

tongue. For instance, Mistral believed that the case of Victoria Ocampo, who learned French before Spanish, was tragic. Another issue is that of *marianismo*, the idealization of motherhood, and *malinchismo*, the woman accomplice of patriarchal domination.

Part 2, edited by Sylvia Mollow, is entitled "Female Textual Identities: The Strategies of Self-Figuration." Here Molloy addresses the question of "what do female texts do when they say 'I'?" Molloy's probings of this question are too complicated to be condensed in a short review but are well worth reading. Some of this section exposes the reader to some marvellous poetry. The merits, demerits, problems and frustrations of translating poetry are well known. However, since many of the readers of this volume will be English-speakers whose Spanish is non-existent or poor, perhaps the most appropriate test is that of W.H. Auden who argued that a translation must succeed as an English poem. By that standard some of these translations are quite wonderful.

Part 3, edited by Beatriz Sarlo, is entitled "Women, History and Ideology." In this section we find the pieces by Rigoberta Menchú, Carolina Maria de Jesus and Elena Poniatowski already noted. However we also hear from Eva Perón on the merits as she saw them of Juan Perón and from Magda Portal, a Peruvian Communist, who came to see very early on that a devotion to Marxist-Leninism does not automatically cure a male of *machismo*.

In conclusion, I predict this anthology will create much frustration. Readers will head to libraries and bookstores looking for translations of complete works by these fine voices. They will find that the translation into English of Latin American women writers lags far behind what is merited. One can only hope this

is a situation that publishers will rectify in the next decade.

Robert Lake
Mount Saint Vincent University

Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance. Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel (eds.). *Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992, Pp. 276 paperback.*

At a very recent, otherwise quite wonderful, postcolonial conference, the only panel that specifically addressed questions of gender swiftly degenerated into a largely untheorized free-for-all, breaking down into camps divided as to whether gender was or was not a significant axis of oppression for the purposes of postcolonial studies. Comments ranged along the well-worn paths of the "there is no sexism" and "racism is worse than sexism" schools of thought. Deeply distressing as this discourse was to many of us at the conference, the sad truth is that feminist and postcolonial theories and theorists still do not always succeed in communicating effectively with one another.

Given this state of affairs, I welcome the appearance of *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance*, which looks at "western" women and their relationship to the (mainly British) imperial drive. (I scare-quote the homogenizing term "western" throughout this review to signify that it, like the commonplace term "first-world," implies a critically unsustainable radical disjuncture between arbitrarily designated sections of the world.) *Western Women and Imperialism* sets out to rectify a critical "neglect of the role of Western women in the colonies" (3). It provides a "context-specific" (192) examination

of the lives and attitudes of “western” women who challenged or altered varying social restrictions and norms, as well as focusing on women who did nothing of the sort. Grouped into sections entitled “Images of One Another,” “Imperial Politics,” “Allies, Maternal Imperialists, and Activists,” “Missionaries,” and “Wives and Incorporated Women,” this compilation of “essays on Western women’s experiences in the colonies ... offer[s] analyses of both complicity and resistance by Western women to the cultural values dominant during an imperialist era” (4-5).

In *Western Women and Imperialism*, however, the colonies are restricted to “representative” portions of India and Africa. The editors discuss this narrowing of focus in the introduction: “Since Great Britain controlled the largest Western colonial empire for over seventy-five years and contained the greatest diversity of imperialist practice, this collection on Western women’s experiences emphasizes the British colonies” (5). “Western” imperialism thus becomes European colonialism, even in Sylvia M. Jacobs’s article on Afro-American missionaries who worked in Africa in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries and who found themselves perceived as both racially inferior (“like” the African blacks with whom they worked) and threatening (a “bad” influence on African blacks) by their white co-workers and the white governments under whom they served. Leslie A. Flemming’s article, “A New Humanity: American Missionaries’ Ideals for Women in Northern India, 1870-1930,” also discusses American women missionaries’ beliefs that they were “bearers of a superior culture” who had a “responsibility to change ... the religious identities [and] ... social roles” (203) of colonized women. The author finds that these missionaries focused on the domestic identity of the women of Uttar

Pradesh. She suggests, however, that, because the missionaries provided educational and organizational opportunities, they created a situation in which “Indian women [saw] *themselves* as potential agents of change” (204). Flemming ends by calling for “an assessment of Indian women’s *response* to the values articulated by the missionaries” (204).

Although the introduction to this volume briefly discusses raj revivalism, Banana republics (in the past tense), and colonial nostalgia, *Western Women and Imperialism* nowhere deals with what it notes as “the modern [imperialist] form of economic control” (2). Written (for the most part) and published from the new imperial centre, *Western Women and Imperialism* critiques old, safely un-present forms of imperialism. Analyses of U.S. women’s relationships to the United States’ interventions in the Caribbean, the Philippines, or South America would have been a timely addition to the text. As well, because it focuses almost exclusively on British “eastern” colonial possessions, *Western Women and Imperialism* evades issues of “western” internal colonialism and the “fourth world.” Burton’s cautionary note (slightly altered by this reviewer), which suggests that “the implications of the ... imperial context for the development of middle-class ... feminism are difficult for many of us in the late twentieth century to countenance — despite the ongoing insistence of non-Western [and “western”] feminists that we look critically at the historical roots and Orientalist presumptions of our own feminist ideologies” (151), might have been taken to heart by the editors of this text. In this context, the “Introduction” might have taken a cue from the thickly noted articles it introduces and acknowledged that *Western Women and Imperialism* is a contribution to an extant, often competently theorized,

field of study rather than a text which "open[s] a new field of scholarship" called "gender and imperialism" (6).

