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.).  

_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.
Canadian Julie Wheelwright’s article on gender and the military is certainly “strong stuff,” but a hearty dose of liberal feminism harnessed to the technocratic military as a worthy occupation? One longs for a marxist-feminist anthropologist to place the men in puncturing fashion and critically examine the buttoned-down tribe of technophilic women who hover on their fringes. The editors commissioned Wheelwright’s article to reveal in exaggerated microcosm how the world, in general, often denies women access to technology, and how twentieth-century technology developed in the context of the military-industrial complex. That is subtly demonstrated with fewer noxious side-effects by Gill Kirkup in her article on women and computer science. Kirkup shows how the percentage of women in computer science programs in Britain was whittled down by the concerted appropriation of the computer as an adjunct penis. In Kirkup’s analysis, necessary math skills, used ferociously, became a fetish employed in part to exclude women, while some of the most interesting developments in computer science began to employ primarily language, visual design, problem definition and organization skills as their base.

Rhada Chakravarthy’s overview of the disastrously uneven effects of science and technology on gender in countries subject to imperialism as well as patriarchy and capitalism is an important contribution to the collection. So is Bina Agarwal’s case study of how technical skills were transferred to poor, rural women and their lives improved through the consultative construction of more fuel-efficient wood stoves in their homes. It is chilling to be reminded that poor women in developing countries not only do a disproportionate amount of toilsome work, but that they and their children will also continue to suffer the most from the environmental degradation of the planet.

Inventing Women’s editors make clear that high-tech solutions to all the earth’s problems are not only inappropriate, but dangerous to our survival as a species. However, that is part of an ironic tone towards science one profitably finds throughout this collection. When Liz Whitelegg calls for the reconstruction of science in her excellent article on science education, she notes, “Girls are not uninterested in science; they are bored by the limited version of it they meet in school” (184). The question becomes less “why do women underachieve in science” and more “why do so many boys choose such a controlling, reductive and unfeeling field of enterprise?”

Inventing Women generally provides much room for debate within the thoughtful contradictions it contains. This is nicely apparent in Canadian Linda Marie Fedigan’s droll, clever overview of women, evolutionary theory and the origins of human society. Fedigan treats us to devilishly fun (but inadequate) feminist reversals of the scandalously inadequate “man the hunter” theories about the origins of human society. In “woman the gatherer” theories, early men simply become walking sperm banks on the periphery of self-sufficient female societies, or competitors not for sexy, passive females, but for attention from their moms. Fedigan is aware that there is a clock ticking away on our culture’s interest in origin stories, due, she says, to their terribly speculative nature. I would add that origin stories will likely cease to interest people altogether in a reconstructed world with a postmodern edge.

Inventing Women is an empowering collection. However, the influence in the book of moral psychologists Carol Gilligan and Nancy Chodorow is a wee bit strong. Editors Kirkup and Smith Keller should have included a shard of feminist anti-foundationalism, to loosen up this deftly consolidating but rather too confident utopia of feminist science. Yes, there is a
feminist science, as this collection cannily, sometimes brilliantly demonstrates, but its "essentials" simply have not been fixed.

Anne Hicks
St. John’s, Newfoundland


The Criminalization of a Woman’s Body is a collection of articles that examines in various ways the increasing judicial surveillance of women’s reproductive capacities. The implicit and, at times, explicit collusion of the medical field with the legal field in this task is made frighteningly apparent. We would be very wise to take note of the events that these articles highlight and to gear ourselves for a battle over the regulation of women’s behaviour in terms of their reproductive lives.

As in most collections of articles, some here are much stronger than others. However, overall, they present a firm coherence that is useful to those of us with previous knowledge in this field as well as providing a rich starting point for newcomers.

The first three articles are the weakest in this collection. “Abortion Approval as a Ritual of Symbolic Control” looks at the Israeli experience. The abortion committee arrangement seems to be very much like Canada’s before the change in abortion law. This article looks at how a committee decides to approve a woman’s request for an abortion and the ways in which the power of committee members acts to control the woman’s behaviour and to foster a sense of what is “proper” or “appropriate” sexual behaviour for females in that particular cultural context. The second article, “Decriminalization or Legalization? The Abortion Debate in Italy,” outlines the status of abortion law in that country. The author provides a glimpse into the history behind the present debate (essentially a debate pitting Church and State against feminists and other women) but, overall, this article provides very little in terms of adding to already existing literature. The same must be said of the third article, “Unwanted Pregnancy, Due Process of Law and Justice White” in which Sarah Slavin discusses U.S. Supreme Court Justice Byron White’s dissenting opinion wherein he claimed that the State has a compelling interest in protecting the life of the fetus and that this compulsion justifies treating pregnancy and non-pregnant women differently under constitutional law. While it is true that this type of distinction will be costly for women, this article offers very little that those of us who attend to reproductive issues have not already heard endlessly debated.

There are two articles that address the issue of surrogacy or “contract motherhood”: “Contract Motherhood: Social Practice in Social Context” by Mary Gibson, and “Surrogate Motherhood and the Morality of Care” by Michael Dahlen. Of the two, Gibson’s article is the most successful. Her arguments against contract motherhood are articulate and precise, and they follow each other in such a way that the overall coherence of her argument is greatly enhanced. This article is indeed more than the sum of its parts.

The final four articles all approach the same general phenomenon: that of using or threatening to use the law to punish a pregnant woman for her behaviour based on the assumption of prenatal harm or predictions that the woman will be unfit to mother the baby when it will be born. “Prenatal Harm as Child