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FROM THE EDITORS

Winter Solstice, 2005.

The sun is shining in southern Wisconsin; I appreciate that on the shortest day of the year. We’ve already had cold and snow for so long, it feels more like deep midwinter than the start of the season.

I’ve taken up knitting again — although “again” might be an exaggeration. I learned enough in high school to make my brother one raggedy scarf and then, in my late twenties, started a simple sweater I never finished. But my multitalented partner not only knits but spins too, and I’m inspired to help her use that lovely yarn. She’s also a glass artist, and last night she presented me with a gorgeous pair of glass knitting needles. Visions of cozily productive winter evenings are dancing in my head. Some who know me might wonder how I’ll find the time, given my myriad other non-job pursuits, not to mention my job. But most of those pursuits — creative writing, editing, raising animals, being an active godmother, keeping the books for the art business, cleaning the house — require a type of engagement that isn’t feasible while I’m visiting with guests, for instance, or attending meetings or riding in the car. And maybe I’ll come to understand the resurgence of this craft and especially its apparent popularity among today’s young feminists.

Speaking of that phenomenon, this seems like a good place to plug a zine we haven’t yet reviewed in FC, which I picked up at the 2004 Madison Zine Fest: Slave to the Needles is published right here in Madison by Aimee Hagerty, one of whose fantasies is to “join a feminist marching band.” Aimee even offers a knitting pattern for “a birth control pill case cozy.” The address for Slave is P.O. Box 260224, Madison, WI 53726-0224.

Writing is a pursuit I take up again and again, and just as often abandon for projects that seem more urgent. Last winter, with the encouragement of the same multitalented partner, I embarked on a “write a novel in 30 days” experiment. I stretched it to six weeks, but actually did draft something with a beginning, a middle, an end, and a few intriguing characters. To combat my abandonment tendencies, I enrolled myself this fall in an ongoing critique group, with a goal of revising my murder mystery within a year. I’m not making phenomenal progress, but the group does push me to honor my intention to write. My story features a lesbian amateur sleuth with a poodle and a day job as an editor (imagine!). Migraine medication and espresso figure into the plot. The book is meant to be funny, at least a little, but I want it to be more than that at its heart. We’ll see.

This issue of Feminist Collections isn’t about knitting at all, or about mysteries, although it does review zines. It is satisfyingly long on book reviews, with five feature-length articles, including one about book publishing and selling, one about feminist philosophy/theory, and two on gender and academia. The fifth, a tour de force from Catherine Orr about the “pasts and futures” of women’s studies as a discipline, will be thought-provoking reading, especially for anyone heading for NWSA’s June 2006 conference in Oakland, California. Catherine is one of the designers of the conference, the theme of which is “Locating Women’s Studies: Formations of Power and Resistance.”

Maybe we’ll see you in Oakland; our office will have an exhibit as always. With any luck, though, you’ll see at least two more issues of FC (Fall 2005 and Winter 2006) in your mailbox long before that.

J.L.
Do you remember the first time you recognized gender discrimination for what it was, rather than as a personal inadequacy or shortcoming? My moment of realization dates back to the late 1970s, when I was an undergraduate student. At that time I naively idealized the university as a site of feminist social change. Little did I imagine that over the next twenty years, disparities in salary, rank, and tenure between female and male faculty would increase rather than decrease, according to a study by the American Association of University Professors.1

These disparities and other manifestations of sexism are examined in the four books reviewed here. Of the four works, *It’s Cold and Lonely at the Middle* is the most basic introduction to gender inequities in higher education. It reports Joanne Ardovini-Brooker’s study on whether the “chilly classroom climate” for women in colleges and universities (an expression that Bernice Sandler and Roberta M. Hall coined in 1982) “is expressed through hostile, dominant, and/or disrespectful behavior within female graduate students’ classrooms” (p.5). Ardovini-Brooker collected quantitative and qualitative data from students enrolled in four introductory, undergraduate sociology classes in the Department of Sociology at Western Michigan University. Female graduates taught two of the classes, and males taught the other two. Ardovini-Brooker observed classroom behaviors and tallied students’ verbal and non-verbal hostile behaviors. Students in these classes answered a two-part survey: the first section comprised four article abstracts, without authors’ names, followed by six evaluative questions about the abstracts; the second was a FEM Scale questionnaire, which measures attitudes toward women and feminism. Finally, Ardovini-Brooker facilitated “consciousness-raising debriefing[s] of the survey population” in all four classes (p.39).

Her analysis of the quantitative data showed that in courses taught by female graduate instructors, male students averaged more hostile behaviors than female students. The qualitative data demonstrated that female graduate instructors face substantial hostility...
from students, who devalue female instructors’ intellectual work.

While Ardovini-Brooker clearly is passionate about chilly climate issues and committed to warming the university for women, her project suffers from some missteps in design. For example, she doesn’t always consider variables other than sexism that could have caused students to sleep in class, and she did not control the order in which students accessed the surveys, and this may have skewed the data. To her credit, she is forthright about these issues.

It’s Cold and Lonely at the Middle is thoroughly accessible. Undergraduate students who are considering pursuing academic careers will benefit from reading it.

Ivory Basement Leadership looks more closely at the status and experiences of women employed in what author Joan Eveline labels the university’s invisible “ivory basement”—the “lower levels of university life.” Eveline identifies ivory basement occupants as “tutors, casual workers, administrative staff in frontline positions, research assistants, lower level academics, and women and men who seek to generate an equitable and diverse workforce” (p.2). A Senior Lecturer in Organizational and Labour Studies in the Business School at the University of Western Australia (UWA), Eveline uses UWA as a case study of leadership modes exercised by women in the ivory basement and of internal reforms intended to reconfigure the university’s traditional gender hierarchy.

UWA’s gender equity initiative occurred within the contexts of a national movement to restructure Australian universities “to help them cope with more students and fewer resources, while also demonstrating the relevance of academic research to applied students generating marketable products” (p.204). Eveline’s study spans 1996, when she was hired at UWA, to 2001. She played an influential role in UWA’s gender equity initiative and throughout took the position of participant-observer. In fact, the internal report on the position of academic women at UWA that catalyzed the university’s discussions of gender and diversity used a theoretical frame-
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However, the consensus achieved around diversifying faculty and staff leadership did not extend to other, more radical changes. In fact, Eveline does not consider topics such as curricular and pedagogical reform. Nevertheless, she does an excellent job of interrogating fissures among UWA’s female employees. For example, she provides a good analysis of how class and rank differences trumped the possibilities for gender alliances and overrode a sense of gender solidarity. Some of the most interesting passages in the book are those devoted to an exploration of ivory basement women’s distrust of solutions proposed by women in UWA’s “ivory tower.” Eveline also examines a multiplexed set of divisions that broke out along the lines of sexuality and race/ethnicity. Some women of color, “minority” women, indigenous women, and lesbians reported being marginalized in the university’s patriarchal hierarchy and by the movement for gender equity. Eveline’s insightful, honest discussion of these fractures shows us a pervasive institutional liberalism that empowers some but not all women.

But Eveline’s analysis of ivory basement women’s modes of leadership, while making significant contributions to the intersection of women’s/ gender and leadership studies, is less than completely satisfying. In some respects, it reiterates other scholars’ attempts to identify leadership styles associated with women and/or favored by women. Most of these efforts, including Eveline’s, slip into a form of
essentialism that idealizes women and womanhood. Although Eveline starts off on the right track by setting out to identify a feminist form of leadership that she labels “post-heroic” because it is antithetical to “great man” theories of leadership, ultimately she develops five categories of gynocentric leadership based on behaviors that she observed in ivory basement women. She classifies them as “networking,” “do-it-yourself,” “distributive,” “diversifying,” and “alliance” leadership forms. In fairness to Eveline, these leadership styles do evidence feminist characteristics. Typically, for example, they are marked by a collaborative rather than competitive ethic. However, Eveline tends to write about them as if they are “women’s ways” of leadership rather than ideologically feminist. Despite this slippage, Eveline’s groundwork establishes a more responsible foundation for identifying and teaching feminist leadership methods and strategies than does any text that I have read in 1991 book *Women of Influence, Women of Vision: A Cross-Generational Study of Leaders and Social Change* (by Helen S. Astin and Carole Leland), often referred to as the benchmark for scholarly studies on women and leadership.

While she concludes by suggesting that the characteristics that she attributes to women’s leadership styles can rescue the university from corporatization, her analysis stops short of showing us how.

*Inside Corporate U: Women in the Academy Speak Out* is an anthology of fourteen essays about university “restructuring” in Canada, which, as in Australia, is driven by universities’ entry into the marketplace and globalization. These articles provide excellent analyses of how the capitalization of tertiary education suppresses women’s voices, marginalizes feminist teaching and research, and contributes to increasing disparities between female and male faculty despite, or perhaps, as many essays suggest, because of, greater numbers of Canadian women joining university faculties.

*Inside Corporate U* contains four sections: “Working in Corporate U,” “Women’s Careers in the Gendered Stream,” “Employment and Educational Equity in the Corporate University,” and “The Student Experience of Consumerism, High Technology and Life in Residence.” Essays in the first section examine the correlation between corporatization’s escalating regulation of scholars and the spike in numbers of female faculty in Canada. The second section looks at the connections between the places where women enter Canadian universities’ hierarchical structures — lower levels are flush with women while women remain underrepresented at the top — and how the hierarchy subverts and obstructs social change initiatives. The third section provides more analysis of sex stratification and the gendered division of labor in Canadian universities. Finally, the last section of *Inside Corporate U* broadens the discussion to critique universities’ practice of invoking students’ interests to justify and defend corporatization, particularly because a majority of Canadian undergraduates are female.

All of the essays are excellent. Marilee Reimer’s introduction gives an outstanding review of the scholarship on university corporatization that superbly frames the questions raised in the book’s essays. *Inside Corporate U* is accessible and engaging. Its scope is broad, treating women’s concerns about the effects of “restructuring” in diverse disciplines and at multiple levels of the university hierarchy. While it is specific to the Canadian experience, the book uses a sufficiently general approach so that its analyses can be extrapolated and usefully applied to other national university systems. Faculty and administrators concerned about corporatization and scholars working on this and related topics will appreciate *Inside Corporate U*. But the audience that most needs to read it are emerging leaders who are planning to make their careers in the university and, perhaps more important, the more naïve proponents of university corporatization among us.

**The capitalization of tertiary education suppresses women’s voices, marginalizes feminist teaching and research, and contributes to increasing disparities between female and male faculty.**
corporatization primarily benefits men. Women are concentrated in lower-level academic positions and fields that tend to generate less revenue. Women, therefore, tend to be more expendable. Second, Currie, Thiele and Harris found that competitive, authoritarian “work styles” remain the norm and are most rewarded. As other scholars have argued with regard to non-academic work settings, more men than women exhibit these styles. Hence, more women than men are disadvantaged by this norm.

This study benefited significantly from the authors’ attentiveness to the intersections of class and gender. Using focus groups and individual interviews as their primary collection tools, the authors, as participant-observers, were careful to cull data from 113 women and 89 men working in multiple strata. Currie, Thiele and Harris interviewed secretaries and managers as well as technicians and academics. Although only two universities were studied, those two were carefully chosen because of significant differences between them. One is smaller and was founded in the 1970s. It has a reputation as a more democratic, female-friendly “alternative” to the traditional university. The other was founded in the 1960s and originally was a technological institute. Its mission is to prepare students for the professions and, according to Currie, Thiele and Harris, has a “strongly masculinist culture” (p.54).

The data and the authors’ analyses are extraordinarily detailed. Currie, Thiele and Harris examine numerous variables, each including multiple subcategories. For example, they examined the variable “type of sacrifice needed to ‘get ahead.’” Subcategories ranged from sacrifices related to ethical choices to decisions related to family. Responses were broken down by gender and class differentials. As a result, we get a rich view of corporatization’s consequences for a diverse range of university employees.

*Gendered Universities in Globalized Economies* ends in a reformist tone. Unlike other writers who merely describe problems, these authors go further to suggest remedies that will support the university in serving public interests rather than revenue generation alone, beginning with specific recommendations that will benefit employees and render the university a more equitable workplace for women. Among their solutions are focusing efforts on making change at local or “micro” levels. They advocate recruiting senior faculty into these initiatives and activating feminist men to work for change (p.184). Furthermore, they call for infusing with feminist ethics “four traditional university values” threatened by corporatization: democratic collegiality, professional autonomy and integrity, critical dissent and academic freedom, and the “public interest” value of universities (p.186).

Finally, they challenge universities to add to this list a fifth element, which is concern for employees’ domestic sphere concerns and responsibilities. While this attempt to identify change strategies is admirable, it is also flawed. For one thing, the authors do not provide sufficient details. For example, the discussion of employers’ responsibility to accommodate workers’ personal obligations does not consider the underlying problem, which is that universities and other enterprises continue to assume that the false division of public and private is natural and legitimate. Moreover, like Eveline, Currie, Thiele and Harris envision only liberal solutions to the neoliberal problem of market globalization. I would like to have seen them acknowledge their liberalism and their reasons for not considering or offering radical remedies.

Nevertheless, *Gendered Universities in Globalized Economies* is a smart book, and the research is robust. It is best suited for scholars and advanced students in sociology, higher education administration, and women’s/gender studies.

Notes


3. “The politics of advantage” is Eveline’s term for the processes by which prevailing norms and institutions erase competing possibilities — alternative systems and ideologies — from cultural systems; thus, the dominant position or network of beliefs and values gives the inaccurate but convincing impression that it is naturally and essentially “true.”

[Colette Morrow is an Associate Professor of English at Purdue University-Calumet. She is a past president of the National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) and currently serves on the editorial board of the NWSA Journal. In 2000–2001, Professor Morrow was a Senior Fulbright Scholar at ENVILA Women’s University in Minsk, Belarus.]
I entered Yale University in the fall of 1995, a member of the first undergraduate class there to matriculate more women than men. Several years later, my stepbrother entered Vassar College, taking pride in telling relatives he was attending his “sister’s school’s sister school.” While the irony of our attending our respective colleges was not lost on our older relatives, most of our classmates were utterly oblivious to the long histories of single-sex education that these universities possessed. Indeed, I chose Yale for its world-renowned research facilities and breadth of academic and extracurricular opportunities; my sibling chose Vassar for its small class size and intimate, nurturing environment. We both graduated satisfied, unable to comprehend fully that just one or two generations earlier, our choices would not have been ours to make.

Since the founding of American universities in the seventeenth century, educators and students have been divided on the roles of women in institutions of higher learning. While some women were attending coeducational and women’s colleges in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, it was not until the civil rights and feminist movements of the 1960s and 1970s that most men’s colleges began to admit women. Several new books discuss the history of women in formerly male institutions of higher learning. In Going Coed, Leslie Miller-Bernal and Susan L. Poulson bring case studies of the integration of women into men’s colleges during the second half of the twentieth century. Rosalind Rosenberg narrows her focus to detailing the history of the education of women at Columbia University in Changing the Subject. Similarly, Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s Yards and Gates collects essays and documents on the changing role of women at Harvard University over the past four centuries. And Gina Barecca’s bitingly funny memoir, Babes in Boyland, gives a personal account of the changes at Dartmouth during the tumultuous early years of coeducation in the 1970s.

Many Universities, One Shared Experience. While many American universities have been coeducational since their inception —Oberlin, founded in 1833, was the first — the majority of colleges and universities only provided single-sex education until the middle of last century. With the rise of the civil rights and feminist movements in the 1960s, many single-sex colleges and universities began admitting both men and women, diversifying by gender as well by race, religion, and class. In Going Coed: Women’s Experiences in Formerly Men’s Colleges and Universities, 1950–2000, Leslie Miller-Bernal and Susan L. Poulson discuss case studies of twenty-three colleges and universities that began admitting women in the past sixty years. These institutions may have come to coeducation in a variety of ways, yet their overall experiences were remarkably similar.

