

## AUSTRALIA - AN OVERVIEW

Susan Magarey

### Women's Studies in Australia —

### Towards Trans-Disciplinary Learning?\*

In 1983 we are drawing close to the end of the ten years which the United Nations designated the Decade for Women. Half-way through that decade, in 1980, in Australia, the proportion of women in the population involved in some kind of post-secondary education had equalled the proportion of men. Only a year earlier it was possible to claim that 'Women's studies courses are at present offered at most Australian universities'.<sup>1</sup> In 1982 the University of New South Wales established a course-work postgraduate degree (a Master [sic] of Arts) in Women's Studies. In 1983 the University of Adelaide set up a Research Centre in Women's Studies. And related courses have proliferated at other educational institutions, ranging from the Studies in Sexism course offered at the Australian National Capital's School Without Walls, through a host of units — Modern Women Writers, Social History of Women, Women and Film, The Family (as a 'small social system') — taught at the New South Wales Institute of Technology, to the Graduate Diploma course in Women's Studies at the State College of Victoria and the Graduate Diploma in Teaching (Women's Studies) taught at South Australia's College of Advanced Education.

Women's Studies, in a variety of forms and places, would appear to be flourishing. Is this cause for optimism or anxiety? Does this fact represent a growing challenge to patriarchal domination of education, or merely containment by an increased number of tokenist gestures? Answers to such questions will, in the end, be determined by the Women's Movement, for women's studies are a reflex of the social event upon learning. They represent the continuing impact made upon the academy by the Women's Movement. Answers to the questions I have posed must begin with the social event.

The structure of Australian society has altered in ways which have brought important changes to the life-conditions of women during the twentieth century, particularly during the period since the second World War. Bettina Cass itemised these changes in an important article published in 1978. Summarised briefly, they are: increased fertility control, shorter periods of child-bearing and child-rearing, increased opportunities for education, increased demand for women in the paid workforce, and a growing tendency among educated women with careers or professional occupations, 'to postpone marriage, to choose not to marry at all or when married to have fewer children'.<sup>2</sup> Such long-term trends provided the necessary conditions for the present Women's Movement to emerge. But they were not, alone, sufficient to generate the demand for women's liberation. More immediate triggers were furnished by the needs of the post-industrial capitalist economy in this country.<sup>3</sup>

The economy enjoyed a period of expanding production, increasing profits, almost full employment, and growing general affluence throughout the 1950s and 1960s. The post-war

decades were a period of the greatest prosperity ever known in the history of advanced industrial countries,<sup>4</sup> and Australia was no exception. But by the late 1960s, the long boom had begun to generate its own difficulties. Firstly, the increase in employment of women, including women who are married, generated for those women a contradiction between the prevailing ideology — which exalted motherhood, home-making, and the domestic sphere as a woman's 'proper place' — and their material reality — of work in the public sphere, with personal earnings and a reference group independent of their households. Secondly, the increasing technological complexity of production required greater, and more specialised, skills of productive workers. They also alienated the worker from her or his work even more than had the productive processes of an earlier stage of industrial development: workers were being alienated not only from the product of their labour, but from production altogether. Increasingly, their work was merely to supervise what the machine produced. Thirdly, for production to expand as it did in the 1950s, it was necessary for consumption to expand as well. For the domestic market, that need generated an enormous increase in the communications industry through which manufacturers advertised their products and sought to persuade consumers to purchase more, and more differentiated, and more individualised items of housing, clothing, food, transport, domestic machinery and entertainment. Manufacturers, through their advertisers, tried to expand the consciousness of the domestic population in order to expand the quantity and variety of the products which that populations would consume. But, as Juliet Mitchell pointed out:

Expanding the consciousness of many (for the sake of expanding consumerism) *does* mean expanding their consciousness. And the products of this expanded consciousness are more elusive than those of the factory conveyor belt. The ideologies cultivated in order to achieve ultimate control of the market (the free choice of the individual of whatever brand of car suits his individuality) are one which can rebel *in their own terms*. The cult of the individual can surpass its use by the system to become that radical revolt of "do-your-own-thing". the cult of "being true to your own feelings" becomes dangerous when those feelings are no longer ones that society would like you to feel. . . . The media that enables you to *experience* the feelings of the world, brings the Vietcong guerilla into your own living room along with the whitest wash of all.<sup>5</sup>

These days it enables us to share in the Pentagon Action of 1981 and Greenham Common in 1982.

