

Discussion Paper

Not a Supplement to Queen's Gazette

12 April 1985

Discussion Paper of the Ad Hoc Committee for the Establishment of a Chair of Women's Studies

April 1985 Members

- | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------------|
| E. Angel | K. Flood | C. Newton |
| V. Barhum | S. French | R. Ogilvie |
| A. Bayoumi | T. Fuller | P. O'Reilly |
| R. Beck | L. Golding | J. Oulton |
| B. Bennett | C. Greene | C. Paraskevopoulos |
| K. Bennett | P. Hardy | S. Peters |
| R. Bongard | J. Harris | S. Rab |
| E. Bostwick | B. Hornick | C. Rosselet |
| S. Boulby | G. Jackson | J. Rouse |
| J. Brewin | S. Jass | J. Schneider |
| C. Bridgen | V. Johnstone | M. Schneider |
| C. Brittain | B. Keiser | J. Shamie |
| B. Broham | A. Kyriakos | C. Shilletto |
| G. Carson | E. Lancaster | D. Shoom |
| K. Clarke | M. Little | A. Sibbald |
| M. Conway | D. Lowden | I. Sobol |
| H. Craik | J. Macrae | J. Soicher |
| S. Crossman | C. Malone | J. Stephen |
| J. Curtis | D. Marciano | P. Stethem |
| E. Dalzell | D. McDade | M. Stoddart |
| A. Dawe | R. McKeague | K. Thomson |
| L. De Kok | L. McKelvey | C. Trudeau |
| K. Driver | S. McKenna | L. Turner |
| B. Farrand | J. Merkel | C. van Heyst |
| A. Feltes | L. Moore | A. Vanderburgh |
| C. Field | F. Murray | J. Wilson |
| A. Fitzhenry | T. Myers | C. Woolford |

Preamble

The Ad Hoc Committee for the Establishment of a Chair of Women's Studies is a committee of over 80 students formed in response to Queen's University's poor record in hiring women faculty and the fact that Queen's, unlike many Canadian and American universities, lacks a program of Women's Studies. Under Women's Studies programs, exciting new research is being conducted and courses are being taught in many fields exploring topics of interest and concern not only to women, but to all people. We feel that Queen's students should not be denied the opportunity to benefit from this rich field.

Women now constitute over half of all students at Queen's, and given their full participation in student life, we regard women's under-representation on faculty as requiring immediate attention. Women pay over half of all tuition, bring to the university over half

of all governmental basic income units, and have pledged over half of the students' contribution to the Queen's Appeal.

Higher education must take equal account of the experience of both men and women, and must credit both as being equally valid. Having women on faculty and establishing a Women's Studies program are good ways to have women's views reflected in teaching and research activities. We are concerned because, for whatever historical, sociological, geographical or other reasons, Queen's has not been able to achieve better representation of women on faculty. As students we would like to see this change in the very near future.

The following discussion paper has been developed in consultation with numerous members of the faculty and administration, to whom we are grateful for their constructive criticism. The paper is published so the Committee may have the benefit of further input from members of the university community before making its final recommendations to the Senate and Board of Trustees. Written comments should be sent to the Committee c/o the Alma Mater Society before May 15, 1985.

I Background

Women currently make up 56% of the student body at Queen's University. In some faculties and schools the percentage is even higher (such as Business [57%], Arts and Science [62%], Rehabilitation Therapy [82%], Nursing [97%]) while even in traditionally male realms, the number of women has been rapidly increasing. In Applied Science, for example, women now represent 17% of the students, which in Canada is second only to the 17.2% of women enrolled in McGill's program. Women also constitute over 30% of the graduate school enrollment, and this percentage holds for women in PhD programs. In Canada, 25% of all doctorates are held by women.

Such percentages are not reflected in the proportion of women on faculty at Queen's. According to the latest administration figures, only 13.7% of the faculty teaching or researching at the university are women. [The appended table compares the percentage of women on faculty at Queen's to other universities in Ontario and Canada.] The statistics generated by Queen's for 1983-1984 show that only 7.5% of tenured faculty are women. In terms of rank, the majority of women (51 of 93) are at levels of Assistant Professor or Lecturer. The bulk of those remaining are at the Associate Professor level. Only 2% of the tenured, Full Professors at Queen's are women. The women on faculty are often the most interesting and dynamic in their departments. As proof of this, while they comprised less than 10% of the faculty eligible, women have won 25% of the Alumni Awards for Excellence in Teaching since the award's creation ten years ago.

While progress has been made in improving this gender imbalance over the past decade, greater efforts and results are essential. The May 1983 Report of the Principal's Advisory Review Committee on the Status of Women at Queen's, in its conclusion in the section on appointment patterns, states:

There is little to be gained in the long run, if women are appointed for very short non-renewable terms. Women who are here this year and gone the next may increase temporarily the number of women

on staff and produce positive results in terms of numbers when appointments made for that year are examined. However, only appointments which allow for renewal and consideration for tenure provide a real increase in the presence of women faculty on campus. (p.9)

In its brief to the Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario (the Bovey Commission), the Association of Women Teaching at Queen's makes note of the "abysmally low number of women faculty in our universities." The Association points out that while the rate of participation of women students has increased at both the graduate and undergraduate level, the rate of hiring women faculty has lagged far behind. This has been due, in part, to the chronic underfunding of Ontario universities over the past decade, as the real dollar funding has been eroded at a rate of approximately 2% per annum. In relative terms, we are operating with only 80% of the budget we had ten years ago. Thus a period of increasing numbers of qualified female academics coincided with a decline in the number of posts available. Women academics are still emerging from graduate schools and finding that there is little or no room for them in our universities. They, like their predecessors, are having to go to other provinces or countries, change careers, or accept positions as adjunct staff with little or no job security. We have lost, and are losing, a whole generation of active, vital women scholars. This has been and is a problem for all post-doctoral students, both men and women, and it retards efforts to correct the gender imbalance.

The brief concludes by recommending that the government make available to the universities a special "Adjustment Fund" which should be used to address and at least partially remedy the gender imbalance:

We urge you [the Bovey Commission] to place a very high priority on recommending that a substantial portion of any such fund be earmarked specially for the purpose of aiding universities to offset the deleterious effects of past discrimination against women and by implementing programs for the recruitment, appointment, promotion and tenure of women faculty in all disciplines."

In addition to the impact of underfunding identified by the Association brief, the historical, but now significantly diminished, problem of identifying qualified women candidates has left its mark on Queen's. Further, Queen's geographical location suggests that special measures will be required to bring not only the best women but the best new faculty to Queen's in the future. Special measures are essential if the faculty balance between men and women, is to be brought to reflect the composition of the undergraduate or even the graduate population.

The high proportion of men teaching and researching at Queen's is of serious consequence, not merely for those women who do not hold positions commensurate with their competence and qualifications, but also for those female undergraduates who are taught almost entirely by men. A clear trend can be noted: after an initial undergraduate enrollment where the proportions of male and female students are approximately equal, there is a marked fall-off of women in advanced courses, a further fall-off in the number going on to graduate school, and a further fall-off of those doing post-doctoral work. There are a number of reasons why the university is uncongenial to women. For students, the relative absence of female faculty means there is a lack of female role models. For graduate students, this means there exists a lack of women to work with as advisers. Both women graduate students and faculty will find a lack of relative lack of support for their

teaching and research initiatives. If women students see no women on faculty, as is the case in Applied Science, they are not encouraged to continue along a path to an academic career. Hence the future participation of equal numbers of men and women in the creation and dissemination of knowledge is adversely and critically affected.

We propose four remedies:

- i) Strengthening Women's Studies and establishing a program in this field;
- ii) An emphasis on the appointment of women through the National Scholars Program;
- iii) Working to retain women scholars already at Queen's on short term appointments;
- iv) Establishing a Chair of Women's Studies.

The creation of a Chair of Women's Studies at Queen's will not solve the problems described, it will only begin to address them. The creation of the Chair would symbolically and academically demonstrate Queen's commitment to Women's Studies. It must be seen as only one of the four steps that must be taken to remedy the current situation. To create only a Chair, and not to create an interdisciplinary program of Women's Studies, or increase the efforts to retain excellent women's scholars already teaching at Queen's, or increase the number of women post-doctoral students hired, would be only to pay lip service to Women's Studies. It would be mere tokenism.

II Why is there a need for Women's Studies at Queen's?

With a number of notable exceptions, history has been recorded through men's eyes, and the teachers at institutions of higher learning over the centuries have been men. Little wonder, then, that the corpus of knowledge has been created almost exclusively by men and most major theories in every field of learning have been developed primarily by men. Contemporary research into cognitive, evaluative differences between men and women lends credence to the claim that there exists an androcentric bias in the corpus of knowledge. Women perceive the world differently than men; their life experiences are different, their cognitive patterns are different, and their values are different. These are predominantly socially and culturally determined differences. It has been incorrectly assumed that what applied to males could be generalized to apply to women as well. Feminist research presents a serious challenge to the corpus of existing knowledge as it must be revised to not only include, but also take equal account of, women's experience, lives, values, perceptions and conceptions of reality. To ignore half of the world's population is a serious distortion of reality.

A Women's Studies program is important because it offers an opportunity for (i) discussion and concentration of the growing body of knowledge explored from women's perspectives and (ii) exposure to men's and women's perspectives so students can better understand the world around them. The ultimate goal is to achieve a non-sexist curriculum and corpus of knowledge in every discipline. Women's Studies is a crucial step towards the achievement of this long term goal.

