

ont suivi avidement le déroulement des activités dans tous les pays impliqués, entrevues à la radio, à la télévision, entretiens dans les presses du monde. Les conférencières se promenaient de villes en villes, de pays en pays, les féministes les attendaient avec curiosité. Elles levaient des fonds pour défrayer leurs dépenses, demandaient un taux d'entrée. Cette petite équipe a même organisé un symposium international à Montréal en 1973, l'hôte étant l'Université McGill. De leur côté, les féministes francophones du Québec n'ont pas voulu former de groupes en faveur du salaire ménager. Toutefois, le journal « Québécoises debouttes », a publié une longue entrevue avec Mariarosa Dalla Costa et Selma James lors de leur passage à Montréal en 1973. Aussi, la pièce « Moman travaille pas, à trop d'ouvrage » produite par le Théâtre des cuisines, a beaucoup contribué à faire connaître dans tout le Québec la perspective du salaire au travail ménager.

Cette énorme tâche fournie par une équipe restreinte n'a pas toujours été populaire. En 1977, le CFI montre de signes d'essoufflement. On sentait que deux débats s'affrontaient : les théoriciennes marxistes anglophones n'étaient pas populaires chez les militantes dont le débat sur le terrain portait surtout sur le bien-fondé de la revendication du salaire pour/contre le travail ménager. De plus on sentait une divergence dans les intentions des « leaders » qui a miné l'envergure du CFI qui a finalement disparu en 1978 sous cette appellation. En guise d'épilogue, Louise Toupin rapporte une entrevue qu'elle a eue avec Silvia Federici en 1996 et complétée en 2013 dans laquelle elle lui pose deux questions: «La politique du salaire au travail ménager est-elle toujours actuelle?» Silvia a répondu: «Oui, mais sur une base plus large. Il ne s'agit pas de demander seulement que le travail ménager soit payé, mais

aussi de réclamer que d'autres moyens de reproduction soient moins sujets aux manipulations monétaires : des maisons, des services de santé, des espaces communautaires.»

Une autre question pertinente de Louise: «Quelles leçons spécifiques à tirer de l'expérience du CFI ? Silvia a répondu: «Une des limites du CFI a été la tendance à interpréter de façon rigide, trop centralisée et trop hiérarchisée le rôle du leadership. Ce qui n'aurait pas été possible s'il s'était agi d'un mouvement de masse où les gens prennent de façon autonome les décisions sans attendre la permission du leadership.»

Jeanne Maranda is a founding member of CWS/cf, where she remains its French language editor. Her life work has been improving woman's images in the media, in advertising, and breaking down barriers in industry, education, and job equity.

THE END OF PATRIARCHY: RADICAL FEMINISM FOR MEN

Robert Jensen
North Melbourne, Australia:
Spinifex Press, 2017

REVIEWED BY DEBRA M. HAAK

Literature about radical feminism, whether supporting or rejecting its structural analysis of women's oppression in patriarchal society, generally speaks to and is written from the perspective of women. One of the biggest contributions of Robert Jensen's book *The End of Patriarchy: Radical Feminism for Men* is, therefore, the fact that it engages with radical feminist theory from a male perspective, with a male audience in mind. Jensen's argument is that the toxic masculinity associated with and found in patriarchal societies is

harmful to both women and men, and that radical feminism has the potential to not only liberate women but also allow men to more fully claim their humanity. He leverages his presumed authority as a man to argue that the system that gives him that authority is dangerous for men. His introductory discussion of radical feminist theory from the perspective of a newcomer makes this book a particularly useful read for anyone unfamiliar with the core arguments animating radical feminist positions on rape, prostitution, pornography, and transgenderism.

Jensen begins his exploration of radical feminism through a consideration of the key and related concepts of sex, gender, and patriarchy. Central to Jensen's exploration of radical feminism is the distinction he draws between sex and gender. He identifies three categories of biological human sex, based on the material reality of who can potentially reproduce with whom: male, female, and intersex. He distinguishes gender from sex, referring to gender as the meaning that societies create out of these sex differences. Jensen describes patriarchy as the system of social practices and structures by which men exert control over, oppress, and exploit women. Throughout the book, he points to the adverse impact of patriarchy on him personally and on men generally whilst also acknowledging that patriarchy delivers some benefits to men depending on their individual attributes and their willingness to play by patriarchy's rules. Patriarchy, he argues, offers no benefits to women.

