

shape their own work experiences,"¹⁶ one could move beyond the limitations inherent in an "either/or" model and could move toward a more holistic framework.

These last three articles do make some interesting and important points about the nature of work and work experience as it varies by gender. However, their publication in 1987 seems somewhat dated in the context of much contemporary work.¹⁷ Their strength lies in their empirical contributions and, as with much of the other work, their weakness lies in their failure to utilize the empirical findings in such a way as to refine or reconceptualize the problematic dichotomy of the "public" and the "domestic."

Sandra D. Harder
Ottawa

NOTES

1. Rosaldo, "The use and abuse of anthropology: reflections on feminism and cross-cultural understanding," *Signs*, 5, no. 3 (Spring, 1980).
2. For an elaboration of early work in this vein, see Sargeant (ed.), *Women and Revolution*, Montreal: Black Rose Books, 1981, and Eisenstein (ed.), *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*, New York: Monthly Review Press, 1979. Important debates along this line are also addressed by Barrett, *Women's Oppression Today*, London: Verso, 1980. For an example of a more contemporary statement, see Phillips, *Divided Loyalties: Dilemmas of Sex and Class*, London: Virago, 1987.
3. Sharistanian (ed.), *Beyond the Public/Domestic Dichotomy: Contemporary Perspectives on Women's Public Lives*, p. 7.
4. In particular, see Fishburne Collier and Junko Yanagasako, *Gender and Kinship: Toward a Unified Analysis*, and deRoche, Connie and John deRoche, *A Rock in a Stream: Living with the Political Economy of Underdevelopment in Cape Breton*, St. John's: Institute for Social and Economic Research Press, 1988.
5. Sharistanian (ed.), p. 12.
6. The work cited by Cann in this paper is Moss Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation*, New York: Basic Books, 1977.
7. Sharistanian (ed.), p. 81.
8. *Ibid*, p. 83.
9. *Ibid*, p. 166.
10. *Ibid*, p. 158.
11. *Ibid*, p. 162.
12. *Ibid*, p. 159.
13. *Ibid*, p. 195.
14. Gilligan, *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982.
15. Miller cites Feldberg and Glenn, "Males and females: job versus gender models in the sociology of work," *Social Problems* 26 (June, 1979).
16. Sharistanian (ed.), p.39.
17. An excellent contemporary discussion of households and work can be found in Paul, *Divisions of Labour*, London: Basil Blackwell Limited, 1984. See also, Redclift and Mingione (eds.), *Beyond Employment: Household, Gender and Subsistence*, London: Basil Blackwell Limited, 1985. Both of these works situate an analysis of work and households in the context of changing capitalist relations at the global, national and local levels. In addition, they draw upon and contribute to current feminist reconceptualizations of work, the economy and social reproduction.

Home Economics and Feminism: The Hestian Synthesis. Patricia J. Thompson. *University of Prince Edward Island: Home Economics Publishing Collective, 1988.*

The aim of Patricia J. Thompson's ambitious, short book is to open the dialogue between feminists, home economists, and others in the academy. She offers a new/old way to understand women in Home Economics and what they do, and while the book may not attempt to resolve the philosophical complexities of dualism or the baffling difficulties of strategies for change in a male-privileging social hierarchy, *The Hestian Synthesis* may very well be the beginning of a whole new area of research and thinking. She is on to something—and she makes you curious about it.

The book is based on—and for the main part is—the proceedings of a three-day workshop held at Belcourt Centre, South Rustico, Prince Edward Island, just prior to the 1986 Canadian Home Economics Association Convention in Charlottetown. The twenty participants in the workshop stayed together for the three days in order to come to terms with what they all clearly see as a crucial issue for Home Economics. Patricia Thompson explained the Hestian/Hermean metaphor for them and then answered questions and posed problems; at the end of the workshop/book, she says, "when you came to this conference you were talking as a home economist, and I hope you're leaving today as a Hestian feminist" (p. 95).

In reading the book we must keep in mind its origin and its intended audience. It is a beginning; it is designed for those who may not have thought of themselves as feminists before; it is reassuring and persuasive. In the introduction, Patricia Thompson sets the tone for the whole when she laughs good-naturedly at her own audacity: "So I've undertaken something no less ambitious than to attack the whole edifice of patriarchal culture!" (p. 6).

