sphere. It would then be interesting to examine how this metalanguage contributes to forms of what we may want to consider as social rituals and how they differ to similar rituals in the rest of the academic field.

It is now about time that I admitted that these remarks are underpinned by a particular view of the academic world and that it is this understanding which shapes my reflection on the

debate about postmodernism. I view academia as a field where latent and active forces struggle to preserve or transform the configuration of positions within this field. Such a model was originally developed by Bourdieu in his analysis of French intellectual life and academic world<sup>9</sup> and provides the conceptual tools to analyse the forms of capital and power as well as the lines of conflict and patterns of change which take place in academia. It proposes an understanding of the academic world as a field where the strategies of its agents depend on their positions in the distribution of the capital specific to the field. Although we would need to analyse the specific forms of capital relating to the object of our inquiry, we can nevertheless surmise that it is the amount of capital held by social agents which determine their success in the field. What interests me in this model is the light it casts on academic debates such as that over postmodernism. According to Bourdieu, 'Every position-taking is defined in relation to the space of possibles ... it receives its distinctive value from its negative relationship with the coexistent position-taking'.<sup>10</sup> Hence this logic of position-taking is exacerbated in debates where, for instance, holders of a certain monopoly of legitimate discourse come to oppose the harbingers of an emerging approach. Such was the case in the debate in the mid-60s between Raymond Picard, professor at the Sorbonne, and Roland Barthes, from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes in France. In this conflict, which a commentator described as 'the Dreyfus affair of the literary world',<sup>11</sup> the forces of the field aligned themselves around the opposition between what was referred to as 'academic criticism' on the one hand and 'la nouvelle critique' on the other hand. Closer to Australia and closer to the debate about postmodernism was the debate which, from 1980 to 1984, opposed defenders against detractors of post-structuralists theories in the columns of the journal *AUMLA*.<sup>12</sup>

Although one would need to flesh out these notions of social agents, symbolic capital and the logic behind positions and dispositions within today's various academic spheres in order to cast some light on the debate over postmodernism and build a satisfactory explanatory model, it nevertheless becomes apparent



that the means and stakes within the space of academia involve a type of symbolic capital based on recognition and consecration, institutionalised or not. This symbolic capital can be expressed in different forms and attempts to legitimise an emerging practice as well as challenges to what is perceived by emergent groups of social agents as a monopoly over legitimate discourse, seem to be an essential part of the logic of the field and the underpinning factor in the debate over postmodernism. One of the results of this logic appears to be a form of polarisation constituting what Bourdieu refers to as an epistemological pairing: the result of a constraint exercised by the structure of the field leading the social agents to restrict the possibilities to two polar positions.<sup>13</sup> In this regard, more often than not the debate over postmodernism seems to have promoted a Manichean vision in one form or another; matching 'progressives' on the one side against 'conservatives' on the other.

Apart from the various debates over postmodernism which have been taking place between academic peers, what also interests me is the way postmodernism has impacted on higher education. Various Departments and Schools have included postmodernism in one form or another in their curricula. In Arts faculties, students now have the opportunity to become acquainted with postmodern authors, issues and discourses which, in some Departments and for some subjects, have become the dominant paradigm. I have often been intrigued by students' reactions to the postmodern idiom and in this regard, it would certainly contribute to the whole debate if we could survey students' reactions and perceptions of courses in which they are confronted with it. In my own experience, I have encountered a variety of students' reactions to the postmodern discourse. The first type is the student who, after attending lectures and tutorials, is still at a loss to explain what it is all about. This type of student has the distinct feeling that the postmodernist approach is somewhat obscure, that lecturers and tutors when asked for clarifications, even further confuse by giving what are perceived as rambling and vague answers. For this first

type of student, postmodernism is perceived as an esoteric form of discourse, with esoteric concepts and notions which everybody 'in the know' seems to be using without being able clearly to explain what it is all about while swamping her in a deluge of new notions and references to more authors' works, the reading of which seems indispensable. The student's feeling is one of frustration and self-doubt ('I must be dumb, all these people seem to know what they are talking about whereas it is all Greek to me'). Mind you, this student seems pretty much akin to the non-postmodern *vulgus pecum* described by Stephen Katz and I am sure that providing her with Katz's advice about how to speak postmodern between a glass of wine and some cheese and crackers would certainly contribute to alleviating many fears and make her feel more comfortable, at least at parties if not during tutorials.