So, by the late 1960s, the long boom had produced three contradictions: between the need for a skilled workforce, regardless of the gender of the worker, and a dominant ideology that a woman's place was not in the paid workforce but at home; between the need for workers to have greater technical skills, and the increased alienation of the skilled worker; and between the need for expanded consciousness among consumers and the likelihood of that consciousness expanding into life-conditions beyond those concerned with consumption. All three contradictions achieved their clearest focus in the various institutions of post-secondary education that were mushrooming throughout Australia to supply the economy's needs. Not surprisingly, then, it was largely from the institutions of higher learning that the radicalism of the late 1960s erupted: in opposition to Australia's participation in the war in Vietnam, in struggle for the rights of draft resisters, then in struggles against racism, struggles for student power and the rights of youth, finally — assisted by the way in which the radical men treated the women who struggled beside them — in the movement for the liberation of women.

The Women's Liberation Movement has, during the succeeding fifteen years, grown into what is, more loosely, called the Women's Movement. It has expanded in size and influence to a point where it is reasonable to surmise that there is not a woman in Australia

who has not at least heard of it. It has formed organisations — the Women's Electoral Lobby and Labor Women; institutions — Women's Centres, Women's Refuges, Rape Crisis Centres, Women's Health Centres, Women's Switchboard and Information Centres, Feminist Bookshops; segments and points of reference within government bureaucracies — the Office of Women's Affairs in the Australian Commonwealth Public Service, the Equal Employment Opportunity Bureau in the Australian Public Service Board, Offices of Women's Advisor to a few State premiers. It has conducted countless campaigns: for more public provision of child-care, for equal pay, for paid maternity leave, for family planning centres, against pornography, and a multitude of other issues. It has debated within its own ranks the rival claims of feminist revolutionaries and feminist reformers, of socialist feminists and radical feminists, of the need for the Women's Movement to make common cause with the Left, the need for the Women's Movement to work with governments, and the need for the Women's Movement to be autonomous.<sup>6</sup> However, unlike social movements which have formed religious sects or trade unions or political parties, the Women's Movement has not itself become an institution with a readily identified membership. Rather, it has remained an amorphous, shifting collection of groups and individuals whose awareness of the subordination of women and wish to change it bring them together at particular junctures to fight for particular causes which express that awareness and wish, or to celebrate women's creativity, energy and humour in forms of expression that were previously unrecognised.

One of the many changes for which people in the Women's Movement have worked has been the introduction of women's studies courses into educational institutions. At Sydney University in 1973, that endeavour became a major battle, with students calling a strike of all members of the university and picketing lectures waving placards which read 'Fight sexist professors'.<sup>7</sup> At the Australian National University in Canberra, the following year, students mounted what has since been called, euphemistically, an 'education campaign' during which they occupied the Chancery for twenty-four hours demanding *inter alia*, a women's studies course.<sup>8</sup> The origins of other women's studies courses have been less tempestuous. In the Faculty of Economics at Sydney University, the School of Sociology, Politics and Philosophy at Macquarie University, the English Department of Queensland University, the History Departments in the Universities of Tasmania and La Trobe, and the School of Social Inquiry at Murdoch University — for example — people gained approval for courses which relate to women's studies without major confrontation with university establishments. But whether they began amid uproar or peaceful negotiation, all such courses have sprung, however indirectly, from the present Women's Movement. That means that they depend for their continuity and intellectual calibre, ultimately, upon the strength and intellectual vitality of the Women's Movement. And that, a year after the third highly successful national Women and Labour Conference, in a year in which Australia has seen unprecedented recognition not only of the importance of women's votes but also of women's ability to gain election to public office,<sup>9</sup> appears capable of overcoming even the back-lash associated with economic recession.

