ARTICLES

CANADA

Veronica Strong-Boag

Mapping Women's Studies In Canada: Some Signposts

Feminist scholarship in Canada is flourishing on a number, although not all, disciplinary fronts. The majority of recent contributions reflect a certain interdisciplinarity of method, perspective or choice of evidence; few confine themselves to a traditional and narrow disciplinary approach.[1] The very abundance and variety of these new investigations make the task of considering them as a whole beyond the scope of this article. They are best appreciated in the context of more specialized reviews. By contrast the purpose of this assessment is to outline the largely institutional contours of Women's Studies as it emerged in Canada in the 1970s and 1980s. Most particularly it addresses issues of philosophy, programmes, journals and associations. The evidence for any final evaluation is yet incomplete and this assessment must be only a preliminary guide to a rich and sometimes contradictory and obscure landscape. The vantage point of this author — that of an historian and a participant in some of the processes recollected — will no doubt be challenged by observers on other mountains. Such contributions will be welcomed. The only legitimate fear for feminists is the closing of debate.[2]

In the 1960s and 1970s women joined other Canadians in debating the nature and future of their prospects. Like concerned citizens within the Company for Young Canadians, the Canadian University Service Overseas and the Committee for an Independent Canada, feminists sought to confront a reality which fell substantially short of their ideal.[3] Their critique was and is wide-ranging but education with all it implied for socialization and opportunity became an early target. Schooling at all levels was censured for not addressing female experience or needs. Like their more junior counterparts, colleges and universities failed conspicuously to provide non-sexist education. In addition, they, especially the universities, made little or no effort to develop the basis of scholarship by which all human experience, both male and female, could be better understood. The fact that women were nowhere given equal opportunity in academic employments was part and parcel of the same problem.[4]

In the 1960s the Dominion's colleges and universities were few in number and for most part bastions of conservative and liberal values. They were ripe for change. Neither their numbers nor their values satisfied young people and their parents whose aspirations had been heightened by post-war prosperity. Rapid change within a relatively small and homogeneous academic community was the result. By 1981 the country counted two hundred and sixty post-secondary institutions. Community colleges enrolled 260,827 full and part-time students and the universities another 527,614. The annual rate of increase in enrolment between 1960 and 1970 in community college was 12.9%, dropping to a still respectable 4.6% in the next decade. Corresponding university increases were 10.5% and 2.1%. Women's numbers also rose in the 1970s from 47% to 51% of community college

students and from 35% to 45% of university students. Also significant was an increase in the number of female full-time graduate students from 22% to 36% of the total; for part-timers the jump was somewhat greater, from 24% to 39%.[5] Results from the unprecedented number and diversity of students were soon felt.

Newcomers tested conventional academic scholarship, teaching and administration often to find them sorely inadequate. Questions of nationality, race, class and sex in particular seemed curiously unappreciated despite a world where they were evidently critical in distributing and withholding reward. Criticism found its most ardent champions in the nationalist, native, radical and feminist movements which voiced the discontent of these who found Canada under the direction of its liberal and white male elite wanting.[6] One result was the introduction of Canadian Studies, Native Studies, Labour Studies and Women's Studies into many, but by no means all, universities and colleges. New faculty were also hired to teach these subjects and for almost the first time research in these areas was considered, by some at least, significant and valuable. Results were also seen in the appearance of new programs, journals, publishers and associations. Not surprisingly, methods and results ranged widely. Women's Studies was no exception. By the 1980s its history was complex. To begin with it encompassed two major types of feminist inspiration, each of which could be distinguished in academe by the early 1970s.

Integration or Separation

Feminists in Canada, as elsewhere, were divided as to the best strategy for transforming the college and the university.[7] To simplify drastically, there were two tendencies within the feminist community, one which might be termed 'integrationist' and the other better characterized as 'separatist'. This distinction was influential although political and practical considerations often required a certain hybridization of approach. For the most part integrationists concentrated on transforming traditional disciplines and departments from within. Well qualified female professionals would convert, so the argument went, hidebound structures to fair-minded treatment of women. Establishing a conventional beachhead would give legitimacy, guarantee funding and reach the largest number. Essentially practical considerations influenced the choice of tactics, but many integrationists prized many of the intellectual conventions of their own disciplines and held alternate modes of viewing the truth fundamentally suspect. Not surprisingly then, integrationists tended to stress professional qualifications with a 'sound' training in the intricacies of the discipline, whatever it might be. Exponents of this view concentrated on hiring female faculty, encouraging female graduate students and introducing female subject matter into their conventional disciplines.

As might be expected, success varied extraordinarily, with some disciplines notably more receptive to 'boring from within'. Within the humanities, for example, English and History seemed especially susceptible to some revision of their traditional mandate. The fact that the former contained a larger than average proportion of female faculty and students was a substantial advantage as was the fact of a subject matter which regularly as a matter of necessity, if rarely of feminist principle, treated women. The legitimation of a greater pluralism of approach which included Marxist and pychoanalytic criticism in the 1960s also prepared the way for feminist incursions. Such critical predecessors also often provided feminists with some of their earliest allies. The development of feminist literary criticism as a recognizable genre was also of help. Ironically enough, however, the very appearance of strength could also encourage a certain indifference to the general situation

of women. The atypical female, whether as university professor or established writer, was sometimes seen to be evidence of equality. The emergence of a new and the discovery of older expression of feminist literary consciousness, however, helped to shake this complacency in the 1960s and 1970s.

The situation in History was different with fewer women involved at every level. The influence of two senior female academics who were both to return to the United States by the mid-1970s was, however, critical. Professors Jill Conway and Natalie Zemon Davis then of the University of Toronto and now of Smith College and Princeton respectively were essential champions of women's history.[8] Without them change would have come a good deal more slowly. Such historians and their sympathizers were further inspired by the advances of what has been termed the 'New Social History' which gave unaccustomed weight to the experience of anonymous and oppressed peoples of the past.[9] Women's history, its practitioners and subject-matter, in Canada as elsewhere were also closely tied to labour, family and urban history with their advocates. The appearance of these largely new specialities in conference programmes and university departments helped legitimize the study of women as well. The sympathies linking the Canadian Committee on Women's History/*Comité canadian d'histoire des femmes* with the Committee on Labour History/*Comité sur l'histoire ouvrière canadienne* are typical of this fruitful association. The result by the end of the 1970s was a substantial number of women's history courses across the country. Many concentrated on Canada but probably just as many addressed the past experience of women in other lands.[10]

Within the social sciences psychology and sociology stand out as disciplines where feminist penetration was also significant. In each case these disciplines already counted higher than normal number of female faculty and regularly encompassed subject matter such a socialization and the family which unlike history's traditional political emphasis could not easily ignore the restriction of gender. The rapid growth of these disciplines, especially sociology which really only entered Canadian universities after World War II, was also important in permitting new initiatives. Close ties with developments in the United States and a somewhat more radical orientation of much contemporary sociology helped as well.[11] Advances while considerable relative to those in political science and economics, for example, were, however, finally limited. There was little cause to challenge a 1980 conclusion that "psychology has been primarily a masculine discipline . . ."[12] The expulsion of feminists such as Doctors Marlene Dixon at McGill and Marylee Stephenson at McMaster made abundantly clear how easily gains could be lost.[13] The demand for courses on sex roles and gender could not, however, be entirely ignored, especially when student enrolment faltered in traditional disciplines. By the 1980s such courses flourished in all but the most conservative of departments. How feminist they were of course requires further inquiry.