The tales of integrating women into formerly male bastions of higher learning follow the familiar trajectory: social change sweeps the country and spurs administrators (frequently) or alumni and trustees (less often) to open the doors of their institutions to women. The women come in small numbers, with meager university resources at their disposal, and struggle against the biases of their classmates.

A COLLEGE OF ONE’S OWN: WOMEN AND COEDUCATION

by Sara N.S. Meirowitz


and professors. Despite these adversities, the women succeed academically and extracurricularly, and eventually their numbers equal or surpass their male classmates’ in graduation rates. Colleges that followed this pattern are as diverse as Princeton and West Point and as the University of Virginia and Boston College. Indeed, reading the catalog of colleges that successfully became coed can be a bit repetitive, numbing one to the historical reality of how difficult it was for the women in the early years of coeducation, and how difficult it remains for women to win tenure or be elected trustees even now.

Some of the stories that stand out in Going Coed are those of less typical universities. Historically black Lincoln University began admitting women when its male matriculation rate began dropping precipitously: male applicants were choosing historically white universities that were starting to admit black students. At the University of Rochester, administrators attempted coeducation early in the century, moved to coordinate education (separate women’s and men’s colleges within one university), and finally re-attempted coeducation in the 1950s. And essays on military schools and on community and for-profit colleges broaden the profile of the representative schools beyond the typical liberal arts institutions.

The overwhelming message of this book’s essays is that coeducation was a good thing for the women and men of these colleges. The average SAT scores of admitted students rose, and, after a period of adjustment, nearly everyone affiliated with the college agreed that coeducation was clearly the correct decision, even the most blueblood of the alumni. I wonder whether case studies could have been found in which coeducation did not go smoothly. Are there universities that became less prestigious or respected after coeducation, or that lost the intimacy they had as all-male institutions? Additionally, despite the success women have had as students at these colleges and universities, women remain underrepresented in the ranks of tenured faculty and university administration. Going Coed does mention the changing roles of women in running these institutions, as well as the growth of women’s studies programs, but focuses primarily on the experience of the students there. Perhaps diversifying the scope of their analysis and storytelling could have led the essay authors to give a broader sense of what constituted success in coeducation. These few quibbles aside, the essays in Miller-Bernal and Poulsen’s book give a terrific introduction to the messy process of integrating colleges and universities.

Coordinate Education and Coeducation: Barnard and Columbia. Rosalind Rosenberg’s masterful history of women at Columbia University, Changing the Subject: How the Women of Columbia Shaped the Way We Think About Sex and Politics, presents a lengthy narrative of the struggle towards coeducation at that venerated institution. Meticulous in its account, Changing the Subject details the roles of literally hundreds of women (and men) in founding the women’s college Barnard, integrating the graduate and professional schools, and ultimately admitting women to the formerly male Columbia College. The paths towards coeducation at Columbia, unlike those at the schools profiled in Going Coed, began in the 1870s and meandered their way to the modern-day unusual compromise: a coeducational college (Columbia College) coexisting with a coordinate women’s college (Barnard College).

Rosenberg details how the founding of Barnard was itself a struggle: even in 1889, some educators felt women and men would be best served through coeducation, while others felt that women deserved no part of higher education at all. The opening of Barnard, with its complicated rules about how many classes would be taught by Columbia College faculty, was a compromise that was seen by some as inadequate. As the graduate and professional schools at Columbia slowly integrated, pressure built to combine the two undergraduate colleges. But since Barnard had hired its own faculty and constructed its own curriculum, less restrictive than the Columbia core curriculum, the administrators, students, and alumnae of Barnard were reluctant to fold that school into Columbia College, as Radcliffe did into Harvard. Indeed, it was the very restrictions on hiring women to teach at Columbia College that led Barnard to hire its own faculty and administrative body, which then prevented full coeducation when the revolutions of the 1960s began. To this day, women can choose to apply to the larger and more structured Columbia College or to the smaller and more nurturing Barnard College.

The dilemma over undergraduate education is only one of the many stories that Rosenberg tells. While the subtitle may overreach a bit, since the book does confine its discussions to the roles of women on Columbia’s campus rather than in changing the outside world, the stories within detail struggles toward class, racial, and religious integration at Barnard. The most impressive and occasionally tedious parts of the book document the roles and lives of the hundreds of women involved in coeducation at Columbia. While the constant parade of names and dates overwhelmed this
nonhistorian a bit, I was impressed by the depth of Rosenberg’s research and her ability to keep the strong narrative flowing while giving each woman her due. One of her arguments is that the urban and cosmopolitan nature of Columbia University made it necessarily more ethnically diverse and more involved in the politics of women’s rights. I enjoyed reading the struggles of a university where many of the trustees and educators were immigrants, Jews, lesbians, radicals — and I imagine that these nonconforming forces helped to give Barnard the strong identity it has today.

Ten Thousand Men — and Women — of Harvard. While Rosenberg’s analysis details the cosmopolitan nature of Columbia University, Laurel Thatcher Ulrich’s Yards and Gates paints a picture of a more homogenous, yet still activist, Harvard. Her mission is to show that “there have always been women at Harvard,” and she accomplishes this task by gathering stories of less-well-documented populations at Harvard, whether they were girlfriends of Harvard men in the 1700s or black scrubwomen in the 1800s. The organization of the first half of the book is somewhat haphazard, blending snapshots of specific female populations at the university with chapters discussing the larger question of gender at Harvard. There are some fascinating chapters, such as those on sartorial choices: accounts of the baggy bloomers that were the only pants allowed to Radcliffe women accompany descriptions of how convincing these women looked in drag on stage. A few women looked in drag on stage. A few descriptions of how convincing these women looked in drag on stage. A few accounts of the baggy bloomers that were the only pants allowed to Radcliffe women accompany descriptions of how convincing these women looked in drag on stage. A few accounts of the baggy bloomers that were the only pants allowed to Radcliffe women accompany descriptions of how convincing these women looked in drag on stage.

The focus and pace of Yards and Gates improves in the book’s second half, which recounts the history of Harvard in the twentieth century, when coeducation became a main challenge for the university. Unlike the courses of study developed by the independent faculty at Barnard, Radcliffe’s curriculum was a mirror of Harvard’s, and all Radcliffe teachers were Harvard professors. While this sort of separate but equal education may have seemed ideal for giving Radcliffe women an education equivalent to that of Harvard men, in fact many male Harvard professors resented having to repeat lectures for the women’s classes and viewed women’s classes as tedious and unnecessary. In 1947, the university merged Radcliffe’s classes into Harvard’s, allowing women to take any university classes on Harvard’s main campus while remaining separately admitted, administered, and housed by Radcliffe a few blocks away. Ulrich’s book contains several striking first-person accounts from women who graduated in these days before full coeducation. Unlike the typical stories of nurturing women’s colleges, these accounts describe Radcliffe life as bereft of an emotional center, with faraway dorms and strict parietal rules but no concurrent feminist consciousness. Given these negative feelings, it is no wonder that most undergraduates (female and male) lobbied for full coeducation in the 1960s. In 1970, Harvard began co-residence for male and female undergraduates; Radcliffe’s identity continued to erode until it was made into a research institute in 1999, leaving Harvard College as the sole undergraduate college at the university.

Unlike those in Going Coed or Changing the Subject, the essays in Ulrich’s book leave a sad taste in the mouth. Complete coeducation was clearly the right move for the women of Radcliffe, yet Cliffies did not become Harvard women without some degree of regret and confusion about the loss of their former identity. When Harvard began allowing women to join its newspapers and yearbooks, participation in the Radcliffe publications dwindled and ceased. Harvard students of both sexes were desperate for co-residence, yet the dorms that had been Radcliffe’s were so inferior in facilities and location that few men wished to move there. In a sense, women at the pre-coed Radcliffe were caught between the ideals of the intimate and empowering women’s college and the intellectual and activist coeducational one, without gaining the benefits of either. Moreover, even in the current climate of complete coeducation, tenured women faculty at Harvard are outnumbered nearly six to one. It remains a project of the next century to equalize the gendered hiring and tenuring process at Harvard — and at universities nationwide.

Brunette Amidst the Blonds: One Dartmouth Woman’s Story. Some of the most compelling essays in Yards and Gates were the personal accounts of women who slogged through the early stages of coeducation at Harvard. In her memoir, Babes in Boyland, feminist scholar Gina Barecca leads us through the tangled webs of sexism, class, and ethnic biases as she chronicles her days at Dartmouth in the 1970s. By turns side-splittingly funny and painfully self-revelatory, Barecca paints a clear picture of the frat-boy old-money school struggling through the growing pains of coeducation. She came to Dartmouth in 1975, a dark-haired ethnic minority in a sea of blond and tanned athletes, just a few years after the college began admitting women. In her memoir, she tells of teachers who told girls that there
Self-empowerment is in academic suicide. One path she finds toward being working-class in a school but her story is suffused in the frustration of privilege. One wonders whether a similar male culture of banter and belonging has been lost in the rush towards coeducation. When I attended Yale, I became aware of the rich legacy of a female professor lead to her professional calling in academia.

Although Barecca managed to excel academically and find a clique for comfort, her memoir remains steeped in bittersweet longing for an ideal college experience. Indeed, reading Babes in Boyland can be cathartically painful, as we experience the constant alienation and longing for inclusion along with our terribly funny narrator. As the memoir nears its close, Barecca leaves for a year in England and embarks on exhausting love affairs, leaving the amusing anecdotes of sexist college life for a more soul-deep ennui. Luckily, with chapters short as a couple of paragraphs, the memoir is able to steer free of the torments of early adulthood by interjecting humor, like the note-perfect recountings of overheard conversations or appropriate sophomoric poetry. Sometimes wrenching, always witty, Barecca leaves the reader grateful for a Dartmouth experience that could produce a memoir as distinctive as this.

Thirty Years Later: Coeducation a Reality? At this point, nearly all formerly male American colleges and universities have become coed, while there still exist a good number of women’s colleges in the U.S. Women who now choose to attend single-sex schools do so for the intimacy, personal attention, and community therein, rather than because it is their only option. In reading these studies of formerly male colleges, one wonders whether a similar male culture of banter and belonging has been lost in the rush towards coeducation. When I attended Yale, I became aware of the rich legacy of “Old Blue,” and I wanted to understand what was lost and gained in coeducation, aside from the cancellation of dances with our sister school. Perhaps more studies of women’s and formerly women’s colleges can help illuminate what makes a college intimate, nurturing, and successful for both men and women. Miller-Bernal and Poulson plan a follow-up to Going Coed focusing on women’s schools — I await it eagerly.

These four books are wonderful places to begin one’s study of coeducation at American universities. Going Coed may be of most use to researchers and scholars of education, while Changing the Subject is an extremely readable history for anyone in education or women’s studies. Yards and Gates would primarily appeal to historians of Harvard, although historians of education or women’s studies will also find it valuable. The very different Babes in Boyland has my unqualified recommendation for the casual or professional reader in need of a good laugh — or cry. Together they tell the story of a tumultuous few centuries of women’s education in American universities and colleges. I look forward to more studies of the roles of gender in colleges and universities, coed and single-sex, to complete this picture.

[Sara N.S. Meirowitz is Associate Editor in Science, Technology, and Society at the MIT Press. One of her favorite haunts is the Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, which is housed at the Radcliffe Institute.]
These two very different readings experiences give us a start to understanding the Women in Print Movement, especially its international dimensions and the tensions between grassroots politics and business profit. Junko Onosaka’s dissertation examines the role of feminist bookstores in the United States as an important part of the ecology of the Women in Print Movement. She argues that the feminist booksellers played a central, activist role in feminism and were not just “culture bearers.” Simone Murray’s book analyzes British feminist presses, academic feminist publishing, and mainstream publishing of feminist bestsellers. Murray argues that we must move past the paralysis of an either political/ideological or corporate support debate, and that examining book production can tell us a lot about the production of feminism.

Onosaka is a champion of feminist booksellers; Murray takes a more dispassionate and, at times, even harsh tone to call feminists to be accountable to ourselves. The two studies make an interesting paired reading, and both are part of what I hope will become a vibrant area of work: feminist print history. Such work promises many inspiring stories and important lessons for how we might continue to evolve communication that works for the social justice that feminisms are about.

Onosaka’s work is based on a series of questions: What was the context? Who started the bookstores? Why? How did they operate? What were the obstacles? How did they flourish when outward signs would suggest they should have vanished? As she states in her introduction, her work refutes two views of feminism: first, “that ‘cultural feminism’ weakened feminism” (p.1), and second, “that feminism was no longer a vibrant social movement as of the early 1980’s” (p.2). Her narrative style is straightforward, using an easily accessible level of language and chronological organization.

Onosaka starts with a succinct history of publishing in the U.S. through the 1960s, pointing to its origin as a “gentleman’s profession.” The reality is that women actually outnumbered men in the trade by the middle of the twentieth century, but the control of publishing remained in the hands of men. She proceeds to develop her theses by looking at the birth of women’s bookstores in the 1970s in conjunction with the beginnings of feminist presses. A key to this expanding symbiosis was the first Women in Print Conference in 1976, a gathering of 200 feminist presses, publishers, and booksellers, convened by the writer and founder of Daughters, Inc., June Arnold. Held at a camp in centrally located Nebraska, that first conference started the organized networking that was essential to the successful development of feminist publishing and bookselling for the next thirty years.

The heyday of Second Wave feminist excitement in the 1970s preceded challenges, conflicts, and backlash in the 1980s. The feminist bookselling world, like the wider world of feminism, struggled with separatism and racism, as well as with the backlash that came with the conservatism of the Reagan-Bush decade. Despite the general political and economic climate in the country, feminist bookstores actually proliferated; they reached their peak number of about 134 stores in the U.S. in 1992.

In the 1990s, however, global merger mania and the advent of the World Wide Web produced tumult in the publishing and bookselling worlds, and by 2001, feminist bookstores were down to a few dozen, and many feminist presses had closed. Carol Seajay, who had long provided a forum for critical information-sharing as the editor and publisher of Feminist Bookstore News, had to stop publishing this critical trade journal in the face of mounting debt. For feminist booksellers, the new millennium was the end of an era.

Onosaka’s research, which clearly involved a lot of legwork, is impressive,
She makes good use of secondary sources for publishing history, and she includes numerous references to a wide range of small, alternative, and feminist press publications, including the twenty-five-year run of Feminist Bookstore News. She also literally criss-crossed the country, accessing archives and spending time at feminist bookstores interviewing store workers and customers. I applaud her directness in stating that it was lesbians who identified as lesbian feminists who were largely responsible for the Women in Print Movement as a self-conscious, political, community-building action. She also does not shy away from a pointed discussion of separatism, racism, and classism as fissures. And she rightly points to the importance of networking nationally and internationally, as well as the growth of women's studies and the textbook sales that came with the programs, as key to helping usually undercapitalized businesses survive. There is no doubt that feminist booksellers can recognize themselves in her work. Onosaka has done an admirable job of capturing their spirit, determination, hard work, mistakes, and victories. The work is also an exhortation to remember the long-range goals and visions developed by the feminist booksellers at that first Women in Print Conference, including, as reported in the very first Feminist Bookstore Newsletter, “find[ing] ways of dealing with the inherent contradiction between being revolutionaryies and being in a capitalist business system” and commitment “to actively support the feminist media and to increase its effectiveness” (FBN v.1, no.1, October 1976, p. 1).

Murray’s book complicates the picture on several levels. Written in more dense language, her analysis challenges us to question just what this thing called feminist publishing is and how the mode of production affects its message. Murray takes feminist scholars to task for the paucity of research and self-reflection on the creation of feminist knowledge in the print format. Like Onosaka, she has brought together extensive materials — archives and a wide body of related print history and theory — with information from interviews. While not claiming “objectivity,” Murray has triangulated data from movement sources with theory and details of the commercial process to argue that “feminism’s best hopes for survival in the publishing sphere” require diversity and market penetration rather than an “unattainable notion of political purity” (p.27).