Our second type of student starts off with a similar impression and feeling, but then, slowly, while still being pretty confused about what it is all about, starts to use the idiom herself, here and there picking up some terms and notions that are timidly bounced off fellow students and tutors in class. Soon this type of student graduates to being more fluent in the postmodern idiom, starting to write and speak postmodern, throwing around neologisms and freshly borrowed or coined notions while dropping names of some magic (preferably French) authors. Such a student can even evolve into a third type, the one that you meet at postgraduate seminars or conferences, presenting a typical deconstructive paper written in state of the art postmodern idiom. At this point, I must say that I have always had the feeling that this 'mutation' in an agent's idiom is concurrent with a change in the agent's appearance. Whether it is just a question of an agent's normal evolution or her cultivating a somewhat imperceptible alternative appearance, I don't really know, but I have developed the silly idea that while adopting the postmodern idiom, the keenest of agents also develop a particular bodily *hexis* which I imagine as being characteristic of the postmodern microcosm, one which would be fundamentally different from what we could observe in non-postmodern circles. Of course, this silly idea of mine is not without any basis, and has its (remote) origin in Bourdieu's analysis (I may be getting self-

conscious here but I feel that I should perhaps apologise for dropping all these French names!) of the economy of linguistic exchanges and the relation between language and symbolic power.<sup>14</sup>

In order really to comprehend the stakes relating to the postmodern debate, I believe that it would be salutary to examine the motivation behind the mutation of linguistic production into a perceptible shade of the postmodern idiom and its eventual relation to what Bourdieu refers to as the anticipation of profits .

The practical anticipation of the potential rewards or penalties is a practical quasi-corporeal sense of the reality of the objective relation between a certain linguistic and social competence and a certain market, through which this relation is accomplished. It can range from the certainty of a positive sanction, which is the basis of *certitudo sui*, of self-assurance, to the certainty of a negative sanction, which induces surrender and silence, through all the intermediate forms of insecurity and timidity.

*Language and Symbolic Power*, 1991, p.81

Stemming from Bourdieu's exploration of the recognition of power in symbolic capital and its impact on strategic modifications of discourses, I can't help but wonder at the extent to which the principle illustrated in the above quotation can be applied to the various types of students that I have presented and their respective *habitus*. Contributing to build our sample of strategic modifications of discourse in the student population and its link to the anticipation of profits, is a fourth type of student which I have encountered, who chooses to adopt the tone, rhetoric and discourse paraphernalia particular to the postmodern idiom for seminars and essays while at the same time privately doubting whether what she has produced has any meaning at all beyond some sort of academic ritual. I also find it interesting that such a strategic approach can be related to the position of some tutors who equally admit privately that they have difficulty making sense of a good deal of what are regarded as postmodern canonical texts.

As a final remark, I must say that I am often puzzled by the way

some characterisations and identity-based arguments, which often pitch an Anglo-Saxon tradition against a continental/French tradition, have found their way into, and have been used in, the debate over postmodernism. In this regard, the attitude of some academics in the United States and the type of arguments they put forward when attacking postmodernism cannot, I believe, be explained without understanding that academia is a site of struggle which also feels the impact of the globalisation of the market for cultural productions. A good example and the latest to date is the book published in France last October by Alan Sokal and Jean Bricmont aptly titled *Impostures intellectuelles*.<sup>15</sup> After his hoax—a parody of a postmodern text—published in 1996 in the very serious(ly) postmodern review *Social Text*—Sokal spearheads a fresh attack on the postmodern nebula. Irritated no doubt by the growth of the Northern American postmodern microcosm and the evolution of some of his American colleagues, Sokal attacks the French intellectuals whose textual imports form the reference of the American postmodern discourse. In their book, Sokal and Bricmont attack the lack of scientific and conceptual rigour of postmodern figures such as Baudrillard, Lacan, Kristeva and Virilio. They demonstrate how some of these Gallic figures borrow and misuse scientific notions and how they shroud themselves in a pretence of scientific rhetoric. Of course, there is no denying that some of these authors have been making a lavish use of jargon, some making far-fetchedness the staple diet of their reasoning process. I am also quite ready to accept that some deconstructionist writings with their use of conceptual acrobatics sometimes amount to what Merquior refers to as ‘dismal unscience’.<sup>16</sup> However, demonstrating how Lacan and Kristeva may have wrongly used scientific concepts and then lumping together very different thinkers such as Lyotard, Latour, Serres, Deleuze, Barthes and Lacan, accusing them *en bloc* of ‘irrationalism’, is not enough in my view to make a point. Sokal and Bricmont’s method is all the more suspect in that, for instance, in their condemnation of Kristeva, they focus on works Kristeva wrote almost thirty years ago when she was a 25 year old student. It is not sufficient to brand all these authors with a scarlet label of

