

manic depressive, subject to bouts of melancholia brought on by his conviction that he was damned. Not only did Montgomery have to perform the role of minister's wife, an arduous one and one that she did not shirk because of strong feelings of duty, but also she had to keep up a front of normalcy in the community during her husband's difficult times. Added to this were the care and rearing of two sons. Montgomery had substituted the role of dutiful granddaughter for those of dutiful wife, mother and community leader. Further, the pressures from her publishers and audience to produce more and more Anne books were strong, and Montgomery had long since grown tired of Anne whom she referred to early on as "That detestable Anne." She desperately wanted to progress as a writer beyond children's literature, but her upbringing which stressed the importance in a woman of subservience to others and her social and family circumstances would not allow it. She maintained personal privacy in spite of her publisher's requests for a biography partly because of a desire to protect her family and community life but also because she was afraid of what a biography might reveal of her frustrations as a writer.

Montgomery's letters reveal a steady darkening of her outlook in her last years. Disappointments concerning her sons, the worsening of her husband's condition, continued demands from her publisher for books she could no longer bear to write and the Second World War

finally broke her. She died in 1942, as spiritually alone as she had been throughout her life, except for her correspondence with Weber and MacMillan which she kept up to the end. Gillen aptly employs the image of being caught up in "the wheel of things," or pressures that she could not control, to represent Montgomery's life.

Gillen's biography makes interesting reading and is well illustrated with photographs. However, it makes clear the need for the publication of Montgomery's letters which will without doubt reveal the woman more immediately and accurately. Also, a more critical and thorough assessment of Montgomery's writing in relation to her life and letters must yet be done.

Carrie Fredericks
Acadia University

Half the Human Experience: the Psychology of Women Janet Shibley Hyde and B.G. Rosenberg. Lexington: D. C. Heath & Company, 1976. Pp. 306.

A book subtitled "The Psychology of Women" might be expected either (a) to present its own theory of such a psychology, or (b) to review and evaluate other theories and the empirical evidence that gives them support.

This work, by Janet Hyde and Benjamin Rosenberg, clearly does not do the first. In fact, in their broad survey of the literature the authors avoid taking any strong stands and restrict their own statements to the soporific. For example, no one needs to be reminded of the heat generated by the debate over how much of observed sex difference should be attributed to the environment and how much is innate. The authors claim they have adopted an 'interactionist' position, which places them above the arguments about biology vs. the environment.

As a matter-of-fact, just about everybody is an interactionist. A pure environmentalist position probably hasn't been put forward since John Broadus Watson, the father of Behaviorism, claimed he could take a baby at birth and turn it into anything desired--banker, lawyer, thief. Even Watson hedged his bet by demanding that it be a "normal" baby. And only those who take astrology seriously are willing to discount the importance of the environment. Some psychologists have created a stir in recent years by attempting to show that groups with "inferior gene pools" have limited intellectual potential; but even these psychologists believe that innate potential interacts with the environment. It's just that they believe some people don't have much innate potential to do the interacting.

This book must be considered a review of

the field. The authors tried to do their review in such a way that scholarship would not be slighted, and the book would be "stimulating to undergraduates." It may be stimulating, but the scholarship is something else again.

Many people say many things about sex differences. Merely recounting the various opinions is bound to be confusing and can hardly be expected to clear up misconceptions or eradicate prejudice. Yet, Hyde & Rosenberg seldom do more than uncritically report what others claim to know. Let me give one (representative) example. Ever since Freud said "anatomy is destiny" the psychology of women has been burdened with the notion of "penis envy" (just as the psychology of men, if such there be, has been afflicted with "castration anxiety"). Here is the Hyde & Rosenberg view of these concepts:

While many case histories are available to document the existence of penis envy among women seeking therapy . . . it remains to be demonstrated that penis envy is common among women (generally), or that it has a large impact on their development. Indeed, empirical research indicates that in psychiatric studies the penis-envy theme is not nearly so common among women as castration anxiety among men. This suggests that Freud, in writing from a male point of view, accurately observed

the castration anxiety of the male, but was less accurate when constructing a parallel--penis envy--for the female.

