

uncovering of losses and questioning the possibility of modernist goals like progress and liberation threatens to transform the field into something not yet imagined.

Susan Heald's essay troubles the bedrock of Women's Studies¹: the social and political import of autobiography and reflexivity. She tells us that students often refuse a reflexive approach due to the "indisputability" of positivism, individualism, a predominant pedagogical attitude that discourages student accountability for learning, and the institutional position of the university. She examines what is arguably *the* most frustrating moment of teaching: when students don't "get it," and a well-crafted assignment fails to illuminate students in the ways we wished for. Heald argues that it is critical for Women's Studies to "interrupt" the liberal-humanist subject that is produced when a singular history of Women's Studies is "passed on," and that reading and learning practices of autobiography can contribute to this process of interruption.

Ann Braithwaite's analysis of autobiographical accounts about the creation of Women's Studies programs in Canada maintains that a disconcerting and common attribute of these narratives is their failure to "double back" upon themselves to ask questions about why these stories are being told now, and what purpose they might be serving. Two consistent features highlighted by Braithwaite are nostalgia for the radical, activist past of Women's Studies in comparison to an overly-intellectual and academic present, and the assertion that race, sexuality, and class have always been central to Women's Studies analyses. These features operate to trivialize the present of Women's Studies, erase and refuse critiques of the (inter)discipline, and bar the possibility of reflexivity and responsibility that is so key to Women's Studies. Braithwaite explores the possibilities that might be opened up if these narratives are read reflexively.

Susanne Luhmann's essay explores

the ambivalent attachments that many of us have to women's studies. Luhmann argues that we might read this ambivalence as a response to a melancholic attachment to the glorious, singular history of women's studies (that likely never existed) rather than as a deteriorating commitment to the field. Perhaps most importantly, ambivalence embraces a love for women's studies in tandem with sustained critique of the field, a position that resists the potential for moralism and stagnation that arise from shoring up a stable definition of the field. Written from the perspective of a scholar who is not only teaching, but also received her graduate training in women's studies, Luhmann's piece illuminates the complicated positions and tensions of coming to women's studies from the academy.

Finally, Sharon Rosenberg uses a novel methodology of looking away from (and then back again) at Women's Studies. She looks away to the Montreal massacre, and as she looks back at Women's Studies, she argues that the emblemization of fourteen murdered women as symbolic of *all* women who experience men's violence is analogous to the emblemization of "women" as a category of analysis in Women's Studies. What happens when we in W/women's S/studies distend the category of "women" as a totalizing category is that we cover over and disavow the losses engendered by the radical challenges posed by difference to W/women's S/studies. Rosenberg's astute analysis offers up the possibilities for "getting lost" in these challenges and losses as a method by which we can rethink and recreate the field.

This provocative collection is a significant contribution to the field of Women's Studies, and is essential reading particularly for teachers, but also for those who have many other investments in the (inter)discipline.

Rachel Hurst is a doctoral candidate in Women's Studies at York University,

and holds a master's degree in Women's Studies from Simon Fraser University. She studies femininity and beauty, vernacular photography, cosmetic surgery, psychoanalysis, decolonizing, feminist methodologies, and the relationship between grief and pedagogy. Rachel teaches in Fine Arts Cultural Studies at York and has taught in Social Science and Women's Studies at York and Simon Fraser.

¹In this review, I follow the individual author's textual preference of representing "Women's Studies" in print: as Women's Studies, women's studies, or W/women's S/studies. Each offers an explanation of her decision in the book.

REMOVING BARRIERS: WOMEN IN ACADEMIC SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING AND MATHEMATICS

Jill M. Bystydzienski and Sharon R. Bird, Eds.
Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2006

REVIEWED BY BRIER KM FERGUSON

Removing Barriers explores the history and current barriers, and suggests improvements for women who are students and professors in academic science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). The chapters present evidence regarding the consistently low numbers of women enrolling in STEM fields, despite there being no statistical evidence suggesting a difference in capability in maths and sciences between men and women. The overall conclusion is that barriers to increasing the proportion of women in STEM fields are systemic. Suggestions focus around how departments and universities