stories of struggle, exploitation and abuse that Italian women have revealed in their oral recollections of their early years in postwar Toronto. To date, immigration historians have neglected this "uglier" side of Italian immigration, preferring to stress the resiliency of immigrant families who confronted the new economy and society of North America. That goal, of course, is a perfectly legitimate one. So, too, is the task of mapping out the positive contributions women have made to their families in these years. Indeed, men who might express sexist views about women's rightful place in the home, often simultaneously expressed their recognition and respect for the self-sacrificing efforts of their wives, whose paid and unpaid labours throughout the postwar years made a major difference to their family's welfare. Women also derived tremendous self-satisfaction from their labours and they expressed the pride of immigrant women who saw themselves as indispensable to the family. But one cannot ignore

the special strains on women's lives and the kinds of gender-specific abuse and exploitation that can wreak irreparable psychological and physical havoc on women's lives. Our discussions of successful families must recognize the important role women played in building the better life which migration to Toronto secured for thousands of southern Italians. Likewise, in our analyses of the resiliency of immigrant families in withstanding new world pressures and in carving out their own lives, we ought not to forget that this was sometimes achieved at great emotional cost, and that women in particular suffered emotional and psychological scars engendered by the difficult early years.

[1] For further statistical details see, for example, Franca Iacovetta, "From Cortadina to Worker: Southern Italian Immigrant Working Women in Toronto, 1947-62," in *Looking into My Sister's Eyes: An Exploration in Women's His-*

tory, ed. Jean Burnet (Toronto: MHSO, 1986).

[2] On women in Southern Italy see, for example, Jan Brogger Montavarese, *A Study of Present Society and Culture in Southern Italy* (Oslo, 1971); Constance Cronin, *The Sting of Change: Sicilians in Sicily and Australia* (Chicago, 1971); Ann Cornelison, *Women of the Shadows: A Study of the Wives and Mothers of Southern Italy* (New York, 1970).

[3] Unless otherwise stated, all of the case histories have been culled from the confidential files of the International Institute of Metropolitan Toronto, PAO.

[4] Social Planning Council Records, City of Toronto Archives. A. Cecilia Pope, R.N., to Doris Clark (15 April 1958).

[5] *Corriere Canadese*; *Toronto Telegram*; *Toronto Star*; *Globe and Mail* (October 1955 issues).

[6] Interviews (confidential, names withheld).

Family Fallout

Nuclear Nightmare

BY JERI DAWN WINE

In this paper, published in Psychology *(Vol. 8, No. 4, 1987), Dawn Wine describes an emerging feminist perspective that focuses on connections between the patriarchal family structure, the relegation of nurturing and caretaking activities to women, gender role socialization processes, male violence against women and militarism. It's suggested that nuclear holocaust may be inevitable unless these connections are unravelled at their very centre—the patriarchal family and its associated practices. Her case is a strong one and begs attention when once again, in 1991, the hairy-chest syndrome of our male political and military "leaders" drags us into war.*

I n this paper I draw links between the patriarchal family form, association social practices, gender socialization processes and the precipice of nuclear destruction on which our planet is precariously balanced. The inherently dangerous gender socialization of males' sense of self in the direction of separation and individuation is contrasted with the communal values and orientation to preservation of life likely to be associated with

female self-in-relation development. I owe much of this analysis to Betty Reardon whose *Sexism and the War System* (1985) I highly recommend, to Birgit Brock-Utne and her excellent *Educating for Peace: A Feminist perspective* (1985), and to Barbara Roberts, a Canadian historian and peace activist who has written several provocative articles linking the nuclear mentality to the war against women, and exploring feminist approaches to peace work.

Historical and social context

What does the term "the family" refer to? I suspect for most of us the image that is brought to mind is that of a man, his wife and his children (my use of the masculine possessive is intentional). For some, the image may be that of a more extended structure, including grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, but a male is likely to be at the center of the family structure. It's instructive that the word 'family' derives from the Latin 'femulus' which means 'slave' or 'servant.' According to Adrienne Rich "patriar-

chy is the power of the fathers: a familial-social ideological, political system in which men — by force, direct pressure, or through ritual, tradition, law and language, customs, etiquette, education and the division of labour, determine which part women shall or shall not play, and in which the female is everywhere subsumed by the male" (Rich, 1976).