Feminist aspirations for the sciences were still more problematic. The number of female scholars and students were fewer by far; the subject matter, whether in biology or chemistry, apparently less amenable to re-evaluation. The presence of an internationally known feminist theorist, Dr. Margaret Benston, in the Chemistry Department in B.C.'s Simon Fraser University was in fact an anomaly as her shift in 1982 to Computing Science and Women's Studies made clear. To be sure by that time too there were occasional feminist scientists in departments across the country but the situation for women remained overwhelmingly unfavourable. Typically "in 1976 the percentage of women doctoral candidates

who received degrees in engineering, mathematics, and the physical sciences was too small to be measurable.''[14]

The 'boring from within' strategy of the integrationists was able to report a number of successes. Practically every history department in the country, for example, was willing at least to consider the possibility of an appointment in Women's History. Some history programmes made their first female faculty appointments in just this way. Indeed, ironically enough, such appointments were sometimes the only ones available as new hiring fell off in the hard times which hit university budgets in the 1970s and especially the 1980s. There were other gains as well. Some departments such as Sociology at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education even became 'notorious' for their recruitment of an influential number of feminist scholars. Women's experience, appeared more and more regularly as one part of departmental offerings. Naturally course additions with 'women' somewhere in the title or description cannot always be taken at face value. For like having a token female academic they can represent a similar kind of *pro forma* but essentially insubstantial recognition. At worse such a course can be used to reinforce all the old stereotypes.

For all the struggles to shift the scholarly and teaching priorities of Canada's institutions of higher learning, the 1980s still saw substantial gaps in coverage. In Arts and Sciences the weakness of political science and economics was especially evident. Philosophy, history and languages were sometimes little better served and the Sciences as a whole nearly hopeless. Statistically, by the end of the 1970s women academics were still in a situation which showed little improvement.[15] Women were always in danger of being isolated, sometimes coopted, as faculty and students. The result would be, as in the past, women who did not in fact represent women.[16] Given such a situation, it was hard to remain optimistic about the influence of even the few feminists who had managed to 'make it' according to the old criteria.[17] A steadily worsening economy still further threatened this precarious situation. Hopes for new women and new courses would evidently have to wait as they had in the past.

While many feminists put a priority on their efforts to gain acceptance within the traditional academic framework others, increasingly aided in some instances by the integrationists, looked to a more interdisciplinary model.[18] From the beginning many of this group appeared more radical, whether Marxist or Radical Feminist and generally more sceptical of conventional academic initiatives, than the integrationists who were sometimes castigated in the jargon of the day as 'careerists'. The involvement of feminist activities with great enthusiasm but limited academic credentials if considerable knowledge, such as Myrna Kostash at the University of Toronto also helped to reinforce the common perception of Women's Studies as a pursuit more political than scholarly.[19] The frequent effort at pedagogical innovation with high levels of student participation also challenged conventional notions of academic respectability. It became commonplace, at least in some circles, to dismiss the early efforts as consciousness-raising pure and simple and thus hardly worthy of a university. Certainly the appearance of greater radicalism made separatists, such as the original Women's Studies Group at the University of Toronto, less acceptable to the traditional academic and administrative hierarchies. Such innovators were thus doubly encouraged to strike out for themselves.

Women, so the separatist argument went, could not be incorporated adequately within the traditional educational structures of a capitalist patriarchal society. The personnel and

the theories which characterized all disciplines were too hostile, indifferent, inadequate or all three. On the other hand the advantages of university affiliation as opposed to setting up some kind of counter initiative with all its problems of funding and legitimation were substantial. Like exponents of Canadian Studies and Native Studies many critics interested in finding a home in higher education turned to an interdisciplinary model in Women's Studies. The possibility of acquiring a separate institutional base within universities was attractive for a host of reasons. Course content could innovate without having to win prior approval from reluctant departments and academics anxious to preserve their own turf and guarantee the 'correct' view. Teaching techniques could be similarly experimental with greater stress on cooperation rather than competition. Finally, hiring and promotion could rest in the hands of sympathizers, an important consideration for any hoping to develop careers in the area. The separatists were not wholly agreed as to the long term future of their efforts. Some hoped, much like the integrationists, that the feminist example preserved in Women's Studies programmes would eventually inspire emulation within conventional disciplines. Women's studies courses would provide a stronghold from which to campaign and finally convert the academic community. Once conversion was complete, at some unspecified date, Women's Studies could wither away. Others were less optimistic about the prospects for influence and more convinced about the independent merits of the interdisciplinary study of women. In their view, Women's Studies should remain an integral part of any comprehensive programme of higher education. In most cases the hope was both to create an interdisciplinary theory and methodology of Women's Studies and to influence traditional disciplines to reexamine old mandates.[20]

The essential division between the integrationists and the separatists remains to some extent to this day but cooperation and sympathy have largely replaced the suspicion, even competition, which characterized their early relationship. This realignment has occurred for a number of reasons. Most obviously there is the fact of increasing contact. Exponents of both strategies often taught the same students and were increasingly associated in many colleges and universities as part of a 'women's package'. A multitude of distinctions faded in importance in face of this common public perception. Moreover, even after the expansion of the 1960s and 1970s the community of feminists in Canadian higher education was sufficiently small to encourage friendship and understanding. Too ardent disagreement over methods was quite evidently costly. It was particularly hard when disputes among female academics were singled out as proof that women could not in fact work together. To a large degree 'sisterhood' then increasingly prevailed publicly among exponents of integration and separatism whatever the internal discussion which characterized their individual meetings.