Queen's cannot maintain its commitment to excellence without having the best possible scholars and programs. We must not remain complacent. Excellence does not come naturally. We must always strive for it. If we are to be the best we can be, that commitment must include a commitment to excellence in the field of

Women's Studies. Future excellence in the field requires action now, since it will take time to change attitudes in the academic community, both inside and outside the university. If we are not to remain permanently behind other universities in this field, we must move forward decisively and immediately.

III Strengthening Women's Studies at Queen's

We are greatly concerned about the need to develop Women's Studies as a field of study by increasing the number and expanding the range of course offerings in all faculties, and establishing a program of Women's Studies.

The possibility of isolating and ghettoizing Women's Studies exists and is a concern. Issues of interest and concern to women are not solely "women's issues" or "women's concerns." Until recently it has been only the academic fields that men have been interested in that have been studied. While these areas of study have at times coincided with those of interest to women, a great number of women's interests and concerns have been ignored. This balance needs to be corrected. Women's Studies should not be an addendum to the corpus of theoretical knowledge (i.e.: Women's Psychology, Women's History, Women's English); it should be accounted for within each of these, and all other disciplines. Women's Studies should be an integral part of every department in this great university. Once this state has been achieved, we will no longer have to use the term Women's Studies; instead it will come to be accepted that the knowledge created and disseminated in each discipline will fully take into account women's perspectives. However, until such time, the establishment of a program of Women's Studies is a crucial step.

A program of Women's Studies must be created at Queen's. This can be done by employing the existing talent and resources. Queen's has strongly supported the creation of a multi-disciplinary introductory Women's Studies course for the fall of 1985, and while this indicates that we are heading in the right direction, we feel a great deal more must be done.

IV Appointing and Retaining Women Scholars

We must seek ways to retain the excellent women scholars and teachers we already have at Queen's, many of them on short term contracts or in adjunct positions. A number of examples could be cited of the brilliant, vital women scholars who have been lost from a number of departments in the past few years.

On November 5 of 1984 the *Globe and Mail* reported that the Honourable Robert Welch, then the Ontario Minister responsible for Women's Issues, released figures illustrating what he called "the dismal record" of publicly funded agencies in hiring women. While anxious for the agencies and institutions to react voluntarily, he said that the province could withhold millions of dollars in funding if they did not respond. The then Minister of Education, Dr. Bette Stephenson, reported that there are still problems in the post-secondary institutions.

On March 8, 1985 the federal government announced measures on employment equity to bring new employment opportunities to women in crown corporations, federally regulated businesses and firms contracting with the government. This initiative emphasizes the continuing importance attached to gender imbalances in publicly-funded institutions.

Queen's is perceived by many women academics and students, both from inside and outside of the Queen's community, as being a conservative, patriarchal, male-dominated university, and as a

result some women academics may be deterred from even applying for positions at Queen's. We must work to overcome such perceptions, by addressing the problems that give rise to them.

Western: A Case in Point

On December 6, 1984 the University of Western Ontario Senate approved overwhelmingly the recommendations of their *Smith Report*, which calls for the creation of new faculty positions to be filled by women. The committee described its rationale in this way:

The committee has no dogmatic or metaphysical ... [reason] ... but rather one based on practicality, common sense and fairness. We consider a ratio of nine to one among full-time faculty to be one of imbalance because it is so far from the balance of the general population, the undergraduate student population, and the graduate student population in a growing number of disciplines (though not all). It appears axiomatic to us that universities, for whatever complex historical reasons, have not been drawing upon the full range of the potentially most brilliant and creative members of the population for their academic staffs. We believe that universities have a responsibility, both to their own aspirations and to the community, to do so. This does not mean, in our view, that the University of Western Ontario should now aim at a ratio of 50-50, or that there is any magic in it. It does mean that we should aim at a balance which is more reasonable than the present one ... (UWO Senate Agenda, Exhibit IV, Appendix 1, p. 1)

The report and its recommendations were reviewed by the Provost, who commented:

I would place particular emphasis on the importance for this University to ensure that we remain attractive as a University to the very best, both students and faculty. In an era in which a significant number of potential recruits are women, we would place ourselves at a competitive disadvantage if potential women students and faculty members were to perceive Western to be less attractive than our close competitors as a place where they will be able to fully achieve their potential. A persistent difference between Western and our competitors would undoubtedly place us at a serious disadvantage. In brief, I endorse the objective of the Committee — to appoint a significant number of highly qualified women to our probationary and tenured faculty ranks — as being in the best interests of this University. (UWO Senate Agenda, Exhibit IV, Appendix 1, p. 1)

The recommendations endorsed so strongly by the Senate call for the creation of 10 special tenured positions at the Associate or Full Professor level over 1985-88, and for 20 probationary appointments at the Assistant Professor level over the same three-year period. Western undertook this initiative, and it is already ahead of Queen's in terms of the percentage of women on faculty.

Queen's Appeal and National Scholars: An Opportunity to Redress the Imbalance

In the Queen's Appeal campaign, launched November 1983, five million dollars has been earmarked for "reinforcing existing strengths in teaching and research." The monies from this portion of the Appeal will enable Queen's to appoint junior faculty for five-year bridge appointments, so that the National Scholars will be ready to move into departmental openings as they become available in the 1990s when there will be a wave of retirements. While it is Principal Smith's hope that a number of the National Scholars appointed will be women, there is no guarantee this will occur. In light of the University of Western Ontario policy and the fact that Queen's University is already at a severe disadvantage

relative to most other Canadian Universities in terms of the proportion of women on faculty, Queen's must seriously consider allocating specific positions, made available by the National Scholars program in the Queen's Appeal, to women.

V Defining the Terms of Reference of the Chair

The Chair of Women's Studies must fulfill a number of purposes. It must bring to Queen's established, prominent, renowned women scholars who have excelled in their field of study. The Chair must be interdisciplinary and it must address the gender imbalance in the Queen's faculty. Unlike traditional Chairs, sometimes held for an academic lifetime, this Chair would begin as a one-year appointment, for reasons discussed below.

It is critical to define Women's Studies. The key to the definition is the theoretical perspective from which the academic approaches her field of study. The purpose of creating the Chair is two-fold: to scholastically counter androcentrism inherent in the corpus of knowledge and, secondly, to increase the number of women on faculty. Thus both the field of study and the gender of the scholar must be the critical criteria upon which the holder of the Chair is selected. Not all women, and not all women academics, credit women with the equivalent intelligence, ability, or capability as men. Often they resort to biological deterministic arguments to support their positions. Anita Bryant, for example, argues that women should be subservient, remaining in the home. Helene Deutsch, an American psychologist, has argued that all women are essentially masochistic and desire and even enjoy being raped. These are not the type of women that we wish to bring to Queen's in the Chair of Women's Studies; they hold to the very androcentrism, the persistence of which the Chair seeks to counter. The Chair must clearly be seen as one bringing to Queen's women scholars who have demonstrated an interest in furthering the opportunities of women in society. We want to attract women who see women as full and equal partners in society. These criteria will not be satisfied by just naming a woman to it.

As defined above, the Chair cannot be seen as part of an imposed quota system; rather it is a desirable academic asset that departments and faculties can voluntarily apply for. The Chair will bring the best and brightest women scholars to Queen's, scholars who have established their expertise in their field of study and are renowned. The Chair must have both the level of funding and prestige to attract scholars such as Margaret Atwood, Margrit Eichler, Mary O'Brien, and Sylvia Ostry to Queen's. Scholars of this calibre will increase the credibility and vitality of a Women's Studies program at Queen's, while also enhancing the academic activity at Queen's as a whole.

Initially the holder of the Chair will serve as a role model for women students and will teach Women's Studies courses. This Chair should reflect not only the importance of this field of study, but also highlight the need for more women scholars at Queen's. The Chair should be open only to women. When parity has been achieved between the number of male and female professors at Queen's, the terms of reference of the Chair could be reviewed.

The same argument applies to the hiring of women academics through the Queen's Appeal. University-wide competitions should be held for the hiring of all such scholars. These special appointments would not be added to the base complements of the departments receiving them; once vacated these positions would again be available on a competitive basis. Men would not be restricted from competing for regular positions on faculty. This would be

comparable to the program that the University of Western Ontario has adopted. Queen's should take this approach for hiring women scholars through Queen's Appeal funds.

The Chair must be interdisciplinary. There are two ways to define interdisciplinary. One definition suggests that the academic field would cover two or more disciplines (e.g. economic history, social psychology, or medical ethics). The second notion of interdisciplinary is the one we are talking of: a Chair which could reside in any discipline. The academic holding that Chair would most likely, although not necessarily, teach and research in one field. The Chair must be interdisciplinary so that it can (i) garner support from all faculties and schools (i.e., each must be able to potentially benefit from the Chair's establishment); (ii) be eligible for federal funding; (iii) bring a number of women scholars to Queen's in a number of different departments. The recipient of the Chair will be expected to be established in her field of study. Thus, if she were an economist she might be noted for her work interpreting current economic theory from a perspective relating to women's experience such as participation in the labour force; in medicine, for research on the effect of reproductive technology on women's lives and the ethical and moral questions that are presented by such technology; in law, how the legal system requires revision in order to give substance to the concept of equality rights within the context of current legislation (i.e., violence against women, affirmative action programs, equal pay for work of equal value); in psychology, a scholar might develop theories which explain behavioural differences in men and women; in English, she might study women writers of a certain period.