However, all the gains made by women's studies courses are also affected by their relationships with the institutions in which they are offered. When funding, staffing, resources, requirements and procedures for enrolment and assessment are controlled by academic bureaucracies, the shape and nature of courses are inevitably affected by the attitudes of those bureaucracies. In general they have been, as Ann Curthoys observed in 1975, 'essentially conservative'. 'Universities' she went on:

exist to provide skills for an authoritarian parliamentary-democratic society based on a capitalist economy, and can only develop into something else in accord with fundamental changes in the society as a whole. The university is contained within the society around it, and is in many ways the perpetrator of some of its most conservative values.<sup>10</sup>

In a social formation whose government is prepared to concede equal pay for equal work in a gender-differentiated workforce, the universities follow suit by allowing women's studies courses to be established, but ensuring, or trying to ensure, that they are adequately contained within the established structure of the institution.

Occasionally, containment remains a threat rather than an achievement. At Flinders University in 1973, for instance, a group of feminists from both inside and outside the institution were able to offer a course which operated on the principles of

participatory democracy in running . . . [it], no appointed teacher to give lectures or seminars, involvement of anyone who wishes to participate, and group assessment.

'There is a very strong feeling in the course', some of its participants noted at the end of that year,

that these principles are necessary for the course to serve the interests of women, and that no compromise would ever be possible for the sake of academic recognition of the course.<sup>11</sup>

In 1974, a similar course at Flinders was concentrating on matters that were 'probably a lot more relevant to the women in the groups who have come from outside the university' than matters which could produce ' "good, solid academic work" ', and distinguished assessment of work — done readily by the whole group, from grading — done only for those students enrolled in the university, and only 'to satisfy the Registry's requirements'.

Increasingly, we are critically assessing the work that people submit to the group, but giving them the grade that they feel that they need. If a person wanted to go on to Honours, for example, and needs a credit to do so, her group might well decide to give her a credit, as well as assessing her work quite separately from that grading decision.<sup>12</sup>

That course was still being offered in 1982, its principles diluted but basically unchanged. But it was able to continue because it received a grant from the International Women's Year funds provided by the Australian government in 1975, and because the Philosophy Department appointed a tutor to co-ordinate the course and provided part-time teaching funds out of its own budget. The university could penalise the department for this by refusing it funds for part-time teaching in first-year philosophy. But the women's studies course was 'by far the most popular second and third year course in the Philosophy Department', so the department continued to risk such a penalty.<sup>13</sup> Such a course appears to have been developing a specifically feminist learning environment by, in Dale Spender's words, questioning 'the efficacy of hierarchies and the desirability of stratification'.<sup>14</sup> And its containment was held perilously at bay.

Other courses, which have conceded to the academic bureaucracies a broad conformity over enrolment and assessment requirements in return for their very existence, can meet a far blunter containment. At the Australian National University, where the Women's Studies Program has offered two full-year courses since 1979, and an honours course which began in 1982, the university's authorities have strenuously resisted any expansion in the Program's resources, despite consistently high enrolments. Indeed, for one semester in 1979, one seminar group was co-ordinated entirely by a group of feminists who were full-time lawyers and had no other connection with the university; they did this work voluntarily — the Program had no part-time teaching money left to pay them. And in 1982,

after finally persuading the administration to concede funds for a second, full-time lectureship in the Women's Studies Program (a two-year post), and after interviewing candidates and selecting an appointee, the university 'froze' the position. Despite strenuous student protest, and letters from outraged participants in the Women's Movement all over Australia, the Program is limping through 1983 with only one full-time member of staff and three full-year courses.<sup>15</sup> Likewise, at Melbourne University in 1980, after a protracted struggle in academic committee rooms, a women's studies course was finally approved and an invitation sent to a woman in London to co-ordinate it, a privilege for which — at least initially — the university apparently believed she would pay her own fare to and from Australia.<sup>16</sup>

Yet other courses can meet a form of containment more subtle than restricted resources and inadequate funds. Where women's studies courses are offered within particular university departments, the issues discussed and the material considered are often restricted by assumptions prevailing within a department about the 'discipline' which that department teaches. Students attending a course on Women in History, say, complain when issues they want to discuss have to be set aside because they are 'not history'. Similarly, a course on Women in Australian Politics, which does not question definitions of 'politics' prevailing in university departments, could examine women's participation in various Australian parliaments, local government bodies, trade unions, and perhaps in pressure groups lobbying parliamentarians and bureaucrats. But it would not consider such concepts as 'the politics of everyday life', or 'personal politics', or 'sexual politics'. Both of these examples are hypothetical but they could — *mutatis mutandis* — describe a great many course which relate to Women's Studies by focussing attention specifically upon the position or activities of women rather than men, but do this within the terms of reference determined by the paradigmatic assumptions of a particular discipline, or of a particular school of thought within a discipline. such course which can, not unfairly, be called 'compensatory', testify to the universities' success in containing potential intellectual disruption.