Murray presents a case history of each of the three largest and longest lived presses in the U.K.: Virago, The Women’s Press, and Pandora. She contextualizes each chapter with information about U.S. and Australian presses evolving at the same time. Virago Press was started in 1972 — or 1973, depending on who is telling the story. The Women’s Press arose in 1977, in large part because of the success of Virago. Both were the idea of collectives, but each obtained a corporate parent early on in order to have the capital to produce high quality, well-packaged books and extensive lists and have wide distribution. Virago, unhappy with its original relationship with Quartet Books, succeeded with a manager’s buyout and became an independent for a while, but re-entered into a variety of corporate relationships, resulting in acquisition in 1995 by TimeWarner, which still owns it today. Virago profitably established itself by reprinting “lost classics” by women such as Vera Brittain and Katherine Mansfield. The Women’s Press initially also reprinted early works, but in the 1980s began to promote itself as the publisher of “Live Authors, Live Issues.” The Women’s Press attempted to solve the problem of middle-class- and white-dominated lists by acquiring Black and Southeast Asian authors’ work. Although the press did exceptionally well on the British edition of Alice Walker’s The Color Purple, the owner of the parent publishing house demanded a downsizing of the Women of Color list in the early 1990s, after what he considered disappointing sales figures overall. Pandora press was started as an imprint of the academic press Routledge & Kegan Paul and published nonfiction.

Murray places Pandora in the context of the rise of academic feminism,
and the chapter on Pandora is also an analysis of the institutionalization of women’s studies and feminist criticism, questioning the market force on the ultimate directions of debate. Murray suggests that feminism in academe has been “neutralizing” and that we need more attention to the communication models we’ve created. Both the Women’s Press and Pandora Press have disappeared since Murray’s book went to press.

If corporate funding depends on profit, and if academic publishing is, as the chapter title proclaims, “Pandora’s Box,” do the radical presses do it better? Clearly, “good politics” do not guarantee solvency, as Murray points out with the chapter “The Demise of Radical Feminist Publishing.” Murray does not hesitate to examine the difficulties of the collective structure. And if longevity and list production are the measure, are not the more mainstream presses more successful? Murray is not this simplistic. She gives OnlyWomen, Sheba, and Silver Moon Books, as well as their U.S. sisters, such as Kitchen Table and Naiad, their due. But she does repeatedly comment that the “manifestos” from the radical presses were too rigid, and she emphasizes the relatively short lives and small lists of those presses. Still, Murray’s message remains that, although we need a reevaluation of the relationship of politics and profit, the independents have proven that there is a market, and they often develop authors who are later picked up by presses with wider distribution.

In the last chapter, Murray jumps from the independent publishers to mainstream published “feminist bestsellers.” Her detailed look at the phenomena of Betty Friedan’s The Feminist Mystique, Germaine Grier’s The Female Eunuch, and Naomi Wolfe’s The Beauty Myth brings an intriguing, if troublesome, piece to her overall argument. She describes the corporate creation of the “feminist start” and the clear commodification in the packaging and marketing of the texts. At the same time, there is no question that The Feminist Mystique and The Female Eunuch brought attention to Second Wave feminism in a way that feminist publishers with smaller distribution could not.

The corporate machinations behind The Beauty Myth are perhaps even more disconcerting. The publisher manufactured great hype for the book: months before it was available, it was proclaimed a feminist bestseller and “groundbreaking,” and Wolfe was sent on international publicity tours. Tellingly, the book was marketed in the profitable and safe category of “self-help,” emphasizing Wolfe’s personal journey and undercutting its own message about social structures. Despite lukewarm reviews, this book has also been widely read. So what do we do with the commodification of feminism as represented by these examples? Is it not in part a sign of success? Not surprisingly, Murray argues that we reconcile ourselves to the complexity of the “modern media sector” and recognize that interplay of the feminist houses and mainstream media, analyzing both and taking what we can from each to continue building a future for feminist publishing.

Whatever that may look like. While the Afterword is way too brief to offer answers, Murray rightly points out that the digital world is again turning publishing on its head. Although “The Book” is showing continued resilience, the impact of print-on-demand is just starting to be seen. And younger women are growing up with next textual possibilities and are using the Internet to communicate in ways that will have an impact on what kinds of discussion take place.

Onosaka is in discussions with a publisher about a book version of her dissertation, but don’t wait. Read her work now, and then also pick up Murray’s Mixed Media. Certainly, both should be added to library collections. They are both compelling reads, and they offer a kind of balance to each other. Onosaka’s work gives us a picture of the grassroots, community-based enterprises that were part and product of developing lesbian feminist identity, as well as Second Wave feminism more generally. It will make you feel nostalgic if you frequented a now-closed store, or lucky if you are within a community that still has such a place; and in either case it will give you a greater understanding of what feminist booksellers have tried to do and of the extended community that was created. Murray’s work gives us a picture mostly from the other side of the ocean, and, while perhaps undervaluing the community- and identity-creating aspects of feminist publishing, as the U.S. Women in Print Movement cast them, the work gives us a challenging and equally detail-informed look at feminist publishing more broadly. It may provoke you, and I believe that’s the point. Second Wave feminism is dead; long live Second Wave feminism. We still have a lot of work to do.

[Michele Besant is a librarian at the School of Library & Information Studies, University of Wisconsin–Madison, and a former feminist bookseller at A Room of One’s Own Feminist Bookstore in Madison.]
Feminist Philosphy or Feminist Theory?

by Lisa Roberts


It is difficult sometimes to understand what the difference is, if any, between philosophy and theory. Certainly, dictionary definitions show barely a recognizable difference between the two words. It has been said that theory is based on empirical observations and aims for practical results — most generally a foundation for policy change. Philosophy, on the other hand, is thought itself, reasoning, and discourse. Yet shouldn’t philosophy be more than just an intellectual battle of abstract thought divorced from empirical studies, practical applications, or even the realities of the world?

In their introduction to Feminist Theory: A Philosophical Anthology, editors Ann E. Cudd and Robin O. Andreasen make an important observation that may reveal, in part, why this constructed distinction exists. They claim that “philosophy fears feminism,” pointing out that feminist theorists have always challenged the sexism inherent in the long tradition of philosophy and philosophical writings. Yet in order to be accepted in mainstream philosophy, women philosophers have had to “choose sides.” “Either they will be considered feminist philosophers, and thus not completely philosophers or they will couch their feminist ideas in carefully worded phrases so as not to be written off by the mainstream philosophers of their chosen fields” (p. 2).

The stated aim of the book is to “address the major questions of feminist theory in a philosophical way” (p.3). In selecting material for the anthology, the editors have chosen what they consider to be “the most well-argued position from the perspective of analytic feminist philosophers” (p.3). The editors feel that feminist theory has been dominated by continental feminists and that, for the reasons stated in the paragraph above, analytic feminist philosophy is a “latecomer.” While this anthology does contain a few brilliant, powerful essays and overall is a good text for illustrating key philosophical systems, it also reveals the limitations of philosophy, strictly speaking, to address feminist theory more deeply.

The remaining chapters address philosophical questions of epistemology, ethics, and metaphysics. Chapter 4, “Is Knowledge Gendered?,” offers a very limited perspective of ethics, with four essays that center on a discussion of the “ethics of care” debate. Although different systems of political philosophy are introduced, the theme of a distinctly female ethics seems problematic at best and outdated at worst. Other fields of ethics, such as legal and medical ethics, are not addressed, nor is the issue of reproductive rights. The one piece in the anthology that seems to cross lines between theory and philosophy, and feminism and humanism, is a lengthy essay by Martha Nussbaum that both
is analytical and has policy implications. Chapter 6, “What is a Self?,” also very limited in its scope, addresses the relationship between an autonomous self and its obligations to society. These essays touch on the social construction of gender, but not quite enough. Emphasis here is on the conflict between liberation and responsibility — echoing themes from Chapter 5 — and on theories of psychological development that are reminiscent of the Second Wave feminist writings now being criticized for their limited perspective. The concluding chapter, “What Would Liberation Be?,” is composed of similarly traditional, almost shallow visions. But perhaps I am too critical. As pointed out earlier in this review and in the editors’ introduction, “philosophy fears feminism.”

In 1949, Simone de Beauvoir asked, in The Second Sex, “What is a woman?” By positing this important question, one that continues to be debated, she raised more questions than answers for feminist theory. What may be agreed on is that feminist theory is concerned with the oppression of women and that any feminist theory should inform politics. It is only through continual questioning of perceived notions that fields of inquiry, theories, even philosophies can remain dynamic and address the multitude of issues faced in an increasingly complex world.

Carole R. McCann and Seung-Kyung Kim met in 1995 at the Ford Foundation’s Summer Institute on Women and Gender in an Era of Global Change, a faculty development seminar offered by the Curriculum Transformation Project at the University of Maryland, College Park. Both editors had taught “theories of feminism” courses for ten years and participated in the seminar to discover new ways of incorporating the experiences of women around the world into their courses. However, they had difficulties locating texts for their courses, and thus began their collaborative project to develop the Feminist Theory Reader: Local and Global Perspectives, for which they served as editors.

The Feminist Theory Reader is unique among its kind in several respects. First is the method in which diverse theories, experiences, and writings are integrated. Many contemporary anthologies simply tack on works by women of color, postcolonial feminists and feminists from around the world as an addition to the historical progression of western, liberal feminism. McCann and Kim aimed for something else: “Instead we incorporated global perspectives throughout the anthology in order to continually challenge western hegemonic concepts and categories” (p.4).

Second is the treatment of the theme of feminism. The editors “shift away from a narrow focus on gender to emphasize some of the ways in which race, ethnicity, class, nationality and sexuality intersect with gender to shape women’s situations and women’s identities” (p.4). As they say in their Introduction, “Meanings of feminism have shifted across time and space and have often been the subject of intense debate, both by those who have used the term proudly and by those who question its usefulness. With all its ambiguities and limitations, the term nonetheless signals an emancipatory politics on behalf of women” (p.1). Thus, the central theme of the anthology could be said to be oppression.

Third is the balance between theory and practice achieved in the selection and arrangement of entries. The anthology includes reports of activism both globally and locally and discussions of the dynamics and conflicts between local and global organizations and activist projects. These reports resonate with the themes highlighted in the theoretical writings.

Finally, although no anthology can be complete, the Feminist Theory Reader serves a buffet of writing styles, from the elegant philosophical prose of de Beauvoir, to the mind bending analysis of gender by Christine Delphy, to the highly personal and honest reflections of June Jordan, to Gayatri Gopinath’s innovative cultural critique of South Asian queer diaspora, to an exploration of the complexities of reproductive and sexual rights issues by Sonia Correa and Rosalind Petchesky, to Donna Kate Rushin’s powerful “Bridge Poem.” This is merely a sample of what the anthology has to offer.

The debates presented in the anthology are “anchored” by four theoretical concepts — gender, women’s experiences, “the personal is political,” and difference — that run through the first three sections. Section I, “Definitions and Movements,” introduces the concepts and illustrates the ways feminist theories serve as a resource for feminist movements. Section II, “Theorizing Intersecting Identities,” deals with differences among and intersections between women. These writings illuminate the varied perspectives of women based on their locus of experience, compare the risks and privileges of various “identities,” and demonstrate how such differences can create, and have created, rifts and fragmentation in feminist organizations and political groups. This section is broken down into the subsections “Race and Nation,” “Class,” and “Sexuality.” Section III, “Theorizing
Feminist Perspectives,” presents two theoretical systems offered by feminist theorists for constructing a ground for feminist politics, given the multiplicity of voices and experiences illustrated in I and II. Standpoint theory was developed primarily by social scientists as a tool for constructing an epistemology based on individual experiences. The articles in this section, which argue that a woman’s social location must be considered, discuss possibilities for creating coalitions among women, rather than building a unified women’s movement. Post-structuralist theories, developed primarily among literary critics, philosophers, and cultural theory critics, build on psychoanalytic theory and literary criticism to analyze the processes whereby identity, gender, and experiences are socially constructed, as well as the power relations inherent in such constructions. The final section, “Locations and Coalitions,” offers a series of essays illustrating possible models for how women might locate themselves in feminist politics and build coalitions with women of different backgrounds.

The editors’ introductions for each section and subsection are excellent additions to the selected writings, almost able to stand on their own. Rather than summarizing the selected writings that follow, the introductions delve into background material and summarize related writings and arguments, thus providing suggestions for further reading. However, a few things are missing from this anthology. Although the essays are followed by their original endnotes and the anthology contains a “Works Cited” list and a list of reprint permissions, there are no bibliographies. Perhaps the next edition can include additional reading bibliographies for each section or for the anthology as a whole. It would also be nice to have, where appropriate, short biographical information on the essayists.

Finally, as I read through the selections I found myself in a continuous cycle of stimulation — from surprise to reflection to enlightenment. The editors tried not to impose a rigid progression on the structure of the anthology; as a result, the audience is naturally engaged in an interactive dialogue with and among the voices, as issues, experiences, and questions resonate through the essays. The beauty of this anthology is best expressed by the editors: “like a kaleidoscope in which a jumble of objects are refracted through a prism in constantly shifting patterns, the organization scheme is offered as a shifting prism of difference through which to examine the mobile and multiple configurations of domination in women’s lives” (p.7). Further, the editors “hope that resonance and discord among the multiple voices and perspectives in this collection of essays will push readers to examine their own assumptions, the explanatory power and limits of theories, and the relationships between feminist theories and practices” (p.4). McCann and Kim set challenging goals for themselves, and in doing so they developed a stimulating and unique — dare I say landmark? — text for this field.

Lisa Roberts is Catalog Librarian at the California State University–Sacramento Library and is responsible for collection development in the areas of philosophy and women’s studies.
Reworking Pasts and Envisioning Futures: Thinking “Otherwise” About Women’s Studies

By Catherine M. Orr


For those of us who enjoy thinking and reading about the political, cultural, and structural implications of our work as women’s studies scholars and teachers, we have much to celebrate with the publication of recent texts, anthologies, and special journal issues about the state of women’s studies.1 By this I mean that important theoretical work about the field, often written by a new generation of women’s studies scholars, is inviting, even demanding, us to “think otherwise” about our women’s studies’ histories, objectives, constituencies, relations with other knowledge production projects, and the future of the field itself.2 Most remarkable about this latest round of books that assess the field is the trend toward questioning the present functions of narrating women’s studies’ pasts. To what uses, many of the authors in these texts ask, are the stories we tell about ourselves being put? (This is especially topical given the recent proliferation of autobiographies by the field’s first-generation practitioners.) As a result of this new line of inquiry, most of the texts I review here indicate a shift in thinking to a more affirmative—and thereby more productive—discourse about the prospects and possibilities open to the field in the future.

Mary F. Rogers and C.D. Garrett raise a provocative question in *Who’s Afraid of Women’s Studies?*: Why does a fear of feminism seem to persist even while women’s studies has experienced such phenomenal growth? Their extended response lands them in the middle of the “women versus gender” debate, a valuable and constructive topic of recent feminist theorizing. Gender, however, is clearly troubling these authors. The “real danger,” they argue, is that gender studies “dilutes feminism’s visibility, . . . does not challenge patriarchy, [and] . . . reinforces people’s sense that women and men are opposite sexes and that there are essential differences between them” (pp.x–xi). Although this is not a set of claims with which all feminist academics would agree, nor is it a satisfactory rejoinder to the authors’ central question, Rogers and Garrett nevertheless tap into an anxiety — pervasive among women’s studies practitioners — that crisis is afoot. In this way their response is not especially surprising: anxieties surface when the historical coherence of any field’s prevailing narrative falters. Here, as with a number of contexts, the reaction to crisis is a demand to return to the past.