Unlike traditional Chairs, where the holder is named for an academic lifetime, this Chair would begin as a one-year appointment. Initially we would like to attract to Queen's a number of prominent women scholars in a variety of fields. There is a great need to immediately raise the profile of Women's Studies both on campus generally and in a number of departments and faculties in particular. Therefore we recommend that appointment to the Chair for the first five years of its existence (Phase I) be for just one year. This would also serve to raise the awareness of women academics in Canada of the existence of the Chair at Queen's, and its annual advertisement would hopefully help to dispel notions that Queen's is one of the last male bastions of academe. The Chair would serve to demonstrate to both faculty and students the value of further developing and expanding the Women's Studies program at Queen's. In this initial phase, the Chair would function like the scholar-in-residence program and would not result in permanent changes to the number of women on faculty or the number of Women's Studies courses being taught. Some of the scholars who we wish to attract would or could only come to Queen's for one year, as they already have tenured positions as full professors at other universities.

For Phase II of the Chair, the appointment should be for a five-year non-renewable term. After five years the recipient would move into the department where she had been working. Departments would have to compete to be awarded the Chair. For instance, the Dean of Law would have to argue that the Law Faculty's proposed scholar in the field of law reform from a woman's perspective had a better scholarly reputation, publishing record, and would contribute more to the university than other candidates.

The department, the faculty, and the university would be required to give the scholar a tenured position at the rank of full professor from the outset of her assuming the Chair. Thus the depart-

ment awarded the Chair would receive a free five-year position, during which it would have time to plan how to free up some funds from its base budget to assume partial responsibility for the scholar. Such a provision would have to be written into the terms of the Chair so that the department, faculty, or the university was/were legally responsible for fulfilling this obligation at the expiry of the Chair's term. A variety of arrangements could be worked out among these three levels of administration, for assuming financial responsibility for the scholar. If departments on their own were to be expected to assume all the financial costs out of their base budgets after five years, there would be a significant number of departments unable or unwilling at any given time to accept this responsibility, due to the long-term plans for the departments and the number of positions opening in the future due to retirements.

Any term of the Chair of less than five years would be too short, as it will take the recipient a certain amount of time to establish herself here at Queen's. A longer term is possible, but it obviously would reduce the number of women scholars who could be brought permanently to Queen's over time. No department would be eligible to have the Chair, during Phase II, more than once in any given twenty-year period. The Chair, during this final and permanent phase, would result in Queen's attracting and retaining over a twenty-year period four exceptionally well established and respected, active, exciting women's scholars in four different departments. While this will not in itself remedy the problem of a gender imbalance, it would represent a step in the right direction as there are currently only nine women at Queen's at the rank of full professors, with tenure. It would also help to make the efforts to retain and attract more women to Queen's more successful.

VI Relationship between the Chair and a Women's Studies Program

The holder of the Chair should not be expected to serve as the focal point of a Women's Studies program, or to perform administrative duties. However, we see the Chair as being one of the integral parts of a Women's Studies program. We expect four things of the recipient: (i) that she have a teaching responsibility for one full and the equivalent of a half course. (We suggest she teach one third-year-level course in a field of her choice and that the course be open to any student in the university at or above the third-year; a quarter course equivalent teaching responsibility for an introductory course in her department, an eighth of a course equivalent teaching responsibility as a guest lecturer in the interdisciplinary Women's Studies course, and an eighth of a course equivalent teaching responsibility for a graduate seminar course in her department); (ii) that she continue her research in conjunction with graduate students in her department; (iii) that she involve herself in the Queen's community by meeting with groups on campus; (iv) that she give two public lectures a year on topics relating to women.

VII Selection Procedure for the Chair

The procedure for the selection of the Chair holder and the recipient department in which she will reside will be very important. Normally the search and selection for Chair recipients is done within departments, and a recommendation is made to the Dean, who in turn makes a recommendation to the Principal. In this case the Search and Selection Committee should be composed of female and male faculty members teaching and researching and students enrolled in the Women's Studies program, preferably

from departments that have not submitted applications. Any member of the university community should be able to submit the name(s), biographical material, and other relevant information about the candidate(s) they think the committee should consider. Upon the recommendation of the committee, the Principal would announce the candidate to the Board of Trustees for their formal approval.

If for any reason the Chair should become vacant, until such time as a new holder is selected, the interest accrued from the principal should be used in the following way: 50% may be used for teaching or research initiatives in the field of Women's Studies, and the remainder, at least 50% of the accrued interest, should be added to the capital.

VIII Is the financial climate ripe for establishing the Chair?

There are a number of public and private sources of funding that either are or could be available to Queen's for the creation of a Chair of Women's Studies. In both cases, it is not only beneficial but necessary to have financial backing and a credible, concrete proposal for developing a program and establishing a Chair of Women's Studies in order to obtain external financial support. Queen's must be seen to be willing to commit some of its own resources before public and private funding can be readily obtained. The remainder of this paper will analyze ways in which financial support can be secured. To be properly established, a Chair requires \$1,000,000 as principal. An endowment of this size would annually generate \$100,000 in interest, which would pay for all the recipient's expenses: \$60-70,000 salary, \$15-20,000 secretarial support, and the remainder for overhead and travel.

In 1984 the Secretary of State announced a program to establish endowed Chairs of Women's Studies. The program called for the creation of one Chair per year for five consecutive years. The chairs were to be regionally distributed as follows: Atlantic Provinces, Quebec, Ontario, Prairie Provinces and Northwest Territories, and British Columbia and the Yukon. Once the election had been called last summer, the Liberal government sped up the process of announcing one Chair a year, and four have been announced. Unfortunately for Queen's, the Chair for Ontario went jointly to Carleton and l'Universite d'Ottawa. However, Ontario did not receive its fair share of the program funding. The province contains 16 of the country's universities educating 41.9% of the nation's full-time undergraduate students, and 40.9% of full-time graduate students (1983 AUCC *Compendium of University Statistics*, p. 13, using 1981-82 Stats Canada figures) yet only 20% of the program's funds were allocated to Ontario. This has led one of the civil servants administering the program to speculate privately that additional funds may be forthcoming for Ontario under this program or a program to reward similar initiatives.

Some of the requirements for the program were that the applicant undertake to seek other funding sources and provide a description of potential donors and proposed approaches to obtaining such funds, they agree to the Chair being interdisciplinary, and that provisions be made for applied research and publication components in addition to teaching activities. The government's contribution under this program, up to \$500,000, was conditional upon the university raising or providing the remainder. If there are to be additional monies allocated to this program or to a similar program assisting universities to implement related initiatives, Queen's will do well to be already on the road to establishing a

Chair

The Dean of Arts and Science made a submission to the program on July 23, 1984. The application is still on file with the Secretary of State. In the event that additional monies become available for this or any related program, Queen's application can be readily updated thereby enhancing the chances of Queen's being awarded funds.

We plan to write to the Honourable Walter McLean, Secretary of State, drawing to his attention the inequality that exists in the regional distribution of Chairs. Arguing that further funds should be allocated to the program for the creation of a second Chair in Ontario, we will, of course, propose that Queen's be the recipient of such a Chair.

The Chair could conceivably receive funding from outside of the federal program discussed above by appealing to individual federal departments. For instance, appeals for funding could be made to the Ministry of Employment and Immigration, Ministry of Health and Welfare, and the Ministry of Justice based upon areas that the Chair recipient could potentially study. As discussed earlier, areas of potential study are: economic theory as it relates to women's participation in the labour force; the effect of reproductive technology on women's lives; law reform in order to give substance to the concept of equality rights. If six potential fields were defined which correlated with federal departments' jurisdictions, each department could be asked for just \$50,000, which could result in a total grant of \$300,000. In making such an application, Queen's would have to make it clear that these were only suggested areas of teaching and research and that the Chair would not be limited only to them. A common application to all six departments could be made through the Honourable Flora MacDonald.

There are, of course, other possible sources of government funding. Once the Chair was established the holder could receive additional funding from external sources for research activities. For example, if the focus of the Chair in any particular year or group of years were to take on an international dimension, by undertaking development-oriented research or academic programs such as women's role in the economic development of Third World countries, applications to funding agencies such as the Canadian International Development Agency (C.I.D.A.) and the International Development Research Council (I.D.R.C.) could be made.

IX Private Sources of Funding for a Chair of Women's Studies

Don Duff, the Queen's Director of Development, has pointed out that when asked to support an appeal which includes a particular project that will benefit women students, the alumnae's rate of participation and their rate of giving to the campaign are greater. The construction of both Ban Righ and Chown Residences, and the establishment of the Ban Righ Foundation were the result of alumnae fundraising. In addition there are a number of very prominent alumnae who, when presented with a project they thought to be appropriate, have donated significant sums of money. For example, Kathleen Ryan recently donated \$500,000 for the restoration of the building housing the archives, which has been appropriately renamed in her honour. Similarly Miss May Ball just donated \$500,000 which will be used to finance the library for the new School of Public Policy to be built at Queen's. These examples are

cited to illustrate the potential financial contributions from some of our alumnae.