Drawing on radical feminist theory, Jensen argues that gender in contemporary societies serves to support patriarchal hierarchy. He suggests ending patriarchy's hierarchical system as a starting point for challenging domination/subordination dynamics at work in other areas of human life. Where radical feminism is generally

associated with the aim of abolishing gender as a means of undermining the patriarchal domination of women by men, however, Jensen sees a more productive role for gender. He argues that the existence of sex differences will invariably result in gendered stories, and we ought to focus on constructing our gender stories about sex differences to advance “collaboration and egalitarianism rather than hierarchy and domination.”

From this conceptual foundation, Jensen considers three contemporary issues: rape and rape culture, prostitution and pornography, and transgenderism. First, he argues that to stop sexual violence, we must consider how men are socialized in patriarchy and move beyond focusing only on acts legally defined as rape. He extends his discussion of how women should not be forced to have sex they don't want to have to prostitution and pornography. Here Jensen sets out the radical feminist position that prostitution is rooted in the subordinate status of women, thereby causing harm through its existence and through its practice. Identifying that pornography usually now involves sex enacted within a domination/subordination dynamic, Jensen argues that focus should shift from the choices women make to participate in pornography to the choices men make – to seek pleasure from viewing women being dominated and sexually degraded. Finally, in his discussion of transgenderism, Jensen argues that patriarchy's rigid, regressive, and reactionary gendered roles constrain the healthy flourishing of both men and women. The question is thus not whether transgender people exist but, rather, how to understand and respond to their experiences. He suggests that men who claim the identity of women or vice versa as a means of responding to their experiences of their sex and gender reinforce the rigidity of

existing gendered norms, which has the effect of bolstering rather than challenging patriarchal ideology.

This book is a personal account. Jensen's discovery of radical feminism allowed him to make sense of his own experience of sex and gender in patriarchal society in a meaningful and productive way. Jensen acknowledges the existence of a range of feminist theoretical frameworks, noting that if there is currently a dominant perspective, it is postmodern rather than radical in character. Those whose feminism focusses less on the structural features of the patriarchal system and more on maximizing individual choices for women will disagree with many of Jensen's arguments, most notably his discussion of transgender issues.

Debra M. Haak is an Adjunct Professor at Osgoode Hall Law School. She recently completed her PhD at Queen's Law. Her research is motivated by a concern over how law and policy in Canada contend with the different and at times divergent interests of individuals and groups in a diverse society. Her PhD thesis considered the intractable debate over prostitution and sex work policy in Canada.

REFUSE: CANLIT IN RUINS

Hannah McGregor, Julie Rak, and Erin Wunker
Toronto: Book*hug, 2018

REVIEWED BY AMBER MOORE

Refuse: CanLit in ruins, edited by Hannah McGregor, Julie Rak, and Erin Wunker, is a force; borrowing from poet Kai Cheng Thom, this project “seriously/ crack[s] open ‘CanLit.’” This collection of re-

sponses to what contributor Alicia Elliott infamously calls a “raging dumpster fire” achieves what Sara Ahmed—an intersectional feminist philosopher drawn from heavily in this text—advocates for: attending to the bumps in feminist work. Certainly, this is an importantly bumpy book. In it, activists, authors, poets, and scholars critically examine and situate the current conversations and controversies in the English-Canadian Literature world. An anchoring introduction positions the project and its curators as goal-oriented; they endeavour to both archive and create new space for feminist activist labour and art that responds to CanLit's systemic problems, including issues of appropriation, class, colonialism, erasure, racism, and rape culture. As such, it is organized in three sections: “Refusal,” “Refuse,” and “Re/fuse,” all preceded by bold introductions.

Part one, “Refusal,” centres the notion of rupture in CanLit—moments of breakage and subsequent pushback against systemic oppression—or, as kim goldberg seems to poetically conceptualize it: the “needles,” “mould,” and “bat shit” that bury and diminish. For example, Zoe Todd begins the section by entangling the reader in “Rape culture, CanLit, and you” as she reflects on the impact of rupture event UBCAccountable—“how it sits with us”—and more generally, the violences embedded in university processes for dealing with rape culture including sexual assault, misconduct, and harassment—all “The You Know” incidents, as Jane Eaton Hamilton describes them in her piece. Also included here is artful, analytical work by Keith Maillard, kim goldberg, Tanis MacDonald, and Gwen Benaway. Lucia Lorenzi's important essay bookends the section, reads as a sharp refusal to acknowledge violence as anything but a longstanding legacy of racist rupture events motivated by institutional self-interest and sys-