

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

onto "formal" political agendas and into the public policy process. It is possibly the first serious look at how the "personal" has become "political."

I devoured this book, not because it was outstandingly brilliant or because it was saying brand new things, but because it attempts to provide an analytic perspective on the successes and failures of the American women's movement in the public policy arena.

Ellen Boneparth is Associate Dean, School of Social Sciences and Associate Professor of Political Science, San Jose State University. She is the founder and Director of the Aegean Women's Studies Institute. She states in the *Women, Power and Policy* preface that the book is written from a "feminist perspective;" more specifically it is argued that "changes in the status of women are necessary and can be affected through public policy." Her observation: "If women are to become more effective in influencing public policy, they must understand the obstacles they face and develop strategies to overcome them," is a statement of the obvious. It is obvious, as well, that analysis of past attempts to influence the policy process can be useful to development of successful strategies.

However, it is *not* obvious to me why we have been so slow to do this systematic analysis. We are yet to do so in Canada. Boneparth's framework for analysis is a useful guide and the case studies approach she has adopted will provide not only food for thought, but indicators for new approaches to government by American feminists.

As the author points out, "while governmental programs do not provide solutions to all problems, they do carry with them authority and resources to change behavior, if not attitudes," or, as a former American President said:

If you have them by the balls, their hearts and minds will follow.

Boneparth sets the parameters for the case studies by outlining the complex of variables which influence the success of a policy or set of policy issues. As well, she looks at the characteristics of the policy changes sought.

She considers the changes in social climate from the 60's to today. The women's movement was reborn in the sixties and early seventies when there was a concern for the oppressed, changing lifestyles, and a political activism, catalysed by civil rights supporters and anti-war demonstrators. Today, post-Vietnam, a "proposition 13" mentality and post-Watergate, with an increasing distrust of social change, widespread support for government solutions to social problems has been eroded. The economic climate has changed too, from expansion to recession - a change that has meant no progress, even in Congress, on financing important programs beneficial to women. For example, consider child-care programs. From success in Congress in 1971 (but vetoed by the President) to stalemate by the end of the 1970's when it was impossible even to move proposed changes out of Congressional Committees due to extreme fiscal restraint.

The political climate, difficult to assess has moved from diffuse opposition to the ideas of the women's movement to concrete visible opposition from groups such as the Catholic, Mormon and fundamentalist Christian churches and their supporters. These are the die-hard anti-ERA, anti-abortion, pro"-morality," preservation of the family, keep the woman at home activists.

The very nature of the American system of government - the highly decentralized decision-making, the complex of countervailing powers, has also made progress difficult.

While the social and economic climate and the political system itself set the stage for policy

making - "political variables determine the immediate prospects for effective policy change." Variables such as:

The women's movement's ability to lobby effectively, to build coalitions, to generate leadership, both in government and in the administration.

Boneparth points out that the characteristics of policies influence their chances for success: Policies can be categorized by their visibility, their degree of controversy, their scope. The author suggests that the more invisible, uncontroversial and limited their scope, the more likely a policy is to be passed. This observation, of course, is true of any policy area not just for women's issues.

She draws on Theodore Lewis' work on policy types (distributive, regulatory or redistributive), acknowledging the difficulty in differentiating *between* the types, but suggests that such a typology can still be useful in analyzing the fate of women's policy proposals.

Policies can also be characterized as leading to "role equity," or "role change." She recognizes that this is not clear-cut either. However, she argues that this distinction can explain the relatively easy acceptance of some women's policies and the massive resistance to others.

She says:

Role Equity fits with the American political tradition of equality; although equity issues engender some opposition in the policy-making process. They coincide with basic economic, social and political values. Equity issues address the distribution of power in society but do not disturb basic sex-role definitions. In contrast, role change challenges traditional sex-role ideology. Role change does more than address the distribution of power, it involves the redef-

inition of sex roles in some areas, the elimination of sex roles in others, and most importantly it involves role change not only for women but also for men.

Power, as Boneparth underlines, has been a "thorny problem" for the women's movement. As a group oppressed, feminists have sought ways to reduce the power of one group over another, to restructure power relation so they are just. However, change only occurs when a group seeking change has sufficient power to influence the policy making process.

The essays cover a wide ground - areas which have concerned feminists in Canada too. Some examples: An assessment of Commissions on the Status of Women (commissions are analogous to our Status of Women Councils), an analysis of the need to go beyond "equal pay for equal work," two "motherhood" policy failures - the search for a national child-care program and, "pregnancy policies and employment of women," review of obscenity provisions, of policies for battered women, analysis of "The Foreign Policy Beliefs of Women in Leadership" and a case study of the Women in Development Program of the U.S. AID Administration. (The latter program is analogous to the women in development program of C.I.D.A., the Canadian International Development Agency).

Boneparth concludes with some strategies for the 1980's and revisits the variables outlined in the introduction. She paints the political environment as hostile - and says that "the women's movement must dramatize the gap between rhetoric and reality by exposing the harsh facts of women's lives..." Women's groups must look for ways to obstruct congressional budget cutting through their political allies, and turn existing programs around to benefit women. She advocates stepping up the use of "insiders" - i.e., public servants - since the women's movement now has so few allies holding elective or appointive office. She says the "outsider tactics" must be

re-invigorated - protest politics (i.e. demonstrations), to engage the "grass roots" and make the allies "inside" more credible. More credible because the outside demonstrations show the government loudly that they have a problem.