APPENDIX

Full-time University Teachers by major Canadian Institutions (Faculty greater than 800), excluding Quebec *

Rank	University	Size	% of Women on Faculty
1	York	1,044	19.9
2	Dalhousie	872	19.8
3	British Columbia	2,041	19.3
4	Toronto	2,859	18.4
5	Newfoundland	852	18.1
6	Alberta	1,674	17.8
7	Calgary	1,178	17.0
8	Université d'Ottawa	999	16.8
9	McMaster	974	16.8
10	Western	1,497	14.8
11	Manitoba	1,329	14.7
12	Saskatchewan	1,118	14.7
13	Queen's	941	11.3
14	Waterloo	827	9.1

Average 17.3%

Of the 52 institutions in Canada (excluding Quebec) which have women faculty Queen's ranks 42nd in terms of percentage of Full-time women on faculty.

Provincial Average of Full-time Women on Faculty: 16.0%

National Average of Full-time Women on Faculty: 16.5%

Average of Full-time Women on Faculty in major Canadian Universities: 17.3%

* Source: Stats Canada 1983 figures, the latest comparative figures available.

The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) was founded in 1977 to further the educational, political and professional development of women's studies. Members include individuals, academic and community based programs, professional women's centers and groups, interested in feminist education at every educational level and in every setting.

Membership in NWSA represents a commitment to our work of furthering women's studies in all educational settings. NWSA works to eliminate not only sexism but racism, anti-Semitism, heterosexism, and oppression based on age, class, religion, ethnicity, disability and national origin, as well as other barriers to liberation in our social structure.

A grass-roots organization, NWSA draws members from all fifty states and assoc-

iate members from abroad. Twelve regional associations and ten caucuses provide additional programs, information and representation on the NWSA Coordinating Council. Members may choose to affiliate with any of the nine recognized caucuses: Women of Color, Women's Centers Services, Student, PreK-12, Program Administrators, Community College, Jewish Women, or Poor and Working Class Women. NWSA policy is set by the Delegate Assembly, composed of elected members from the twelve regions and nine caucuses.

Members receive a quarterly newsletter, discount subscriptions to feminist publications, a membership directory, affiliation with region and or caucuses, and discounts at the National NWSA Conference. No person or group will be

excluded from membership because of inability to pay. Dues are set on a sliding scale. For further information on membership, contact the national office.

Please send dues to NWSA National Office, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742. Individual membership is available on a sliding scale.

	Income	Annual dues
Under \$ 5,000		\$ 7.50
\$ 5,000 - 9,999		15.00
10,000 - 14,999		25.00
15,000 - 19,999		35.00
20,000 - 29,999		50.00
30,000 - 39,999		60.00
Above 40,000		75.00

International members add \$5.00 for postage.

NWSA Conference Registration


2

Alhabasca, AB Canada, TOG,
Alhabasca University

Women's Studies
Rebecca Couler

Alhabasca University
2111 1st Ave
1st Floor, Box 5
Alhabasca, Canada

Department of Education
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195

University of Washington 



NWSA

National Women's Studies Association

CREATING CHOICES THROUGH FEMINIST EDUCATION

June 19-23, 1985

University of Washington, Seattle

Location

Seattle, Washington is a cosmopolitan and dynamic city famous for its public market, theatre and arts community, beautiful waterways and nearby mountain ranges. You might consider extending your stay to explore the San Juan Islands, Mount Rainier, Mount St. Helens, or the rugged coastal areas, all reasonably close to the city.

The weather in the Seattle area is variable, to say the least. Statistically, the average temperature in June is a high of 70 and a low of 53. The only things we can tell you with certainty are that whatever the temperature, it will get colder at night, and always be prepared for rain. In June hip waders are usually no longer necessary, but an umbrella is strongly recommended at all times. But seriously, Seattle is beautiful in June. It is the end of the Rhododendron season and everything is green. The University is bordered by lovely Lake Washington to the east and Portage Bay due south. The temperature is mild but warm and sundown guarantees a gorgeous view of Mt. Rainier and the Olympics.

Travel Arrangements

Kawaguchi Travel of Seattle, the largest woman-owned travel agency in the U.S., will offer special services for those flying to the conference. Early registrants (before May 20) who book flights through Kawaguchi on United Airlines will be guaranteed a rate that is either 25% below the normal coach fare, or 10% below the super saver fare, whichever is lower.

To make travel arrangements with Kawaguchi, call their toll-free number: 1-800-782-8811 inside Washington, or 1-800-426-3222 in the continental U.S., in Alaska and Hawaii call collect (206) 625-9295.

NWSA Low Income Scholarship Fund

The Low Income Scholarship Fund was established two years ago and continues to offer a method for funding conference registration and room and board charges for women who otherwise could not afford to attend. We urge you to donate to this fund in whatever amount you can afford. The more of our sisters who can attend, the more valuable the conference learning experience will be for all of us. A space is provided on the registration form to indicate the amount of your donation; please be as generous as possible.

The Low Income Scholarship Fund is administered through the National NWSA office. For further information contact them at:

NWSA National Office
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454-3757

Registration Includes

- ▶ Admission to all plenaries, sessions & workshops
 - ▶ Entry to the book exhibit
 - ▶ Admission to all visual arts exhibits
 - ▶ Press and caucus receptions
 - ▶ Coffeehouse music performances
 - ▶ Film series, poetry & fiction readings, dances, and much more.
- ▶ Your registration also allows you access (for a small fee) to the University Sports Facilities.

Registration Information

1. Fill out forms completely, otherwise your confirmation will be delayed and your reservations denied priority.
2. Register early: you will save money if

registration is received by May 20. Many services and events require reservations before a certain date (check registration form for specifics)

3. We have a special commitment to include disabled women in the conference. Please let us know by May 1 if you have a special need not noted in "Additional Registration Information."
4. University of Washington housing regulations require that room reservations include board. Commuter meal options are available. See registration form. Commuters are encouraged to make advance reservations for meals. Only a limited number of meal tickets will be available on a daily basis at a higher per meal rate.
5. If registering as NWSA member, make sure your dues are paid. See NWSA rate schedule and information included on this form.
6. Kawaguchi Travel offers many benefits to you and NWSA. Contact them before making your travel arrangements.
7. Registration confirmation will be sent to you soon after receipt of your form and payment. Specific information about arrival at the University of Washington, travel and special services requested will be sent at a later date.
8. In person registration will begin Wednesday, June 19 at noon in the residence halls.
9. The Boat Cruise & the Festival Concert have limited space available. Reservations are strongly recommended. Many other cultural events will be occurring during the conference which do not require advance reservation.

Payment Information

Please follow the instructions carefully.

- ▶ Payment must be included with your registration.
- ▶ Payment must be made in U.S. Funds, by U.S. check or bank draft.
- ▶ Checks should be made payable to: **University of Washington.**
- ▶ Mail checks and registration to: **NWSA Conference Registration University of Washington, GH-25 Seattle, Washington 98195 USA**
- ▶ Contact numbers:
Telephone (206) 543-2310
Telex (901) 474-0096 UWSEA
- ▶ Note: All refund requests must be submitted in writing to Conference Registration. No refunds will be issued after May 29, 1985, and all refunds are subject to a 10% handling fee.



Kawaguchi Travel Service
offers many benefits to you and NWSA.
Contact them before making your travel arrangements.

Drawing for Free Flights

All conference participants who book their flights through Kawaguchi are automatically eligible for a drawing to receive one of two free round trip flights on United Airlines anywhere in the U.S. (May be used for your flight to the conference.)

NWSA

CREATING CHOICES THROUGH FEMINIST EDUCATION

June 19-23, 1985

University of Washington
Seattle

Conference Preview

The Women Studies Program of the University of Washington is delighted to celebrate its 15th anniversary and the summer solstice by presenting the 7th annual National Women's Studies Association Conference "Creating Choices Through Feminist Education." We invite you to join us for the four-day conference occurring June 19-23, 1985.

The spirit of the conference will be the spirit of the community: sharing knowledge and experience with women from all over, and gathering strength from our innovation and scholarship. During the four and a half days of the conference we hope to broaden the definitions of "feminist education" to include forms of learning and teaching not traditionally associated with "education." Read over our Program Highlights to see some of the choices feminist educators have been making in their broadening definitions.

The conference also will celebrate women's creative expression through musical extravaganzas, arts exhibitions, and fiction and poetry readings. A special highlight will be our Feminist Festival Showcase Concert on the evening of the summer solstice.

Entertainment

Fun and festivities will be a part of the conference too: a coffeehouse featuring feminist musicians, a feminist film series, boat cruises on the Puget Sound waterways, original theatre productions, readings by Northwest women writers, and a fundraiser fun run will all be part of this celebration of women's creativity. A special highlight will be our Feminist Festival Showcase Concert featuring Casselberry Dupree, Mary Watkins and Gayle Marie Motherlode, and Nancy Vogl.

Book Exhibit

The book exhibit will be a widely varied area including academic and feminist press representatives with recent and favorite feminist releases, vendors with women-made products, demonstrations of new technologies, exhibits, entertainment and more.

The Program

We hope to create a warm environment from the start with the Wednesday evening welcoming plenary that will include poetry, music and brief introductions. Sessions are scheduled for Thursday, Friday, Saturday and part of Sunday.

Plenaries scheduled for Thursday and Saturday mornings will explore such issues as the conference theme, "Creating Choices Through Feminist Education," feminist theory and practice, and relationships between work, race and class. Plenary speakers will include: Paula Gunn Allen, Charlotte Bunch, Judy Grahn, Barbara Smith and Merle Woo.

NWSA business will be conducted throughout the conference, with caucuses and task forces meeting frequently. The Delegate Assembly will take place on Saturday afternoon and Sunday morning.