The patriarchal male-headed family structure has a long history in Western culture, its roots traceable through Roman and Judaeo-Christian customs and laws. The first known record of western marriage laws were those proclaimed by Romulus around 753 B.C.: "This law obliged the married women as having no other refuge, to conform themselves entirely to the temper of their husbands and the husbands to rule their wives as necessary and inseparable possessions" (Dobesh & Dobesh, 1979, p. 35). Judaeo-Christian law enforced the patriarchal ideology of the Old Testament, which defined women as men's reproductive property, the primary purpose of their existence to produce children who were also considered men's property. Male ownership of women's bodies is particularly evident in Judaeo-Christian laws surrounding rape, which was defined as a crime only in the context of the rapist defiling male property. Men were encouraged to view the family as their domain, and to exercise control over their wives and children by whatever means necessary.

The core of the marriage laws Western societies have inherited from Roman and Judaeo-Christian roots remained little changed until this century. As recently as the late 19th century, British common law allowed a man to use "a rod not thicker than his thumb" in beating and chastising his wife. Marital rape is still not illegal in many states of the U.S. Though it has become illegal in Canada, the rule of defense relating to "honest belief," that the perpetrator of sexual assault honestly believed his victim to have consented, renders it unlikely that the law will be of use to women who have been raped by their husbands. Though wives are no longer legally considered to be the property of men in North America, religious beliefs and cultural practices uphold the male property view of the patriarchal family structure.

One of the major concomitants of capitalistic industrialization that has affected family structure has been the deep separation of the public sphere of production from the private sphere of reproduction. The public sphere is considered to be the proper domain of men where the "real work" of the world is carried on. Women have historically been relegated to the private sphere and are held responsible not only for reproduction, but for virtually all physical and emotional nurturing and life-sustaining activities. The private sphere is typically considered to be sacrosanct, "A man's home is his castle," and a man's behavior in the home and with his family is rarely scrutinized. Tacit permission is thus accorded for the exercise of male violence in the control and oppression of women. According to Barbara Roberts, "wife abuse is probably the most common form of violence in North America." Estimates of the incidence of wife battering vary from the conservative estimate of the Canadian Advisory Council of the Status of Women that one in ten women are battered by their husbands every year, to the estimate based on surveys of U.S. women that one in every two or three women at some point in their lives is beaten by a man with whom they are in an intimate relationship.

Clearly, any understanding of the origins of militarism must come to terms with the massive war that is waged against women by men, evident not only in the high incidence of wife battery, but the fact that the highest category of homicides in North America is the murder of wives by husbands, the expectation that one in three or four North American women will be raped in her lifetime, and that one in three girls will be sexually abused before the age of 18. Any discussion of abuses of power must recognize that virtually all men are able to exercise power over at least one female in their lives. Though such exercise of power is not always overtly violent, the threat of violence is implicit.

There seems to be currently a variety of changes in the ideology surrounding male-female relations, many men, especially middle class, well-educated men giving lip service to egalitarian relations in marriage. The changes are more apparent in verbiage than in action. A number of researchers have demonstrated that though the majority of North American women, including approximately half of all married women, have moved into the public sphere and are doing paid work (at two-thirds the salaries of men), married women are maintaining the full brunt of the workload in the home. The employed wife is a woman carrying a double workload. A depressing example with regard to a well-educated affluent group, one that might have been expected to be progressive with respect to men's and women's roles, was reported in a 1980 study of Canadian Psychological Association members (Williams, et al., 1980). Married female members reported an *increased* workload of about three workdays a week, after marriage.

Marriage is an institution constructed to meet the needs of men; it is not good for women either psychologically or physically. Those women who devote themselves entirely to the family, housewives, have been shown to be at the highest risk psychologically, having the highest rate of entry in psychiatric treatment of any occupational group. On the other hand, married employed men show the lowest rates of psychiatric disturbance (Bernard, 1971, Greenglass, 1981).

Gender role socialization

Nancy Chodorow (1978) and Dorothy Dinnerstein (1977) have presented analyses based on object relations theory of the effects on gendered personality characteristics that result from the early caretaking of children being carried out exclusively by women. Their analyses are most applicable to industrialized societies, in which the private and public spheres are quite separate, and in which maleness is prized. In such societies children are cared for by mothers; alternative caretakers are typically other women.