But, she cautions, since protest wears thin with use, the women's movement must get more involved with electoral politics. She says that the Reagan policy of decentralizing more authority to the states can't be ignored. If more power is going to the states - then that's where attention should be focused by feminists. However, "incremental policy change" must still be sought at the federal level in areas clearly under federal jurisdiction - such as the elimination of sexual discrimination in social security, pensions and insurance. To work within the current political climate and given dearth of resources and political allies, women within the major interest groups must be sought out; eg. in law, medicine and in trade unions.

She comments on strategies to deal with "pro-life," and stresses that "feminists who believe that progress can be made on other issues while losing on abortion miss the crucial point that the pro-life movement and other right wing groups, while starting on abortion, have geared up to attack women's rights in all areas."

Boneparth suggests a general strategy for promoting women's policies, such as:

1. Stressing that the women's movement policies are designed to foster choice for women.

2. That some policies which have direct benefits for women have indirect benefits for men (eg. expanding family income, etc.).

3. Recognize that *some* like Affirmative Action and other "role change" policies will generate intense opposition but nonetheless, women ought to keep at it.

4. Do a better job of promoting its family policies as family protection (to steady the thunder of the right).

5. Change perceptions that women's groups are losing ground.

A tall order! Her call for analysis of past failures to lead the way to the future can't be ignored.

While there are considerable parallels in particular policy areas, the general context of politicizing women's issues, that is getting a government to respond and then act, has not had the same history in Canada as in the U.S.

Here, the Royal Commission on the Status of Women, chaired by Florence Bird, was the key to legitimizing women's issues within the jurisdiction of the federal government. In Canada, the women's lobby in large measure grew up *after* the Royal Commission Report was tabled in Parliament in 1970. It was able to grow in success and influence because all parties had been tuned into the importance of the issues by the Commission.

The first mechanism established in government to deal across the board with policy issues affecting women was created to direct the federal government's response to the Royal Commission. The Office of the Co-ordinator, Status of Women, was established within the Privy Council Office in 1971 and, in 1976, became a government agency "Status of Women Canada." (The Women's Bureau in the Department of Labour had since 1954 played a more restricted, although very important educational role within its sector). The Women's Grants Program in the Secretary of State Department is certainly unparalleled in the U.S. Administration, as is an ongoing, financially supported, Advisory Council.

This early legitimation, by the process and report of the Royal Commission, probably accounts for women's issues being less divisive in

Canada, compared to the U.S. (witness the success of the Charter of Rights fight here, compared to E.R.A.) and, the fact that "improving the status of women" is viewed as an appropriate political goal by all three parties.

This does not mean that high enough priority is placed on equality issues by governments, or that policies to improve women's economic security win out in the battle for scarce new government dollars, but it does mean, at very least, that there's concern enough to discuss them and the decision-making process of government has a legitimate avenue through which they must be aired.

The fact alone that there is a minister responsible for the Status of Women at the federal level and in many provinces, ensures at least one voice in Cabinet mandated to put before ministerial colleagues the policy concerns of women.

There are important differences in this legitimation process comparing the federal government and most provinces, other than Quebec. Only Quebec has produced an equivalent to the Royal Commission report, focussing on provincial jurisdiction. In most provinces, there are not the bureaucratic structures to ensure airing of women's issues in an organized fashion through the decision-making process. These differences themselves are worth analyzing for impact on the development of equality policies. We urgently need a Canadian equivalent to Boneparth's useful approach to *Women, Power and Policy*.

Maureen O'Neil  
Status of Women Canada

**Women in Top Jobs 1968-1979.** Michael Fogarty, Isobel Allen and Patricia Walters. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1981. Pp. 273.

In 1971 Fogarty, Allen and Walters published their study *Women in Top Jobs: Four Studies in Achievement*, which was part of the "Sex, Career and Family" series produced under the auspices of Political and Economic Planning in Britain. Ten years later, the follow-up study by the same authors appeared, *Women in Top Jobs 1968-1979*. This book examines the progress made by women in various levels of professional and managerial positions in Britain over the ten-year period. The authors analyze the extent to which sexual barriers have been overcome in organizations, and assess, from a practical point of view, what still remains to be done.

The methodology used is never clearly elaborated but it appears to be the following: three groups of informants, i.e. women and men in middle and senior positions, young women management trainees and personnel managers and department heads (both men and women) were interviewed and in some cases answered a questionnaire. Statistical data are presented in the book. However, due to the small numbers employed, the authors rely mostly on qualitative material.

*Women in Top Jobs 1968-1979* focuses on case studies of women in four milieux: civil service administration, two industrial companies, the B.B.C. and the architectural profession. The findings indicate that although the number of women recruited in junior positions has increased substantially, there has been little or no change in the numbers of women in top jobs.

In the two industrial companies, as well as in the B.B.C., there was a fractional increase in the proportion of women holding management positions, but among the highest managers and department heads, no change was found. In the Civil Service, the proportion of women among deputy Secretaries increased only minimally and there were very few to begin with (2 out of 80 in 1968 compared to 4 out of 149 in 1978). No woman was appointed Permanent Secretary over