The passion that springs out of *Who’s Afraid of Women’s Studies?* emanates from a desire, first, to delimit women’s studies’ proper objects, methods, and goals and, second, to police the boundaries set up by this particular delimitation from outsiders who don’t subscribe to its tenets. Ultimately, then, the authors are endeavoring to discipline women’s studies, a high-stakes endeavor that will always require a delicate touch, a nuanced argument, and, given the field’s history, a healthy
resistance to drawing boundaries too rigidly. Unfortunately, the authors give way to the temptation of strict limits, despite their rhetoric of openness that emphasizes multiple feminisms. *Who’s Afraid of Women’s Studies?* resonates with a pessimistic assessment that chides current women’s studies practices and practitioners for straying from the path set forth by the field’s founding generation.

To accomplish this disciplining endeavor, Rogers and Garrett map separate genealogies for women’s studies and gender studies, a rendering that rings somewhat false. For example, questions about the limitations of women’s studies’ object of analysis, methods, constituencies, raised over the years by the very authors they quote — Judith Butler, Gayle Rubin, Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, Shane Phalen, Donna Haraway — fail to raise the “gender question” for Rogers and Garrett. Gender studies, according to the authors, has its origins in “sex roles” research in sociology, anthropology, and social psychology. But nowhere are readers able to discern contestations among feminist theorists fomented a vast amount of research about gender in the context of women’s studies. (That so many women’s studies programs, including my own, are — quite deliberately and with no outside pressure — changing their names to account for this expanded focus demonstrates that gender studies is hardly an alien invasion.)

A passage that makes this effacement apparent uses the words of Judith Butler (who penned a fairly well-read text titled *Gender Trouble*) — “No one stands within a definition of feminism that would remain uncontested” — yet proceeds to argue, in the authors’ words, that gender studies is “seducing women’s studies away from its feminist foundations” (p.x). The concern I am raising is not that Rogers and Garrett are making an argument about what the feminist foundations of the field should be; that is an important conversation that I would like to read about. The problem for me is the implication that consensus has been reached.

Rogers and Garrett completely disregard debates that have yielded some of the most important theoretical contributions of women’s studies — debates about the incongruity of feminist politics and its foundational assumptions (think: critiques of women’s studies by women of color, lesbian feminists, postcolonial scholars, poststructuralist theorists, gender/queer activists, etc.). In other words, despite their claims to support feminisms’ diversities and contestability, the authors’ stake in a singular, fixed, and static rendering of women’s studies’ feminist foundations is unmistakable.

The irony is that although the authors advance what I consider an ill-conceived framework for disciplining the field, the bulk of *Who’s Afraid of Women’s Studies?* nonetheless manages to be a well-researched and accessible introductory text that orients readers to basic areas of inquiry in women’s studies. In each of their six chapters (“Bodies,” “Anger, Agency, and Desires,” “Sexuality,” “Feminist Methods,” “Differences,” and “Backlash”), Rogers and Garrett review foundational feminist issues in broad sweeps, consider various points of view among feminist scholars and activists in easy-to-follow prose, and conclude with inspiring pleas to maintain feminist agendas and multicultural alliances.

So here is the mystery: Who is the target audience for this text? For which introductory-level women’s studies student is the disciplinary turf war that introduces the book a high-stakes issue? Which women’s studies novice needs to know, let alone will care, that the academic enterprise she or he has just decided to investigate is supposedly doing battle with the journal *Sex Roles*? Or that authors who go by the names of Carol Gilligan and Susan Faludi used to write about women and now write about men? Women’s studies has much to say about our everyday lives, as the book’s subtitle iterates. Readers new to women’s studies are best served when their concerns, not ours, form the framework of the field’s introductory materials. Despite the useful middle of this text, the authors’ dual intentions of both disciplining and introducing women’s studies works against their purpose.

Overall, I am sympathetic to Rogers and Garrett’s discomforts with recent shifts in women’s studies’ objects of analysis. Questions of disciplinarity are serious ones, given that they determine legitimacy and, therefore, resource allocation from administrative bodies in our respective institutions. However, I think we need assessments of the field that offer more nuanced accounts of how and where these shifts occur, and they should not be slipped into introductory texts as an inoculation technique for students. While *Who’s Afraid of Women’s Studies?* is unsuccessful as a text that seeks to genuinely respond to questions about the state of the field, it nevertheless covers some well-trodden territory of crisis narratives about current and future areas of interest for women’s studies practitioners. In this way, the subsequent texts reviewed here formulate a sort of response to the more general laments Rogers and Garrett echo.

Robyn Wiegman’s anthology, *Women’s Studies on Its Own: A Next Wave Reader in Institutional Change*, signals a deliberate break with the
field’s pasts as they have been constructed in previous narrations and histories. In addition to mapping out a grounded and theoretically nuanced reading of the state of women’s studies, Wiegman challenges academic feminists who consistently seem to find “the present at fault for its lack of coherence with the past” (p.3). Banished are the questions that frame considerations of women’s studies as a story of loss and lament. Rather, Wiegman wants “scholars to trace the difference that resides in the present and to judge that difference in relation to the institutional project of academic feminism” (p.3). In other words, she asks: What if women’s studies was assessed based on its present incarnations—as a highly diverse, prolific, and influential intellectual movement that has found an unsettling but accommodating home in the academy? What if we stopped judging ourselves by an ever-present past that only legitimizes women’s studies existence inside the academy by sometimes-real/sometimes-imagined constituencies and events outside of it?

It is not that Wiegman and the bulk of her contributors dismiss out of hand the field’s relationship to its past. On the contrary, both inspiration from and anguish about the field’s past provide a point of entry for deeper analysis. The different path that Wiegman introduces is marked by critical reflection, not nostalgia or, as she calls it, “celebratory self-narration.” For example, in the opening section of the anthology, “Histories of the Present,” authors take on the past with chapters that include provocative treatments of the nationalist narratives embedded in women’s studies by Caren Kaplan and Inderpal Grewal, the historiography of feminism by Jane O. Newman, and Rachel Lee’s consideration of women’s studies’ investment in “women of color” as a category of difference.

As Lee notes, a number of women’s studies programs use “women of color” both as a course designation for undergraduate degree requirements and as a sort of prop in what she terms the field’s “contradictory logic of fetishized marginality.” She argues that “the narration of Women’s Studies’ critical progress inheres in the field’s ability both to incorporate the ‘outside’ and to substitute itself for the ‘outside.’ . . . [W]omen of color remain eminently useful to the progress narrative Women’s Studies wishes to create for itself, where the fullness of women of color’s arrival within Women’s Studies is always ‘about to be’” (pp.88–89). In other words, Lee is arguing that “women of color” within women’s studies — both the designation and the people the designation represents — provides a sort of “racial alibi” that covers for the field’s own “blind spots” and puts off considerations of how curriculum, research, and administrative practices continue to marginalize women of color (p.83). In critically analyzing the stories that women’s studies tells about its pasts, presents, and futures, authors like Lee are presenting us with a different mirror through which see our own disciplinary practices.

Most of these essays are contextualized by, rather than fearful of, the institutionalization of women’s studies in the academy. In the section “Institutional Pedagogies (A Forum),” short position papers continue to challenge narratives of lament and loss and thus open up productive lines of inquiry. Among the most interesting contributions is Bonnie Zimmerman’s “The Past in Our Present: Theorizing the Activist Project of Women’s Studies,” in which she considers the ways in which our curricular requirements for activist projects, community service, and internships attempt to reconstruct an activist women’s studies history for our students: “[W]e cannot go back to the model of activism and academia that existed in 1972,” Zimmerman reminds us (p.186). Although an obvious statement, it provides a refreshing starting point for opening up new lines of investigation of the community-based curricular elements common to many women’s studies programs:

[I]t is not clear to me that this work necessarily does any-
thing to transform the balance of power or undermine oppressive institutions in the larger society. Indeed, the emphasis within Women’s Studies on volunteer activities, whether in the public sector or in the nonprofit agencies that employ so many of our graduates, may actually reinforce current power structures and relations by taking on some of the work that used to be considered the responsibility of the state. (p.188)

Although a basic insight about the cooptation, this sort of claim is rarely fostered in a context that uses the field’s activist past to judge its academic present.

Ultimately, these different approaches to familiar themes in women’s studies will lead readers to, as Wiegman puts it, “think about the field otherwise” (p. 3). And because of Wiegman’s pioneering work in this volume and other recent publications, many of us do. Although this anthology lacks a certain amount of institutional diversity (a topic I take up elsewhere), it nonetheless sets a standard for assessing the state of women’s studies that is genuinely innovative and desperately needed. Women’s Studies on Its Own lays out an important intellectual foundation upon which others already have begun to build.

The next book is a good example of building on these new foundations. Co-authors Ann Braithwaite, Susan Heald, Susanne Luhmann, and Sharon Rosenberg join to make use of Wiegman’s initial insights about the temporal dimensions of women’s studies’ narratives in a multi-vocal volume titled Troubling Women’s Studies: Passes, Presents, and Possibilities. Donning the title “bad girls” in their Canadian women’s studies circles, the authors take inspiration from Judith Butler’s embrace of unstable categories (hence the term “troubling” in the title) to delve deeply into women’s studies’ “origin stories.”

This book emerges out of our collective observation that for many people currently working within Women’s Studies, including ourselves, the term ‘Women’s Studies’ — in both an intellectual and institutional sense — is increasingly seen to be an unstable or even impossible term to define and uphold. Indeed, each of us came to this collective project with our own unease about Women’s Studies, and a shared belief — albeit for often quite different reasons — that something about how this particular intellectual project is currently organized and practiced is not (no longer?) working. (p.10)

In this way, these authors are addressing the same “crisis” as Rogers and Garrett, yet their response is to question whether change and instability must necessarily constitute a crisis. They cast aspersions on the limited set of responses women’s studies practitioners have thus far mustered, having “either attempted to claim and shore up a singular meaning of ‘Women’s Studies’ as a discipline or, alternatively,瘕K suggesting] that Women’s Studies itself is no longer a worthwhile project” (p.11).

Intelligently honest about the limitations, contradictions, and possibilities of women’s studies, these authors devote a significant amount of space to our personal relationships with the field. So many of us defend women’s studies as a sanctuary outside of the marketplace/traditional-disciplines/politics-as-usual spaces. To outsiders, we often praise this intellectual movement as if we invented ourselves through it. At the same time, we frequently feel betrayed by the myriad of ways it disappoints, falls short, fails us. Ambivalence is the key term here. Troubling Women’s Studies provides a sobering look at the attachments we have to our own revolutionary desires, especially as they manifest themselves through our chosen (inter)discipline. Although some will find this acceptance of the field’s inherent and inevitable instability rather disconcerting, I admit that I find it emancipating and full of productive possibilities for seeing women’s studies — and our individual relationships to it — otherwise.

The text derives much of this effect from its form. It is a “tag-team” anthology of sorts, very much a mutually constituted project (as evidenced by the co-authored introduction and references to each others’ work throughout), but with different chapters that reflect individual authors’ perspectives, methods, and topics of interest. Although a conclusion that reiterated the significance of the “big picture” would have helped drive their insights home (the book simply ends with the fourth author’s somewhat esoteric essay), the format nonetheless displays a collaborative method that sustains its overarching argument in ways that the anthologies reviewed here do not.

Susan Heald’s chapter, “Just My Opinion? Women’s Studies, Autobiography and the University,” begins the book’s complex and multifaceted argument by considering the role of autobi-
ography in feminist pedagogy. Heald argues that although “finding one’s voice” and personal “empowerment” are concepts central to women’s studies contexts, they are problematic nevertheless as they so easily converge with the cult of individualism and effacement of larger economic and social structures that disempower various identity groups. Heald’s critical observation is that, more and more, students don’t seem to “get it.” In other words, in their readings of autobiographies from women in various oppressive contexts, the students fail to grasp the social contexts out of which these stories emerge. Their focus is on product rather than process. “At best,” she says, “it seems, many students relegate the material they read to the category ‘opinion,’ and their readings seem to encourage or facilitate the easy surfacing of their own unreflected ‘opinions’” (p.59). Rather than exposing discourses in which we are all entangled, Heald argues, students take their cue from other disciplinary traditions based on positivist assumptions about “facts” and more aligned with the needs of the increasingly corporate logic of higher education. In other words, students dismiss autobiography as not speaking in the voice of “the Expert,” and offering just one more opinion in a world of opinions that, of course, includes their own. This is quite the dilemma for feminist academics who seek to challenge their students’ received wisdom.

Ann Braithwaite takes the process-not-product theme and turns her attention toward the recent wave of autobiographies by early Second Wave feminists and first-generation women’s studies practitioners. She wants to question what it is — and likewise what should it be — that these stories “pass on.” Why is it, she asks, that so many of these authors make an integral and necessary connection between feminism(s) as a social movement and Women’s Studies as part of the institution of academia so central to their ruminations? Why are these two different sites consistently yoked together throughout this genre? What are the stakes in making and insisting on such a connection as a defining moment for either of these fields? How do contemporary practices of Women’s Studies in academe themselves replay some of these troubled and troubling habits of passing on? (p.101)

Drawing from Katie King’s work on “origin stories” and the role of “magical signs,” Braithwaite argues that “‘the women’s movement’ comes to act…as a new magical sign, a new place of condensation, displacement and reduction” (p.105). What her contribution to the volume makes clear, then, is that rather than reflecting on women’s studies’ relationship with The Women’s Movement (certainly a multifaceted and contradictory complex in its own right), most of these authors simply state the relationship as indisputable, unproblematic, and even automatic. In this sense, expertise in women’s studies emerges from an unreflective reproduction of an event that subsequent generations did not experience. Thus, women’s studies becomes that which is always already lost. Of particular concern to Braithwaite is how these narratives about the emergence of women’s studies claim that race and class were at the center of this field’s attention from the beginning. Given that academic feminists of color are much less likely to cast their stories of the movement/field relationship as stories of nostalgia and loss, it is clear to both Braithwaite and her readers that these narratives that yolk the two together are indeed troubling.

Susanne Luhmann’s contribution, “Trying Times for Women’s Studies: Lost Past, Ambivalent Present and Predetermined Futures,” takes a psychoanalytic approach to women’s studies narratives. Luhmann looks closely at the field’s frequent expressions of ambivalence and loss — the former being an important dynamic in attachment and the latter being a result of established narratives that begin to “falter.” To extend her therapeutic metaphor, the move here is to see destabilization in the field as an opportunity for reflection and growth rather than as a cause for panic and resistance. Rejecting the generational representations that cast the field’s “founding mothers” as “heroines” that the current generation (the daughters?) should emulate, Luhmann, echoing Wiegman, questions the insistence that women’s studies’ present or its future must be shaped by its past. Stripping any sense of nostalgia away, she states:

We know that in so many ways women’s studies’ institutional history has not been a tale of unfettered progress and improvement; it has not moved in a linear fashion towards achieving institutional stability, changing the university, producing transformative knowledge, solving the problem of interdisciplinarity and whatever else were its founding goals. Yet still the view of heroic and progressive histories prevail. (p.183)
The final essay by Sharon Rosenberg provides some complicated solace. ‘At Women’s Studies’ Edge: Thoughts on Remembering a Troubled and Troubling Project of the Modern University’ is the most experimental, emotionally charged, and difficult (in multiple senses) of the four essays in Troubling Women’s Studies. Taking up the theme of vulnerability, both in terms of women’s vulnerability to violence and women’s studies’ vulnerability to the corporate logic currently creeping through most academic institutions, Rosenberg rethinks women’s studies through methodological processes: “looking away” and “getting lost.” These two terms are fleshed out in her conceptualization of feminist collective memory as it emerged in the aftermath of the Montréal massacre, in which fourteen college women were murdered for being, in the eyes of the man who gunned them down, “a bunch of fucking feminists.” Her “central assumption” is “that there is no neutral formation of memory nor a singular history to be passed on; rather, there is a demand to recognize that every remembrance is partial and invested and, on these terms, to attend to ways in which a complex, multi-vested and, on these terms, to attend to ways in which a complex, multi-vested” (p.213).