'postmodernism' to make the critique valid. Instead, it would be healthy to look into the origin of what I am quite ready to call 'the scientific pretensions' of some of these writings. To do so, we would need to look into the structuralist paradigm which flourished in France in the 1960s and how it reacted to the dominant atmosphere of humanism and historicism of the period, embodied by Sartrean existentialism. We would need to look into Barthes' early writings, for instance, and observe how the tack of scientificity had already been taken and how what would subsequently evolve into poststructuralism already resembled a prototypic conceptual Hydra-headed monster, lumping together concepts and notions snatched from numerous discourses as different as psychoanalysis, marxism, linguistics, and anthropology. However, writing an archeology of postmodern discourse would demand an understanding of the field of French academia in the sixties as well as a knowledge of the socio-economic context in which these intellectual and philosophical turbulence started. This, although pertinent, would take us far beyond the limits of this article.

To come back to the idea of academia as a site of struggle, what interests me is Sokal's acknowledgment that his book is actually aimed at a section of the American left which uses, abuses and worships, as he claims, the works of the French thinkers he accuses of being impostors.<sup>17</sup> This may explain why, while claiming to be the wardens of scientific rigour, Sokal and Bricmont do not include in their critique other intellectuals, exponents of the neoliberal dogma, who pretend to reduce the behaviour of social agents to pseudo-scientific equations. One of the dangers of Sokal and Bricmont's exercise is that undoubtedly, because books are written and consumed necessarily within a social field, once its English version is published in the U.S.A., it will rest in the hands of the liberal think-tank who will not fail to recuperate such a piece for more direct political purposes.

I believe we need to realise when discussing 'postmodernism' that, while it has become a social phenomenon in the United States and maybe to a lesser extent in Australia, it doesn't mean much to a French reader. The works of Foucault, Derrida, Barthes,

Lacan and others are extremely different and come from very distinct intellectual and philosophical horizons. I remember when I first arrived as a new tutor in an Australian university wondering what people meant by 'postmodernism' and feeling pretty stupid not knowing what it was about when everybody seemed to expect a French person to keep them up to date with the latest news on the topic. To me, it just looked like an American construct. I realised then, that when people referred to 'postmodernism', it was some sort of convenient labeling which drew its foundations from an eclectic corpus of works by French thinkers, whom I had always thought of as very different. I later came to associate this label or any claim to it with try-hard intellectual groovers jumping on the bandwagon of fashionable rhetoric, apparently because it provided them with some half-digested conceptual tools that made them sound progressive and intellectually groovy, or so they thought. On the other hand, if I mentioned the label or the name of one of these French thinkers associated with 'postmodernism', I can still remember the air of distress on the faces of some senior and older staff members as they thought to themselves, 'Oh no! Not another one of them!'. Now, after just over ten years in Australian academia, 'postmodernism' seems to me very much linked to the particularities of the Northern American and Australian academic fields as well as to the structures of their respective markets of cultural production. Yet, during the ongoing globalisation of the cultural market, it seems that the debate is catching the French scene on the rebound, as witnessed by the reaction of the French media to Sokal and Bricmont's pamphlet.<sup>18</sup> Denouncing the excesses of some of France's contemporary intellectuals is not a new exercise;<sup>19</sup> the novelty here is that it comes from across the Atlantic and seems to condemn *en bloc* the figures of the French intellectual scene. In this regard, one of the puzzling facts in many attacks coming from America is that the hidden agenda seems set to target new areas of inquiry (Gay Studies, Lesbian Studies, Women's Studies, and the much discussed Cultural Studies) which analyse social constructs and reflect on the socio-historical conditions of knowledge and symbolic systems as instruments of domination, a stance which

antagonises, among others, the proponents of acute neoliberal authority.

As for a conclusion, I am sure that any critique of postmodernism in the States or even in Australia satisfies numerous people, reassuring them that the majority of intellectuals are delirious impostors, a good deal of them living in France. Yet, it never ceases to amaze me that some of the most delirious theoretical outbursts in this postcommunist age, such as Francis Fukuyama's essay *The End of History and the Last Man* (1993) come from the New World and have found their place in the global field of cultural production, without, as Pascal Brucker remarks,<sup>20</sup> the self-appointed wardens of scientific rigour raising an eyebrow. It seems that in a New World Order, the stability of meaning has become paramount and forms the basis of an anti-sociological and anti-historical discourse. Lumping together authors under the 'impostor' label has the regrettable tendency to prevent asking real questions about our social reality.