Of course, she is only half joking. Borrowing from the French *Annales*, from European mythologists, and from recent feminist theorists, she explains her metaphor of the two domains, Hestian and Hermean, private and public. She argues—very loosely—that she is not talking about gender divisions or even simple role divisions, but fundamental attitudes to natural law, to stability, continuity, and energy. In our times, she says, the Hermean domain of control has so thoroughly overshadowed and silenced the Hestian domain of connection that the Hestian is often thought to be irrelevant, trivial, inferior. The discipline of Home Economics values, embodies, preserves, and investigates the Hestian domain.

If this all sounds very familiar, that is Patricia Thompson's point. She is not simply substituting Hestian for "women" and trying to give an old/new label to a feminist perception of dualism and patriarchy. Nor is she trying to beguile her listeners/readers into recognizing the domains she describes so that she can then say, "You see, you are a feminist after all." She is, instead, really talking about a broader view of the gender-intensive discipline of Home Economics itself and as her feminist, non-home economist readers will find, to their surprise, she has something new to say about the way we look at each other.

As she explains it, Home Economics has become a target for feminist anger—it has seemed to embody the values that have oppressed women: "Every bit of anguish and anger that feminists have felt about their role and status as women has been projected onto Home Economics uncritically" (p. 94). She introduces the Hestian dilemma with words that must be considered in and out of the academy as we assess the aptness of the metaphor itself: "As a feminist and a home economist, I find feminist theory helpful in explaining our present position. Our devalued, privatized, invisible world, the oikos, became a 'separate sphere.' The very thing that has happened to women generally has happened to home economists particularly, and even to Home Economics as a profession!" (p. 11)

Patricia Thompson's book/words are a challenge to home economists and to feminists alike, but the very nature of this challenge is in keeping with the reassuring, positive attitude of the book. There is no angry finger-pointing and fault-finding above or below the surface; instead, her challenge offers a way to open the dialogue at long last so that we can listen to each other. Patricia Thompson sees Hestian feminism as a powerful answer to the "current feminist dilemma about women and families" (p. 6), and from reading her answers to the questions of the women at Belcourt Centre, this reviewer thinks she is taking us in the right direction.

The book suffers and benefits from being presented as the proceeds of a conference workshop. The informal questions and the comfortable dialogue make easy reading and do stimulate thinking, but much of the heat and point of the ideas must be lost in so much ease. There is no time nor place in this format, in this setting, for deep explorations. After the initial introduction of the Hestian/Hermean metaphor, the best of the book is found in the second half of chapter three, "The Hestian Archetype." It is here, and with the brief reference to *Women's Ways of Knowing* at the end of the book, that more work will be done.

The book is not meant to be a deep exploration, after all. It is meant to get the dialogue going, and that, I believe, it will do. At the end of the third chapter, while making her stand on integration clear, Thompson throws out a challenge I hope will be irresistible:

It is not that males are male. It is not our husbands or our lovers or our sons that are the enemy. It is patriarchy. It is the assumption that male privilege is justified. Even for mediocre men! The men who have ambitions, who are not our husbands, our lovers, or friends, don't owe us anything. They benefit from patriarchy. And it's a mistake for women to transfer their loyalty to a Hermean system that doesn't have Hestian interests at stake. That's a lot different from arguing that patriarchy needs to be replaced by matriarchy. The drive to dominate and control is Hermean. The desire to connect and collaborate is Hestian. We need a Hestian manifesto! (p. 84)

As women—and men—unite to counteract the injustices of patriarchy, the dialogue will grow. Now these dialogues should welcome those who consider and wish to explore the Hestian perspective.

Elizabeth R. Epperly
Memorial University of Newfoundland

NOTE

In writing this review, I have benefitted from conversations with Muriel Houston, doctoral candidate at Dalhousie University.

On Education. Northrop Frye. *Toronto: Fitzhenry and Whiteside, 1988, Pp. 211.*

The book is *On Education* by Northrop Frye. This sounds innocuous to a feminist, even interesting, because Frye has been a teacher all his life and is one of Canada's great intellectuals; but, the book is not innocuous. It is misogynist, with muddled thinking revealing its bias. Frye actually has praise for women in one chapter (and only one)—that which deals with culture and society in Ontario. What else could he do, given the stature of women writers in the province's history? In the other 18 chapters, women are ignored or demeaned.

The first alarm of his bias is in the sexist language. It is pervasive. We learn all about the professional man, the common man, the educated man, the young man, but nothing about women of comparable status. We find that