Nor was it only a case of papering over fundamental disagreements. What happened in many cases was admission by both integrationists and separatists that their methods needed some reconsideration in light of the 'hard knocks' as well as success stories both had to remember. On the one hand many integrationists came to appreciate that within any discipline they would be a small band indeed. Even the most impeccable of credentials would never convert colleagues whose careers and personalities were founded on an assumption, acknowledged or not, of female inferiority. At the same time it also became evident that the methodologies and theories of the conventional disciplines were largely insufficient. Although they might be made more satisfactory by the application of feminist insight new approaches based on interdisciplinarity seemed of greater promise.[21] Identification with women's studies advocates was also encouraged in some cases at least by a lack

of collegiality even rejection by discipline traditionalists who held the final power of promotion and tenure. A growing radicalism on the part of some integrationists also favoured cooperation as they found their shifting perspective sharing much with the Marxists and Radical Feminists. The association of the historians, Mary Lynn McDougall and Veronica Strong-Boag with Simon Fraser's Women's Studies Program, and Sylvia Van Kirk with the program at the University of Toronto in the late 1970s reflected this increased community of interest.

For their part the pioneers of Women's Studies — one might think for example of the psychologist Meredith Kimball at Simon Fraser, the philosopher Kathryn Morgan at Toronto and the English specialist, Greta Neimroff at Concordia and Dawson College — came likewise to develop friendships and associations with more disciplinary-oriented feminists. It may be too that experience with colleges and universities had a sobering influence. Confrontation and a rejection of academic conventions were clearly of limited use when it came to protecting hard won gains on a permanent basis. Separatists became increasingly conscious that prospects for academic survival were substantially improved by secure bases within conventional disciplines. At the same time influence over students, curriculum and scholarship could be maximized by cross or joint appointments for example. This evolving strategy also reflected the change in the feminist movement itself within Canada. Perhaps most importantly with experience came the acknowledgement that, however fervently desired, a feminist revolution was not an immediate prospect. A long-term campaign had to be planned. The fact that feminism of various kinds had infiltrated much of the political and academic community also favoured tendencies toward cooperation, although some called it cooptation. Consciousness-raising with all the anger it engendered as such was no longer so essential within classes — students like faculty increasingly shared that experience. The broadening of the feminist movement into transition houses, rape crisis centres, research programmes, front-line politics and private homes also allowed academics to concentrate to a greater degree on what was after all their special function, scholarly inquiry. The question which so long troubled academic feminists — what is our relationship with the feminist movement — was if not completely settled at least not so divisive. The primary role of academic feminists was to serve as teachers and scholars, a reflection of the maturing and diversifying of Canadian feminism as a whole. Naturally this accommodation had its critics who saw only a descent into conservatism.

Today agreement on means is still not complete, nor is it likely that it will ever be. Many academics teaching and researching on women feel acutely uncomfortable outside of their own disciplinary boundaries. Interdisciplinary investigations and associations are still suspect in some circles, as are Marxist and Radical Feminist perspectives, for failing in scholarly rigour. The fact that, as for example, at the University of British Columbia and for that matter most junior colleges, Women's Studies appears especially vulnerable sometimes confirms the sense of arrogance. In turn, some advocates of Women's Studies cling to the days when academic politics seemed purer and scholarship less essential, days before 'careerist' allies. Some of this group have been effectively marginalized or indeed removed as they have failed to meet the more rigorous academic standards of the new Women's Studies. Others have found more congenial environments in journalism, publishing, politics and film-making. What is clear, however, is that resources in a small population scattered across an enormous landscape need to be shared if Canada's women are to be

served at all. The new Women's Studies relies on the cooperation of both separatists and integrationists if it is to prevail.

The Major Programmes

At present there are at least four major centres for Women's Studies in Canada: Mount St. Vincent University in Halifax, Concordia University in Montreal, the University of Toronto and Simon Fraser University in Burnaby. There are also significant courses in a number of other institutions, notably Dalhousie University, McGill University, the Universite de Quebec a Montreal, the University of Western Ontario, the University of Waterloo, the University of Winnipeg, and the University of British Columbia. The first four are, however, perhaps the most well established and visible.

Mount St. Vincent University, or "the Mount" as it is more familiarly known, has a long record of special interest in women. Established in 1914 by the Sisters of Charity, it is one of the few Canadian examples of an institution of higher learning founded especially for girls. For some time in the 1960s it seemed it might like so many women's colleges elsewhere — notably Radcliffe, fall to the tide of co-education. Fortunately under the presidency of Dr. Margaret Fulton it has revived its old mandate. In the words of its calendar "The University considers the educational needs of women to be a priority, and therefore remains particularly sensitive to the changing needs of women in society".[22] The 1981 move of the major Canadian Women's Studies' journal, *Atlantis*, from Acadia University to the Mount is an enormous asset. The creation one year later of the Institute for the Study of Women reaffirmed a modern feminist orientation. Its plan is fourfold: to concentrate on research, education, social policy and communication of benefit to women. These recent developments contrast curiously, at least to some observers, with the traditions of an institution which is one of the few still to offer diplomas and degrees in secretarial arts. A similar problem of reconciliation is suggested by the intention to have the Mount characterized also, this too in keeping with its roots, by a "Catholic Tradition".[23] The ability to resolve such issues will be worked out, one suspects, in the fate of the Bachelor of Arts degree in Women's Studies established in 1980. This is constituted with one interdisciplinary introductory course and others drawn from the offerings of seven departments. No faculty member is specifically appointed in Women's Studies *per se*. Recent developments at the Mount constitute an experiment unprecedented in Canada, even perhaps in North America. Its fate should tell a good deal about the larger appeal of feminism.

In many ways Maritime institutions, including the Mount, have been slow to develop momentum in the area of Women's Studies. What is now Concordia University, introduced its first interdisciplinary course on 'The Nature of Women' in 1970 long before any more eastern equivalents. This was very successfully team-taught by Christine Allen of Sir George Williams' Philosophy Department and Greta Nemiroff of Dawson College's English Programme. Courses on women were made available through departments and through the Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies. By 1977 students could register for a Minor in Women's Studies and plans existed for a Major.[24] The 1977 decision to amalgamate the non-denominational SGW and the Catholic Loyola College as Concordia prompted efforts to establish a series of Thematic Colleges or Schools built around different philosophies or functions. The first proposal coming jointly from faculty, students and staff called for the creation of a Women's College. This was realized in 1978 as the Simone de Beauvoir Institute/*Institut Simone de Beauvoir*, which did not, however, initially assume responsibility for the Women's Studies Programme which remained in the Centre for Interdisciplin-

ary Studies.† The Institute set out a broad mandate: to help improve working conditions of the university women, to serve as a resource centre on women for both the university and the general public, to establish links with women's organizations and interested groups in CEGEPS and universities, and to establish contact with the business community.[25] The Institute's founding met with considerable enthusiasm.