#### Notes

- 1 Colin Nettelbeck, 'The "Post-Literary" French Novel: Echenoz, Pennac and Company'. Paper read at the French Studies Conference, Monash University, Melbourne, 17 September 1993.
- 2 Ross Chambers, *On Teaching 'French'*. The 1992 Sonia Marks Memorial Lecture, Department of French Studies, University of Sydney, 1992. Ivan Barco, *French Studies: an Australian Tradition, an Australian Future?* The 1993 Sonia Marks Memorial Lecture, Department of French Studies, University of Sydney, 1993. Anne Freadman, *Models of Genre for Language Teaching*. The 1994 Sonia Marks Memorial Lecture, Department of French Studies, University of Sydney, 1994.
- 3 Philippe Lane & John West-Sooby, *Traditions and Mutations in French Studies: The Australian Scene*, Boombana Publications, 1997.
- 4 Barco, p.4.
- 5 Ross Chambers, 'Cultural Studies as a Challenge to French Studies', *Australian Journal of French Studies* (1996): 137–156.
- 6 Sandy Petrey, 'French Studies/Cultural Studies: Reciprocal Invigoration or Mutual Destruction', *French Review* 68 (1994–1995): 381–392.
- 7 Chambers, 'Cultural Studies', p.145.
- 8 Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, Harvard, 1991, p.84.

- 9 Pierre Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, Paris, 1984.
- 10 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production*, Polity Press, 1993, p.30.
- 11 R. Matignon, 'Le maintien de l'ordre', *L'Express*, 2–8 mai 1966, cited in *Homo Academicus*, p.152.
- 12 The debate was triggered by Denis Boak's review of René Pommier's book *Assez Décodé!* and continued until 1984. See Denis Boak (Professor, University of Western Australia), 'On René Pommier's *Assez Décodé!*', *AUMLA* 54 (Nov. 1980): 228–231; David Wills (James Cook University), 'Begging to Defer: Roland Barthes and *La Nouvelle Critique!*', *AUMLA* 56 (Nov. 1981): 219–226; Peter Cryle, Anne Freadman and Michael Spencer (University of Queensland), 'Cryle, Freadman, Spencer versus Boak', *AUMLA* 56 (Nov. 1981): 226–232; Denis Boak, 'Structuralism: A Rejoinder Boak versus Cryle, Freadman, Spencer and Wills', *AUMLA* 58 (Nov. 1982): 178–193; David Wills, 'The Literary Supplement—Replies to Denis Boak', *AUMLA* 60 (Nov. 1983): 262–275; Peter Cryle, Anne Freadman, Michael Spencer, 'A Further Reply to Denis Boak', *AUMLA* 60 (Nov. 1983): 275–278; Roland Sussex (Professor, University of Melbourne), 'Saussure Agonistes?—A linguistic perspective on literary structuralism', *AUMLA* 60 (Nov. 1983): 278–295; Denis Boak, '(Post?)Deconstructuralism: A Last Word', *AUMLA* 62 (Nov. 1994): 226–235; Göran Hammarström (Monash University), 'Traditionalism versus Structuralism in Linguistics and Literary Studies', *AUMLA* 60 (Nov. 1983): 235–244.
- 13 Bourdieu, *Homo Academicus*, p.149.
- 14 Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*, pp.81–89.
- 15 Alan Sokal, Jean Bricmont, *Impostures intellectuelles*, Odile Jacob, 1997.
- 16 J. G. Merquior, *From Prague to Paris—A Critique of Structuralist and Poststructuralist Thought*, London, 1986, p.213.
- 17 'Nos philosophes sont-ils des imposteurs?', an interview in New York with Alan Sokal published by *Le Nouvel Observateur*, No 1716, 25 Sept.–1 Oct. 1997, pp.48–50.
- 18 Sokal and Bricmont's book accompanied by the question 'Are French intellectuals impostors?' made the cover of one of the most respected French magazines, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, No 1716, 25 Sept.–1 Oct. 1997.
- 19 Merquior; Luc Ferry, Alain Renault, *La pensée 68: Essai sur l'anti-humanisme contemporain*, Paris, 1985; Jacques Bouveresse, *Le philosophe chez les autophages*, Paris, 1983 and *Rationalité et cynisme*, Paris, 1984.
- 20 Pascal Bruckner, 'Le risque de penser', *Le Nouvel Observateur*, No 1716, 25 Sept.–1 Oct. 1997, p.53.