

some of the yawning gaps in our existing knowledge of French labour. Nor is Magraw's account entirely exempt from error and omission. Every specialist will undoubtedly note various minor mistakes in his/her own domain. This reviewer found Magraw's brief account of reactions to the important Le Chapelier Law (June 1791), which banned trade associations, inaccurate and highly misleading. (Parisian workers did not strike in protest and bourgeois radicals never opposed the law.) And he was disappointed by Magraw's brief analysis of Parisian labour unrest in 1830-33 — the single most crucial period in the forging of nineteenth-century artisanal militancy — which is confused and superficial.

The publishers apparently embrace their author's luddism: they fail to avail themselves of modern technological wonders such as a "spell check" program (but even good old-fashioned copy editing would have sufficed). Erratic punctuation and bizarre typographical errors abound in the text, especially in the spelling of names: for example, Theodore Zeldin is transformed into Zeddin,(1: 50) Annie Kriegel becomes Kriegal (2:118), Simon Schama is alternately Scharma or Shama (300), and poor Fátá,álicitá,á de Lamennais turns up as Lemennais, Lammenais, and Lammenais!(1: 74, 82, 298) This is irritating and quite unacceptable in so excellent and interesting a book.

Michael D. Sibalís
Wilfrid Laurier University

The Chilly Collective, eds., *Breaking Anonymity: The Chilly Climate for Women Faculty* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press 1995).

It is heartening to see the publication of *Breaking Anonymity: The Chilly Climate for Women Faculty* in the same year that our federal government dismantled the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women and our provincial government jettisoned Bill 79, The Employment Equity Act. The message conveyed by the con-

tributors to this book by its 27-member editorial collective and by all those who testify within its pages to the sexism racism and homophobia of academic communities is clear: women faculty will not be silenced. The decision to speak out — however — even to publish the essays collected here, was not arrived at easily. In many respects, this book can be said to reflect contemporary struggles within the women's movement to acknowledge the diversity of women's lives and to achieve, rather than simply proclaim, solidarity.

On 7 November 1995 Alison Wylie, philosopher at the University of Western Ontario, member of the editorial collective, and contributing author of *Breaking Anonymity* presented an overview of the book at Wilfrid Laurier University. Most striking about her talk was not the details of what makes academic life chilly for women (these are all too familiar), but her account of the ambivalence surrounding the book's publication. This ambivalence also discussed in the book's Preface, involves two separate concerns. The first is that the original Chilly Climate reports (from the late 1980s) are now dated, and their failure to speak to the diversity of women's experiences could be said to outweigh the advantages of publishing them, even as historical documents. The second concern is that publishing women's accounts of discrimination might create a climate even more hostile than the one being described in the book. This is certainly a sad reflection on the institutional climate today, and one can be sure the University of Western Ontario is not alone in perpetuating such a climate. Fortunately, the collective's desire to share their history, knowledge, and experience so that other women might feel less isolated and might be better defended against attack gained the upper hand. But more must be said about the decision-making processes that brought this book into being.

One of the most remarkable and admirable features of this collection is the level of self-awareness and self-criticism that is evident in its preface and in many of the chapters. Originally conceived as a collection of previously published essays and reports on the Chilly Climate (some of which had received wider circulation than others), the editorial collective was keenly aware

of the weaknesses of these essays (which focused on gender to the exclusion of other, equally important factors, which generalized about “women,” ignoring important differences among them, and which focused on faculty, neglecting staff and students). Taking seriously the recommendations of two referees for the WLU Press, Patricia Monture-OKanee and Susan Heald (both of whom ought to have been acknowledged for their work), the editorial collective reframed their project, presenting the original essays as historically significant, if limited, records of particular experiences of discrimination, and adding some new essays. The result is a set of moving accounts of the chilly climate (including sexism, racism and homophobia) by women who have had different experiences of it.