The efforts of Allen and Nemiroff in raising support among a broad spectrum of the university and wider community were essential. Unfortunately difficulties surfaced early. First there was dissension over the title of the Institute with a Canadian name, notably that of Thérèse Casgrain, losing out to that of the French feminist. Critics believed, among other things, that this choice reflected a certain intellectual colonialism and further still reflected at least the isolation, intellectual and otherwise, of English Montreal in Canada and indeed Quebec. This was not evidently the sentiment of the majority led by Allen and Nemiroff.[26] Ironically enough, however, their influence was not to last as Allen left for two years of research and writing and Nemiroff found herself increasingly alienated from the new elite and finally dismissed as a part-time instructor. Professor Mair Verthuy of the French Department was selected as the first principal of the Institute, in large measure due to her bilingualism and community contacts.

Bitter controversy soon erupted over governing principles. Verthuy led those, many of whom were long established faculty, who wished feminism to be downplayed and power to rest with permanent full-timers. The resulting controversy split the women's studies community badly, to the point that Allen, Nemiroff and their supporters withdrew from the Institution they had been critical in founding. This conflict was the outcome of many factors, some of which were peculiar to Concordia and its specific history. The issue of the role of part-time and untenured female faculty was, however, absolutely critical in the minds of the 'losers' in this instance. The treatment of Nemiroff and the attempt to concentrate power in the hands of a few senior faculty members seemed to promise little more than a female version of familiar hierarchical structures. The 'Queen Bee' syndrome was especially feared and there was some agreement among Allen, Nemiroff and their supporters that the feminism of Principal Verthuy and her group was fundamentally inadequate if it did not include an attempt to address directly the issue of women's marginal status in academe. They did not accept arguments from the principal and others which stressed the scholarly distinction between full and part-time faculty and believed them simply to camouflage efforts to shore up the position of a few tenured academics. The result of these debates divided not only full and part-timers but permanent faculty as well with Susan Russell of Sociology and Veronica Strong-Boag of History leaving the Institute. The subsequent fate of the Institute and the Women's Studies Programme which is now under its aegis is a matter of conjecture. Verthuy argues that little was permanently damaged. To be sure, a number of faculty careers have been furthered, in the short term at least, by its survival. Critics find the low profile of the Institute nationally — for example, its lack of significant input at the major 1981 Women's Studies Conference at the University of Toronto and the creation of the Canadian Women's Studies Association in Ottawa in 1982 — a better indication of blighted hopes. On the other hand the Institute appears to have a more favourable reputation internationally owing to its recent hosting of an international conference on Women's Studies. Nevertheless, it is tragic that such a gifted feminist scholar as Christine Allen no longer finds it possible to affiliate with her own creation. Perhaps it is too soon to make a final judgement about Concordia's fate, but certainly this

type of conflict is especially costly when times are bad for universities, especially English language institutions in Quebec.

In any case it is still possible to take both a minor and a major in Women's Studies at Concordia. Two interdisciplinery courses, one an introductory series of lectures and the second a senior seminar are required. Students draw from a range of courses offered under the aegis of various departments. There are no ongoing, full-time Women's Studies faculty as such.

The situation at the University of Toronto appears much more harmonious. Founded in 1972, it now offers Specialist, Major and Minor Programmes. Like Concordia, its core courses are interdisciplinery. Other courses concerned with women within individual departments are also cross-listed by the Women's Studies Programme. There are two core courses, one an "Introduction to Women's Studies" and the other "Scientific Perspectives on Sex and Gender". Specialists take a programme of twenty courses, of which thirteen are required. Majors have a fifteen course programme, six of which are compulsory. The Minor Programme demands three courses.

Although there were some early disagreements between the original Women's Studies Teaching Collective, founded in 1971, and integrationists teaching in disciplines such as history, reconciliation now seems largely complete. As a result and owing too to the active feminist community in Toronto, including particularly faculty, students and staff of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Women's Studies Programme, located within New College, has been very successful. In 1982-83 it counts five core faculty — Sylvia Van Kirk, Mary Nyquist, Kay Armitage, Paula Caplan and Kathryn Morgan — who are cross-appointed from various departments, colleges and institutes. Not surprisingly, Toronto's Women's Studies Programme also benefits as part of the country's largest university. Faculty, student, archival and library resources remain the envy of others in Canada. By the 1980s the University of Toronto group was highly visible in Women's Studies across Canada. One price of this prominence is, ironically enough, concern about being perceived as yet one more agent of Toronto's traditional attempt at cultural and intellectual hegemony.

Fortunately, Women's Studies is evident from coast to coast — all the more as places like Athabasca University and the University of Winnipeg are beginning to show promise as well. The particular strength of the West Coast lies, in great contrast to the Mount, in an institution with decidedly secular inclinations. Simon Fraser's Minor's Program dates from 1975 with first courses in place in 1976. In the early days under the guidance of Andrea Lebowitz of English, Margaret Benston of Chemistry and Honoree Newcombe of the Association of University and College Employees the emphasis tended to be somewhat segregationist, a reflection of lack of support from much of the traditional academic community. The existence of the innovative and relatively powerful Faculty of Interdisciplinary Studies which already housed such academic pioneers as Communications, Kinesiology, Criminology and Canadian Studies offered an institutional structure and base for a coordinated, central area of study on women. The 'grandmothers' of the Women's Studies Program viewed affiliation as attractive because "despite the suspicion cast on IDS in general, it was harder to push W.S. to the periphery and out the door, and we were not alone in attempting an interdisciplinary mode of inquiry".[27] The result was integrationist in the sense that it entered an already existing faculty and credited disciplinary courses but separatist in that it aimed to provide an external check on purely disciplinary initiatives

which at SFU as elsewhere are notoriously reluctant to include consideration of female experience.

Careful manoeuvering then established the Joint Appointment procedure by which long term survival was to be guaranteed. Each appointment was to become a full member of an academic department as well as an appointment in the Women's Studies Program. The employment of Meredith Kimball, a psychologist previously with U.B.C.'s Women's Studies Programme and Department of Psychology, was the first step, followed between 1976 and 1981 by appointments in Philosophy, History, the Centre for the Arts and Computing Science. In almost every case the effect of the additional disciplinary base was to favour a more integrationist approach.