Mother-reared infants, both female and male, develop a sense of self through identifying with their mothers. Their early powerfully experienced emotions, including rage, fear and helplessness as well as awe and love occur in the context of their relationship with their mothers. In the later process of the formation of gender identity, males resolve their helplessness and their need for differentiation from their mothers through separation and denial. The father is typically a more distant, abstract identification figure than is the mother and the boy's gender identity process is carried out more through distancing from mother and denial of his

early identification with her and thus denial of his own "female" characteristics than through direct identification with the father. Girls must also resolve the issues of helplessness and differentiation from mother but they do so in the context of a connected, ongoing relationship with her. Part of their gender identity process involves the experience of empathy, and learning the values and skills associated with nurturance and physical and emotional care-taking. Of course, there are unfortunate consequences in girls' gender identity process that have to do with mothers often having internalized denigrated images of femaleness, and with the lack of power that women possess vis-à-vis men.

Though Chodorow and Dinnerstein's analyses are useful ones they are incomplete. They fail to give sufficient attention to the distant, but all-powerful father in the formation of gender differences. Men have enforced compulsory heterosexuality and their ownership of women's bodies through institutions, laws, religion, and the violent and more subtly controlling acts of individual men toward "their" women. In spite of his misogyny and efforts to conceal male abuse of women and children, we can give Freud some credit for recognition of the importance of the father in the gender identity process. "Identification with the aggressor" is surely a very powerful ingredient in the gender identity process for boys.

Recent psychological research indeed demonstrates that fathers play an extremely important role in the gender socialization process and enforcement of gender differences. "The overwhelming part of the research conducted during the last ten years on fathers and children shows that despite the little time they actively spend with their children, fathers play a greater role in the sex-stereotyping of children than do mothers" (Brock-Utne, 1985, p. 104). Though fathers spend much less time with children than do mothers, they tend to spend most of that time playing rather than care-taking, and to spend twice as much time playing with boys, usually in rough, physical activities, than with girls. Fathers are much more concerned about cross-sex behaviours in both their sons and daughters than are mothers. An instructive study (Maccoby, 1980) in this regard was one in which children were encouraged to play with toys usually

identified with the other sex, and their parents subsequently were brought into the room. The fathers were much more likely to chastise their children, especially sons, for "sex-inappropriate" play than were the mothers. It's important to note that most of the boys' toys in this study were killing instruments — war toys, soldiers, guns, holsters. The feminist peace slogan, "Take the toys away from the boys," recognizes the early origins of men's preoccupation with instruments of death. Though fathers spend more time with boys and circumscribe their sex-typed activities more than they do girls, fathers may also have more impact than mothers on sex stereotyping of girls. Fathers of "feminine" girls tend to describe themselves as masculine and actively encourage feminine behaviour in their girls (Brock-Utne, 1985).

Carol Gilligan's research in moral development has reported highly provocative findings on some of the consequences of gender socialization. Her work addresses the differences between a morality based on connectedness and a morality based on rationality and separation. In her wonderful book *In a Different Voice* (1982) she starts with women's experience and defines a perspective on morality that emphasizes care and responsibility, non-violence, concern for the welfare of living things, a contextual embeddedness in human situations — a very different perspective than the male-centred one of separation, rationality and equal rights described by Lawrence Kohlberg.

Gilligan's more recent work explores the presence of both voices in women and men. Not surprisingly, since women must learn male perspectives in order to survive, she reports that women are likely to have both a strong voice of connectedness, as well as of rationality. On the other hand, while the voice of connectedness may be present in men, it tends to be considerably more muted than is the voice of rationality and equal rights.

In related work on development of a female self-in-relation theory, feminist scholars, most notably Jean Baker Miller and Janet Surrey, have presented their work through a series of papers of the Stone Center at Wellesley College in Massachusetts. These scholars have noted the importance to females' developing sense of self of capacities related to being in relationship with others, of the com-

plexity and centrality of empathic understanding to self development, and of the importance of developing new language to represent women's sense of self and related capacities in positive ways. Male-authored theories of self development have described separation and individuation as *the* pathway to self development and have described women's ego boundaries in contrast to men's as permeable and weak. In contrast, these feminist authors suggest terms such as flexible and inclusive ego boundaries to highlight the communal values and relationship-enhancing strengths of women's sense of self. Clearly, strengths, attitudes and behaviour flowing from a self-in-relation are likely to be life-enhancing in contrast to the conflictual consequences of a separated self.

Reproductive Consciousness

Mary O'Brien has presented a brilliant dialectical and materialist analysis of the origins of the power differential between men and women in her *Politics of Reproduction* (1980), positing differences in the reproductive consciousness of women and men. From O'Brien's materialist perspective the discovery of the male role in the biology of reproduction was the determining factor in the development of patriarchy. Women have a connectedness to the life-giving process that results from carrying a child in their bodies throughout pregnancy. The alienation from the new life that is produced in birth is mediated by their labour in the birth process. Men's connection to the life-giving process is a distant, intellectual, abstract one. The connection between ejaculating during intercourse and birth of a child nine months later is a very distant one and can be mediated by thought. The discovery of this connection must be made in every culture; it is not self-evident as is woman's. A man can never know with absolute certainty that a particular child is his, while the woman who gave birth to that child will never doubt it. O'Brien posits that the vast weight of law, institutional structures, family practices dictating male ownership of female bodies were instituted to insure paternity.