To those readers tempted to plead ignorance about sexism in universities today, I highly recommend Bruce Feldthusen's chapter, “The Gender Wars: Where the Boys Are.” Drawing on his own experience as well as on his observation of male colleagues, Feldthusen theorizes the exercise of “the right not to know” (about sexism) as “the ultimate tool of oppression.” (282) I recommend this chapter not only to male colleagues to whom it speaks most directly, but also to female colleagues who may benefit from his insight into widespread negative perceptions of women and of feminist perceptions that are sometimes shared by women as well as men. Although women faculty have more at stake than men in breaking anonymity to testify against their own inequitable treatment, Feldthusen also risks a good deal in bearing witness to discriminatory behavior both in the academy and in himself.

The decision to include essays by women whose experiences or perspectives were either excluded or rendered invisible in the original Chilly Climate reports may be construed by some readers as tokenism. The former's willingness to be included in this collection, however, might also be read as a gesture of solidarity. Here, solidarity is offered by those who openly acknowledge their previous omissions, and accepted by those who know that solidarity

must be cautiously and critically approached, not proclaimed as a *fait accompli*. Two essays by law professor Patricia Monture-Okanee contribute the perspective and experience of a First Nations woman; an essay by Leela MadhavaRau, former Race Relations Officer at Western, contributes a very moving account of her experience there; and an essay co-authored by Claire Young and Diana Majury, former members of Western's faculty, contributes the perspective and experiences of two lesbian professors. Including these essays helps the reader identify both the differences and the similarities of these women with the accounts of the non-specified women interviewed in the original Chilly Climate reports. While appreciating the specificity of the ways in which various and multiple forms of oppression function, I was struck by the similarities of tactics and effects. Patricia Monture-Okanee while pointing out the omission of race and culture from the original reports, also comments that their authors were "telling what was in my mind and heart almost." (14) Including the word "almost" indicates that similarity never means sameness, and Monture-Okanee eloquently describes in her introduction some of the causes of her anger, of what she calls the "thunder" in her soul. (23)

To that diverse group of people who share the belief that at least privileged white middle-class women have little difficulty moving into male dominant professions such as law, I recommend Sheila McIntyre's account of her treatment at Queen's University. In the lengthy analysis and commentary on events surrounding her first year of teaching McIntyre writes: "When women break our silence, our voices resonate in other women's muted selves and something permanent shifts. New voices emerge. Many retreat in a panic to the old lies. A few do not. Those few mobilized touch other women." (221) McIntyre is one of those courageous few whose "memo" of 1986 to her law school students and colleagues at Queen's University served as a catalyst to other Chilly Climate reports. The infamous memo is reproduced in McIntyre's chapter but most important is her detailed account of its impact. McIntyre may have begun writing as a "personal act of survival" (she was

victim of viscous rumor campaigns and prearranged classroom disruption by male students; she appeared as pornography on washroom walls; and she was misrepresented and discredited [241]) but she has ended up with a very poignant analysis of these events, as well as a vision of what might shift if women (and men) refused the old lies. McIntyre experienced all of the strategies of oppression Feldthusen observes, and she names their effects on herself, and potentially, on all of us.

While some may assert that McIntyre “caused” her own ill-treatment, her only “mistake” was to teach her classes with integrity, “as if what [women] know, see, feel and believe should be worth knowing, seeing, feeling and believing personally, subjectively.”(221) Clearly what women know, see, feel and believe varies depending on their specific location in the world. After at least a decade of struggle to get mainstream feminists to recognize differences among women, and to recognize the ways in which they/we have often exacerbated instead of alleviated the oppression of specific minorities, it is perhaps time to learn how to work together on issues that affect us in similar, if not identical, ways. *Breaking Anonymity* is an example of how this work might begin. The authors of the original reports are not asking for “absolution” (as one contributor seems to assume [Young, 346]) nor do they construe the addition of previously neglected perspectives as somehow making up for their previous omission. Instead, by taking responsibility for the effects of oppression, the authors initiate a dialogue that is long overdue. And those contributors who engage in it — however cautious their approach — are clearing the way for further understanding among women. Sandra Woolfry and members of the Wilfrid Laurier University Press are to be commended for publishing this collection not because it will be a best-seller (however much it deserves to be read by all academics), but because it demonstrates a concern for women faculty that is of considerable political importance today.

Patricia Elliot
Wilfrid Laurier University