

rebellious against it. The Armstrongs contend, however, that little will come of the rebellion unless or until the segregation is eliminated by fundamental alterations in the economic structure.

Whether or not readers agree with the thesis of *The Double Ghetto* they will find it a valuable contribution to the growing volume of writing about Canadian women at work. The writing is clear and straightforward, marred only occasionally by professional jargon, and is sharpened from time to time with a touch of irony. An excellent list of references forms a useful bibliography. Warning: some housewives will resent and be disturbed by generalizations about their work and status.

---

*Sexism and Science*, Evelyn Reed, New York, Pathfinder Press, 1978, pp. 178, paperback \$4.45.

Meg Luxton

The struggle for women's liberation occurs on many fronts. One of our tasks is to arm ourselves so that we can move out decisively to win gains for women. One very important arena for such struggle is in those sciences that study human beings—biology, sociology, anthropology, and primatology. These sciences have provided many of the arguments that are used against women. It is time for women to use the tools of these sciences to show the inadequacies of existing knowledge and theory and to develop new, more accurate sciences.

Evelyn Reed's latest book, *Sexism and Science*, does just that. In eight related articles she summarizes the basic arguments from biology, sociology, anthropology, and primatology. She attacks one predominant current in these sciences—that which argues, from a sexist position, that women have always been subordinate to men and that men, and not women, were the instrumental agents in human evolution. Instead, she argues, using the tools of those very sciences, women have always been crucial in all human societies and women, as well as men, were instrumental in human evolution.

Women who are not experts in these fields are frequently intimidated by the arguments that maintain that women's subordinate position is rooted in innate, genetically-based biological characteristics. Reed's book helps us to affirm that these so-called 'objective' scientific observations are in fact disguised political theories. She provides us with a model of how to take on these arguments, show their inadequacies, and put forward the convincing case that women's oppression is not biologically based. It is instead socially determined, a part of the social relations that emerged with class society.

We are regularly confronted with these pseudo-scientific arguments, designed to prevent women from demanding equality. As a result, I urge people to read this book. It will help you translate your instinctive anger into a scientific tool.

---

*but can you type? Canadian Universities and the Status of Women*, Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam, Toronto, Clarke Irwin with the Canadian Association of University Teachers, 1977, pp. 146, paperback \$5.95.

Marsha Mitchell

Higher education is a major route into jobs in Canada's power

structure—and women's place in higher education is dismal. This is the message of *but can you type?* Co-authored by Jill McCalla Vickers and June Adam, this is the first of a series of monographs planned by the Canadian Association of University Teachers, intended to investigate issues facing Canadian universities and their relationship to Canadian society. The preface, by general editor Dr Naomi E.S. Griffiths, states the goal of the series as presenting 'scholarly yet popular accounts of the various problems facing Canadian universities, accounts that the Canadian taxpayers would find interesting to read and informative enough to allow them to come to their own conclusions about the issue in question'.

There is no doubt that this first monograph fulfills that goal. It covers the situation for female undergraduates, for female graduate students or those entering professional fields, and for female faculty—relating all of these situations to women's status in the Canadian power structure. The statistics, gathered by June Adam, are both thorough and well presented in easily read charts. By grouping these charts in topical sections at the end of chapters 2, 3, and 4, the authors do make it easy for readers to compare the data and reach their own conclusions. The text itself, contributed by Vickers, is an interesting, though highly personal, interpretation of the statistics, refreshingly free of jargon.

The statistics, by themselves, present a very bleak picture of every aspect of women's participation in Canadian universities. They establish beyond a doubt that women are under-represented as undergraduates, as graduates, and as faculty. Further, they point out that even though female enrolment in universities has been gradually increasing, enrolment in the predominantly 'male' disciplines of science, engineering, and professional schools is still scandalously low. For example, in 1969-70 the percentage of students who were women and enrolled in arts was 44, while the percentage in pure science was only 22, in engineering 1, and in law 17. The statistics go on to show that women are, rather naturally, similarly under-represented in these 'male' professional jobs. In universities themselves female faculty are paid less, are clustered in the lower academic ranks, and hold few of the power positions on senates and boards of governors. Altogether we are left with no choice but to realize that in academia at least we've still got a long way to go.

While the statistics are clear enough, the interpretation is less so. In fact, so little do the authors themselves agree that June Adam felt compelled to add her own 2½-page 'Interpretive Note' is extremely valuable to balancing the overall presentation in the book. Vickers's interpretation is one of such unrelieved gloom, as well, one surmises, as personal frustration, as to suggest that she absolutely refuses either to have her cake or to eat it. For example, she makes the point several times that 'Unless and until women force themselves into the "prestige" professional disciplines and into the male or senior professions—the routes through which most Canadians gain entry into our elites—the increased participation of women in higher education will have little or no impact on the problem of the status of Canadian women.' However, when confronted with the statistical fact that women have indeed forced their way into the 'male' discipline of pharmacy, she refuses to accept this as evidence of success: 'The decline of the independent pharmacy, however, and the fact that almost all of the women receiving degrees in this field work as salaried employees in hospital pharmacies or large chain drugstores may well indicate that the higher presence of women in the field is more the result of men moving out than of women successfully forcing their way in.'

There is as well one major inconsistency in her interpretation. She points out that these senior professions are almost exclusively the realm from which politicians are drawn, and that this may shed light on women's virtual invisibility in the political arena. Despite this, despite the fact that women are some-

what better represented in the university than in government, and despite her stated belief that women's issues won't be dealt with adequately until women are in government, she nevertheless concludes that we must look to government intervention to force an improvement in women's status on campus.

