

were facing for the first time a moral dilemma in which there was available no completely right choice - no choice that would not result in harm to someone. Some of their comments reveal a tremendous struggle with understanding and making the best possible decision. By contrast, the polarized political arguments about abortion necessarily seem shallow and inadequate.

I hope that this book will be read widely by scholars in the social sciences. Not only does it help to put our cultural biases into perspective, but it is a potentially vast source of ideas for research. In fact, I wish that Gilligan had placed more emphasis on outlining her views on the implications of her theory for future research on human development. She argues in her final chapter that a priority on the agenda for research is to "delineate in *women's own terms* the experience of their adult life" (p. 193). How this is to be done, however, she leaves to the reader. It is a challenge that feminist scholars will no doubt be quick to accept.

Hilary Lips
University of Winnipeg

Still Ain't Satisfied: Canadian Feminism Today. Edited by Maureen Fitzgerald, Connie Guberman, Margie Wolfe. *Toronto: The Women's Press, 1982. Pp. 318.*

Feminism in Canada — From Pressure to Politics. Edited by Angela Miles and Geraldine Finn. *Montreal: Black Rose Books Ltd., 1982. Pp. 315.*

I have been asked to write *reviews* of these two books, not a review. I shall examine them separately below, but it is worthwhile first to look at them together. On the surface, they are very similar—*Canadian Feminism Today* and *Feminism in Canada*. They are both anthologies,

both collections of articles by women dealing with feminist concerns. Under the surface, they are completely different. If looking at them together does nothing else, it should clearly remind us not only of the ideological, theoretical, political and philosophical divisions within Canadian feminism today, but also of the diversity among feminist writings in levels of abstraction, focus of interest and basic assumptions about feminism.

Still Ain't Satisfied (SAS) has twice as many articles in about the same number of pages as *Feminism in Canada (FinC)*. The articles in *SAS* are quite specifically focused on practical issues such as rape, reproductive rights, unionization, immigrant women, native women, lesbianism, politics, the arts, etc. *FinC* does not look at particular issues, but rather asks where women should be standing and where they should be moving, ideologically, theoretically and practically in the women's movement today. This book tries to show how "Integrative Feminism" (Angela Miles) can imbue research, science and female revolutionary political action as we move beyond "pressure to politics." Few of the authors in *SAS* are academics. Instead, they come from a variety of backgrounds and have a variety of experiences—both in work and in the women's movement. The authors in *FinC* are primarily academics, with many also being active in the women's movement. This does make the two books quite different in focus and in tone and I suspect in audience.

Before I discuss each of these books, I will comment on reviewing collections of readings. It is the hardest kind of book for a reviewer to do justice to. It is impossible to give adequate attention to each article. Some worthwhile articles may be neglected and thus be falsely seen by the reader as less important than others. Articles often differ not so much in quality as in scope and intention. But a cursory review may not make this clear to the potential reader. As a reviewer, I find myself asking: "If I did not have

to review these two books, would I read them all the way through?" Certainly not *SAS*, which contains twenty-seven articles in 300 pages! And the articles are too specific and varied to encourage sustained reading. I can imagine reading *FinC* straight through (even without having to) since it does have strong internal thematic and philosophical unity. But it is *so* heavy, a characteristic partly resulting from the reader's need to inhabit consecutively thirteen complex individual worlds in order to comprehend their unique and yet common characteristics. Most readers will not read either of these books all the way through, or from beginning to end. One rarely does with a collection. So how does the reviewer guide the potential reader so that she can make the most of the collection? And who is the potential reader? Is it surprising that I prefer to review a book with one voice, one author, one point of view, one message? But then, why have I agreed to review *SAS* and *FinC*? Because both of these collections are important in very different ways for feminism in Canada today. Minimally, they give even the casual and unsystematic reader signposts that mark where women are now and where we may be heading, and maximally they provide a great deal of food for thought, reflection and even inspiration.

I must be clear about what I intend to do in these reviews. I cannot evaluate fairly and thoroughly forty articles by forty different people. To pretend to do so would be unfair. I can tell potential readers and browsers generally what is in each of these books, what the focus is and how it is realized. I can mention a few articles that stand out for me. Everyone will find different things to like or dislike, to approve or disapprove in these books. I believe that my job is to let you, the readers, know what you will find when you pick one of them up.