The specific purpose of Troubling Women’s Studies is to ask feminist academics to think carefully about how specific interests are served by particular pasts. As Elizabeth Grosz has observed, “It is the present that writes the past rather than, as positivist historiography has it, the past that gives way to the present” (p.174). This is a brave, exciting, and important book for any women’s studies practitioner who has experienced pangs of doubt about where the field is headed. Honest reflections about where we have been, after all, will chart less anxious paths toward our future.

The prospects and opportunities ahead of us constitute the organizing principle for Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy and Agatha Beins’s anthology, Women’s Studies for the Future: Foundations, Interrogations, Politics. “How,” the editors ask, “does the field need to adjust its goals and methods to respond to and effect change in the contemporary world and thrive into the future?” (p.1). Although it contains several essays from the October 2000 “Women’s Studies for the Future” conference that were already electronically published (http://ws.web.arizona.edu/future/), along with reprints from other sources, Women’s Studies for the Future nevertheless provides a valuable and multilayered discussion, among a diverse array of feminist scholars. Its approach and tone mark mark a certain level of the field’s maturity given the recent proliferation of Ph.D. programs in the U.S. The editors are interested in teasing through a set of issues associated with institutionalization, especially how institutionalization is experienced and negotiated at program and department levels at contemporary research universities. In this way, I found the administrative side of my women’s studies self hailed by this text.

In focusing on the future, the anthology seeks to preempt any suspicion that it is preoccupied with the field’s failures or impossibilities. In fact, Kennedy, a second-wave veteran, declares failure fatigue: “the endless criticisms sound like a Greek chorus, locking women into failure and victimhood and preventing feminist scholars from analyzing the nature of the social institutions that they inhabit” (p.3). Kennedy’s collaboration with Beins, an MA graduate from her program, provides a framework of engagement and compromise across not just feminist generations, but also theoretical divides. They are self-conscious and accepting of the other’s orientations (Kennedy calls herself a materialist, whereas postmodern theories are most compelling to Beins) and model a spirit of collegiality: “We have learned in working together that it is useful to understand that we are both right. Women’s studies’ vitality as a field comes from its ability to encompass contradiction. Our differences and similarities have been equally fundamental in the way we have related to and developed this anthology — broadening what is included but staying focused on the challenges of successful institutionalization” (p.3).

The book’s five sections organize future considerations for the field into a finite number of key questions: “What is the Subject of Women’s Studies?” “How Does Women’s Studies Ne-
negotiate the Politics of Alliance and the Politics of Difference?" “How Can Women's Studies Fulfill the Promise of Interdisciplinarity?” “What is the Continuing Place of Activism in Women's Studies?” and “How Has Feminist Pedagogy Responded to Changing Social Conditions?” Again, Wiegman's influence is easily discerned, not just in her contribution in the opening section (“The Possibility of Women's Studies”) but also in a number of essays that continue to build on both her insights and her publications. For example, Vivian M. May's “Disciplining Reflections about the Women's Studies PhD” draw heavily on essays from Women's Studies On Its Own to respond to the question that struck May when she attended a conference on the topic: “How could the women's studies PhD—its parameters, methods, implications, and goals — still somehow be an absent presence at its own conference?” She notes the frustration of graduate students and faculty alike with the field's multiplicities of “methods, constituencies, identities, geographies, and activism” (p.185). In responding to her colleagues, May echoes a number of the contributors in the anthology that see the field's future in positive terms because they have let go of certain tendencies of the past:

The very “messiness,” indeterminacy, and lack of sameness that signify problems to others are, to me, part of the promise of both the women's studies PhD and the field. In fact, nostalgic efforts to adhere to some form of coherence, or to retrieve an originary women's studies that allegedly thrived and existed before things became so “con-

tested,” stifle women's studies' potential. (pp.185–86)

Although she returns several times to the wise words of Anna Julia Cooper, nineteenth-century black feminist educator, for a conceptual framework about the “worth” of an education, May flits and scurries between author and quote to construct an organized cacophony of voices that build a messy and indeed undisciplined response. She talks about women's studies as a “compound space” rather than a “bounded territory” (p.188), and models, in both style and substance, a playfulness and optimism that beat away any memory of lament and loss.

The range and unevenness of the essays — in terms of style of expression, assumptions, uses of data, foci, and so forth — are predictable outcomes in an anthology, especially one based on proceedings from an interdisciplinary conference. What's interesting is how the direct questions (above) provide the organizational framework as well as a set of limitations for the anthology function. Although that is not unique to this publication, reading about women's studies' futures got me thinking about the ways we tend to categorize our present in the most mundane of our disciplinary materials, like anthologies. I find myself wondering why Lorenia Parada-Ampudia's article, “The Institutionalization of Women's and Gender Studies in Mexico: Achievements and Challenges,” was included in the “Activism” section and not in “Alliances and the Politics of Difference,” given that it said so many interesting things about the influence of NGOs on curriculum but almost nothing about activism per se. In the same way, I found Monica Brown and Miroslava Chávez-García's “Women's Studies and Chicana Studies: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future” to have at least as much relevance for the “Promise of Interdisciplinarity” section as for the “Alliances and Politics of Difference” section where it was placed. In fact, Brown and Chávez-García speak to these politics of location when they recount how conference organizers initially asked that their panel (the only to address Chicana/Latina issues exclusively) “combine” with the presenter on Jewish American feminist issues as a way of organizing or, more cynically for Brown and Chávez-García, consolidating the difference (the authors successfully convinced the organizers otherwise). Chandra Talpade Mohanty's “‘Under Western Eyes’ Revisited” could easily have traded places with Banu Subramaniam's “Laboratories of Our Own,” and so on.

Feeling the pressure to arrange essays in a “logical” manner for my own anthology project, I am sympathetic to conference organizers and editors trying to balance sections or create coherent categories where none necessarily exist. However, frameworks of reading and understanding ideas and identities are fostered by the ways panels are constructed and anthologies arranged. Any tendency to populate the “difference” section with the “hyphenated” authors speaks to how even our interdisciplinary logics seek the familiar dualisms.

So here is yet another challenge for the future of women's studies: how can our compound spaces contain and display our intellectual allegiances and identity-based orientations in ways that allow for multiple readings and understandings? How can familiar forms, like anthologies and conference panels, that transport our ideas and
orientations to others embody or encourage the field's embrace of ambivalence? What, in other words, can we use to tell different stories about our and others' relationships with our chosen interdiscipline? Following May, I hope we begin to experiment with different academic modes of address and make "messiness" an asset, at least in some of our spaces and with some of our practices. I take my inspiration from so many of the voices included in these texts that make "thinking otherwise" about women's studies so very seductive.

[Catherine M. Orr is Associate Professor and Chair of Women's and Gender Studies at Beloit College. Her work has appeared in Women's Studies Quarterly, NWSA Journal, and Hypatia as well as in Feminist Collections. Her co-edited anthology, Locating Women's Studies, will be published in 2006.]

Notes

1. In addition to the texts under review here, see the recent Feminist Studies forums on disciplining women's studies (v.24, no.2, 1998), interdisciplinarity (v.27, no.2, 2000), and the women's studies Ph.D. (v.29, no.2, 2003); the special issue of Women's Studies Quarterly titled "Women's Studies Then and Now" (v.30, nos.3–4, Fall/Winter 2002); the special issue of NWSA Journal titled "25 Years of NWSA: Vision, Controversy, Transformation" (v.14, no.1, Spring 2002); Ellen Messer-Davidow's Disciplining Feminism: From Social Activism to Academic Discourse (Durham, NC: Duke University, 2002); and Florence Howe, ed., The Politics of Women's Studies: Testimony from 30 Founding Mothers (New York: The Feminist Press, 2000).

2. I refer here to Robyn Wiegman's demand that women's studies practitioners "think about the field otherwise," which, as will be elaborated on below, asks us to cease using the past as an idealized blueprint for the future.

3. This tradition is illustrated well in Howe, 2000, when she invokes a family bond that extols the accomplishments of the founding mothers and laments the current amnesia, presumably among the field's "daughters."


E-SOURCES ON WOMEN & GENDER

Our website (http://www.library.wisc.edu/libraries/WomensStudies/) includes all recent issues of this column, plus many bibliographies, core lists of women's studies books, and links to hundreds of other websites by topic.

Information about electronic journals and magazines, particularly those with numbered or dated issues posted on a regular schedule, can be found in our “Periodical Notes” column.

WEBSITES

Here’s a good find from the blogosphere: writer Debbie Notkin and photographer Laurie Toby Edison, who collaborated in 1994 on the spectacular book Women En Large: Images of Fat Nudes, are now co-bloggers on BODY IMPOLITIC at http://www.laurietobyedison.com/discuss, where they write and invite comment about racism, disability activism, their newest publishing project (Women of Japan), raising children with healthy body image, American Girl dolls, Muslim dolls, fashion designer John Galliano’s wide range of models, the fat dance movement, and masculinity and male nudity (and more, of course).

FEM is “a UCLA-based collegiate feminist newsmagazine” with an online presence at http://www.bruinwalk.com/groups/FEM/. FEM reports local, regional, and national news as it relates to feminist concerns: currently (early December 2005), California’s Proposition 73, the Alito Supreme Court nomination, protests over Occidental College’s plan to replace its Women’s Center with an Alumni Center, and prisoners’ reproductive rights. Some pieces are written by FEM’s student staff; some are links to other news sources.

Anniversary! As of December 2005, FEMINIST.COM is ten years old! Read a press release about the history of this pioneering Web resource for women at http://www.feminist.com/whatsnew/10yearrelease.html (and, if you haven't lately, take a look at the rest of the site while you're there).

Sponsored in part by chewing gum, credit cards, sports drinks, and sports bras, GO GIRL GO! aims to move girls to action — physical action, that is. A project of the Women’s Sports Foundation (founded by Billie Jean King), the GoGirlGo campaign (with a website at www.girlgo.com) offers free education kits for coaches, mentors, and teachers, as well as financial grants to expand sports and physical activity programs to “economically disadvantaged girls and/or girls from populations with high incidences of health-risk behaviors.” Girls themselves are encouraged to use the “GoGirl World” part of the site (http://www.gogirlgo.com/cgi-bin/iowa/ggw/index.html) to find out what physical activities might suit them best, “[r]ead about how your favorite athletes deal with life’s curveballs,” “[l]earn the tricks to being a stellar leader,” “[f]igure out what you might want to do with your life,” and more.

The University of California at Berkeley has a website of INTERNATIONAL GENDER STUDIES RESOURCES at http://globetrotter.berkeley.edu/GlobalGender/index.html, “featuring research and teaching materials meant to facilitate the integration of Women’s and Gender Studies into International and Area Studies philosophy and curricula. This site offers general and specific bibliographies and filmographies on issues pertaining to women and gender in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Arab World, and among minority cultures in North America and Europe.”

JEISH WOMEN AND THE FEMINIST REVOLUTION is the title of a new online exhibit created by the Jewish Women’s Archive and mounted at www.jwa.org/feminism. In the exhibit’s “Timeline” section, viewers are invited to “[t]ravel through four decades of feminism’s Second Wave, during which Jewish feminists worked to transform American society and Jewish life in America.” Influential feminists from Rachel Adler to Naomi Weisstein are profiled in the “Collection” section (which is searchable by name, date, topic, format in which they worked, and key word), and in “Themes,” the same women can be found under the headings “Foremothers,” “From Silence to Voice,” “Setting the Feminist Agenda,” Confronting Power,” “The Personal Is Political,” and “Feminism and Judaism.” Each woman contributed an artifact represented on the site, ranging from photographs and print documents to audio and video clips.
Mary Turner, author of *The Women's Century: A Celebration of Changing Roles, 1900–2000* (Surrey, UK: The National Archives, 2003), is building a companion website, HER-STORIES, at http://www.her-stories.co.uk/index.htm. The site offers a “Woman of the Month” page featuring both well-known and obscure British women (in December 2005, it's Mary Seacole, “nurse and heroine of the Crimean War”), as well as an overview of twentieth-century social changes in Britain that affected women, some suggestions for further reading, and information about how to buy Turner's book or book her to give a talk.

**ONLINE PUBLICATIONS**

Coaching Women: A college women's sports team is much less likely now to have a female coach than when Title IX was first passed, according to a study called CAGE: THE COACHING AND GENDER EQUITY PROJECT, which was funded by the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the National Association of Collegiate Women Athletics Administrators, and the Commission for Women and Athletics of the Pennsylvania State University. The project investigators' concerns about, analysis of, and suggestions for improving this situation are detailed in their final report at [http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/CAGE.htm](http://lsir.la.psu.edu/workfam/CAGE.htm) (by Robert Drago, Lynn Hennighausen, Jacqueline Rogers, Teresa Vescio and Kai Dawn Stauffer).

The INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY OF WOMEN LIVING WITH HIV/AIDS (ICW) — “the only international network which strives to share with the global community the experiences, views and contributions of 19 million incredible women worldwide who are also HIV positive” — offers numerous free publications online at [http://www.icw.org](http://www.icw.org) (from the menu at the left of the screen, select “Publications” under “Resources”). Some are available in French or Spanish as well as in English. A sampling: “A Positive Women's Survival Kit,” “HIV Positive Women, Poverty and Gender Inequality,” “Pharmacists Listen to HIV Positive Women,” “Working Positively: A Guide for NGOs Managing HIV/AIDS in the Workplace,” and many issues of the quarterly *ICW News*.

© Compiled by JoAnne Lehman
SPECIAL NEW BOOK ALERT FOR OUR WISCONSIN READERS...


From its Foreword by Shirley Abrahamson, Chief Justice of the Wisconsin Supreme Court, through its closing chapter, “Never Done: Women’s Work for the Wisconsin Centennial into the New Millennium,” Women’s Wisconsin charts the history and contributions of women to Wisconsin. The other chapters reprint excerpts and articles published over many years in the Wisconsin Magazine of History, set in context by McBride, director of Women’s Studies and Associate Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. This is an excellent text for courses in Wisconsin and women’s history, and will appeal to anyone interested in frontier women’s history, suffrage and the women’s movement in the Upper Midwest, reformists, women on the home front during wars, and more.

***

For a comprehensive listing of books, articles, and websites on Wisconsin women’s history, consult our Wisconsin Women’s History bibliography at http://www.library.wisc.edu/libraries/WomensStudies/bibliogs/wwh/.
NEW REFERENCE WORKS IN WOMEN’S STUDIES

GEOGRAPHY


Reviewed by Diane Gwamanda

What is feminist geography? What do feminist geographers do? Where does feminism fit in geography? The sixth volume of the Blackwell Companions to Geography series approaches these questions by providing an up-to-date and authoritative introduction to the field of feminist geography.

Editors Nelson and Seager open the introduction with a poem by Esmeralda Bernal that evokes “some of the key insights and sites of feminist geography. Locating her poem within the gendered body, Bernal weaves together the politics of public and private space, the state and nationalism” (p.1). The editors go on to provide a detailed introduction describing the historical development of feminist geography beginning in the 1970s in North America and the United Kingdom and leading to the four central themes of the field today: that feminist geography is closely allied with diverse political movements; that it is an innately interdisciplinary subfield; that place matters; and, finally, that feminist geography asserts the importance of foregrounding women as a subject of study.

The book’s chapters are a series of articles written by professionals within the fields of geography and/or women’s studies, tied loosely together by category: Contexts, Work, Body, Environment, and State/Nation. Each chapter includes an extensive bibliography, and most include acknowledgements and notes. Brief biographies are provided for all contributors, and the volume is indexed as a whole.

Reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of feminist geography, chapters run a wide gamut of topics. Under the category of “Contexts,” Audrey Kobayashi gives the reader an overview of “Anti-Racist Feminism in Geography,” while Jennifer Wolch and Jim Zhang report in “Environment” on the extensive research that resulted in their chapter, “Siren Songs: Gendered Discourses of Concern for Sea Creatures.” In “City,” Phil Hubbard discusses “Women Outdoors: destabilizing the Public/Private Dichotomy,” and in “Body,” Jasbir Kaur Puar introduces the reader to “Transversal Circuits: Transnational Sexualities and Trinidad.” The range of topics is fascinating, and the thirty-nine chapters offer something of interest for anyone wishing to learn more about feminist geography.

Feminist geography is a fascinating but little-known subfield, and this companion is a well-rounded introduction for the layperson that should also appeal to specialists in women’s studies and feminist geography. An excellent purchase for geography and women’s studies reference collections.

HEALTH


Reviewed by Katie Ravich

Recently, someone very close to me underwent a minor cosmetic surgery procedure. She had developed a handicapping social phobia about what she perceived was her overwhelming physical defect. After her surgery she is much more confident and is no longer suffering from social phobia or engaging in avoidant behaviors to hide herself. Her experience caused me to revise my opinions about cosmetic surgery.

It was with this more open attitude that I approached The Internet Guide to Cosmetic Surgery for Women by M. Sandra Wood. Wood has thirty years of experience as a medical reference librarian and has edited several other Internet guides. I found my non-judgmental attitude quickly eroding within the first paragraph of Wood’s introduction. The first sentence proclaims, “I am the original candidate for an ‘Extreme Makeover’ — the TV show might have been named after me” (p.1). She ends this paragraph with the reason she hasn’t undergone and doesn’t undergo multiple procedures: “Ah, if I just had the money!” (p.1). I accept that someone who writes an Internet guide to information on cosmetic surgery isn’t exactly setting
out to judge the right and wrong of the procedure, but I was taken aback by how unequivocally enthusiastic Wood seems about all cosmetic surgery opportunities. I expected some mention of objections to plastic surgery (other than those about safety), but there are none in this book.

With that said, I think Wood has compiled a comprehensive and reliable guide to Internet resources about cosmetic surgery. The first chapter covers basic information and states her earnest, reference-librarian reason for writing this book: to pre-sift the glut of information on the Internet for the reader. The second chapter explains to absolute beginners how to use the Internet. Experienced users would want to skip this, but Wood was diligent in not making any assumptions about her readers’ Web searching experience. The third chapter gives well-documented information about selecting a good plastic surgeon. The rest of the chapters provide annotations of websites dealing with different categories of plastic surgery. For instance, in Chapter 7, “Cosmetic Surgery of the Face, Head and Neck,” you will find a section on websites about Buccal Fat Pad Removal and Jaw Augmentation. Each section on a different type of plastic surgery opens with a short description of what the procedure actually is (Buccal fat pad removal is when the fat pads in the lower cheeks are removed to give a more “defined” look to the cheeks — in case you were wondering).

Any published Internet guide begs the question: how long will this information be relevant? I think that question itself grows less and less urgent as the Internet becomes more embedded in our information culture. Many of the sites that Wood relies on, such as WebMD and the site of the American Society of Plastic Surgeons, are established and here to stay. In fact, Wood points out that the Internet is actually the place where one can find the most — and the most relevant — information about plastic surgery. If that is true (and I have no doubt that it is), as plastic surgery is a “hot topic” that changes rapidly), this guide becomes a very useful resource for anyone who needs help sifting through the immense amount of information about cosmetic surgery on the Internet.

Katie Ravich is a graduate student in Library and Information Science at the University of Wisconsin–Madison.


Reviewed by Heidi Marleau

Nowadays, it is rare that a new field of medicine emerges that necessitates the first edition of a new medical text, but that is the case with Principles of Gender-Specific Medicine. Editor Marianne J. Legato, founder and director of the Partnership for Women’s Health at Columbia University, as well as one of the few worldwide authorities on gender-specific medicine, was uniquely poised to champion this comprehensive collection.

If you are looking for a good, overall text on women’s health, this publication is probably not your best choice. However, if you are a health professional or serve those who make therapeutic decisions or just have a keen desire to understand what makes the human body tick — and tick differently in women and men — this text will be of interest.

Legato explains in her preface, which gives a nice history of the field, that “the general scientific community assumes that ‘gender-specific medicine’ means ‘women’s medicine.’ It doesn’t: Gender-specific medicine is a study of the differences in men and women’s normal function and in their experience of the same disease” (p.xv).

Legato and her section editors had the challenge of culling, from all the scientific studies that look at both men and women, contributions by the 223 authors represented in Principles of Gender-Specific Medicine. Until the 1990s, “fully two thirds of the diseases that affected both sexes had been studied exclusively in men” (p.xv). The editor admits that gaps remain even in the present clinical literature, and she welcomes future research. Even so, enough substantive content was found to fill the fourteen sections of this two-volume set.

Each section is introduced by its editor in a short preface, which is followed by one to eleven chapters on individual topics that all include well-referenced and current bibliographies. The first section, on gender and development, includes chapters on neonatology and adolescent behavior. The last section in the work is on aging.
There are sections covering various systems of the body, such as the central nervous system, as well as types of diseases, including cancer. Others address nutrition, drug metabolism, and areas that need further research.

Each of the two volumes weighs nearly five pounds. The complete table of contents and a thorough index to the entire work are reproduced in each volume. Black-and-white photographs as well as figures and tables are of good quality throughout, which should make for successful photocopying and scanning. The color plate section is also of excellent quality, although its placement in the middle of the Volume I index seems rather odd.

I hope researchers will take to heart the recommendations for further investigation that appear at the end of nearly every chapter. If they do, we can look forward to future editions that highlight additional characteristics that make women and men unique and that lead to better treatment options for all.

[Heidi Marleau is a Health Sciences Librarian at the University of Wisconsin–Madison’s Ebling Library.]


Reviewed by Gerri Wanserski

Any woman who plans to undergo a medical screening test in the future, who is unsure why a test has been recommended, or who has received laboratory test results that she didn’t know how to interpret will welcome the publication of this book. The authors (both M.D.s) have provided a detailed, thorough, and comprehensive reference that is easy to read and understand and, on occasion, humorous.

So what exactly is done when a Pap smear is taken? First of all, as Dr. Hatch did with Frannie, we need to visualize the cervix. This is why we use those funny looking instruments (remember the bill of a duck?) to open your vagina so that we can see inside. (p.21)

Doctors Moore and DeCosta, one a family physician specializing in women’s health and the other an Obstetrics/Gynecology professor, have written from a female point of view, using fictional characters based on real-life patients. Although the book is primarily geared to women, men would also find much of it useful — for example, screening for bone loss, colon cancer, heart disease, and vision are all covered.

The text is arranged by medical condition or disease (e.g., pregnancy, diabetes), and entries vary in length, with the most common conditions and diseases treated in the greatest detail. For disease screening, risk factors for the disease are presented, along with what to expect when the initial test is done, the benefits of having the test, an overview of diagnostic tests that will follow if the initial screening warrants follow-up, and the limitations of the test. Chapters on screening for conditions (e.g., pregnancy) discuss home screening tests as well as those used in clinics or hospitals, and explain what the test is trying to discern and why (e.g., Rh factor). A chapter on laboratory tests explains how to interpret common hematology, chemistry, and urinalysis tests and includes a chart with normal values. Genetic screening tests are explained, along with the societal implications for patients who opt to have this done. Tables are included throughout, and websites and books appear at the end of each chapter for those desiring further information on a disease or condition.

A strength of the book is that medical terminology and acronyms are used throughout, but are accompanied by explanations for laypersons. This makes the content understandable while familiarizing the reader with terms likely to be used by medical professionals. The guide is indexed, and a patient questionnaire, a list of basic screening tests by age, and a glossary of medical terminology are included as appendices.

The guide is appropriate and highly recommended for the home library as well as any public, hospital, or academic library reference collection.

[Gerri Wanserski is a Health Sciences Librarian at Ebling Library, University of Wisconsin–Madison.]


Reviewed by Ulrike Dieterle

Menopause is a marker of immense change in a woman’s journey through life. In 1900, women experienced menopause at the end of their lives. Today, they can expect to live a full third of their lives beyond its onset (p.xvi). Over the past decade, the topic of menopause has come “out of the darkness into the light.” With this
book, authors Minkin and Wright open the doors wider, offering a holistic approach and clear information for making sound healthcare decisions.

Mary Jane Minkin, M.D., clinical professor of obstetrics and gynecology at Yale University School of Medicine, and her long-time collaborator, Carol V. Wright, Ph.D., have produced numerous scholarly articles and books on women’s health and specifically on menopause. Minkin translates what she observes firsthand in her medical practice, relying on realistic patient scenarios to support her recommendations.

Building on the powerful impact of studies within the Women’s Health Initiative (WHI) and the past practices of hormone replacement therapy (HRT), the authors cover the physiology of menopause, signs and symptoms, PMS, risks and benefits of the hormone “trinity” (estrogen, progesterone, and testosterone), midlife annoyances such as fibroids and incontinence, reproductive cancers, osteoporosis, heart health, and diet. They explain the effects of menopause on the body and the mind, detailing related dangers and complications that significantly impact a woman’s life.

The sixteen chapters are enhanced with numerous tables and illustrations. A thorough index, an extensive resource list including websites, and a helpful glossary are included. Each chapter begins with a narrative, then moves into a frequently-asked-questions (FAQ) format. The FAQ design creates a conversational tone, bringing the medical terminology and details closer into the lay reader’s comfort zone. In what seems a slight detour, the authors provide a subjective view on the efficacy of health management organizations and the unfavorable impact on the doctor-patient relationships.

The Guide is not a reference resource in the classic sense of “quick checks.” It deserves more time to be read cover to cover. Readers are cautioned about the changeability of medical information. Medical preferences can shift quickly; new pharmaceuticals appear and clinical evidence may alter best-practice patterns. The authors would do well to issue periodic revisions to keep the information up-to-date and fresh. Readers would be best served by checking medical information in a variety of resources, never relying on only one. And, of course, even the most comprehensive medical resource does not replace the services of a physician or caregiver.

This title is highly recommended for all women and those who love them. Readers are presented with a wealth of information at an affordable price. It is an essential addition to women’s collections, consumer health libraries, and any collection hoping to meet current needs for information on women’s health topics.

[Ulrike Dieterle is Distance/Outreach Coordinator at the Ebling Library for the Health Sciences, University of Wisconsin–Madison.]

**JEWISH WOMEN**


*Reviewed by Kathy Dodd Miner*

The first question to ask about this book is whether or not its basic premise makes sense. Are the opinions and observations of Jewish women qualitatively different, on the designated range of subjects, than those of any other group of adult females? The second question is where this trend will take us. Will it be the next “Chicken Soup” series? Will we soon see *The Quotable Catholic Woman* and *The Quotable Lutheran Woman*? Can *The Quotable Sorority Woman* or *The Quotable Pet-Owning Woman* be far off?

Those quibbles aside, there is much to appreciate about Partnow’s book. She leads it off with a memorable passage from Faye Moskowitz about female ancestors “connecting me to the intricately plaited braid of their past.” She ends it by providing several blank pages where the reader may record favorite sayings of her or his own. In between, she provides a thorough if slightly uneven biographical index, a glossary of Hebrew and Yiddish terms for the non-Jewish reader, the full citations for all works quoted, and, oh yes, the quotes themselves.

From the section called “Violence and Rape” (p.354): “My purpose in this book has been to give rape its history. Now we must deny it a future.” (Susan Brownmiller, in *Against Our Will*, 1975.) Don’t we wish.

*The Quotable Jewish Woman* is organized topically, making it more like most other quote collections and less like Partnow’s previous work, *The Quotable Woman: The First 5,000 Years*. From Bella Abzug to the Virgin Mary (really!), from Anne Frank to Sophie Tucker, the words of 317 women are included — but some names crop up much more frequently than others. A few of them are guaranteed to surprise you. (Note to EBP: next time don’t cite yourself or your sisters quite so often.) Enjoyable and well-con-

Feminist Collections (v.26, no.4, Summer 2005)
structured, but a rather specialized book, intended for a narrow audience.

[Kathy Dodd Miner graduated from the School of Library and Information Studies at the University of Wisconsin–Madison in 2004. She works in environmental education at the UW Arboretum, where she manages a small browsing library on the side. She is a published poet.]

LATINAS


Reviewed by Mary Pfotenhauer

Sylvia Mendoza, a Latina journalist whose previous book titles include the romance novels Serenade, Flights of Passion, Waves of Passion, and On Fire, is the author of the ambitious new Book of Latina Women, which profiles 150 important and influential Latinas “from all periods in history and all walks of life.” Each entry is about two pages long, providing a short biography and an explanation of why and how this particular Latina was influential. Bibliographies and a thorough index at the end of the book provide additional reading material and a convenient way to find key terms and people within the book.

The Book of Latina Women is divided into eleven chapters, each of which focuses on Latinas in different influential areas: athletics; the arts; the sciences; television; activism; leadership; and politics; entrepreneurship; writing and editing; the practice of medicine; education; and entertainment. The first chapter, entitled “Trailblazers: Opening the Door,” starts the book off well, but is a bit confusing. The first few entries profile Spanish women such as Queen Isabella I de Castile, Benvenida Abravanel, and Saint Teresa de Avila — none of whom, by most definitions of the term, were Latina. (A working definition might have been useful at this point, as many definitions of Latino/Latina conflict, while some people reject the term altogether.) Perhaps this chapter is meant to lead up to the following ones, with these women serving as trailblazers to the trailblazers, so to speak, but later entries in this chapter include such women as Sophia Hayden (1868–1953), an architect, and Sandra Ortiz del Valle (1951–), the first female referee of men’s professional basketball — entries that seem better suited to the arts and sports chapters.

After the first chapter, however, Mendoza settles down into a comfortable groove; the rest of the entries (with a few exceptions) are fairly well organized — although, far from including entries on Latinas “from all periods of history,” the rest of the chapters are dominated by twentieth-century women. This is understandable in the chapters profiling Latinas in sports or in television, but surely not all influential Latina artists lived in the twentieth century. In “The Arts: Stunning Creations,” Mendoza includes an admirable range of artists, from sculptors to conductors to ballerinas, but only one entry on a Latina born before 1900. This entry describes the life and work of Luise Roldan of Spain (who, again, may or may not be considered Latina, depending on what definition of the term you prefer), who lived from 1656 to 1704. Were there no Latina artists for the rest of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries?

The Book of Latina Women is a quick and easy read; Mendoza’s experience in journalism really comes through in her writing, with short, to-the-point sentences, reading almost like a magazine. While it might not be the kind of book you would want to read cover to cover in one sitting, it is the kind I would love to have sitting on my coffee table, so I could pick it up now and then for a fun but informative read. It certainly made me want to know more about many of these women, and hopefully it will do the same for other readers. Despite a few frustrating omissions, the dominance of twentieth-century Latinas, and the occasional confusing organization of entries, The Book of Latina Women has a worthy set of goals: not only to celebrate these women and give them their “rightful place in history,” but also to make today’s generation — Latina and non-Latina alike — aware of all the women who worked to get us where we are today.

[Mary Pfotenhauer is a former student assistant for the Women’s Studies Librarian’s Office and a recent graduate of the University of Wisconsin–Madison, where she earned a B.A. in Music History.]