The program, like that of the University of Toronto, is run cooperatively as signified by the title of coordinator rather than director or chair of the Women's Studies Programme. This may be traced to the continuing determination, in face of contrary academic tradition, to promote democratic procedures. The result, if predictably time-consuming, is progress very much determined in consultation and largely by concensus. The essential shape of this joint exercise was set early. Andrea Lebowitz recalled:

> The core program was in place right from the start. This was a very important point to us. We were advised to start with one course, but we refused to do this. We had a conception of the whole program right from the start, and we set up that basic program, because we didn't want a higgily piggily thing wandering all over the place. True, courses have been added but to offer more alternatives not change the core. Again we were very aware of the need to have a respectable integrated program for ourselves as well as for the demands of traditionalists and critics.[28]

The program itself consists of nine required credits in the first two years of study and fifteen in the last. There are two compulsory courses, one an Introduction to Women's Studies and the second a 400 level feminist theory seminar. Other required credits are made up of offerings in Women's Studies given by the joint appointments, special topics courses taught by sessional or permanent instructors and courses cross-listed from departments. An MA is being planned, contingent as always on continued funding, for 1984.

The development of four major centres for Women's Studies seems a creditable record for a nation without any substantial academic feminist tradition pre-dating 1970. The formation of the Canadian Women's Studies Association in June 1982 at the Learned Societies Meetings in Ottawa was also promising in its ambition to spread the good word still further. News of new initiatives in Women's Studies seemed to come almost weekly. There was nevertheless, a darker side to the picture. From coast to coast slashed education budgets have damaged or even eliminated courses and programmes, most evidently at the junior college level. In British Columbia for example, Women's Studies has almost ceased to exist as a coherent programme in the two-year colleges. U.B.C.'s programme has similarly experienced one difficulty after another due to insufficient funding and no permanent faculty.[29]

Solutions are, however, being sought. The founders of the Canadian Women's Studies Association hope, for example, to prepare strategies to deal with budget-tight administrations and to facilitate communication between the different feminists now operating within Women's Studies programs. The selection of Professor Frances Early of Mount St. Vincent's History Department as National Coordinator and Veronica Strong-Boag from History and Women's Studies at Simon Fraser as the 1982 Programme Coordinator like the

all-critical role played by Sylvia Van Kirk from History and Women's Studies at the University of Toronto affirms the cooperative national mandate of CWSA. The difficulty in finding a francophone coordinator is, however, a sign that efforts may be largely confined in the first instance at least to English Canada. French Canadians have their own agenda in this as other matters.

Journals

In contrast to the prominence of historians in the Canadian Women's Studies Association the original and still most significant journal in the field has beens singularly well served by sociologists. *Resources for Feminist Research*, published as the *Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women* from 1972 to 1978 has depended substantially on the labours of sociologists such as the founders, Marylee Stephenson and Margrit Eichler. Originating as rather a modest undertaking published by the University of Waterloo it proposed to:

(1) establish and/or improve communication in Canada among those who are doing research on women;
(2) list on-going research on Canadian women in particular;
(3) list selected relevant research on the international scene; and
(4) provide for an exchange of ideas on courses about sex-roles or women.[30]

In its first decade, *Resources* more than achieved its goals. Serving a broad spectrum of feminist academics and scholars it became, almost overnight, the standard work of reference for those interested in following the course of Women's Studies in Canada. In fact its very success, which continued apace after the move with Margrit Eichler to OISE in 1975, made its mandate all the more difficult to fulfill in its entirety. The fourth goal was most fully realized in *Women's Studies Canada 1977* compiled by Loretta M. French and published as a Supplement, and "Women Studies Canada 1978".[31] It is, however, in need of more regular updating than has yet proved possible. As a result there exists no regular source of information either on courses or programmes. On the other hand, *RFR* has produced a host of unexpected dividends, notably *The No-Name Newsletter* with current information on conferences, jobs, films, journals, government news and other publications. There have also been a series of special issues focusing on history (8:2, July 1979), political theory (8:1, March 1979), "Humanities: research and creativity" (7:2, July 1978), women and the politics of culture (8:3, Pt. 2, Nov. 1979), women in Canadian political science (8:1, March 1979) and women and anthropology (7:3, Nov. 1978). Other special interests have also been served by bibliographies on sexual harassment (10:4, Dec. 1981/Jan. 1982), the sociology of women (8:4, Dec. 1979) and women of Iran (9:4, Dec. 1980/Jan. 1981), an annotated index to Canadian women film-makers (8:4, Dec. 1979) and guides to Women's Studies elsewhere (9:4, Dec. 1980/Jan. 1981). *RFR* has been increasingly successful, an all too rare example in Canada's academic publications, in producing material on and from French Canada. Especially noteworthy have been Marta Danylewycz's and Jacinthe Fraser's *"Les Femmes au Québec: Quelques Récents Développements"* (7:3, Nov. 1978) and Yolande Cohen, *"La Recherche Universitaire sur les Femmes au Québec"* (10:4, Dec. 1981/Jan. 1982). Just as carefully cultivated have been contacts with feminist scholars and activists all around the world. A reading of *Women: A Bibliography of Special Periodical Issues* (August 1976) and the second volume (January 1978) both by Jennifer L. Newton and Carol Zavitz, together with the now regular updating of special issues in *RFR*, introduces Canadians to scholarship not only in English and French but other languages as well. In a host of ways *RFR* has

provided critical intellectual leadership. The development of Women's Studies in the last decade would have been incomparably more difficult without its contribution.

Yet for all its critical significance funding continues to be a major source of concern as every editorial is forced to repeat. The present economic recession has made long term prospects seem even gloomier. Indeed the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education has been increasingly tentative in discussing long term funding. A reorganization of the editorial board and increased subscription rates have been designed to deal with this emergency. In the issue announcing the recent crisis, *RFR* also editorialized more generally than has been its custom to declare

> It is not simply the case that feminist interests are seen as frills which can be trimmed when times get tough. The reaction to feminism which is the essence of New Right politics goes much deeper than that. We cannot ignore the fact that education in general and the education of women in particular are targeted as enemies of social and political stability by forces which are extremely adept at the organization of political pressure.[32]

The 'New Right' in Canada as in the United States renews old threats to feminism and all its enterprises, academic and otherwise. The battle for women's studies like that for women's rights will be fought on a broad front as the editors of RFR appreciate.