One complaint against both books! The value of a book is greatly increased if it possesses an index. Why does neither of these have a comprehensive index? Many similar subjects are dis-

cussed differently in a variety of articles; it would be extremely helpful for the reader to be able to make some internal comparisons. I do appreciate the fact that each book contains bibliographical material for further reading—in *FinC* at the end of the book, in *SAS* at the end of each article. The bibliographies are brief and very selective, but they are a beginning. With all the extras out of the way, let us now look at each of the two works in some detail.

Still Ain't Satisfied

To appraise this book fairly, it is important to recognize what it is. It is a "celebration" of the survival of The Women's Press and of the "survival and strength of the women's liberation movement" (13). Published in the tenth anniversary year of the Women's Press, it is a ten-years-later sequel to the anthology, *Women Unite!* With its goal, then, to mark where the women's movement now is in terms of where we were ten years ago, the editors have conceived a book that would touch on as many specific issues relating to women as possible. In fact, in the Introduction the editors apologize for not including discussion of many other issues, such as microtechnology, Quebec, the anti-nuclear movement. I respond quite differently from the editors. I would prefer to have fewer, not more, subjects covered. Breadth has been substituted for depth. Many of the articles are frustrating to read because in a few pages the author can only touch the surface or examine *one* specific aspect of a topic. The bibliographies help and some of the authors do try to note the broader context within which their articles fit, but it is still frustrating.

The editors recognize the difficulties of arranging these articles and the format they have chosen at least provides some provocative section headings—"Out of the Bedrooms," "Into the Work Force" and "Onto the Streets." The first section includes articles on reproductive rights, pornography, battered women, rape, heterosexuality and lesbianism, and one which seems

to be in the wrong section. Ridington's "Providing Services the Feminist Way" deals with the provision of women's services and the complex issues revolving around government funding, self-help groups and service. The second section includes articles on the need to politicize housewives, day care, feminists and unionization from different perspectives, sexual harassment, health hazards on the job, a Vancouver strike for equal pay for work of equal value, and two articles on women in nontraditional occupations. Many of the articles in this section particularly suffer from the problem found throughout the book—they are too specifically focused on one set of incidents, one locale, with references to the broader issues often very brief or forgotten. The third section is supposed to bring together articles dealing with women's organizing and mobilization. This section seems least coherent as a section. There are articles dealing with the need to expand the still too-limited women's movement (still limited primarily to middle-class, white heterosexuals) to include lesbians and lesbian groups, immigrant and native women and groups, others dealing with feminist publishing, women's education in and out of school and feminist art. Naomi Wall introduces the anthology with an article, "The Last Ten Years: A Personal/Political View," which we are told by the editors is not intended to be a comprehensive overview, but rather a partially generalized depiction of Naomi Wall's experiences (and therefore, say the editors, it can reflect the experiences of many of us). While I found the article interesting and frequently perceptive and thoughtful, I wonder why someone *could not* provide a comprehensive overview. This is what a book of this kind needs.

Similarly, the book concludes with a transcript of a conversation among some intelligent socialist feminists (from IWDC) about feminist organizing. It raises some important issues; it ends with a fanfare; it does not give us an overview. This problem afflicts this book. Feminists who have worked on or studied any of the par-

ticular issues discussed will find the articles on those subjects limited and superficial. Those who have not will be frustrated by how little they are told. On a more positive note, some of these articles may pique curiosity just enough to send the reader to some of the recommended readings. Maybe that is all we can hope for in a book that attempts to cover so many subjects in one volume.

In the Introduction, the editors tell us that *S&S* is not intended to be a history or survey of the women's movement in Canada, but "rather an evaluation of feminist activities over the last ten years" (13-14). I agree that it is not the first—it is too scattered. I fear that it is not the second either. We do not receive a comprehensive evaluation of feminist activities and feminist issues. But that does not mean we receive nothing. In many parts of this book, important issues are raised. Scattered throughout, in some articles more clearly than others, are questions about where we are going, what obstacles are standing in our way, what the implications of our actions are. Many of the authors raise serious questions about the implications of the economic recession and hard times on women's hard-won gains and continued struggle for equality. Others raise questions about the moral and political implications of some of the stances feminists have taken over the years and the ambivalences that some of these stances have concealed.

