

(1931-66). Comparisons with the works of other diarists and autobiographers (Coleridge, Wordsworth, De Quincey, Lamb, and Yeats) give a panoramic view of the worth of Nin's *Diary*, and enrich it. The syntheses offered readers familiarize them at a glance with the events and personalities involved in the various volumes under scrutiny, enabling them to pick out the particular volumes they would like to read. Yet here, too, the sensitive artist, the poet, the moving and poignant force behind the objective and cogent descantations, is nowhere to be found.

Section III devoted to Nin's critical works: *D.H. Lawrence: An Unprofessional Study* and *The Novel of the Future*; and to her nonfiction: *A Woman Speaks* and *In Favour of the Sensitive Man*, is unfortunately inadequate. Important with regard to Nin's literary, aesthetic, and spiritual evolution, these relatively objective appraisals are given short shrift and little critical analysis.

As reflected by its title, *Anais Nin: An Introduction* is best read and studied by those beginners who seek to learn more about the outpourings of this phenomenal woman and artist. The plots are masterfully summarized, the characters expertly delineated, and the events sharply underscored. For those deeply involved in Nin's writings, however, a serious omission will be found: the life blood of this ethereal visionary—musicologist of words and form, painter of images—whose creative power was hypnotic, crystalline, as well as lunar, compelling those with whom it came into contact to experience greater awareness and deeper consciousness into Self: as microcosm and macrocosm.

Bettina L. Knapp
Hunter College and the Graduate Center
at the City University of New York

IN TRANSITION: HOW FEMINISM, SEXUAL LIBERATION AND THE SEARCH FOR SELF-FULFILLMENT HAVE ALTERED OUR LIVES. JUDITH M. BARDWICK. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979. Pp. 203.

In Transition presents the author's view of the attitude changes of the 1970s and the psychological consequences of these changes. Bardwick's main thesis is that feminism, the human potential movement and the sexual revolution have challenged many of the basic attitudes of our culture, especially attitudes about women's place in society. All three movements are rooted in and have served to further develop an orientation of egocentric hedonism which characterized the 1970s. Although all three movements are discussed, the book focuses primarily on feminism and the effects of an increasing awareness of feminist issues on work, motherhood, sexuality, marriage, divorce, women's relationships with women and our sense of our femininity or masculinity. Throughout the book, Bardwick emphasizes the necessity of a wide range of human activities and commitments for the development of healthy individuals and a healthy society. She defines sexism as ". . . not only disparagement of what women do but also disparagement of what women are."¹ She emphasizes that it is not enough, indeed it is sexist, to assume that the only route to self esteem and competence for women is through paid employment. We must also revalue activities and qualities that have traditionally been done by and assigned to women. People need both a sense of autonomy and a connection to others through relationship.

The strengths of *In Transition* lie in the intensity of personal vision presented and in a number of psychological insights that provide a basis for further discussion, analysis and research. In the Introduction,

the author tells the reader that the issues in the book are personal, she has experienced the value changes she is talking about, and she does not pretend objectivity. Her involvement with the material in the book is evident in her writing style and the book is beautifully written. Thus, it is not a personal book in the sense that Bardwick tells us about the details of her personal life, although she occasionally does include experiences of her own. Rather, it is personal in the sense that her caring for the material she discusses shows in her writing. She does not distance herself from the excitement and the doubts that come from change. The words she chooses are clear, intense and often absolute. Thus, when she says "Success is a gratifying and a dangerous lifestyle"² or "Ambivalence is an inevitable result of all commitments,"³ she conveys an understanding that is based in her own experience as well as in the psychological literature she reviews.

The other strength of the book is in Bardwick's ability to generate psychological insights and hypotheses. Her discussion of the psychological origins of women's distrust of women is an example. She rejects the common psychological explanation that this originates in adolescence in a competition among girls for boys. There is, she hypothesizes, an earlier origin in the girl's friendship pattern of "best friends." This pattern makes the young girl vulnerable to rejection by her best friend, particularly if another girl joins the dyad. There remain a number of empirical questions that this analysis leaves unanswered such as: Do girls more than boys have a best friend rather than a group of friends? Is the boy who is rejected by the gang less hurt than the girl who is rejected by her best friend? Are girls more likely than boys to experience rejection by a same sex peer? Nonetheless, the idea is an interesting one and worth pursuing. Bardwick's discussion of power and power relationships among women is another area in which she presents the reader with a richness of insights about the differing perceptions of those who have and do not have power, women's relationships to power and the problems inherent in confusing the lack of formal power structures with egalitarianism.