Program Highlights

- ▶ Two-day concentration of sessions focusing on community action and outreach, working class women, women in poverty, refugee women, women of color, older women and disabled women
- ▶ Pre-K through grade 12 teaching/learning issues
- ▶ Western States Project on integrating women into the curriculum
- Also, sessions exploring such issues as:*
- ▶ feminist assessments of technology
- ▶ new research on lesbian history
- ▶ confronting racism
- ▶ feminist resistance to nuclear holocaust
- ▶ building a feminist theory of militarism
- ▶ right-wing terrorism in women's health care clinics
- ▶ history of women's peace activism
- ▶ special focus on issues of multiple oppression
- ▶ How ya gonna keep 'em down on the farm: rural feminism
- ▶ new research on female sexuality
- ▶ feminist literary criticism: the latest scholarship
- ▶ feminist mentoring
- ▶ cross-cultural views of wedding ceremonies

For Further Information

Program Inquiries

NWSA Conference
Women Studies Program, GN-45
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195 USA
(206) 543-6900 or (206) 543-4303

Registration Inquiries

Conference Registration, GH-25
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98195 USA
(206) 543-2310
Telex: (901) 474-0096 UWSEA



to: All members of the Advisory Committee on
Women's Studies

date: Sept. 5, 1985

from: Leslie Stewart

our file:

your file:

subject: Re enclosed materials

Please post/distribute the enclosed Women's Studies Courses brochures and the Dale Spender flyer as you see fit. Dale Spender's itinerary is included for your information.

- 10 brochures
- 4 flyers.

DR. DALE SPENDER

Distinguished Guest Lecturer to the
Advisory Committee on Women's Studies
University of Alberta
September 19 - October 3, 1985

Schedule of Events

Friday, September 20

*3:00-5:00 pm
Meeting with the Advisory Committee on Women's Studies

Saturday, September 21

2:00-4:00 pm
Book signing
Common Woman Books, 8210 104 Street
Contact: Halyna Freeland

*6:00 pm
Pot Luck Supper
Pauline Belanger's House
Contact: Pauline Belanger

Monday, September 23

*10:00 am-12:00 pm
Seminar - Sociology (for senior undergraduates,
graduate students and staff)
Topic TBA
Contact: Ros Sydie

7:30-9:30 pm
Public Lecture: *Mothers of the Novel: 106 Good Women Novelists Before Jane Austen*
Humanities, Lecture Theatre 1

Tuesday, September 24

2:00-3:30 pm
Public Seminar: *Reflecting Men*
Athabasca University, Athabasca
Contact: Rebecca Coulter or Michael Owen

*8:00-11:00 pm
Reception
Faculty Club

Wednesday, September 25

1:00-3:00 pm
Seminar - Political Science
There's Always Been A Women's Movement This Century
Tory 10-4
Contact: Frances Adam

*4:00-6:00 pm
Reception
Women's Program and Resource Centre
Contact: Val Hesp

Thursday, September 26

Seminar - English
Women's Intellectual History
Humanities L-3
Contact: Robert Wilson

7:30-9:30
Public Lecture: *The Silence of Women*
Humanities, Lecture Theatre 1

Friday, September 27

*3:00-5:00 pm
Seminar - Romance Languages
The Nature of Literary Criticism
Location TBA
Contact: Robert Thornberry

Sunday, September 29

Brunch with the Advisory Committee on Women's Studies

Monday, September 30

3:30-5:00 pm
Seminar - Family Studies
The Feminist Challenge to the Nature of Knowledge
General Services 814
Contact: Diane Kieren

Tuesday, October 1

12:30-1:50 pm
Seminar - Canadian Studies
Feminists as Intellectuals
Humanities 2-34
Contact: Susan Jackel

7:30-9:30 pm
Public Lecture: *Reflecting Men*
Humanities, Lecture Theatre 1

Wednesday, October 2

2:30-4:30 pm
Seminar - Educational Foundations
The Nature of Knowledge
Education 5-180
Contact: Marilyn Assheton-Smith

**Indicates that the event will not be open to the general public. Departmental seminars which are not marked with an asterisk will be open to any interested persons. Since seating at these seminars will be limited, they will not be as widely publicized as the evening public lectures. However, please feel free to tell anyone that you think may be interested.*

Sept. 5 ③
years old, some thirteen hundred recommendations were formulated to give a proper place to Canadian studies in these three areas. The number of recommendations tells the story; the Commission established no priorities and so provided no guidelines on how to allocate limited resources.

The third volume once again places Canadian studies in the broader context of the Canadian university. Sections on faculty citizenship, faculty age structure, foreign students, and the status of women up-date the data and provide a sobering commentary on our failure to respond to problems which were widely recognized years ago. As in the earlier volumes, however, the authors have shied away from priorities. The present imbalance is somehow to be corrected by reason and a sense of justice without changing the men or the structures which have created the inequities. Not surprisingly, the authors seem to believe that more data will actually change politics. Their report, however, is a useful reference book because, consistent with its underlying assumption, it does include a good deal of data provided by Statistics Canada. Among the questions of balance for the reader is the chronic underfunding which is nonetheless developing a "world class university system" (50).

The Commission on the Future Development of the Universities of Ontario has a very different perspective. It was appointed to "rationalize" the provincial system in an era of fiscal restraint. In the end it opted — to the chagrin of the Minister of Education and the relief of most academics — for gradual change instead of ruthless restructuring. The report is unequivocal, however, on the direction in which universities should evolve. Lip-service is paid to excellence in teaching and the research and scholarship related to teaching, but what is important is the "resource-intensive research" which will make Canada competitive economically. It is even necessary to introduce some degree of separation of research from instructional funding to encourage its development. The Commission then goes

to the heart of the matter, from their point of view. They recommend that universities which emphasize this form of research should be rewarded by being allowed to reduce undergraduate enrolment without any loss of income. The ideal university begins to resemble a research institute.

If there is no consensus among these studies on what a university should be, there is nonetheless some agreement on the immediate future. All three volumes see the universities as underfunded and expect fiscal restraint to continue. The approved response from two out of three is to reduce enrolment. If provincial governments are true to form they will be more interested in this proposal than the objectives, and will soon be questioning the shibboleth of accessibility. Only the shibboleth of research will be left to justify university grants.

Blair Neatby,
University of Ottawa

Women Have Nothing to Gain from a Harvard of the North

THE GREAT BRAIN ROBBERY: CANADA'S UNIVERSITIES ON THE ROAD TO RUIN. David J. Bercuson, Robert Bothwell, J. L. Granatstein. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1984.

It was a special pleasure for me to participate in October 1984 in an evaluation of the progress of women's history and feminist studies over the past ten years,¹ for it had been exactly ten years since I had travelled to Radcliffe in Cambridge, Massachusetts with two students from Memorial University, to attend the second Berkshire Conference on the History of Women. It is hard to describe what a galvanizing experience that was. Until then my impression of conferences of historians was gathered from the annual meetings of the AHA and the CHA, and the former in particular had always left me

with a sense of oppression. Held in large hotels in big American cities, they were dominated by men in dark suits or brown corduroy jackets and ties, men shaking hands with one another, men huddled together talking, men striding purposefully to the podium, men with briefcases, unsmiling men. Then suddenly in Cambridge in the fall of 1974 everywhere I looked there were women, colourfully attired academic women, chiring sessions, taking part in panel discussions, and giving solid scholarly papers on women's history to audiences of other women listening with critical attention. I heard Natalie Zemon Davis deliver her groundbreaking paper "Women's History" in Transition: The European Case"² and Linda Gordon, her equally trail-blazing paper on women's campaign for voluntary motherhood in nineteenth-century America.³ The effect was exhilarating. Dare I say liberating? I went from knowing little or nothing about the history of women and the history of feminism to knowing that that's what I wanted to study and that gaining such knowledge was a legitimate enterprise.

I returned to Memorial fired with enthusiasm to begin working in the area of women's history myself. The following semester (spring 1975) the head of the department gave me permission to introduce an experimental course under the elastic rubric of one of the department's special topics courses, Contemporary Problems in Historical Perspective. My first course in women's history consequently bore the title Contemporary Problems in Historical Perspective: Feminism, and I had to explain to my students how this was a misnomer, since I did not regard feminism as a problem but rather as a solution.

Between 1975 and 1980, when I left Memorial, that course was offered twice again, once more by me and once by Jane Lewis during a summer semester, and I also had a chance during one semester to offer a fourth-year seminar in women's history. Finally, through the combined efforts of women in a number of departments and stretching over many years, a women's studies minor was instituted at

Memorial in January 1983, thus securing a permanent place for a two-semester women's history course within the history department's programme: Women in Western Society and Culture, I and II.

During approximately this same period, 1974 to 1984, most universities in Canada have seen the introduction of women's history and other women's studies courses and sometimes women's studies minor and major programmes. At the most recent Berkshire Conference on the History of Women held at Smith College last summer, we were told that some 2,000 dissertations had been written in women's history since the revival of the Conference in 1972. While women's historians and graduate students in women's history are far fewer in Canada, it does seem that we too have made progress. Canadian academe supports, with government aid, a number of women's studies and feminist studies journals, among them *Resources for Feminist Research*, *Atlantis: A Journal of Women's Studies*, and *Canadian Woman Studies*. The former Liberal government allocated funding for five chairs in women's studies, one in Atlantic Canada, one in Quebec, one in Ontario, one in Western Canada, and one in British Columbia. I myself now teach at a graduate school cum research institute with a Centre for Women's Studies in Education and a lively focus in feminist studies across departmental and disciplinary lines. And enough articles have been written in Canadian women's history since *The Neglected Majority* was published in 1977⁴ to persuade Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice to follow up that collection with a second entitled *The Not So Neglected Majority*.