Atlantis: A Women's Studies Journal was founded in 1975, a beneficiary at least in part of *RFR's* cultivation of feminist scholarship in Canada. It devotes itself to "critical and creative writing in English or French on the topic of women",[33] feminist graphics and photographs, and more recently to the publication of "Canadian Women's Archives". Like *RFR* it too is interdisciplinary in focus. The result was, at least at the beginning, somewhat uneven, a reflection of the immaturity of the field. Over the last few years volumes have, however, been increasingly impressive. The quality on average matches that of most academic journals and in addition is a good deal more entertaining. What is quite evident is that authors who formerly might elect disciplinary publications are opting for the greater breadth and sympathy of audience found in *Atlantis's* readership. The contributions to the recent issues on "Domestic Labour and Wage Labour" (7:2, Fall 1981) illustrate the rigorous policy-oriented analysis which may be discovered regularly in the journal's pages. Meg Luxton in "Taking on the Double Day" and Ronnie Leah's "Women's Labour Force Participation and Day Care Cutbacks in Ontario", for instance, set forth the critical assessment which the female labour force rarely receives in conventional academic publications. Historical writing on Canadian women is also regularly well-represented, to a much greater degree than is evident in the *Canadian Historical Review* or even *Histoire sociale/Social History* for example, The result introduces non-specialists as well as experts to new thinking on women in fields as diverse as economics, anthropology, political theory and literary criticism. Like *RFR* there is a special quality to *Atlantis* which springs from enthusiastic participation in a common cause. The poetry, the drawings, the fiction, the editorials and the more traditional academic material combine to produce volumes of wide appeal. In reading *Atlantis* it is difficult to ignore evidence of the interlocking dependence of the feminist community, artistic, literary and academic in Canada. Thanks in large part to the efforts of *RFR* and *Atlantis* communication among feminists exists on a wide and deep front. This eases immensely the isolation which inevitably afflicts feminists in higher education across the country.

Unfortunately for all the excitement and loyalty it inspires *Atlantis* is also constantly facing hard times. Its five year tenure at Acadia University under the careful direction of

Margaret Conrad, Susan Clark and Donna E. Smyth was troubled by continual insecurity of tenure and lack of wide faculty acceptance. Financing by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council too seemed always in jeopardy. Happily Atlantis's move to Mount St. Vincent University and the Institute for the Study of Women should offer it greater stability of funding as well as more harmonious surroundings. Certainly the Mount is singularly fortunate to have in association a major journal which so aptly reflects its own concerns.

The third major addition to the periodical literature focusing on women is *Canadian Women Studies*. First published in the fall of 1978, its origins in Toronto's Centennial College help explain its closer attention to the needs of the feminist community working in high schools and junior colleges in particular. It also set out to serve and support feminists working in a wide range of public and private enterprises. Its shift to York University in 1980 does not appear to have changed this fundamental orientation. The decidedly activist orientation was outlined very precisely in the first issue:

> C.W.S. is a magazine encouraging change and requiring action. If a scholar has a theory that can help women it will remain just that unless it can be converted into action. This is why C.W.S. needs academic articles that have gone the extra step and been demystified.[34]

An editorial board member defined the projected agenda in more detail:

> We want to help to break down the barriers between the education of women in the classroom, in the community, and in the workforce. We believe this will unite women and give them power. By raising consciousness, by sharing knowledge, we will help each other to understand why we have been in a dependent and powerless state. In doing so we will create a structure and a process to conducive to political action and social change, that there will be no turning back.[35]

Implicit within this statement is the suggestion that *CWS*, even more so than *RFR* and *Atlantis*, is formally committed to no single interpretation of feminism. A preliminary reading of its pages also indicates that socialist feminism is less well represented here than in the other periodicals. This essentially liberal orientation would seem in keeping with the broadening out strategy advocated by the founders.

CWS's explicit intention to pursue consciousness-raising, a task which *RFR* and *Atlantis* largely presume to have occurred among their readers has lead to a spelling out of basic critical issues. *CWS* is the only one of the three, for example, to introduce right at the beginning a discussion of the character of Women's Studies and the whole concept of interdisciplinarity *per se*.[36] The same attention to form and method was evident in articles on Concordia's first course on French women writers[37] on "Women Studies in an Alternate Setting", [38] and "On Teaching 'Women and Literature' to Grade 13 Students".[39] The strong community orientation of *CWS* was also visible early with contributions on feminist career counselling[40], on an association of household workers[41], female painters[42] and wife battering.[43] As this last section illustrates *CWS* has also been notably successful in drawing forth French-Canadian contributors. This high participation rate owes a good deal to Mair Verthuy, Principal of Concordia's Institut Simone de Beauvoir and also an editor for *CWS*. The result is probably a higher level of bilingualism and biculturalism than that achieved by either *RFR* or *Atlantis*. This constitutes probably the greatest contribution of Concordia's Women's Studies to the national scene. In contrast the others — the Mount, Toronto and Simon Fraser — are more visible in the more scholarly journals.

For all its more popular orientation *CWS* has made a number of significant contributions to the body of knowledge in women's studies. In particular its special issues are worth

systematic attention, as for example with that on "Photographie/*la photographie*", "Law and Politics/*La Loi et la politique*", and "Women, Nation Builder/*Femme, batisseuse de la nation*".[44] The particularly effective use of photographs which characterize this journal also makes it especially valuable and accessible to a broader range of readers.

The mandates of these three publications are rather different but in unison they serve the feminist community very well. Their approach, which can be characterized as broadly non-sectarian, ranging in their contributions from radical to marxist to liberal feminism, enables them to draw widely on academics, archivists, activists, students, housewives, artists, and unionists for material. Other, more specialized publications also contribute to the body of Canadian women's studies. One thinks, for instance, of the literary magazine, *Room of One's Own*. Very little of what is happening in the field at large, however, escapes the attention of *RFR*, *Atlantis* or *CWS*. To understand them is in many ways to appreciate the direction, substance and arguments of women's studies in Canada.