As an example, Kathleen McDonnell, looking at the issue of reproductive rights, challenges us all to look at the hard moral choices, to recognize our own deep ambivalences about abortion, and to reevaluate the right to life movement as more than a simple reactionary monolith. I found this a thought-provoking and disturbing article. Similarly, in a number of articles, I was challenged by the authors' insistence that the issue of institutionalized heterosexism must be confronted by feminists. Another subject appears in provocative discussion in more than one article—the challenge posed to feminism by the Right

with its glorification of women's traditional submissive role in family and home. Meg Luxton is one who intelligently discusses how feminists can meet this challenge in a meaningful way. (I have mentioned only a few of the authors in this volume. There are far too many others for the space of this review. Failure to mention names is not to be construed as denigration of anyone's article).

From *SAS*, I came away with questions buzzing in my head, questions about erotica, pornography and free speech; questions about how to broaden the base of the feminist movements; questions about the sticky relations between art and politics (any art, any politics); questions about separate or integrated unions. The authors know their subjects; they have been intimately involved with what they write about. They also know the dangers that arise from focusing so closely on specific issues that the larger picture is forgotten. But they are handicapped by limitations on the scope of their articles. Unfortunately, the result is that this book is not as good a representation of feminist issues and activities as one would wish it to be. We all want to celebrate The Women's Press whose continued existence is important to every one of us. This is a flawed book, but it is still important, not so much as a celebration as for warning us that there are serious road-blocks ahead to feminist progress and for reminding us of the many feminist goals still unachieved.

Feminism in Canada

Considering that this work was built from some presentations made at a feminist interdisciplinary session of the 1981 Canadian Political Science Association to which were added a number of articles written for other purposes (an approach to creating a book that often results in fragmentary, incoherent, and exceedingly uneven texts), *Feminism in Canada* is remarkably focused and both thematically and theoretically unified. Whether the reader shares the vision presented

here or not, she can only recognize with respect the fact that editors and authors have built a *whole* book. Maybe this has happened because, as Angela Miles says in the Introduction, all the authors are committed scholars with a shared "unique female vision."

Because of the clear intention of the editors to present this common vision, the Introduction by Angela Miles, her article in Part II, and the Conclusion by Geraldine Finn become the important pegs on which the rest of the volume hangs. In the Introduction, Miles claims, even insists, that although feminists widely differ in their concerns and their analyses, although they appear as liberals, Marxists, socialists, anarchists, radicals and lesbians, many of them do share "a feminism that goes beyond pressure to represent an embryonic new politics of general relevance and universal significance" (12). And what is this new feminism but one that focuses on the specificity of female characteristics and female values as the basis for the total restructuring of society and human relations. It is this belief that, Miles argues, brings all the authors in this volume together whatever their other divergencies. Male dominance over females is seen as the fundamental oppression, but the implications drawn from this familiar radical feminist conviction by "integrative feminists" are somewhat new. To challenge this dominance we must encourage a specifically female view of the world, a female view which will provide all of humanity with true revolutionary liberation. All the traditional dichotomies will go, all the splits will be fused—nature and culture, production and reproduction, the personal and the political, the objective and the subjective. The vision is one of a world of reproduction of self-actualizing human beings; not the substitution of female values for male values, but a new integration of particular female values—caring, sharing, cooperation, nurturing, intuition, emotion—with established (male?) values—equality, justice, freedom.

In her article in Part II, Miles elaborates on how women's specificity can provide the base for a new politics and an alternative set of values, and for the revolutionary transformation of the world. Finn, in the Conclusion, describes feminism as a "movement and a commitment; of and to women—women's values, goals and understanding; of and to women's liberation from the historic rule of men" (299). She talks of revolution but not revolution in a "male" sense. She envisions a revolution that reclaims women's hearts and minds from male domination, a revolution which will undermine the patriarchal social structure. Just how this is going to happen is not made clear, but she stresses that it will happen as women acquire growing control and power over their own lives and thus experience lowered dependence on men.

This is a challenging and stimulating and occasionally baffling perspective. It is clearly incongruent with other contemporary versions of feminism; economic realities and class divisions, vitally important to socialist feminists, are not central to this work. Consciousness, culture, language, female politics, reproduction—these are the important themes.