Nevertheless, the repressive tolerance of post-secondary educational institutions in Australia most often appears velvet-gloved, in commitment to a liberal ideology which professes to reject all kinds of 'political indoctrination' in education and to endorse free enquiry and unfettered research an analysis. These ideals can rebel in their own terms. such ideals can, for instance, lead students of sociology concerned with crime and social deviance to perceive the political and administrative assumptions permeating definitions of the criminal as innately wicked, or of the deviant as socially inadequate or socially deprived, and to press for a fresh consideration of crime or deviance as a process of transaction between the individual and a mutable conditional law or social norm. Such ideals can prompt economics students to discern the political assumptions embedded in consideration of economic issues solely as mathematical models and to demand a return to, or revision of, courses in political economy.<sup>17</sup> Similarly, such ideals have allowed women to perceive the androcentric assumptions underlying all forms of social inquiry, and even the priorities governing the processes by which knowledge has been divided and subdivided through time, with the development of increasingly specialist research. And their perception has led to expressions of a need, not only for compensatory courses on women-and/in-this-or-that-specialism, but also for courses, research and analysis which may draw upon many of the established intellectual disciplines to find ways of understanding stasis and process in whole, as opposed to parts of, social formations. That need is usually expressed

as a demand for 'interdisciplinary' or 'multi-disciplinary' and 'trans-disciplinary' women's studies.<sup>18</sup>

There is a distinction which is not unimportant to be drawn between the three. But first it is necessary to define a 'discipline' — no easy task when, in so many discussions, definitions are more often assumed than spelt out, and vary widely. Often, a discipline is thought to be defined by its object of inquiry: physics is concerned with inanimate matter, biology with living organisms, psychology with the behaviours and psychic construction of human individuals (despite all the time it spends with rats), history with the past, and so on.<sup>19</sup> But such definitions do nothing to explain why, for instance, physics and geology are considered distinct disciplines, or politics and sociology, or history, and anything since everything has a past. Similarly, when J.P. Powell simply equates 'discipline' with 'established university department', he begs all the questions he began with.<sup>20</sup>

More epistemologically sophisticated definitions of a 'discipline' do address this question. Stephen Toulmin's, for example, makes 'an isolable and self-defining repertory of procedures' the hallmark of a 'discipline'; Paul Hirst distinguishes any one 'discipline' from another by its 'dependence on some particular kind of test against experience' for its distinctive expression.<sup>21</sup> Such definitions are probably adequately summed up in Martin Trow's succinct phrase — 'a body of knowledge and characteristic ways of extending knowledge'.<sup>22</sup> Such definitions make any 'inter-disciplinary', 'multi-disciplinary' or 'trans-disciplinary' enterprise into a 'field', not a 'form' of knowledge,<sup>23</sup> and suggest that the distinction between the three must be drawn according to differences in methodology, technique and procedure. Accordingly, an 'inter-disciplinary' enterprise adopts specific repertoires of procedures from the disciplines between which it has developed. A 'multi-disciplinary' exercise must, then, be one which draws upon the procedures of a multitude of different disciplines, and will face enormous difficulty in establishing criteria for doing so, and deciding what to do with them once it has done so. Mere eclecticism will generate teaching and research that is either superficial, or chaotic, and probably reluctant to confront negative evidence. A 'trans-disciplinary' enterprise, by contrast, endeavours to transcend a specific range of disciplines, and this must mean that it establishes criteria for assessing and selecting techniques and procedures from those disciplines, even if the criteria are chiefly of the rough and ready kind which determine selection according to their usefulness in illuminating a particular field of knowledge, or in facilitating synthesis of information from a variety of intellectual traditions.