POLITICS


Reviewed by Nancy M. Lewis

In the United States, women have worked hard to gain the right to equal participation in the political process.
As part of ABC-CLIO’s Political Participation in America series, which seems to be aimed at high school and college students, Women and Political Participation is intended to provide both facts and a conceptual base for a better understanding of the context of this participation for all diverse groups of women.

The first three chapters, providing background information on feminism in the United States, protests, and movements and organizations, seem to be the weakest section, in part because they try to cover too much information in a simplified format. However, there are also some glaring omissions, such as the role played by lesbians in the many forms of the feminist movement. The contributions of women of color, and particularly Native American women, also are poorly represented in this part of the book. And in the “Current Controversy” section, although abortion is mentioned, there is no mention of breast/ovarian cancer, health care funding, or environmental issues. The chapter on protest politics fails to mention the important formation of local consciousness-raising groups in Second Wave feminism, which was the key to raising many women’s political awareness, and thus participation. And the section on movements and organizations barely mentions the work of important social activists such as Margaret Sanger, and never once mentions labor activists such as Emma Goldman.

The strength of the work lies in the chapters on participation in electoral politics and women in public office. While much of the data can also be found elsewhere, such as on the website of the Center for American Women and Politics (http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~cawp) and in the Almanac of Women and Minorities in American Politics (Westview Press, 2002), the author, whose prior work has focused on women in Congress and the public’s opinion of women in political life, has provided important background information that allows better understanding of the trends and patterns of women voters and women running for office.

The work is rounded out with the inclusion of some documents referred to in earlier chapters (and some not mentioned before, such as the “Third-Wave Manifesta”). There is also a list of key people, laws, and terms, which includes many items in the text, with some unexplained exclusions. For instance, Urvashi Vaid is mentioned once in the text, but not included in the list of key people; and Wilma Mankiller is not mentioned in the text, but is included in this list. The resource section includes many important organizations, but again, there are omissions, such as the national Women’s Research and Education Institute, and, in the state-by-state category, the Maine Women’s Policy Center.

If the topic is not already covered in your library’s collection, you may want to consider purchasing this title. But if you already have the above-mentioned Westview Press almanac and the Encyclopedia of Women in American Politics (Oryx Press, 1999), which has a very good article on political participation, I would not recommend adding this work.

[Nancy M. Lewis, Head of the Reference Department at the Raymond H. Fogler Library, University of Maine, is also the Women’s Studies Librarian, as well as adjunct faculty in Women’s Studies. Prior to coming to the University of Maine, Lewis was a legislative assistant to then-Congresswoman Olympia Snowe.]

**Suffrage**


Reviewed by Martin Garnar

In these times of stagnant or shrinking budgets and a pronounced preference for online materials, librarians must stretch their dollars when considering print resources. This is doubly true when considering “updated” editions of existing reference works in their collections, as these sometimes fail to have enough new material to justify their purchase. Therefore, it’s always welcome to find a work in this category that is truly worth the expense. The updated edition of Women’s Suffrage in America not
only includes additional materials to enhance our understanding of historical events, but also has expanded its scope to better communicate the connections between voting rights and other women’s issues.

Frost-Knappman and Cullen-DuPont have organized the book into thirteen sections based on time periods from 1800 to 1920, along with three appendices containing primary source documents, biographies, and maps. In each section, the authors start with an essay for providing a historical context, then follow with a chronology of notable events related to women’s suffrage and other accomplishments. These prefatory materials lead up to the main substance of the book, which are historical documents providing “eyewitness testimony” to the events of the period. This is a typical format for Facts on File’s Eyewitness History series, of which this volume is a part.

The documents range from diary entries and excerpts from letters to news articles and transcripts from public speeches. All the familiar names in women’s suffrage are represented, with letters of Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Carrie Chapman Catt featured prominently. While some longer documents are included in these sections, the practice of using shorter documents and excerpts allows the authors to showcase the range of opinions and, indeed, the divisions that occurred within the women’s suffrage movement. Selected longer documents, such as the 1848 Declaration of Rights and Sentiments from the pivotal meeting in Seneca Falls (pp. 375–76), are reproduced in their entirety in Appendix A.

As part of the updating process, the authors have expanded the chronology’s scope to include items beyond those with a strict connection to the suffrage movement. Events related to education and professional advances not previously included demonstrate the interconnectedness of women’s issues, such as how expanded educational opportunities across the country gave rise to the demands for voting equality. The chronology now also includes important court cases that defined the legal status of women throughout the years, thus showing the incremental changes that led up to the ultimate success in 1920. In addition, historical figures are now labeled with a short description of why they’re notable, thus making the chronology accessible to non-specialists. For example, the listing of Lucy Larcom’s birth in 1824 is more instructive when she is identified as a mill worker and editor (p. 9). Other updates include the incorporation of additional “eyewitness” documents, as the continuing expansion of women’s history as a field has uncovered a wealth of new sources in archives and other repositories.

Geared toward Grade 9 and above, this book is an appropriate addition for high school, public, and academic libraries. Those with the earlier edition should purchase the updated one, as it has significant changes that increase the value of an already excellent resource.


Reviewed by Kristi L. Palmer

More scrapbook in nature than reference work, the sixth volume of the Working Americans series maintains the primary-document focus of the previous five volumes. The lax manner in which the primary documents are used, however, has the potential to mislead first-time users of such documents. Photographs, advertisements, and cultural objects glaringly lack citations. The reader is drawn to a multitude of unique images that beg for social commentary, but finds oneself thoroughly disappointed with the realization that sources are not cited and therefore cannot easily be obtained.

Scott Derks does not directly identify a particular audience, but he suggests, as does this reviewer, that the work would fare well in the hands of high school students and undergraduates with the guidance of an instructor or librarian.

The title efficiently describes the work’s scope and content, covering American women’s working life from 1880 to 2005. The volume succeeds at presenting various cultural, regional, economic, and age-related points of view, and includes entries on former slaves, teenage students, upperclass volunteers, rural farmers, and Turkish immigrants. Current thought/historiography on each topic, as well as current (2005) information, is provided.
Each chapter documents a span of ten years and includes a profile of a specific woman, a historical snapshot of the span of years, indepth coverage of some years, and a news profile for a given year. The snapshots list traditional bits of reference information, while the personal profiles, formatted into brief, bulleted statements about the person's background, activities, and thoughts, allow one to understand how those dates and events actually affected a given woman's life — a nice balance between facts and social commentary.

One matter that will cause confusion is the interweaving, with no obvious distinction, of history and historical fiction. Some of the women profiled — for instance, Gwendolyn Price and Ida Tarbell — actually existed, but completely fabricated profiles are also included. The work's lack of citations makes the line between fact and fiction (even if worthwhile and well-constructed fiction) rather fuzzy. The index is not as useful as one would hope, which brings into question the work's uniqueness.

Overall, the volume is visually appealing, with a proliferation of images, advertisements, and facsimiles from diaries, allowing users to form their own opinions of the time, people, and country.

If one is searching for a traditional reference work that includes the history of women's work in the U.S., sources such as The Encyclopedia of Women's History in America, by Kathryn Cullen-DuPont, and Handbook of American Women's History, edited by Angela M. Howard and Frances M. Kavenik, are better choices. A complementary work is Catherine Reef's Working in America: An Eyewitness, which, like Women at Work, includes a great number of primary sources.

Lest we forget, scrapbooks provide valuable historical and social information. Therefore, although this work is not recommended for libraries seeking a traditional reference resource, it is certainly a worthwhile purchase for junior high, high school, and perhaps even undergraduate libraries looking to introduce students to interpreting primary resources in women's U.S. history.

[Kristi L. Palmer is Metadata Librarian and Liaison to the Departments of History and Women's Studies at IUPUI University Library, Indianapolis, Indiana.]
PLEASE POST

Announcing...

Scholarship in Jewish Women’s Studies from the Jewish Women’s Caucus, National Women’s Studies Association

Applications are now being accepted — through March 1, 2006 — for the 2006 award. The applicant must be a graduate student who is enrolled full time in an accredited academic institution, and has a special interest in the lives, work, and culture of Jewish women, as demonstrated by research, thesis or dissertation topic. The award will be announced at the annual conference of the National Women’s Studies Association to be held June 15–18, 2006, in Oakland, California.

This $1,000 scholarship is supported by the Steven H. and Alida Brill Scheuer Foundation. For further information about the scholarship and a link to the application see http://nwsa.org/jewish.html, or contact Phyllis Holman Weisbard, Scholarship Chair, Jewish Women’s Caucus, NWSA, by emailing via http://www.library.wisc.edu/libraries/WomensStudies/emailform.shtml
PERIODICAL NOTES

NEW AND NEWLY DISCOVERED PERIODICALS

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEXUALITY EDUCATION. 2005— . Eds.: William J. Taverner & Elizabeth Schroeder. Publ.: Haworth Press. ISSN (print): 1554-6128; (electronic): 1554-6136. 4/yr. Subscriptions: individuals, $45.00; institutions other than libraries, $125.00; libraries and subscription agencies, $145.00 (higher rates outside the U.S.), The Haworth Press, 10 Alice St., Binghamton, NY 13904; phone (607) 722-5857. (Issue examined: v.1, no.1 [2005], uncorrected prepublication galleys.)


GENDER RESEARCH IN SWEDEN. 2005— . Ed.: Lena Olson (email: lena.olson@genus.gu.se). Publ.: Swedish Secretariat for Gender Research. ISSN: 1653-0349. 1/yr. Subscriptions: Free. Swedish Secretariat for Gender Research, Göteborg University, Box 200, SE 405 30 Göteborg, SWEDEN; email: sekretariat@genus.gu.se; website: www.genus.gu.se

“Gender Research in Sweden is a new journal that will introduce Swedish gender research in its fullest breadth to an international audience,” writes Anne-Marie Morhed, director of the Secretariat. “In this first edition, we give examples of research results of current interest from the four areas of gender science: gender equality research, women’s studies, men’s studies and queer studies.” Here’s a sampling of article titles from the issue: “Paternity Leave — The Key to Equality?”; “Changing Sex Habits Among Teenagers”; “Sex Is Big Business on the Internet”; “Girls Miss Benefits from Games”; “Make Men Choose Social Sector Jobs.”


Editor Dokmanovic and webmaster Orcic, in an introductory online letter, lay out questions that will be addressed in the journal by “eminent experts in fields such as economics, law, human rights, women’s rights, sociology, and political sciences.” They include these queries and many others:

What will citizens get from their country’s membership in the World Trade Organisation?...What is the “care economy,” and how is it connected to a national economy? How is unpaid women’s work in their homes linked to economic development? What is “gender budgeting,” and how can it contribute to promotion and implementation of women’s rights? Why have women’s rights become indispensable to researching various aspects of globalisation?

countries, EU Central and Eastern European new member states, and EU old member states.


“Over the past two decades,” write the editors in their first introduction, “there has been a veritable explosion of research, both historical and contemporary...on Middle Eastern women’s everyday lives, their multiple identities, and their agency and activism amidst multiple areas of constraint. Yet, this rich literature...is scattered across the disciplinary landscape, having found homes in journals that are rarely read by regional specialists.” JMEWS seeks to remedy this by providing “a forum for the community of scholars who are contributing to knowledge production in Middle Eastern gender studies.”


**POLITICS & GENDER.** 2005—. Eds.: Karen Beckwith & Lisa Baldez. Publ.: Cambridge University Press. ISSN: 1743-923X. 4/yr. Subscriptions: Individual (print only) in U.S., Canada, or Mexico, US$75.00; elsewhere, UK £43 + VAT. Institutions (print + electronic) in U.S., Canada, or Mexico, US$180.00; elsewhere, £105 + VAT; institutions (electronic only) in U.S., Canada, or Mexico, US$155.00; elsewhere, £90 + VAT. Cambridge Univ. Press, 40 West 20th St., New York, NY 10011-4211; phone: (800) 221-4512; website: [http://journals.cambridge.org](http://journals.cambridge.org) (Issue examined: v.1, no.1, March 2005)

This is the new official journal of the American Political Science Association’s Women and Politics Research Section. Editors Beckwith and Baldez ask us to “[n]ote that we aim to publish the very best work being done on women and politics, and on gender and politics. This is an important distinction... [W]e also envision Politics & Gender as a forum in which discussions and debates about the validity and significance of this distinction will take place.”

[Note: Women and Politics, published by Haworth, was formerly the Section’s official journal. Haworth is continuing to publish a journal in this field, but has renamed it the Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy. The issue numbering system is continuous from Women and Politics to Journal of Women, Politics, and Policy.]

WOMEN & MUSIC: A JOURNAL OF GENDER AND CULTURE. 1997—. Ed.-in-chief: Suzanne G. Cusick. Founding & managing ed.: Catherine J. Pickar. Publ.: Univ. of Nebraska Press for the International Alliance for Women in Music (IAWM). ISSN: 1090-7505. 1/yr. Subscriptions: included in membership for IAWM members; $55.00 for institutions (+ $6 postage outside the U.S.); $40.00 for single copy. Customer Service, Univ. of Nebraska Press, 233 N. 8th St., Lincoln, NE 68588; phone: (800) 755-1105 or (402) 472-3584. (Issues examined: v.7 [2003]; v.8 [2004].)


SPECIAL ISSUES OF PERIODICALS

THE GERONTOLOGIST v.43, no.3, June 2003: Special section: “Self-Rated Health, Gender, and Mortality.” Ed.-in-chief: Linda S. Noelker. ISSN: 0016-9013. Published by the Gerontological Society of America, P0 Box 79151, Baltimore, MD 21279-0151; website: http://www.geron.org/journals/gerontologist.html. Individual articles (not whole issues) available for $5.00 each from The Gerontological Society of America, Attn: Todd Kluss, 1030 15th Street NW Suite 250, Washington, DC 20005. Also available online to licensed users of the ProQuest Research Library Database.


Hundreds of years ago, computers existed, but they weren’t machines sitting on desks, or even machines filling up whole rooms: they were people employed to do calculations, such as those required for publishing the astronomical tables used for navigating at sea. This special issue of the IEEE Annals tells the story of the sole woman among the 35 “human computers” so employed in the late eighteenth century in England. This and other fascinating stories and memoirs about women pioneers in computing fill this very readable issue: “Mary Edwards: Computing for a Living in 18th-Century England,” by Mary Croarken; “Lovelace & Babbage and the Creation of the 1843 ‘Notes,’” by John Fuegi & Jo Francis; “A Systems Analyst’s Computer Watch: 1943–2003,” by Elizabeth Phillips Williams; “Programming at Burroughs and Philco in the 1950s,” by Adele Mildred Koss; “Beatrice Helen Worsley: Canada’s Female Computer Pioneer,” by Scott M. Campbell; “Half a Lifetime in Computing: Experiences in Zambia, Britain, and Australia,” by Valerie A.G. Macduff; “Computer-Based Office Work: Stories of Gender, Design, and Use,” by Linda Steppulevage; and “Anecdotes,” from oral histories of women pioneers in the field, compiled by Anne Fitzpatrick.
JOURNAL OF SEX RESEARCH v.40, no.1, February 2003: Special issue: “Gender and Sexuality.” Issue ed.: Charlene Muehlenhard. ISSN: 0022-4499. Published by the Society for the Scientific Study of Sexuality, P.O. Box 416, Allentown, PA 18105; phone: (610) 530-2483; fax: (610) 530-2485; email: thesociety@sexscience.org; website: http://www.sexscience.org/publications/index.php.


Articles on featured artists: “Rhoda Yanow,” by Christine Proskow; “Polly Thayer (Starr),” by Robert K. Carsten; “Gaëla Erwin,” by Katherine Mesch; “The Colors of Light and Air” (including artist Donna Levinstone), by Maureen Bloomfield; “Mary Joan Waid,” by Maureen Bloomfield. Also includes, in the column “Artist’s Viewpoint,” an essay titled “A Woman’s Place,” by Margot Schulzke (“As women, we’ll raise our visibility in the art world when we play by the same rules men have long known.”).