Miles seems to believe that this new "Integrative Feminism," even if certain kinds of feminists do not explicitly support it, can unite feminists. I am doubtful. I am sure that there are many feminists of varying stripes who would find it wrong-headed and attack it with intensity. But whether one agrees that it is in this direction we all must go, one has to admit that the questions raised or implied by this perspective are crucial ones we must confront. Where do these specifically female values come from? Why do we have them? Biology? Socialization? Our relations with our mothers? Our oppression by men? Will we lose them when we are no longer oppressed? What are the implications for humanness of emphasizing a real difference between female values and male values? Will pushing the good of female values tie us even more firmly to

the personal, private sphere? How will these values take over the world, the world that rejects them? How can one bring the revolution by transforming consciousness? And more. But one point must be made. Whatever the disagreements and the questions and the challenges, it is refreshing and encouraging to have at least part of the women's movement focus attention on approving and supporting that which is positive about women's experience—caring, sharing, nurturing, feeling. It is good not to have to attack ourselves in order to free ourselves. It is a positive rather than destructive way to undercut the arguments of the New Right. It is exciting to be able to challenge the male way of looking and thinking and speaking and being, not by aping it, but by trying another alternative way of looking and thinking and speaking and being.

The book has two parts. Part I, *Scholarship: Theory and Practice*, concentrates on sexism in scholarship and how to rebuild various academic disciplines, including the scientific method itself, from a new feminist perspective. Part II, *Politics: Theory and Practice*, deals with the implications of this new feminist perspective for practice, for political action, for the "articulation of a transformed revolutionary project for humanity." (Miles, 21).

In Part I, authors take on:

1. the methodological canons of research (Vickers);
2. a particularly repellent form of the scientific method (Benston), a form which I am sure many men as well as women would reject out of hand;
3. psychology (Wine);
4. economic man (Cohen);
5. history (Pierson & Prentice), an article reprinted from *Atlantis*;
6. anthropology (Yawney);
7. philosophy (Finn); and
8. the helping professions (Levine).

Overall, these papers are scholarly, compelling, cogent, and, in one case at least, witty and clever (Finn). I found the anthropology article less clearly focused than the others; the article by Helen Levine was moving and personally most interesting, but it seems to me less directly pertinent to this part of the book than the others. Margaret Benston seems at first to be attacking all science, the scientific method, rationality, and objectivity, but in actual fact she is attacking the present perverted forms of all of these and then associating the perversions with men. While this is on one level quite true—since men have for the most part been the scientists, and while much of her attack is well-grounded, I would argue that to be correctly objective and truly scientific is not a particularly female as opposed to a male characteristic. I think she might not disagree with me.

I appreciate the scholarship, sensitivity and intelligence of the papers in Part I, particularly those by Vickers, Finn and Pierson/Prentice.

Part II, *Politics: Theory and Practice*, is less satisfying as a set of papers, although the articles are generally provocative and interesting. The articles have less coherence with one another. It is not clear why Helen Levine's paper is not included in this section. Mary O'Brien's work is now quite familiar to feminist readers, but she does provide a good summary of her thinking in her two papers. Angela Miles develops in interesting detail the concerns she has expressed in the Introduction. Yolande Cohen has written a sensitive article on women's special relationship to political power. I found it cogent, except for her conclusion that since we women are not limited by politics, we can overthrow politics, which sounds wonderful to me, but I don't know what it means.

While Madeleine Gagnon's article is beautiful and fascinating—if only for giving us a sample of the relatively new attempt to create a distinctively feminine language and voice, it does not

fit easily with the other articles in this section. And Patricia Hughes' concerns about how women and men should relate in the feminine revolution operates on a different level from the other articles. As noted earlier, the book concludes with an article by Geraldine Finn, summing up the purpose of the book and the papers in it, and envisioning the radical revolutionary transformation of society that *is* going to occur.

SAS calls itself celebratory. It really is not. It is a rather somber warning to us all. On the other hand, *FinC* sounds quite celebratory—maybe too much so. The female revolution will bring the human revolution; all the seams and divisions will be healed; women *are* becoming powerful. It is hard to be so sanguine. Feminists do not agree with one another. The ideological disputes make deep rifts among us. A celebratory book is not enough to close them. How is this revolution really going to happen? I find myself sharing Madeleine Gagnon's retrospective view of her own article. As she says, she was too triumphant when advocating solutions to the problems facing women, and "even worse, when proclaiming that these have been found: displaying the radiant happiness of certainty" (280).

I found the first half of this book stimulating and thought-provoking. The second half certainly has these qualities too, but sometimes the rhetoric too strongly dominates the analysis, the wish obscures the reality.

Gertrude H. McPherson
University of Saskatchewan

Women, Power and Policy. Edited by Ellen Boneparth. *New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.* Pp. 312. (Book Society of Canada).

Women, Power and Policy examines how women's issues in the U.S. have made their way