If these definitions can be accepted, then the need for women's studies which are not merely compensatory research and teaching within established disciplines, is a need for 'trans-disciplinary' work. Their 'field' of knowledge and inquiry focuses upon the position and activities of women, but extends to whole social formations, their procedures derive from whichever of the disciplines is most appropriate for consideration of, or inquiry into, specific questions or issues raised within that field of knowledge. Research into the sexual division of labour in Canberra, for example, follows procedures developed by the social sciences — sociology and social anthropology. Inquiry into the biological basis of gender differentiation follows, or examines, procedures developed by both natural and social sciences, biology and psychology. But in such instances, the procedures followed are themselves subject to scrutiny and the final result of such work is a logically coherent integration of information and discussion consistent with assessment of the procedures

adopted, directed towards illumination of issues and questions posed, not by an incestuous scholasticism, but rather by the Women's Movement.

Courses attempting 'trans-disciplinary' work, even in a conservative, penny-pinching, ideologically repressive institution, are — I would argue — subverting its patriarchal domination of learning, if not so much by an explicit challenge to its hierarchical material structure, then certainly by a clear and explicit challenge to its ordering and use of knowledge. The challenge of an endeavour of this kind is great, for it is extremely difficult. Some women's studies courses — those at Griffith University in 1979 and 1980, at Melbourne University in 1980, at the Australian National University in 1978 and 1979, for instance — have attempted to meet the challenge through collective, co-operative teaching, undertaken by a group, each member teaching those aspects of the trans-disciplinary course which relate to her own discipline. I think that these will eventually be seen as transition measures — enterprises to be sustained until all of us, those whom the university calls students and those it call teachers, alike, have acquired the intellectual confidence and experience necessary to assess not only information but also procedures drawn from a range of disciplines, and to integrate their research and analysis.

To say all this may be simply to offer an elaborate version of Ann Curthoys's argument, in 1975, against people 'opting out of existing disciplines and into women's studies'. 'In my view', she wrote:

unless women's studies draws from and feeds back into the traditional disciplines it will become an isolated enclave within the university, representing the intellectual ghettoisation of women. So far women's studies courses represent a content area and perhaps to some extent have some ideological/political unity, but I cannot see how they can develop methodological coherence. I see disciplines as essential to methodological coherence and intellectual depth, even though disciplines exist only to be transcended.<sup>24</sup>

However, if the Australian publications which can be used in women's studies courses are any guide, such self-conscious and critical transcendence of disciplines and the boundaries between them still lies ahead of us. Most of the books that have appeared so far have been either firmly grounded in a single discipline, or are theoretically eclectic collections which draw together work carried out in a range of disciplines but make no attempt to integrate it. In the first category, the historians, probably made the earliest impact with the publication in 1975 of Beverly Kingston's study of domestic work, and Edna Ryan's and Anne Conlon's *Gentle Invaders*, an examination of the dual labour market, women's wages and the fight for equal pay.<sup>25</sup> Historians have been well served, too, for in 1977 the International Women's Year research project published its two-volume annotated guide to historical sources about women in Australia, Beverly Kingston published a collection of historical documents, *The World Moves Slowly*, and in 1980 Kay Daniels and Mary Murnane brought out another collection of historical documents, compiled from the extensive and wide-ranging research they had undertaken for the guide to historical sources about women.<sup>26</sup> But the appearance, in 1982, of *Women at Work* by Kaye Hargreaves, a sociologist, may indicate a challenge to the historians' precedence from the sociologists.<sup>27</sup> Anne Game's and Rosemary Pringle's *Gender at Work* will be in the bookshops by mid-1983.