Her proposals to effect improvements in the university are thorough and could be effective. Upgrading of part-time courses, recruiting and counselling directed specifically to women, and 'redirection' courses, particularly in maths and sciences (thus allowing women to move into 'male' fields without high-school preparation), would all lead to some improvement in the outlook for women. One can only hope that women currently involved in the university will take a slightly more optimistic view of the possibilities than Vickers does, and begin themselves to implement some of these changes and lobby for others.

---

*Women: a Psychological Perspective*, Elaine Donelson and Jeanne E. Gullahorn, eds., Toronto, Wiley, 1977, pp. 342, hardcover \$13.95.

*About Men*, Phyllis Chesler, New York, Simon and Schuster, 1978, pp. 281, hardcover \$13.95.

Merle Wallis Bolick

I become increasingly irritated by women who say, 'Oh, I've gone beyond women's liberation now; I'm into human liberation,' as if the two were mutually exclusive. Often we hear these women speaking sympathetically of the hardships imposed upon men by their sex role. After their professed 'feminist' stage, they 'advance' toward knowing their place, toward comforting and worrying about (male) children.

My heart bleeds for tyrants, hereditary or otherwise. It was therefore with much trepidation that I began to read *About Men*, the beautiful, lively, and daring new book by Phyllis Chesler, author of *Women and Madness* and *Women, Money and Power*. I also wondered if such a work merited notice in a Women's Studies journal, since we already spend too much time in Women's Studies discussing men and male attitudes. But Chesler's new book forms part of a consistent corpus that deserves a place on any Women's Studies bibliography.

Paradoxically, a major focus of *About Men* is women, for Chesler's concern is 'with displacements of male-male rage and grief onto safe targets, namely away from stronger men, away from envied and feared men, and onto weaker men, onto children, onto women.' It is these displacements, argues Chesler, that have led to wars, pollution, slavery, and mass psychoses of all kinds, in the service of the male religion of death. Chesler seems to be saying what the most cynical of us have always suspected: that women are no more hated for themselves than loved for themselves, but act rather as pawns in the deadly male 'homosexual' power game known as patriarchy. Women are not important enough to be hated for themselves. Rather, we are hated as mothers (mothers-in-law, aging wives), for failing to protect our sons (husbands) from the violence of their fathers (bosses, political leaders). Male bonding is a way of identifying with, and thus earning rewards from, father-figures.

Alternatively, Chesler posits womb-envy as the basis of men's resentments of women. How we can be at once envied and despised is a problem for others to deal with, and I sometimes think that womb-envy, while plausible, is a hypothesis based on female wishful thinking.

The main strengths of *About Men*, and its major weakness, lie in Chesler's mytho-poetic and visual account of the interactions

of men with men, and men with women. The implications of intended filicide and unintentional parricide in the Oedipus myth are inescapable. However, it is indeed a rare Father who sacrifices His Son in western mythology. Isaac is spared and Oedipus escapes with a limp, whereas both Jephtha and Agamemnon sacrifice daughters for the war effort, and in patrilineal societies female infanticide is much more common than male infanticide.

The Bible [says Chesler] is haunted by the ghost of a missing son, a firstborn son, a most-beloved son: a murdered son.

This is so only because the lives of sons were already more highly valued than those of daughters. While Chesler is right in rejecting the notion that male hatred and contempt are based on actual qualities possessed by women, she has not gone deep enough. Women are 'safe' targets for transferred rage because at some point in prehistory they were deprived of the real powers they held in matrilineal society. Chesler's model is thus weakened by her assumption that the power structure has always been as it now is.

Because of its non-linear approach, *About Men* may not break through to the very men and women who most need to read it. Perhaps they will prefer the more traditional psychoanalytic section, with its excerpts from interviews.

*Women: a Psychological Perspective* suffers from precisely the opposite approach. Set up in bland textbook format, this book is relentlessly left-brained in its effort to undo illogical and emotional stereotypes of women, and to promote androgyny. There are elaborate apologies for any statements that might be viewed as political. Anger, radicalism, emotion, are not part of the method. Significantly, the only reference to Chesler's *Women and Madness* is to the statistical basis of her argument, not to the impassioned argument itself. Yet *Women: a Psychological Perspective* ought to be read by everyone.

*Women* is not as meticulously edited, designed, and proofread as *About Men*. It is riddled with typographical errors, and its editors cannot decide from sentence to sentence whether 'data' is a singular or plural noun. But it is full of distillations and reinterpretations of the most up-to-date research on female psychology. For example, the editors suggest in one chapter that famous studies proving women's 'fear of success' actually reveal that women, perhaps realistically, have low expectations of success. For such insights and for its bibliography, the Donelson and Gullahorn should become a standard first-year text.

Rather than being more limited in scope than the average 'human' psychology text, Donelson and Gullahorn is in fact much more comprehensive. It appears to be impossible to provide a psychobiological profile of women without providing background information on males, especially since the data on males are much more complete. Many times the contributors have had to report the inadequacy or nonexistence of findings on vital matters of female development.

Generally, however, the main fault of this work is its very scope. I wonder if yet another four-page table on the relative advantages and disadvantages of the common methods of birth control is necessary here, although I applaud efforts to get this information into the hands and heads of all young women and men. Then too, there are overstatements of the obvious:

Because lesbian women usually do not have husbands to provide financial support, losing their jobs [through 'coming out'] could be economically disastrous.

The real point to be made is that women's salaries are so low that lesbians (like all single women) tend to live perpetually on the brink of financial disaster if they forgo male support.