The weaknesses of the book are related to its strength. Personal vision that is strongly felt can too easily be presented as if it were fact. Although Bardwick does this in a number of different areas throughout the book, the most distorting is in her repeated assumptions about what the Women's Movement is and stands for. After a very brief discussion of differences within the women's Movement in which she divides it into conservative, mainstream and radical branches,⁴ she proceeds to describe the views of mainstream feminism. Her definition of feminism: "More than anything else, feminism is a psychological revolution based on women's insistence that they have a basic right to make choices and to be judged as individuals"⁵ is followed throughout the book by statements that the Women's Movement or the Women's Movement literature degrades housewives, glorifies success in paid employment, emphasizes the costs but not the rewards of motherhood, discusses women's relationship to men but pays little attention to women's relationships with women, describes women's traditional roles in ways that verge on caricature, and above all reflects and condones an egocentric hedonism that results in women being unwilling to stay with any commitment as soon as it ceases to be pleasing and satisfying. Either I am reading different sources than Bardwick or we are reading the same things and interpreting them differently. It is difficult to know which since she does not give examples or discuss feminist sources. Although I would take a very different view of the message of the Women's Movement my major problem is not so much with Bardwick's view as with the fact that her view is presented as definitive, final and authoritative rather than her personal reading of feminist literature.

Until we have a well developed body of work in feminist theory, interpretations of what the Women's Movement is and what it represents will necessarily remain subjective. Bardwick could have given a much less simplistic description of the Women's Movement had she integrated some other feminist sources into her book, since there are many interesting points of comparison between her ideas and those of other feminists.

In Bardwick's discussion of motherhood she begins from an assumption that our society is a coercively pronatal but also an anti-child society. Her analysis of the stereotype of an ideal mother is perceptive and ends with the conclusion, "The stereotypic ideal of mothering is thus, paradoxically anti-child and anti-mother."⁶ Her conclusion is an assumption that is central to Adrienne Rich's work in *Of Women Born*,⁷ although Rich, in separating the experience of mothering from the institution of mothering, can both explain the paradox as well as show how the institution of motherhood in a patriarchal society can change the experience of motherhood from one which is inherently rewarding and challenging into one which is oppressive.

In Transition is also weakened by a use of psychological reductionism to the exclusion of political and economic explanations. This is particularly evident in Bardwick's use of egocentric hedonism. To assume that the Women's Movement, the Human Potential Movement and the Sexual Revolution all arose in the early 1970s out of a basic orientation of egocentric hedonism is at best over simplified and at worst wrong. In stating these links as if they were simple facts, Bardwick is ignoring the diverse political, economic and social factors behind each of these movements. The Women's Movement has a complex history much of it rooted in reformist and revolutionary politics.⁸ Any feminist who has been involved in any political struggle around women's issues would rightly take offense at the assumption that her motivation can be reduced to egocentric hedonism and that her commitment to the movement as well as to her interpersonal relationships is dependent on these situations continuing to please and satisfy her.

Because *In Transition* is a book written from an intensely personal and psychological perspective, it is uneven, especially considered in academic or scholarly terms. Bardwick presents a number of sources to support her views, but once she gets outside academic psychology her use of sources is at times indiscriminate. This is

especially true where she ventures into anthropology. At one point she uses such varied sources as Margaret Mead's *Male and Female*, an article by Levi-Strauss, Theodore Reik's *The Creation of Women*, and Steven Goldberg's *The Inevitability of Patriarchy* to essentially bolster her view that in dual career couples there is a need for the man to retain some symbolic and subtle expression of dominance.⁹ The reasoning is sweeping and ignores many complexities and biases present in the anthropological literature. The book's strength is not in its academic qualities but in its intelligent use of insight and intuition. It should be read for the hypotheses, ideas and interesting connections it provides, but not for a balanced view of social change nor for an analysis of the views and effects of the Women's Movement.

Meredith Kimball
Simon Fraser University

NOTES

1. Judith M. Bardwick, *In Transition* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1979), p. 35.
2. Bardwick, p. 54.
3. Bardwick, p. 66.
4. Bardwick, p. 5.
5. Bardwick, p. 12.
6. Bardwick, p. 72.
7. Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1976).
8. Jo Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation* (New York: Longman, 1979).
9. Bardwick, pp. 113-118. Her sources are: Margaret Mead, *Male and Female* (New York, 1949); C. Levi-Strauss, "The Family", in *Man, Culture, and Society* (New York, 1956); Theodore Reik, *The Creation of Woman* (New York, 1960); Steven Goldberg, *The Inevitability of Patriarchy* (New York, 1974).