Organizing for Change

In the 1970s a number of groups emerged to press for a greater recognition of women in teaching, research and staffing. A good many attempted to work within disciplines as with the Canadian Committee on Women's History/*Le Comité canadien d'histoire des femmes*, the Interest Group on Women and Psychology and the Society of Women in Philosophy. There are also such interdisciplinary groups as the Society for Women in Science and the Canadian Women's Studies Association. The success of these groups varies tremendously but they are essential in building morale and support for members isolated in a wide range of institutions. Their efforts also provide an essential resource for the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. Founded in April 1976 in response to International Women's Year and at the beginning of International Women's Decade CRIAW focused on the near absence of research on Canadian women. Its objectives include:

- To promote the advancement of women through feminist research
- To encourage and facilitate communication and information exchange among academic women, community workers, women's groups, and concerned individuals
- To disseminate research results through the CRIAW Papers, and eventually, through a computerized bibliographic retrieval system
- To sponsor and assist research into areas of vital interest to Canadian women.[45]

CRIAW has sought to fulfill its mandate in a number of ways. It established the CRIAW Bank of Researchers as a computerized record of feminist scholars in all disciplines. Research Grants-In-Aid have also been made available to assist projects promoting the advancement of women. The CRIAW Papers were inaugurated in the fall of 1981 to facilitate the publication of research. A quarterly newsletter offers up-to-the-month information on opportunities for the feminist research community. There are also two annual prizes. The Marion Porter Prize is awarded for the best feminist article and the Muriel Duckworth Prize to the Canadian woman or women who best communicates feminist goals through any medium. Finally there are annual conferences bringing together feminist researchers and activists across the country.[46] In the works is a proposal to computerize the abstracts of all current literature on Canadian women. The potential for this activity is obviously tremendous and the conferences and papers have demonstrated a quality comparable to that of other academic gatherings and publications. Although it has encountered the problems familiar to any feminist organization in raising funds, CRIAW shows every sign of becoming an influential lobbyist at the national level. A good deal of this influence

stems from that fact that there is at long last emerging a vital group of relatively established female academics. These feminists are sufficiently senior to be able to devote valuable time to an interdisciplinary national enterprise. The presidents — Pauline Jewett (1976-78), Elizabeth Percival (1978-79), Muriel Duckworth (1979-80), Ann Hall (1980-81), Margrit Eichler (1981-82), and Corinne Gallant (1982-83) — provide practically a roll-call of senior female activists and scholars.

Nor is CRIAW alone. Of clear importance for the emergence of Women's Studies within institutions of higher education are the Canadian Council on Learning Opportunities for Women, the National Action Committee, and the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. The latter in particular with its recently strengthened research arm should bring valuable new additions to the material currently available on the experience of Canadian women.

For all these groups finances remain problematic. In face of mounting budgetary crises and a conservative backlash there is no reason to believe this will soon change for the better. Despite this dilemma they remain energetic, a reflection of the strength of feminist activity. Recently too there are also promising new prospects for research. In particular, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council has identified two strategic grant areas of special importance to feminists: the 'Family and the Socialization of Children' and 'Women and Work'. The existence of such funding sources may be essential to the survival of feminist scholars in the coming decade.

Also promising in the 1970s was the emergence of significant feminist presses. Press Gang Publishers began in Vancouver about 1970 as a leftist print shop for both sexes but the men soon left. The result today is a feminist publishing collective. In 1972 Women's Press emerged in Toronto and publishes today from a socialist feminist perspective. In Quebec *Les Editions du remue-ménage* has been offering feminists the chance to publish since 1976. There is also *les Editions de la pleine lune* but little is known about its activities. Eden Press of Montreal was founded in 1977 as an independent publishing house for scholarly Women's Studies. Women's Press and Press Gang have been the most influential in supplying books to be used in universities and colleges. All are essential counters to the conservatism of bigger conventional presses.[47]

Conclusion

The 1970s saw the emergence of feminist scholarship on an unparalleled scale in Canada. Very little existed in any field before this time. The change in universities, while sometimes disappointing in light of high hopes, has nevertheless been dramatic. Women and their study have become highly visible in a variety of settings from coast to coast. This is not to suggest that gains are necessarily permanent. The disappearance of courses and the loss of jobs still threaten in many areas. Hiring freezes and budget cutbacks pose real, sometimes monumental, problems. The strength of the New Right now evident in attacks on hospital abortion committees and demands for religious instruction looms far too great to give any feminist peace of mind. Anti-feminism can also still be retailed by some academics as respectable, fair-minded scholarship. Yet for all this gloom there is a generation and more of feminists who will not easily give up hard-won gains, in women's studies or elsewhere. The next decade will test just how far they have been able to convince their contemporaries of the merits of women's cause. The future of Women's Studies and academic feminism in general will depend on that support.

Notes

*My thanks to Meredith Kimball, Andrea Lebowitz and Mary Lynn McDougall for reading an earlier draft of this article.

† Editor's Note: Dr. Elizabeth J. Saccha, the recently appointed Principal of the Simone de Beauvoir Institute, has indicated misgivings of the interpretation of events because there is a suggestion that the program at the Institute is somewhat moribund; rather, the opposite is the case. A description of the Program will be included in the December 1983 issue of this Journal.

[1] Notable recent examples include Sylvia Van Kirk, *"Many Tender Ties": Women in Fur Trade Society in Western Canada, 1700-1850* (Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer, 1980), Meg Luxton, *More Than a Labour of Love. Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home* (Toronto: Women's Educational Press, 1980), Mary O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981), Pat and Hugh Armstrong, *The Double Ghetto* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1978), Barbara Latham and Cathy Kess, eds. *In Her Own Right: Selected Essays on Women's History in British Columbia* (Victoria: Camosun College, 1980), L. Kealey, ed. *A Not Unreasonable Claim, Women and Reform in Canada 1880s-1920s* (Toronto: Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1979) and Lorenne Clark and Debra Lewis, *Rape: The Price of Coercive Sexuality* (Toronto: The Women's Press, 1977).

[2] Regarding the need for self-criticism see the useful reminder by Marlene Mackie, "On Congenial Truths: A Perspective on Women's Studies", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 14:1 1977, 117-128.

[3] There is as yet no comprehensive guide to the dissent of these decades. To be sure a recent volume, *Canada Since 1945. Power, Politics, and Provincialism* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981) by Robert Bothwell, Ian Drummond and John English does take up the issue, only to treat protest movements of all kinds, including that of women, in a superficial, patronizing and essentially ahistorical manner.

[4] For an indication of some of the problems facing academic women see Anne-Marie Henshel, *Sex Structure* (Toronto: Longman Canada Ltd., 1973), chapter 5, "A Case Study of Status Differential: Women in Academia".

[5] See *Education in Canada. A Statistical Review for 1980-81* (Ottawa: Statistics Canada, 1981) passim.

[6] For an insider's view of some of the issue Myrna Kotash, *Long Way Home* (Toronto: James Korimer & Co.: 1980).

[7] On the variety of opinion in the United States see Marilyn J. Boxer, "For and About Women: The Theory and Practice of Women's Studies in the United States", *Signs* 7(3) 1982, 661-695.

[8] For a brief indication of their influence see Strong-Boag, "Graduating into Women's History", *Resources for Feminist Research* (henceforth *RFR*) 8:2, July 1979, 10-11.