But given the reactionary tenor of the times, can we afford to feel complacent? I think not, especially in light of a recent book written by three well-established Canadian historians and bearing the sophomoricly cute title *The Great Brain Robbery*. Its sub-title, *Canada's Universities on the Road to Ruin*, calls to mind other reactionary tomes crying the immanence of doomsday, like Spengler's *The Decline of the West* or Anne Roche's *The*

*Gates of Hell: The Struggle for the Catholic Church.*³ I most certainly have refused to buy a copy (I borrowed one for the purposes of this paper), and I would not have paid it any mind, were it not for the fact that the three authors are widely published and well respected in Canadian academe, David Bercuson at the University of Calgary, Robert Bothwell at the University of Toronto, and J. L. Granatstein at York University.

Canadian Studies bears the brunt of the authors' attack, but they also explicitly attack women's studies in a number of passages, particularly in the Chapter "Canadian and Other Useless Studies." More importantly, the entire nature of their perspective on higher education has insidious implications for women — for women's history, women's studies, women professors, and women students.

Because it is those implications I want to concentrate on, I will pass over the fact that these self-proclaimed protectors of the disinterested pursuit of truth have written their work in the inflated rhetoric of a tent evangelist, as when they speak of Canadian universities on the "Road to Hell" and needing to "regain their souls" (p. 8). I shall also pass over their even more distressing use of metaphors of disease in the tradition of the most unscrupulous demagogues and in apparent ignorance or disregard of the work of Susan Sontag.⁶ The most striking example of this is their reference to a time "before the cancer of student revolt ate away at Canadian campuses in the late 1960s" (p. 51). And, because of the constraints of time and space, I will in no way be able to itemize their many abuses of reasoning. I can only suppose that they believe they have excused their lapses in judgment and logic with their open admission that their "book is a polemic" (p. 8). But how did they get the notion that polemic stands for a license to use loose language and illogic? Certainly not from the classical education that the direction of their argument would lead them to espouse.

They gleefully anticipate an angry response from many of their readers. But it is not the "polemic" that angers; it is

the disingenuous nature of their "polemic." For they pose as the advocates of scholarly excellence, when what their outburst really is all about, as they at one point almost concede, is money. Well situated and well funded as the three of them are, they are upset that some public funds have been and are being allocated for research in fields in which they have no particular interest.

And that brings me to one of the most serious implications of their book for women and women's studies. Throughout they employ such terms as "the best education" (p. 7), "high-quality universities" (p. 8), the "quality of higher education" (p. 30), "excellence" in teaching and scholarship (p. 51), and "a solid foundation of essential knowledge" (p. 73), as if such expressions were unproblematic: that is, value-free and politically neutral. To do so is either naive or dishonest. Certainly, it is disheartening, as it bespeaks either willful or uninformed disregard of one of the most fundamental elements of feminist theory: the point that determining what counts as knowledge and who should be admitted to the canon is in some measure a political act. Male control of the gates of knowledge and the groves of academe has worked to exclude women from cultural recognition and intellectual discourse. This point has been made eloquently by Dorothy Smith in "A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's Exclusion from Man's Culture," by Dale Spender in both *Man Made Language* and *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them from Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich*, and most recently by Joanna Russ in *How to Suppress Women's Writing*.⁷ It has been made in the present-day language, respectively, of the sociologist, the educationalist, and the literary critic. But they were not the first to raise the issue. Mary Ritter Beard did so in 1942 when she criticized the *Encyclopedia Britannica* for having an entry on pig-sticking, a locally specific but male activity, while omitting one on bread-making, an almost universal but usually female activity.⁸ Indeed Christine de Pizan as far back as 1405 took issue with the male-centred nature of the exclusively male-

authored history books.⁹ That many of us are unaware of the centuries-long opposition to the androcentric character of institutionalized knowledge is itself an index of the male-centred education we ourselves have received.

Observe, for example, this cavalier or cunning skirting of the whole issue on the part of our three male historians in their chapter advocating a return to the basics in undergraduate education:

A core curriculum is built on the assumption that there is a body of knowledge to which all educated persons in society should be introduced, that some subjects are more important than others, and that students should be introduced to those subjects in a logical and orderly fashion. (p. 73)

Permit me to reach back for a moment into my own educational experience to evaluate that claim.

I went to university, completing all my course requirements for a B.A., M.A., and Ph.D. before the curriculum changes which students won, according to our authors, by "holding the university to ransom" (p. 84) in the late sixties and early seventies. I majored in history as an undergraduate, and specialized in history, specifically European history, for both graduate degrees. As an undergraduate I took an advanced course, and as a graduate student a seminar, in the history of the French Revolution and Napoleon. One of the three fields I chose to be examined in for both my M.A. and my Ph.D. comprehensives was the history of the French Revolution and Napoleon. Yet after all those years and all that study, I do not remember ever hearing of Mary Wollstonecraft. Thomas Paine, to be sure, and Edmund Burke, but not Mary Wollstonecraft. In fact, by the time I had my B.A. I had read almost every work by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, but not a word by Mary Wollstonecraft. And it must be said, for the purposes of this polemic, that I earned my Ph.D., at least, at one of the consistently "high-quality institutions" (p. 112), in the estimation of our querulous threesome who repeatedly hold up

Harvard, Yale and Princeton as the yardstick of excellence.

I, however, do not cast a vote of excellence for those men who educated me and who assumed that all educated persons in society should be introduced to Thomas Paine but not Mary Wollstonecraft, that the *Rights of Man* was more important than *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, and that the logical and orderly fashion in which I should be introduced to these subjects was to be given Jean-Jacques Rousseau to read but to be left to discover Mary Wollstonecraft on my own.

Perhaps the most serious implication for women and women's studies of the Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein tirade is their false equation of elitism with excellence. According to our three academic aristocrats, what is now needed "in the determination of academic policy" is "a strong dose of elitism" (p. 56), for "compromise," which they associate with democracy, is, in their minds, "the destroyer of excellence" (p. 51). Make no mistake about it. Elitism in their terms would mean a thinning of the ranks of women students, the near disappearance of women from the professoriate, withdrawal of funds from research on women, and consignment of women's studies to the dust bin.

Many years ago George Rudé, in a now classic study, exposed the right-wing bias of those historians who persisted in referring to the crowds of the French Revolution as "the mob," "the rabble," "la canaille."¹⁰ That lesson was either lost on Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein, or they felt no need to hide their contempt for students — whose increasing numbers since the 1960s they deplore as the "incoming mob" (p. 17) or "the flood of warm bodies" (p. 67). If they had their way, our professorial triumvirate would stem the tide. "There must be an end to the open accessibility that has ruined the universities" (p. 28), they cry, and in blinkered defiance of social-economic reality assert that "it is still almost true that anyone who wants to enter a Canadian university and embark on the pursuit of a degree can do

so" (p. 61). Margaret Brennan, a secretary at OISE, would not find that statement amusing, for exactly in that period (the late 60s) when, in the eyes of Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein, enrollments were being allowed to rise to irresponsible heights, she was forced by economic constraints to leave high school before completing grade 13 and go out to work. Because her mother, a widow, had four children to raise singlehandedly, it became necessary for Margaret, the eldest, by the time she was eighteen, to start making a major contribution to the family income. But she is only one of thousands of Canadians, then and now, for whom a university education is an impossible dream.

Nonetheless our three wise men contend that quality education requires a sharp reduction in the student population. And how would they limit accessibility? By abolishing enrollment-based provincial government funding and raising individual student fees. This would ensure, they seem to think, that only the best students would make it to university. They could hardly have stated more crassly their assumption that money equals brains. They deny, of course, that they want to discriminate against the working class, and call for "a vast scheme of scholarships (not bursaries or loans) so that all students of talent, rich or poor, have a chance to get all the education they can handle" (pp. 28-29).

Have they forgotten or have they never studied the history of education in twentieth-century Britain where such a scholarship system guaranteed that only in the rarest of instances and at horrendous social-personal cost could a working-class person, and then usually male, make it to Oxford or Cambridge? Although I should argue that any educated person in English-speaking society should have read Virginia Woolf's *Three Guineas*, it would appear that our trio have never heard of Arthur's Education Fund, that powerful symbol of the sacrifice in patriarchal society of the education of daughters to the education of sons.