Men have described their alienation from life-giving as "freedom," and have invested their energies in other activities in the public sphere. O'Brien notes that the language of reproduction has been

used by men to describe their "creative" activities since early Greek history; e.g., "seminal thought," "seminars," "it's his baby," the "conception" of ideas, etc. She, like Mary Daly (1978), further notes that male-stream philosophy and religion are preoccupied with death, typically labelling it in procreative terminology such as "spiritual rebirth." Brian Easlea's *Fathering the Unthinkable: Masculinity, Scientists and the Nuclear Arms Race* (1983) is a documentation of the use of reproductive metaphors in the language of nuclear technology, and of the inevitable extension of unchecked male-gendered behaviours and characteristics into nuclear annihilation. Among the many chilling examples cited by Easlea of the permeation of reproductive metaphors into the jargon of nuclear technology:

After the "successful" testing of the first hydrogen bomb, affectionately dubbed "Mike," —a bomb some 1,000 times more powerful than the atom bomb that destroyed Hiroshima — Edward Teller sent a telegram to Los Alamos proclaiming "It's a boy!" He was subsequently named the "father of the H-bomb" by the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

O'Brien sees the alienation of men from the life-giving process as being basic to the philosophy of dualism that permeates western beliefs, the most pernicious being the dualisms that separate mind and body, self and other, man and environment, masculine and feminine. Also basic to this dualism is the gender role socialization process to which boys are subjected that insures that they will reject their own feminine attributes, and that they will separate and distance themselves from their early identification with mother. This dualism leads to a perception of women as inferior and worthy of contempt or attack, of people different than oneself as alien and "other" — the enemy. It underlies an attitude toward the environment of subduing and conquering it, an orientation toward knowledge as the acquisition of decontextualized technology. J. Robert Oppenheimer's statement about the creation of the atomic bomb is instructive in this regard: "It is my judgment in these things that when you see something that is technically sweet you go ahead and do it and argue about what to do about it only after you have had your technical success.

That is the way it was with the atomic bomb" (1954). And that seems to be the way it is with the continuing development of nuclear technology. There are over 100,000 nuclear technologists, most of them men, all over the world working at this moment in time to crack their own particular "technically sweet" problem, decontextualized from consideration of their personal responsibility for the consequences of that problem solution.

Conclusions

Though I have painted a rather black picture I, like most other feminists, consider the male and female characteristics to which I am pointing in this paper to be socially constructed, not biologically ordained. I consider gender differences associated with connectedness and separation to be deep ones, but they are a function of social practices and power structures and they are not unmalleable. They are largely due to the relegation to the female private sphere of the work and associated values involved in physical and emotional care-taking and the sustenance of life, to the denigration of everything female including the skills and values associated with life sustenance, and to the enormous power vested in the simple fact of being male — a power that is enforced at every level of human society, from the most macro to the most micro human interaction.

The work of feminist peace activists and researchers urges us to consider peace as much more than the absence of war, even of violence. The creation of peace will involve embracing values of care, responsibility, connectedness to other human beings and life forms, and commitment to the survival of the planet. It requires us to hold men in positions of power, whether nuclear technologists, industrialists or politicians, individually responsible for the consequences of their actions.

If one holds to a materialist perspective on social change, surely the discovery that the nuclear nightmare has the potential to destroy the planet, and the increasingly frequent demonstrations of that destructive potential are a sufficient material change in the experience of humankind to initiate massive historical change. We are seeing huge numbers of people awaken all over the world to the horror;

we must assure that those men in power do so as well.