[9] On the New Social History see Strong-Boag, "Raising Clio's Consciousness: Women's History and Archives in Canada", *Archivaria* 6, Summer 1978, pp. 70-1. For a very useful appraisal of Canadian women's history see Alison Prentice, "Women's History in Canada: A Project in Process", Paper presented on the Colloquium on Social History, Carleton University, June 1982.

[10] See the course listed in Loretta M. French, compiler, *Women's Studies Canada 1977, Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women* (henceforth *CNRW*), May 1977 supplement and "Women's Studies Canada 1978", *CNRW* 7:4.

[11] For a useful, although somewhat dated, assessment of sociology see Lorne Tepperman, "Sociology in English-Speaking Canada: The Last Five Years", *Canadian Historical Review* 49:4, December 1978, 435-46.

[12] Tannis McBeth Williams; Merle L. Zabrack; Linda F. Harrison: "Some Factors Affecting Women's Participation in Psychology in Canada", *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadiene* 21, July 1980 p. 98.

[13] Regarding Dixon see Margaret Gillet, *We Walked Vary Warily. A History of Women at McGill* (Montreal: Eden's Press, 1981), Chapter 9.

[14] "Introduction", *Who Turns the Wheel?* (Ottawa: Science Council of Canada, 1981), p. 7. For a similarly bleak appraisal see Janine Pinet, "La Femme et La Science", *Atlantis* 3:2, Part II, Spring 1978, 96-115.

[15] C. Tausig, "Women Academics: Little Change in Status Over Past Decade", *University Affairs* 9, 1979:2-3.

[16] On the lack of representation see T. McCormack, "The Professional Ethic and the Spirit of Sexism", *Atlantis* 5:1. Fall 1979, 132-40 and Maureen Baker, "Academic Queen Bees", *Atlantis* 1:2. Spring 1976, 84-93.

[17] On the dangers see D. Smith, "An Analysis of Ideological Structures and How Women are Excluded: Considerations for Academic Women", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 2, Part 1, November 1975: 353-69 and Nicole Lawin-Frenette, "Les femmes dans la sociologie", *Sociologie et societes* 13:2:3-18.

[18] For a description of the interdisciplinary initiatives at Concordia or Sir George Williams University as it was in 1970-1 see Greta Hoffman Nemiroff, "Rationale for an Interdisciplinery Approach to Women's Studies", *Canadian Women's Studies* (henceforth *CWS*) 1:1 1978, 60-68.

[19] For brief and provocative indication of the character of some early initiatives see Donna E. Smyth, "Interview with Myrna Kostash — "A Western, Ukrainian, Regionalist, Feminist, Socialist Writer", *Atlantis* 6:2, Spring 1981, especially pp. 181-2. Kostash was involved as student and teacher in the first Women's Studies courses at the University of Toronto.

[20] On this dual mandate see Nemiroff, "Rationale".

[21] The need to reevaluate the university curriculum through the application of interdisciplinary methodologies and insights was felt widely as the special issue, "Thoughts on Interdisciplinarity" of the *Journal of Canadian Studies* 15:3, Fall 1980 made clear. Curiously, however, the significance of interdisciplinarity for the study of Canadian women was nowhere acknowledged.

[22] Mount St. Vincent University, *Calendar* 1980-1, p. 9.

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] See Nemiroff, "Rationale".

[25] *First Annual Report of the Simone de Beauvoir Institute of Concordia University, Montreal,* May 1979, submitted by Mair Verthuy, pp. 4-5.

[26] It should be noted that the author was a critic of Allen and Nemiroff on the issue of the name and their supporter in the debates which saw Nemiroff's departure.

[27] Andrea Lebowitz to Strong-Boag, December 1982.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] For an appraisal of the UBC situation see Kathy Ford and Muriel Draalsma. "Women's Studies Slip and Slide", *The Conventioner,* June 30, 1982, p. 13.

[30] "Editorial", *Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women* (henceforth *CNRW*) 1:1, May 1972, p. 1.

[31] *CNRW,* 6:2, May 1977 and *CNRW* 7:4, 1978.

[32] "Editorial", *RFR* 10:4, Dec. 1981/Jan. 1982.

[33] *Atlantis* 1:1, Fall 1975, back of front cover.

[34] "Editorial", *CWS* 1:1, 1978 p. 3.

[35] Marion Colby, "Women's Studies: an Inclusive Concept for an Inclusive Field", *CWS* 1:1, 1978, p. 6.

[36] See, for example, Nemiroff, "Rationale".

[37] Mair Verthuy, "Y a-t-il une specificité de l'écriture au feminin?", *CWS* 1:1. 1978, pp. 73-7.

[38] Kathy Waters, *CWS* 1:1, 1978, pp. 78-9.

[39] Ann B. Shteir, *CWS* 1:1, 1978, pp. 80-1.

[40] Helen Doyon and Pat Hacker, "Feminist Career Counselling — An Account of One Successful Experience", *CWS* 1:2, 1979, pp. 12-13.

[41] Danielle Bouchard, "Association du personnel domestique", *CWS* 1:2, 1979, pp. 38-40.

[42] J. Doris Hunt, "Annora Brown of Fort Macleod", *CWS* 1:3, 1979, pp. 91-3.

[43] Michele Chardourne, "Mon Vécu", *CWS* 1:2, 1979, pp. 49-51.

[44] *CWS* 2:3, 1980; 2:4, 1980: 3:1. 1981.

[45] *CRIAW*, publicity brochure.

[46] April 8-9, 1976, CRIAW Founding Meeting, Ottawa.
November 10-12, 1977, "Whys and Wherefores of Research on Women", Winnipeg.
November 9-11, 1978, "Women's Health — Physical, Emotional and Social", Quebec City.
November 9-11, 1979, "Women as Persons", Edmonton.
November 14-16, 1980, "Women and Power during the Eighties", Toronto.
November 13-15, 1981, "Women and Culture", Halifax.
November 19-21, "Sexism in Research and Its Policy Implications", Ottawa.
November 11-13, "Feminism in Action: New Knowledge, New Education, New Society", Vancouver.

[47] On the feminist press in general see Margie Wolfe, "Feminist Publishing in Canada", *CWS* 2:2, 1980, pp. 9-11; Joan Hind Smith, "Women's Press", *Status of Women News*, Spring 1982, 19-21; Doris Anderson, "Women's Magazines in the 1970s", *CWS* 2:2, pp. 15-16; and Penny Kome, "Homemakers", *CWS* 2:2, 1980, 17.