And if Bercuson, Bothwell and

Granatstein would make university education even more inaccessible to the sons of the working class and to the daughters of all but the wealthiest families, they would admit to the august company of professors only those made in their own male image. Or so one can infer from their use of gendered language. At least when speaking of students, our authors acknowledge about half of the time that they come in two sexes, male and female, he and she. Not so when speaking of professors. For Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein, the professor is always masculine. They express downright nostalgia for the pre-sixties "prof" who, "bewhiskered, tyrannical, elderly, and befuddled," wore "a tweed suit, appropriately moth-eaten," "beamed over his male undergraduates," and "if unmarried," "would court desirable young females" (p. 12). Another indication of their desire to masculinize the professoriate can be found in the procedures they recommend for deciding questions of tenure and promotion. In fact, they would abolish tenure and replace it with five-year renewable contracts, one of their only suggestions worth serious consideration. The point in question is to whom they would entrust the power of review. Not to students, not to administrators, not to junior faculty, not even to faculty in the middle ranks, but only to "senior scholars, respected by all" (p. 106), or to be more precise, to "representatives of the full professor rank appointed by a committee of full professors chosen in some appropriate fashion" (p. 54). They do not say whether that would occur before or after the deadwood within the existing body of full professors has been cut away. The following passage, in which Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein are arguing for a restoration of an appropriately large gulf in authority between professor and student, throws into some doubt just how many female professors, particularly women who teach and research in women's studies, might get through such a screening process:

If a university professor has come to *his* position by virtue of achieving those standards of

scholarship and knowledge that have satisfied *his* peers of *his* entitlement to enter the profession..., then that professor should teach and the students should learn.

(Emphasis mine, p. 83).

Lest someone object that our authors were obviously using the generic he/his in that passage let me stress that they avoid the sexist use of pronouns with respect to students at least some of the time, but never with respect to professors. That says something, I would argue, about their conception of an ideal professoriate.

"He who pays the piper calls the tune," quote our authors in their attack on government control through government funding of education (p. 19). But in one of their more blatant lapses in logic, while they would fund education by raising student fees, they have no intention of letting students even suggest the melody. From their point of view, student accountability is the corruption of democracy into anarchy (p. 84). Are they unaware of the general rule within professions that professionals are expected to be accountable to their clients, and that, in the case of professors, this means, or should mean, students?

Feminist academics take a rather different view of the relationship between student and teacher. Adrienne Rich, for instance, has counselled women students to refuse to be passive recipients of learning and instead to claim an education.¹¹ Most who teach in women's studies not only respect that claim and try to offer on the basis of our expertise what guidance and direction we can to the students' pursuits; we also know that the learning process is a two-way street and that we have learned as much from our students as they have learned from us. By contrast, in the academic world as constructed by Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein, equality between professors and students "Breeds Familiarity" and "Familiarity Breeds Contempt" (p. 80). A professor's teaching is kept vital, not through interaction with students but through involvement in research and publishing. They

breathe not one word of the anguishing conflict many of us experience between commitment to students, their needs and interests, and the dictates of research and publication deadlines.

To whom then would Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein have professors be accountable? Mostly to themselves. Indeed in their best of all possible worlds, the professoriate would operate as an exclusive club of the guardians of academic excellence, accountable to no one but its own members, with the possible exception of the Department of National Defence.

Undoubtedly one of the more disingenuous aspects of their book is their pose as the defenders of independent research. This is evident in their attack on the strategic grants programme of the SSHRC. They object on the grounds that otherwise independently motivated scholars will tailor their projects to fit the areas designated strategic and, what is even worse, that the incompetent and the opportunistic will cook up projects just to be eligible for the easy money. One might well be persuaded by that line of argumentation did it not jostle uneasily against this long and significant passage:

Scholarly articles and books are the usual form in which academics present their research results. Those publications are assessed and reviewed by experts who can praise or condemn the methodology and the data base and style. To an academic, the praise of *his* peers is confirmation of *his* ideas and approach, and that is more satisfying than the applause of students. In many fields, the praise of reviewers is also the way to win a chance to affect or even shape public policy. An economist, for example, who can derive new ways of measuring growth or unemployment might just find the federal government interested in *his* methods; a sociologist with expertise in studying alcoholism might just find the

Addiction Research Foundation at his door. And — there is no point in avoiding this implication — such success in research can often win the professor major research grants or lavish contracts from government, foundations, or public agencies. To publish widely and well, to do research in germane subjects with skill, is to open many doors to academic success.

(Emphasis mine, p. 111)

And this from the defenders of independent research? Now it would appear that socially relevant, applied research as defined by branches of the federal government other than the SSHRCC, or by private foundations, or, by implication, by private industry, is fine, laudable in fact, and, best of all, well-paid.

What, then, is their real objection to strategic grants? That through them government is trying to redress some of the inequities and inequalities in Canadian society and channel research funds into areas where the subjects to be studied do not command sufficient power and resources to hire their own research, such as the aged, the inhabitants of Canada's north, and working women? One can only wonder, when on the one hand our authors present the strategic grants as the first step on the road to total state control of research, and on the other hand write that "In some areas, the government has the right (and, indeed, the duty) to organize and direct research — national defence-related subjects are just one example" (p. 117).

And this returns me to the false claim of Bercuson, Bothwell, and Granatstein with which I started: the claim that knowledge is impartial. Members of ethnic minorities, the poor, and almost all women know from experience that the contrary is the case, that knowledge is a social construction. The long passage just quoted is itself a confirmation of that fact. In the words of Adrienne Rich, "When you read or hear about 'great issues,' 'major texts,' 'the mainstream of Western thought,' you are hearing about

what men, above all white men, in their male subjectivity, have decided is important."¹² Furthermore, as Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein well know, scholars in very few fields pursue truth ascetically for truth's sake. Research in most areas follows money. It follows that the funding of research is a political issue of great importance. Recognizing this, our three historians have written their political tract to persuade the government to put a stop to what they regard as the "millions of dollars being squandered by a variety of agencies, associations, and government departments on 'Canadian Studies' and on other 'Studies' programs such as native studies, northern studies, women's studies, and so on" (p. 155).

Bercuson, Bothwell and Granatstein begin their critique of higher education in Canada with the melodramatic statement "Canadians are being robbed" (p. 7). I should like to end my remarks with the counter assertion that it is they who would be the brain robbers and rob Canadians, working-class Canadians, ethnic Canadians, and female Canadians of all races and classes, of an equal chance for higher education and of any chance for a higher education on their own terms. I don't know how many Bercusons, Bothwells and Granatsteins haunt the halls of our universities; I hope not many. I also hope that provincial and federal governments, funding agencies, and publishing houses will not be taken in by their spurious reasoning and woolly social policy. I trust the public will not. But if those with power are taken in, I say we women in academe, women students and women professors, particularly in women's studies and feminist studies, have much to fear.

RUTH ROACH PIERSON,
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

NOTES

1. "Teaching and Writing Women's History: A Panel," at the Twentieth Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for American Studies, University of Ottawa, October 11-13, 1984, which took as its

theme "Ten Years On: Perspectives on Women, Gender and Family — the 1970s and 1980s." It is my understanding that the Tenth Annual Conference of the Canadian Association for American Studies, University of Ottawa, October 9-12, 1974, which had "Women in North America" as its theme, had an effect on many women who attended very similar to that which the Second Berkshire Conference had on me.

2. Published in *Feminist Studies* 3, 3/4 (Spring/Summer 1976): 83-103.
3. Incorporated within Linda Gordon, *Woman's Body, Woman's Right: Birth Control in America* (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1976).
4. Susan Mann Trofimenkoff and Alison Prentice, eds., *The Neglected Majority: Essays in Canadian Women's History* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1977).
5. Anne Roche, *The Gates of Hell: The Struggle for the Catholic Church* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1975).
6. Susan Sontag, *Illness As Metaphor* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1978).
7. Dorothy Smith, "A Peculiar Eclipsing: Women's Exclusion from Man's Culture," *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 1, 4 (1978): 281-96; Dale Spender, *Man Made Language* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980), and *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them from Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982); Joanna Russ, *How to Suppress Women's Writing* (Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1983).
8. Mary Ritter Beard et al., "A Study of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* in Relation to Its Treatment of Women," submitted Nov. 15, 1942, reprinted in *Mary Ritter Beard: A Source Book*, ed. Ann J. Lane (New York: Schocken Books, 1977), pp. 215-24.
9. Christine de Pizan, *The Book of the City of Ladies*, trans. Earl Jeffrey Richards (New York: Persea Books, 1982).
10. George F.E. Rudé, *The Crowd in the French Revolution* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959).
11. Adrienne Rich, "Claiming an Education (1977)," in *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence: Selected Prose 1966-1978* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1979), pp. 231-335.
12. *Ibid.*, p. 232.

Mountie versus Outlaw: Inventing the Western Hero

INVENTING BILLY THE KID: VISIONS OF THE OUTLAW IN AMERICA, 1881-1981. Stephen Tatum. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982. 242 + xii pp.

VISIONS OF ORDER: THE CANADIAN MOUNTIES IN SYMBOL AND MYTH. Keith Walden. Toronto: Butterworths, 1982. 243 + ix pp.

Everyone can identify Dudley Do-Right and Billy the Kid: each is a western hero — Do-Right a cartoon mountie "getting his man," Billy the Kid the premier American outlaw, a man "all bad." The attraction offered by the mountie and the outlaw to the society which spawned them has waxed and waned during the century or so since each entered our cultural consciousness — witness the revelations of the Macdonald Commission — but the fact remains: the red-coated mountie and snot-nosed Billy, the boy murderer, are imaginative fixtures of the North American imagination. As both Stephen Tatum and Keith Walden demonstrate in their finely-argued studies, Michael Ondaatje was right in *The Collected Works of Billy the Kid*; there, the poet presents a newspaper interview with the Kid, whose response to the question "do you think you will last in people's memories?" is "I'll be with the world till she dies."¹ The same should be said of the mountie. Whatever meaning is assigned, mountie and outlaw are compelling presences, figures that reflect the mores, anxieties, and being of their separate societies; they help to define the difference between the American and the Canadian psyche — so the popular wisdom goes. Yet do they? Taken together, Tatum's and Walden's books are complementary: as companion pieces they confirm many similarities between Canadian and American western heroes unknown to popular wisdom; the few hard distinctions that remain, therefore, are all the more salient, all the more crucial.