In the second category, an early assemblage such as *The Other Half* edited by Jan Mercer, has yielded place to later collections.<sup>28</sup> One of these, edited by Norma Grieve and Patricia Grimshaw — *Australian Women: Feminist Perspectives* — set out to be 'an interdisciplinary reader for students pursuing studies of women in universities and colleges

of advanced education'.<sup>29</sup> Those students may well gain much from a few of the individual articles in the book, but unfortunately the editors have neither integrated the articles into a coherent whole, nor addressed the question of what 'inter-disciplinary means'. The collections compiled from the first two Women and Labour Conferences, too, give little explicit attentions to the conventions of intellectual disciplines. But the first, *Women, Class and History*, is a collection of predominantly historical articles, so that the editor's introduction can focus its discussion entirely upon the kinds of history represented, or to be aimed for in the future, without having to raise questions about other disciplines.<sup>30</sup> And the second, *Worth Her Salt*, a collection of thirty-one papers culled from over two hundred offered to the conference held in 1980, divides into two sections, the first concerned chiefly with analysis of oppression, the second with struggle for change, so that it takes its intellectual touchstones directly from the Women's Movement rather than from any concern with disciplines.<sup>31</sup> Carol O'Donnell and Jan Craney have assembled ten articles which draw on a range of disciplinary expertise, solid scholarship and practical experiences in *Family Violence in Australia*.<sup>32</sup> Even more than in *Women, Class and History*, the contributors share similar theoretical orientations to their work, and since this is sharply focussed on a single — if many-sided — issue, the articles form a single coherent study. But they still do not address explicitly the assumptions in the wide range of disciplines which have helped form their contributors' ideas. As Anne Summers wrote, in her path-breaking synthesis, *Damned Whores and God's Police*, as long ago as 1975, it is most unlikely that 'a comprehensive picture of women's expectations and experiences can be gained by confining one's inquiry to narrowly defined conventional academic disciplines.'<sup>33</sup> But it is also unlikely that we will gain such a picture if we ignore the assumptions that we have learned to make without even thinking about them, from the intellectual disciplines which inform our schooling, even institutions of tertiary education.

The Women's Movements' protest against patriarchal relationships has generated the recognition among feminist scholars that androcentric research has produced not merely analyses of societies and of ways of perceiving that present women as unimportant, but rather analyses that are substantially inaccurate. They have failed even to ask the questions which would produce accounts of whole social formations, instead of halves masquerading as wholes. They have failed even to ask the questions that would reveal the gender-lock of the ways in which they think and see. And this means that — to return to the questions with which I began — if the women's studies courses which are flourishing in post-secondary education are at least aiming at trans-disciplinary inquiry, then the Women's Movement has good cause for optimism on this front in its struggle. For such courses work like 'revolutionary reforms'. Their conformity to the institutions' procedural requirements may make them appear innocuous. And the people involved in them may suffer the schizophrenia of conflicting demands. Yet both are, themselves, conditions from which we learn. And trans-disciplinary inquiry informed by such learning will, eventually shake the conceptual foundations of our knowledge.

#### Notes

\* This article is a feminist, and a collective, product. I would like to thank particularly Cora Baldock, Ann Curthoys, Daphne Gollan, Elizabeth O'Brien, and Julia Ryan for their help and encouragement.

<sup>1</sup> Beverly Walker and Margaret Smith, 'Women's Studies Courses in Australian Universities', *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, II, 3, p. 375.

<sup>2</sup> Bettina Cass, 'Women's Place in the Class Structure', in E.L. Wheelwright and Ken Buckley (eds.), *Essays in the Political Economy of Capitalism* (Sydney, 1978).

<sup>3</sup> The analysis in the following paragraph is drawn from Juliet Mitchell, *Woman's Estate* (Harmondsworth, 1971), pp. 29-33, and from a suggestion by Cora Baldock, to whom I am grateful.

<sup>4</sup> E.J. Hobsbawn, *The Crisis & The Outlook* (London, 1975).

<sup>5</sup> Mitchell, p. 31.

<sup>6</sup> Documentation of all the activity and discussion indicated here would require a footnote as long as the article. Four useful summaries are: Susan Eade [Magarey], 'Now We Are Six: A Plea for Women's Liberation', *Refractory Girl*, Nos. 13-14; Ann Game and Rosemary Pringle, 'Women and Class in Australia: Feminism and the Labor Government', in Graeme Duncan (ed.), *Critical Essays in Australian Politics* (Melbourne, 1978); Marian Simms, 'The Australian Feminist Experience', in Norma Grieve and Patricia Grimshaw (eds.), *Australian Women Feminist Perspectives*, Melbourne, 1981; Anne Summers, 'The Women's Movement', in Henry Mayer and Helen Nelson (eds.), *Australian Politics* (Melbourne, 1976).