Finally, lasting peace will exist when concerns about responsibility, care, the welfare of all are taken into every aspect of every human relationship, most particularly to the most intimate, and "private" ones of the family. The recognition that nuclear destruction, the modern version of war, is a logical extension of the war that men wage against women is basic. Men must give up power and privilege and begin to share not only in child care but all of the other physical and emotional care-taking activities of the private sphere, and women must demand that they do so. I must admit that I experience some deep misgivings as I write these words. I have a vision of nurseries all over the world being militaristically organized, children marching in and out of step, with their tiny rifles on their shoulders. However, Brock-Utne reported in her book on some work that has been completed in Sweden, not yet translated into English, that provides encouragement for men becoming involved in early childcare. "Good" fathers were identified, those who deeply cared for their children, respected their emerging personalities and tried to understand them on their own terms. The researchers found that the single feature that was characteristic of the good fathers was that they had spent a considerable amount of time in care-taking with their children. This was usually not a matter of choice, but rather was forced by circumstances such as the father's unemployment or the mother's ill health. Whatever the reason, simply spending time nurturing children seemed to have a humanizing effect on these fathers and to cause them to become connected to their children in meaningful, responsible ways.

In addition, we must move away from the distorted vision of proper "masculinity" and "femininity" for our children, and realize that it results in truncated versions of humanity for both, especially boys — a version of humanity that inevitably leads to violence and war. The view must be altered that the proper developmental path for boys' self development is toward ever greater separation and individuation from others. Clearly, there are a variety of features of the female gender role development that must be altered as well, the most important one being to move from devaluing to prizing girls'

developing skills in the areas of capacities to foster and value relationships and to care for others.

The gender role socialization processes that lead to distorted visions of masculinity and femininity are firmly grounded in the traditional patriarchal family form. Fortunately, there are a variety of alternatives to the patriarchal family form that are being lived out today, e.g., single-parent families which usually means woman-headed, gay and lesbian couples some of whom are raising children, communal living arrangements and so on. We must give credence and encouragement to alternative family forms, as well as working toward transformation of the traditional one.

[1]An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Psychological Association, June 1986.

References

Bernard, Jessie. (1974). *The Future of Motherhood*. New York: Penguin.

Brock-Utne, Birgit. (1985). *Educating for Peace: A Feminist Perspective*. New York: Pergamon.

Chodorow, Nancy. (1978). *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

Daly, Mary. (1978). *Gynecology; the Metaethics of Radical Feminism*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Dinnerstein, Dorothy. (1977). *The Mermaid and the Minotaur*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Dobesh, R. Emerson and Dobesh, Russell. (1979) *Violence Against Wives*. New York: Free Press.

Easlea, Brian. (1983). *Fathering the Unthinkable: Masculinity, Scientists, and the Nuclear Arms Race*. London: Pluto Press.

Gilligan, Carol. (1981). *In a Different Voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Greenglass, Esther. "A Social-Psychological View of Marriage for Women." Inaugural address to the Institute on Women, Section on Women and Psychology, C.P.A., Toronto, June 1981.

Maccoby, Eleanor. (1980). *Social Development, Psychology, Growth and the Parent-Child Relationship*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Miller, Jean Baker. (1984). *The Development of Women's Sense of Self*. The Stone Center Work in Progress Series, No. 12.

O'Brien, Mary. (1980). *The Politics of Reproduction*. London: Routledge-Kegan Paul.

Oppenheimer's testimony (1954). *In the Matter of J. Robert Oppenheimer*. Washington: Atomic Energy Commission.

Reardon, Betty A. (1985). *Sexism and the War System*. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Rich, Adrienne. (1978). *Of Woman Born*. New York: Bantam.

Roberts, Barbara. "Peace Studies and the War Against Women: A Survey of Research." Presented to the Canadian Peace Research and Education Association Annual Meeting, Univ. of Ottawa, June, 1982.

Roberts, Barbara. (1983). "No Safe Place: The War Against Women." *Our Generation*, 15, 7-26.

Roberts, Barbara. "Ain't Gonna Study War No More: Feminist Approaches to Peacework." Presented in the Women and Peace Lecture Series, Univ. of Toronto, September, 1984.

Surrey, Janet. (1984). *The Self-in-Relation: A Theory of Women's Development*. The Stone Center Work in Progress series, No 84-02.

Williams, T.M., Zabrack, M.L. and Harison, L.F. (1980). "Some Factors Affecting Women's Participation in Canada." *Canadian Psychology*, 21, 97-108.

The Grass Is Like Me

The grass is like me.
It learns to love life
Only after feet have crushed it.
By becoming wet
Does it mean to show
Modesty's warmth, or
Passion's heat?

The grass is like me.
As it lifts its head
The mower
Promising to turn it to velvet
Levels its lifting top.

You really labour
To put women down.
But the desire to grow
Dies neither in the earth
Nor in the woman.
Hear me.
The old idea to make a track was good.
Those who shy from the heat of courage
Will still be trampled
To make tracks for authority.
But they are straw,
Not grass.
The grass is like me.

Kishwar Naheed