Because the field of "gender and imperialism" covers a good deal more than "western" (primarily white) women's responses to imperialism, the most successful articles in this book are those that engage in what Mary Louise Pratt has coined in her book, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992), as "criticism in the contact zone." This critical approach "treats the relations among colonizers and colonized, or travellers and 'travelees' ... in terms of copresence, interaction, interlocking understandings and practices, often within radically asymmetrical relations of power" (7). In "Chathams, Pitts, and Gladstones in Petticoats": The Politics of Gender and Race in the Ilbert Bill Controversy, 1883-1884," for instance, Mrinalini Sinha explores Indian and Anglo-Indian reactions to a bill which would have allowed Indian civil servants to "exercise criminal jurisdiction over European British subjects living outside the chief Presidency towns" (98). Sinha's reconstruction of the (cynical) use of the trope of English womanhood by both male and female Anglo-Indians is important; her investigation of Indian (male) responses to this tactic is equally so. Her analysis of that response, which focuses on articles published in the *Bengalee*, the *Reis and Reyyet*, the *Hindoo Patriot*, and the *Amrita Bazar Patrika*, suggests that the respondents were on some level cognizant of the fact that "in the colonial context, racial ideology was often articulated in gendered terms and gender ideology in racial terms" (112).

Mervat Hatem's article, "Through Each Other's Eyes: The Impact on the Colonial Encounter of the Images of Egyptian, Levantine-Egyptian, and European Women, 1862-1920," fully emphasizes "contact." Hatem shows,

through a wide-ranging analysis of the lives and writings of Egyptian and European women, that they "presented idealized and partial images of one another. Because they viewed each other as alien, they were not able to relate to each other's experiences, learn from them, or to integrate them into an understanding of the dilemmas that were also their own" (35). Hatem also discusses the ways in which Levantine-Egyptian women, "with their simultaneous links to the two cultures, ... tried to use the traditional" female roles of "the protectors and conveyors of cultural definitions of culture" propagated by "cultural nationalism in its Orientalist or anti-colonialist discourses" to criticize "the new and old definitions of women's roles in the East and West" (55). Thus, Hatem's work occupies the actual site of intersection between race and gender, social and geographical positioning. It is this type of carefully researched women's history and feminist theory, in conjunction with explorations of colonial discourse theory and post-colonial criticism that suggests feminism and postcolonialism have much to say to each other.

Western Women and Imperialism itself encourages future work on "indigenous women's views of and responses to sexuality in the colonial context" (12) and concludes by calling for "more and better texts in colonial ethnography" which will aid in "the task of tracking the unfolding of today's gender constructions against the uneasy backdrop of economic shifts, political changes, and ideologies disseminated by local and Western mass media" (265). Though I could wish that it had answered its own call, *Western Women and Imperialism* nevertheless provides a selection of extremely interesting investigations of the ways in which gender, race, class, age, hierarchies of culture, "scientific" states, and geographic locality influenced individual "western" women and groups of "western"

women at specific times in specific places. It is thus a welcome addition to the discourse currently operating in the "contact zone" between feminist and postcolonial criticism.

Catherine Nelson-McDermott
University of Alberta

Inventing Women: Science, Technology and Gender. G. Kirkup and L.S. Keller (eds.). Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992.

Inventing Women is a transformative, consolidating anthology of writings on gender, science and technology. Anyone teaching a university course on the subject will want to investigate this book as a very smart map, if not a textbook about a diverse field. Perhaps the only general treatment of the subject that surpasses *Inventing Women* in its deeply intelligent range, though not in organization, is *Gender and Expertise*, also a British-edited text. That said, *Inventing Women* is a sobering text as well as an accountably utopian one. Sobering, because girls and young women will not presently or very soon be exposed to such empowering ideas in elementary and high school, where they will need them the most!

Although neither the editors nor the contributors of *Inventing Women* say so, some feminist theorists have proclaimed that a feminist science cannot actually exist without radical changes in society and in science. The contributions to *Inventing Women* add up to more hope than that, and sophisticatedly so. Harding and Fox Keller, theorists of feminism's existence in science now, are ably represented in the collection, while Lynda Birke expertly whittles away at biological myths of gender. What is regrettable about this anthology is the absence of Donna Haraway's work. The reason for this omission becomes clear in co-

editor Gill Kirkup's article, "The Nature of Science and Technology." While rightly criticizing anti-foundationalism for its relativism and its inability to explain the success of science, she proclaims that Foucaultian-inspired anti-foundationalism is both anti-science and anti-technology. In fact, Foucault is not against technology; he is simply anti-science. Haraway, who has read Foucault with profit, is not the single-minded postmodernist type to whom Kirkup objects. What Haraway does is show how to "read" science as narrative in a way that is deeply and subversively perception-changing. She is a feminist subversive of the most intelligent kind. The omission of her work is counter-intuitive.

Inventing Women gives some sense of the heterogeneity of practices in science of which Fox Keller writes; regrettably, this anthology does not detail some of the internal cracks in the deeply masculinist ideology of science it so ably documents. Some male cultural critics of science are writing of theory and practices by men in science and technology that are openly corrosive of cherished notions about what science means. *Inventing Women* could have used a local studies report about contested approaches to doing science among men.

I have major concerns about two articles in this collection. Cat Cox's "Eco-feminism" is the usual, literate manifesto about men's denigration and domination of both woman and nature. Editors now need to get severe with the self-contained and rather too saleable goods eco-feminists routinely produce. In my opinion, eco-feminism is not a viable, comprehensive philosophy, but certainly a useful rhetorical tool with which to criticize the patriarchal biases of deep ecology and social ecology. Cox, a noted environmental researcher, surely could have produced a case study of eco-feminism as critique.