UTNE: UNDERSTANDING THE NEXT EVOLUTION

“[W]omen's work is making a difference,” claim the magazine’s editors on page 60 of this issue. “What's more, women are bringing a new spirit not only to the realm of social action, but also to the business world and to their own communities. Qualities like compassion, nurturing, and caregiving that are traditionally ascribed to women (and often belittled) are critical for our future.” The next eleven pages are an UTNE-style mix of interview (Nina Utne talking with “social entrepreneur” Nina Simons), quotation, short take, excerpt, and essay (“The Magdalene Mystique: Why Her Archetype Matters,” by Lila Sophia Tresmer & David Tresmer), plus a quiz (David Deida’s “Gender Quotient Test”) and a timeline summarizing “what the great thinkers” from Plato to Charles Spearman “think about women thinking.”


 Compiled by JoAnne Lehman
QUEENS OF THE ZINE SCENE: BEST LINES

by M.L. Fraser

Some of the best lines come from random writings. These are lines that you think about for days and wonder if they don’t somehow matter in the real screenplay of your life. Here is the latest review of zines and the best lines that came out of them. Some are funny, some cathartic, and some just plain thought-provoking or “yeah, I’ve been there.” Enjoy, and remember to promote these women.

Blue Ink Tornados (issue is undated, but contains some pieces dated 2004)

Stephania Shea returns with a smarter, sharper version of the voice she first presented in her fledgling zine Escape Philosophy (reviewed in Feminist Collections, vol. 25, no. 2, Winter 2004). Still a teenager, still trying to find her way, she is now using herself as the focal point for exploration. And that is what makes this zine terrific. Stephania’s budding feminism is a joy to behold as she remarks on teenage homosexuality and on her painful coming of age, as she finally has permission to read her father’s poetry, realizing that it well could have been her own writing. She is still using friends’ pieces in her zine, although not as much, and always in keeping with the theme. A great piece on cutting is here, as well as very raw thoughts on being the child of a mentally ill person. It is still a teen zine, and still worth the read. Go Stephania Go. Keep writing. If this is any indication of your direction in the world, we are lucky to have you here with us. Best Line: a journal entry to her physically present mentally ill dad, reading, “bye. I love you. Call me. I’ll write.”

Stephania Shea, P.O. Box 2135, Leicester, NC 28748; email: prettip0is0n@yahoo.com (note the zeros in the username). No price listed.

Chainbreaker: nos. 1, 2,3 (undated, but all before Hurricane Katrina)

A zine dedicated to all things bicycle. Shelly gives a great history of the bike in this zine, as well as a brief recounting of women’s fashion and how the bicycle changed it. She gushes eloquent in the first issue about how bicycles can save America and the world if we would all just get them and hop on. It would be preachy, except she is so charming about it that you kind of get where she is coming from and can’t help but think that the subculture she is describing there in New Orleans is a cool one. I especially like the fact that she talks about the collective where she repairs bikes and collaborates with other bike folk, and that there is a “women only” clinic twice a month at the collective.

Issue 2 talks about Shelly’s trip to India and Ireland and how she thinks that bikes really can change the world, and that the world can change bikes. It is an interesting perspective, and it remarks upon the ideas of global feminism in a new way. Bike friends who have taken trips and seen various forms of livelihoods produced by bikes write many of the articles in this issue. The idea of bikes being an economy and a conscious choice made by Americans as a political statement (transportation and oil) is presented in a fresh way and is written intelligently. A review of a book written in 1895 by a female bicycle enthusiast adds a feminist note, and it made me want to go out and get a copy to see what that first girl biker had to say.

The third issue is a compilation of stories and opinions from other bike mechanics. The opinions are insightful, especially the one from “Mary Christmas,” entitled “The girl at the bike shop: A tale of biceps, bitterness and grease.” It remarks on the sexism that seems to be inherent in any sport that requires machinery of any sort. Ethan, to whom Shelly refers quite a lot in Issues 1 and 2, hilariously recounts a race he staged, and provides the best line: “This isn’t so bad, . . . lying here, on this parking lot. Maybe I will just stay.” We have all felt that way, either literally or emotionally.

I really like this zine. It offers clarity and candor about the bike world — a world I was aware of, given that I have so many friends who love bikes, but had not really considered until Shelley brought things to light.

Shelly, 621 North Rendon, New Orleans, LA 70119. (Note: This was a pre-hurricane address, but it’s all we have. We hope Shelly and the messengers, along with their bikes, are all okay. If this is the end of an era, we are saddened; this zine is a wonderful piece of history.) Stamps, $2, or “ten tootsie pop girl bikers.” Also available through distros, e.g., http://www.lastgasp.com/, http://www.microcosmpublishing.com/, http://papertrail.zinetastic.com/
Honeypot: no.3 (Love me, Love my Elephant; undated)

Okay, I LOVE this zine. It is exactly cool. The cover has a hand-pulled woodblock print of an Elephant-man graphic, by a friend of the author, that is just amazing. An essay about self-acceptance based on the author’s one-legged cat is remarkably touching. This girl is very smart and a good writer. She doesn’t use much of the blatant humor that is often seen in the zine crowd, but the wryness with which she approaches most subjects is tender and human, making her work all the more real. In this issue there is an interesting interview with the famous bondage model Elkie Cooper, who puts the Betty Paige in Betty Paige. Cooper makes some expected remarks (i.e., questioning who is exploiting whom) and then offers up some insight into technology and pornography. Because it is a zine, there is only so much that can be said, but what is said is interesting. I also like the commentary applauding Kate Winslet, who grew appalled and then threw a hissy upon finding out that she had been reduced by 30 pounds via airbrush. Nicely done. Many of the topics in this zine and on “Honey’s” website concern the topic of sex and how our culture approaches it. There’s some stuff that has been said before, but mostly it is good, and marvelously presented. Definite get. Best line: “Self-medication is better than the other kind.”

This issue: $1.00, plus .50 for postage. Other issues: see website. “I accept cash, checks, money orders, stamps, or trades for intelligent, well-produced zines or other DIY pieces. E-mail me your trade offers!” Melissa Kirk, P.O. Box 5605, Berkeley, CA 94705–0605. Email: honey_b_temple@yahoo.com; website: http://www.honeybtemple.com.


Michelle Aiello has outdone herself. These little perzines are so honest they make your teeth hurt. Michelle is very forthcoming with what happens to her and how people affect her. But the stories she tells are not maudlin or “poor me.” They are just what they are, and she does not embellish for emotional reaction. She is almost minimalist in the telling, yet the tale is complete. Interesting accounts: the time she was arrested and thrown in jail for credit card theft, and the story of her six-year relationship with a boy with DID (Dissociative Identity Disorder, also known as Multiple Personality Disorder, or MPD). Very cool art is included, and this is one area that is not completely created by “Mish,” as she calls herself. The only other non-Mish pieces in the zine are a couple of poems by Freddy and Sarah, and they are outstanding; each of these puts up a good fight in the contest for “best line.” Terrific “every issue” entries include a listing of lyrics misheard (by herself and friends) and a soundtrack that she would play if she could while you are reading her zine. Her only mistake is to replicate textbook information about ADD in Issue 14. Other than this, reading these two issues was a delightful way to peek into someone else’s pain for an hour or so. The voyeurs among us will find their new hero in Mish. Best line: “Why, if I am so young, do I feel as if my life has passed me by?”

No price listed. Michelle Aiello, P.O. Box 180143, Chicago, IL 60618. Email: pinup1950@yahoo.com.

Leeking Ink: no. 28 (January 2004)

Davida Gypsy Breier’s perzine is quirky and more on the literary side of things. She is a highly skilled craftster, and I can easily see why she won the “Best Zine in Baltimore” award (given by a local paper). The story about the death of her beloved dog Sophie is great. What’s nice about this is that Davida does not tear-jerk; she simply tells the story with love for her friend. Anyone who has had a pet cannot help but sniffle at this one. There are several other entries that are like this, but not all of them are.

My only issue with this zine is that it gets tedious. Sometimes a zine is something to read while passing the time in a bus station or while waiting for a friend coming to meet you for coffee. This one is an involved process, and halfway through one or two of the pieces I found myself not caring about the outcome, especially in the one about the fictitious movie. Then, in others, I found myself very engaged and fascinated by the writing process that Davida goes through. This zine is hit-or-miss, because emotional commitment is required to really get into each entry (and sometimes you just don’t feel like it), while at the same time, Davida is a fine, fine writer (always a treat). She was clearly not the happiest person when she wrote this issue, and she complains of always feeling this way, but this is what zines are for, to help us work out our stuff. So, the jury (me) says there’s a lot of value in this zine. Don’t expect fluff, and don’t expect to get through it in one sitting. Definitely a good read. Best line: “And all of this is helping me live longer, exactly how?” Great question.

“Issues are published roughly twice a year.” $2.00, or “stamps, or a fair trade.” Davida Gypsy Breier. P.O. Box 963, Havre de Grace, MD 21078. Email: davida@leekinginc.com; website: http://www.leekinginc.com. (Davida is also the source for the collaborative review zine Xerography Debt.)
Quantify: no. 5 (December 2003)

This is one of the best-written zines I have ever seen. Lauren is an educated, thoughtful individual who remarks succinctly on identity issues and gives examples of how we unconsciously attribute characteristics and capabilities to others. Lauren does not fit neatly into any social category, and she has a good time messing with all her alter egos and other people’s perceptions. Luckily, we get to come along for the ride. She has a great conversation about Judy Chicago’s "The Dinner Party," in which she points out the racism, classism, and all-around shortsightedness that is so heavily institutionalized in even the greatest of feminist icons. An excerpt from a novel she began further discusses both discussions of socially institutionalized ideas of identity. My only gripe with this zine, and it is a small gripe, is that Lauren's language and use of formal academic theory might alienate the less-well-read. And this is an interesting line for any zinestress to walk, as intelligence and thoughtful insight need to shine through. If the academic is who you are, and the voice is authentic (and Lauren's is), then those who might be isolated from your writing might simply just not be ready for it yet. This is never comfortable for any writer, as we all want to reach our audience, but the line is about voice not getting read. I think Lauren walks the line pretty well. She does err on the side of educated intellectual, and yet I am willing to read anything she has to say. Best line: "Welcome to the world of angry cullid folk."


Sister Friend: nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, & 16 (undated)

Yay. We got sent five issues of Sister Friend. Each one has a delightful and unique cover that always depicts the two sisters who are friends (oh, I get it) in a wonderfully artsy style. Taken as a series, these issues are an interesting way to tell the story of these two women. J.J. is the younger sister who seems to go through unsuitable men like they are water. At least, this is according to her older sister, so we need to take the truth of that with a grain of salt. Leslie teaches writing and English as an adjunct professor at a local university in Illinois. She rants about, justifies, and exploits her job in writing this zine. I understand this — I would do the same in my zine (oh, wait, I already do) — and I think she does it well.

Taken one by one, the five different issues are “quickies” that, like the namesake, are fast and unsatisfying. Taken together, they tell a linear story, from a slightly quirky viewpoint, about two young feminist women who are just trying to get through their lives. One goes to grad school, and then stops going. The same one is going to get married, and then at the last minute she doesn’t, so we get the party favors on the cover of the next issue (in this case, a seed packet of daisies with the names of J.J. and the now-defunct Paul on them). The other bullies her sister into finishing the zine every month (probably just as irritating as it is productive). That same one is married and has a child, but, oddly, never talks about this. I would like this zine much more than I do now if the annoying interviews with each other went away, and if the issues were a little more spread out. I think doing that would make each issue stand on its own a bit more, since I think the voice here is interesting. These sisters are people I like very much, and I am engaged with most of what they say. Get several issues together and you will be, too. Best line: “If I am made in God’s image, then God has a fat ass.”

No price listed, but trading apparently goes on.
J.J. or Leslie, P.O. Box 4539, Fairview Heights, IL 62208.

[M.L. Fraser teaches psychology and women's studies at a community college in Northern California. She does not own tractors, skis, or other people's baggage. She does own dancing shoes, cats, and a surfboard, all of which she plays with on a regular basis.]
ITEMS OF NOTE

In HAPPY BIRTHDAY: A PLAY FOR ELDERS ACTED BY ELDERS, five women, almost all of whom are in their seventies or older, take advantage of a surprise birthday party to discuss aging. The play, based on the research findings of Ruth Harriet Jacobs, has been published as a 37-page working paper (ID# bk1015) by the Wellesley Centers for Women. It can be purchased for $10.00, either in book format or as an emailed PDF document, at http://www.wcwonline.org/title434.html. The website also has a mail and fax order form that can be printed and sent with payment to the Publications Office, Wellesley Centers for Women, 106 Central St., Wellesley, MA 02481-8203; fax: (781) 283-2504.

The following four publications are Occasional Papers from the United Nations Research Institute for Social Development Press (UNRISD). The first three are part of the project “Policy Report on Gender and Development: 10 Years After Beijing,” while the last is from the Social Policy and Development Programme. The papers are available in hard copy for $12.00 each, or $6.00 for students and readers in developing countries. To order, contact UNRISD Reference Center, Palais des Nations, 1211 Geneva 10, Switzerland; phone: +41 (0)22 917 3020; fax: +41 (0)22 917 0650; email: info@unrisd.org. These publications may also be found online by going to http://www.unrisd.org. From there, click on “Publications” at the top of the page, then go to the “Browse by...” box at the left and click on “Title.” Scroll down the list and click on the title of the paper you’re looking for. This will lead to a page with a summary of the paper, a link to an online order form, and a link to download the document in PDF format for free.

1. The many ways in which women have become more involved in Latin American agriculture is the topic of THE FEMINIZATION OF AGRICULTURE? ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING IN RURAL LATIN AMERICA, by Carmen Diana Deere. According to the author, women are working increasingly both as wage laborers, packing fruits, vegetables, and flowers for export; and as the sole farmers of their land as many men leave to work off the farms. Deere addresses the issue of farming families’ increased need for supplemental income, which has brought large numbers of women into the agricultural workforce, as well as whether this trend has improved the social status of women. This is Occasional Paper 1, Order OPGP1.

2. From 1989 to 2002, Éva Fodor conducted a study on women’s status in the labor markets of three Central European countries. The resulting paper, WOMEN AT WORK: THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE LABOUR MARKETS OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY AND POLAND, Occasional Paper 3 (Order OPGP3), outlines the similarities and differences between women’s situations in each of these nations, from Hungary, where rich women are making much more progress than the poor, to Poland, where women are largely discouraged from working outside the home at all. Fodor contends, however, that in general women’s positions in labor markets have not weakened as much as they could have.

3. Occasional Paper 4 (Order OPGP4) THE POLITICS OF GENDER AND RECONSTRUCTION IN AFGHANISTAN, by Deniz Kandiyoti, discusses how women’s rights are changing with the many political, economic, and social transitions occurring in Afghanistan today. Kandiyoti explores how women’s rights have been politicized in past conflicts and looks at current obstacles facing those who would reform the legal code in favor of greater rights for women.

4. Susy Giullari and Jane Lewis discuss new models for welfare proposed for Western countries in their paper THE ADULT WORKER MODEL FAMILY, GENDER EQUALITY AND CARE: THE SEARCH FOR NEW POLICY PRINCIPLES, AND THE POSSIBILITIES AND PROBLEMS OF A CAPABILITIES APPROACH. The authors compare two relatively new models, the “Adult Worker Model Family,” which recognizes men and women as workers in a family and generally places the responsibility for care within the formal sector, and the “Capabilities Approach,” which focuses on gender equality and strives to offer choices to both women and men as to work and caregiving. The paper also explores how policy makers in the European Union have modified their assumptions about work and caregiving, and how they use these models to craft policy. This paper is Order SPDPP 19.

 Compiled by Nicole Grapentine-Benton
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