The first problem here is that the authors want to put women in general on one side, and women-seeking-therapy and men on the other. Freud's theories of sexuality are apparently correct with regard to the latter, but not to the former. This is certainly uncharitable to women-seeking-therapy (and to men, of course). But it is also a dangerous line to take in debunking Freud's idea of penis envy. Freud was particularly self-consistent in his 1907 theories of sexuality, and if one accepts some postulates, the door is open for the rest of them. It would be taking a stronger line (and, I think, a more accurate one) to deny the influence of things like penis envy and castration anxiety in the psychology of the sexes. That these show up in psychoanalysts' interpretations of their patients' dreams says more about the worth of case studies than about anything else. The authors, rather than undertake such critical analysis, are content to rely on what they call "psychiatric studies" (what is a psychiatric study?), and give references to journals like Psychiatric Quarterly and Contemporary Psychoanalysis (not know for their rigor).

In the absence of anything like hard evidence from the authors, I will close this review by looking at a published research project, supported by grants

from the U.S. Public Health Service and the National Institute of Mental Health. Calvin Hall and Robert L. Van de Castle collected thousands of dream records from undergraduates at Western Reserve University and the University of Denver. Dreams were scored for many things, including "penis envy" (PE) and "castration anxiety" (CA). For the whole sample, dreams of CA outnumbered dreams of PE, supporting the Hyde and Rosenberg contention--so far. They also found that males were more likely than females to have CA dreams, 3 to 1, and that females were more likely to have PE dreams than males, 2 to 1 (why should any males have PE dreams, I wonder?). Hall and Van de Castle claimed their results were "clearcut in favor of the (Freudian) hypothesis."

While this study is more rigorous than anything Hyde & Rosenberg present on the PE/CA business, it does not stand up to inspection. For example, in the scoring criteria used to rate dreams, there were four types of dreams that could be scored CA dreams, but only three types that could be scored PE dreams--no wonder CA dreams were more common than PE dreams! When one looks at the actual criteria used by the judges it is found that one major determinant was: "a dreamer dreams of being a member of the opposite sex, or of wearing the clothes or accessories of the opposite sex." The problem is, when a male has such a dream it is scored CA, but when a woman has such a dream it is scored PE. Thus, in the

very constraints imposed on the data by the investigators' theoretical perspectives, for a man to dream about being a woman represents a fear, but for a woman to dream about being a man represents envy. No wonder such research finds support for its pre-conceptions.

Non-scientists cannot be expected to understand all the sources of error in studies of this kind. But more might be expected of psychologists such as Hyde & Rosenberg, writing a book intended for university classes. It takes considerable analysis and critical appraisal to separate truth and illusion in the turbulent area of sex differences.

Patrick O'Neill
Acadia University

Canada's Nursing Sisters G.W.L. Nicholson. Toronto: Samuel Stevens Hakkert & Company-National Museum of Man, 1975. Pp. 272.

Official histories often tend to be narrow in focus and prosaic in tone. Canada's Nursing Sisters is no exception. As a history of Canadian military nursing it is very much an administrative study reflecting the conventional interpretation of Canada as a non-military nation,

never preparing for war, arming only in an emergency. In 1885 the emergency which prompted the introduction of military nurses was the North West Rebellion. Initiated as a temporary measure, little was done to integrate the nurses into or make them a part of the permanent force so that with the outbreak of the Boer War, some years later, an ad hoc arrangement again had to be made. Even when they became part of the permanent force the ebb and flow of their involvement continued. In peacetime their numbers were small and their work routine; only in wartime did they come into their own.

This is a frustrating book in many ways. We find out what these women did but not who they were. Their deeds, often heroic are suitably catalogued. And many of them deserve to be. Of the 3143 nursing sisters in World War I, 2594 served overseas and 46 died as a result of injuries or sickness sustained through military service. But why did these women do what they did--was it only for patriotic reasons as Nicholson suggests? Why did these women go into nursing in the first place? Were the reasons the same in 1885 as they were in 1939? Obviously the social context of opportunities for women had altered. Had the reasons changed as well? Once in the profession what prompted them to choose military nursing? No effort is made to answer these questions. When the first four Canadian nurses arrived in Cape Town during the Boer War they found they could not accompany their countrymen to the field hospitals as there was no accomo-