The Women's Studies Institute will be an autonomous unit, reporting to either the Vice President (Academic) or the Vice President (Research).

STRUCTURE

Director: The Director of the Institute will be a member of the University of Alberta's full-time continuing academic staff, seconded to the Institute for a period of three years. She will have the responsibilities of the chairperson of a department, and will work with other departments in the University to designate Women's Studies courses. In addition, she will teach a maximum of two Women's Studies courses.

Associates: The Institute will have four types of Associates. An individual can have more than one designation (e.g., a person can be both a Teaching Associate and a Research Associate).

Teaching Associates: Teaching Associates will have joint appointments with the Institute and another department of the University. To ensure that Institute staff maintain a significant contact with their basic discipline, the maximum appointment to the Institute will be 1/2. To teach a course designated as a Women's Studies course, the person must be a Teaching Associate of the Institute. The Teaching Associates are the "members of the department" for academic purposes (e.g., decisions on tenure, salaries and promotion, course approval).

Research Associates: Research Associates are those people doing research in the area of women's studies. Research Associates will have a full appointment in their home departments, but will be affiliated with the Institute for research and collegial purposes. Research Associates will include (but not be limited to) staff at the University of Alberta as well as staff from other institutions who are taking study leave at the Institute. While not approving specific research, this group will approve the use of the Institute's name on research proposals and publications. It is anticipated that the Research Associates will develop on-going research projects to which all members of the group can contribute.

Community Associates: Community Associates are those individuals both in and out of the University who are working in the community on issues of concern to women. These individuals, who are practicing what is being taught and researched in the Institute, will provide field contacts and support for the other Associates. Examples of such persons would be consulting psychologists working with victims of sexual assault, lawyers in the field of family law, and persons working with the Women's Secretariat of the Government of Alberta.

Student Associates: Both graduate and undergraduate students will be eligible to be Student Associates. Student Associates will be affiliated with one of the other three Associates groups. It is expected that undergraduate students will most likely affiliate with the Community

Associates group (for practical experience) or the Teaching Associates group (to provide input on course development), while graduate students will most likely affiliate with the Research Associates (for research advice and experience) or the Teaching Associates (for teaching experience).

Selection of Teaching, Research and Community Associates will be made by the Board of Advisors, on the recommendation of the particular group. Selection of Student Associates will be made by the Board of Advisors on the recommendation of the both the Student Associates group plus the Associates group with which the student wishes to affiliate.

Board of Advisors: The Board of Advisors will (1) serve as a coordinating body and (2) advise on policy for the Institute. It will be composed of the Director, five Teaching Associates, five Research Associates, five Community Associates, and five Student Associates. Each group of Associates (Teaching, Research, Community, and Students) will select their own representatives to the Board. Representatives will serve for a term of three years. The Board will select its own Chairperson from among its members. Note: For the first two years of the Institute's existence, the Board of Advisors will consist of the members of the Advisory Committee on Women's Studies.

Non-academic Staff: The Institute will require an Administrative Officer and one secretary. This level of administrative help will be necessary because of the complex nature of the Institute's structure and functions.

WOMEN'S STUDIES

- a) Based on 1984-85 calendar:
(*- not offered in 1984-85)

*C LIT 366: Women in World Literature (3)
HIST 206: Introduction to the History of Women (3)
HIST 371: The History of Women in Canadian Society (3)
HIST 413: Women in Modern European History (3)
INT D 347: Women and Socialism: USSR and Eastern Europe (3)
*LAW 585: Women and the Law (2)
*ANTHE 410: Sexe et statut social: approche comparative (3)
*SOCIE 301: Sociologie de la femme (3)
*ANTHR 410: Sex and Status in Comparative Perspective (3)
SOC 301: Sociology of Sex Roles (3)
SOC 491: Gender Stratification and Differentiation (3)
SOC 577: Seminar on Sex Stratification and Differentiation (3)
ORG T 442: Sex Roles in Organizations (3)

- b) Drawn from informal survey of faculty members:

HIST 470: Topics in Canadian Social History. Examines the impact of women in European and North American society from the middle ages to the 20th century. Both terms. Dr. Pat Prestwich.

CANST 401: Canadian Feminism, Contexts and Critiques. Interdisciplinary seminar. First term. Dr. Susan Jackel, 306 Arts Building.

ENGL 670: Feminism and Literature. Both terms. Dr. Pat Clements.

CHR T 318: Feminist Theology. First term. Dr. William Close, St. Stephen's College.

Physical Education & Sports Studies: for feminist perspectives on this field, contact Dr. Ann Hall.

Educational Foundations 501: Women, Education and Work. Prof. Marilyn Assheton-Smith.

FAMILY STUDIES

FAM 357: Human sexuality: an enquiry into the nature of sexual behavior.
Dr. Dianne Keiren/Dr. Norah Keating

FAM 541 -Seminar: Human sexuality & sex education in family life education.

ANTHROPOLOGY

ANTHR 210: Sex, Society and the Individual: an ethnographic review of how societies organize sexual differences and what it means to be a man or a woman in different societies.

CLASSICS

CLASSICS 484 II: The Ancient Tragic Heroine: Framed and Framed Up . A seminar selecting and examining various plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides from a feminist literary critical point of view. Rosemary Nielsen, second term, time TBA

POLITICAL SCIENCE

POL S 421, Section B 1: Seminar on women, power and politics. F. Cruchley-Adam; second term, TR 1400-1520

Women's Studies at the University of Alberta: Current Status

Although the University of Alberta does not have a formal program in Women's Studies, we are nonetheless actively engaged in a wide range of activities in the area. For example, undergraduate and graduate level courses dealing specifically with women and/or gender are currently listed in many departments and faculties. It is important to note, however, that virtually all of these courses came about through individual initiatives often by members of the Committee. In some cases, the courses are extra to an individual's already heavy teaching load or there is no guarantee by the Department or Faculty that they will be offered on a permanent basis. These courses are as follows:

Anthropology

ANTHRD 410 Sex and Status in Comparative Perspective

Business

✓ ORGT 442 Sex Roles in Organizations - Dallas Cullen

Canadian Studies

✓ CANST 401 Canadian Feminism - Sue Tackel

Comparative Literature

C LIT 366 Women in World Literature

Educational Foundations

ED FDN 501 Women, Education and Work - Marilyn Ashburn-Smith

Educational Psychology

ED PSYCH 597 Counselling Girls and Women - Rosemary Liburd

English

ENGL 670 Feminism and Literature - Pat Clements

⊕ Family Studies

History

✓ HIST 206 Introduction to the History of Women

✓ HIST 371 History of Women in Canadian Society

✓ HIST 413 Women in Modern European History

✓ HIST 470 Seminar in Women and the Family

Law

Law 585 Women and the Law

Physical Education and Sport Studies

✓ P ED 546 Sport and Gender Ann Hall/Cathy Bray

Slavic and East European Studies

✓ INT D 347 Women and Socialism: USSR and Eastern Europe - Tova Pedlin

Sociology

SOC 301 Sociology of Sex Roles Ros Sydie (Coord.)

SOC 491 Gender Stratification and Differentiation

SOC 577 Seminar in Sex Stratification and Differentiation Ros Sydie

Extension

Women's Program (see below)

St. Stephen's College

CHR T 318 Feminist Theology - *Bill Cloze*

Faculte Saint Jean

ANTHE 410 Sexe et statut social: approche comparative

SOCIE 301 Sociologie de la femme

As noted, several members of the Advisory Committee teach these courses. In addition, several other courses in, for example, Family Studies, Psychology and Education include substantial portions that deal with topics specific to women. Obviously there are gaps in our course offerings (for instance, in psychology, economics, political science, and all of the sciences) particularly at the undergraduate level. The offering of badly needed new courses, particularly core courses, would be an immediate benefit of a formalized Women's Studies program.

Active scholarship in Women's Studies is also exemplified by the large number of graduate (both Masters and Ph.D) theses completed which are either about girls or women and/or utilize feminist scholarship. Among the academic staff, there are many individuals committed to the academic discipline of Women's Studies be it through teaching or by means of their own scholarly research and publishing.

The Women's Program in the Faculty of Extension links the resources of the University of Alberta with the needs and interests of women in the community. In the three and one half years since its inception in 1981, the Women's Program has developed and offered over 150 non-credit courses, workshops, public forums and major conferences to over 5000 people, largely women. In addition to direct course offerings, the Women's Program also provides informal counselling and referral to women seeking information on resources, services, organizations and issues. In fact, the program is in the process of setting up an extensive, computerized Women's Resource Centre which will contain books, periodicals, articles and information on, by and about women and issues of special concern to women. The Women's Program also maintains an active liaison with women's organizations and has been instrumental in organizing women on such issues as pension reform and the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. As well, major research activities have also been stimulated by the Women's Program such as two provincial conferences on women and research organized in conjunction with other academic staff at the University of Alberta. These conferences brought women from unions, community groups and women's organizations together with academic and community researchers to discuss and engage in the process of collaborative research on women's issues.

Finally, several campus organizations provide support and communication networks for women's activities and Women's Studies. For instance, the Academic Women's Association, a group open to faculty, administrative staff and graduate students, has sponsored