<sup>7</sup> *Financial Review*, 22 June 1973; *Daily Telegraph*, 3 July 1973; *Sydney Morning Herald*, 20 July 1973; Anne Neale, 'The Philosophy Strike: Feminism by-passed at Sydney', *Refractory Girl*, No. 3.

<sup>8</sup> *ANU Reporter*, 24 May 1974; Gwenda W. Bramley and Marion W. Ward, *The role of women in the Australian National University* (Canberra, 1976), pp. 115-16.

<sup>9</sup> On 5 March 1983 Australia elected a new federal Labor government, and a new parliament. Eighteen of the new parliamentarians are women, thirteen of them members of the Australian Labor Party. See Sue Johnson, 'A Woman's Place . . .', *National Times*, 18-24 March 1983.

<sup>10</sup> Ann Curthoys, 'Women's Studies, the University, and the Women's Movement', typescript, June 1975.

<sup>11</sup> 'Flinders', in Penny Ryan (ed.), *A Guide to Women's Studies in Australia*, Mulgrave, [1973], p. 41.

<sup>12</sup> P. 42.

<sup>13</sup> See 'Women's Studies Handbook 1979', and 'The Women's Studies Course at Flinders University', typescripts. I am grateful to Anna Yeatman for sending copies to me.

<sup>14</sup> Dale Spender, 'Educational Institutions: Where Co-operation is Called Cheating', in Dale Spender and Elizabeth Sarah (eds.), *Learning to Lose* (London, 1980), p. 42.

<sup>15</sup> Personal experiences as Program co-ordinator since March 1978.

<sup>16</sup> Patricia Grimshaw to Susan Magarey, 30 January 1980.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Stanley Cohen (ed.), *Images of Deviance*, Harmondsworth, 1971, introduction; *Papers* of the first-several national Political Economy conferences, Sydney, Melbourne and Adelaide, 1976-1982.

<sup>18</sup> E.g., J.E. Branson, 'The Nature of Women's Studies and its Potential Role Within the University', typescript, Monash University, [1974], p. 36.

<sup>19</sup> I owe this observation to Jill Matthews, to whom I am grateful.

<sup>20</sup> J.P. Powell, 'Towards a Definition of Interdisciplinary Studies', *Vestes*, XVII, 2.

<sup>21</sup> Stephen Toulmin, *Human Understanding*, vols., Clarendon, 1972, vol. 1, p. 359; Paul H. Hirst, *Knowledge and the Curriculum*, (London and Boston). 1974, p. 45.

<sup>22</sup> Martin Trow, 'The American Academic Department as a Context for Learning', *Studies in Higher Education*, 1, 1, p.11.

<sup>23</sup> Hirst, p. 46.

<sup>24</sup> Curthoys, *op. cit.*

<sup>25</sup> Beverly Kingston, *My Wife, My Daughter and Poor Mary Anne*, Melbourne, 1975; Edna Ryan and Anne Conlon, *Gentle Invaders: Australian Women at Work 1788-1974* (Melbourne, 1975).

<sup>26</sup> Kay Daniels, Mary Murnane and Anne Picot (eds.), *Women in Australia*, 2 vols., Canberra, 1977; Beverley Kingston (ed.), *The World Moves Slowly*, Stanmore, 1977; Kay Daniels and Mary Murnane (comp.), *Uphill All the Way* (St. Lucia, 1980).

<sup>27</sup> Ringwood, 1982.

<sup>28</sup> Jan Mercer, (ed.), *The Other Half* (Ringwood, 1975).

<sup>29</sup> Grieve and Grimshaw, *op. cit.*, p. xi.

<sup>30</sup> Elizabeth Windschuttle (ed.), *Women, Class and History: Feminist Perspectives on Australia 1788-1978*, Melbourne, 1980.

<sup>31</sup> Margaret Bevege, Margaret James, Carmel Shute (eds.), *Worth Her Salt: Women at Work in Australia* (Sydney, 1982).

<sup>31</sup> Melbourne, 1982.

<sup>32</sup> Anne Summers, *Damned Whores and God's Police: The Colonization of Women in Australia* (Ringwood, 1975), p. 14.