

curriculum gives the reality of women's lives a central place.

We're always told that we're just another interest group. But we're fifty-two percent of the population. So the marginalization of women's issues is nonsense. These are issues that have influence upon the majority of the population, and they have to be further mainstreamed so that they become part of everyone's world view.

Incorporating feminism into the curriculum is more than just a matter of telling students and other significant writers, politicians, and other women in history. It seems to concern writing feminism across and into the disciplines, and changing the very form and content of what is taught.

Adding information about the lives of women to curriculum content is important. But that's not enough. The commonsense idea of sexism is that women are ignored by the culture, and we have to go beyond that and understand that the entire definition of knowledge and the curriculum itself is male-defined. We have to ask: How would this be different if women had had an equal say in developing it?

In fact, while there are significant women in history, women have not been permitted an equal role in developing knowledge. We're not saying that you shouldn't read Shakespeare because he's a man. What we're saying is now that women have struggled to participate in a much more central way in society than we were permitted in the past, how does that change the way we teach?

It's now two years since Marc Lepine entered the University of Montreal engineering department, separated fourteen women from the students there, and shouted "You're all a bunch of feminists" before killing the fourteen. Have you been encouraged or discouraged by the response of campus culture and the academic establishment to the massacre?

Both. There's no question that the massacre created a hugely increased public consciousness of violence against women. The other thing it did was not make me and a lot of other people issue directly involved in the violence issue look much more deeply into that issue. On campus, the response so far has

been very uneven. This year universities and community colleges had date rape consciousness programs in orientation, they're tending toward "safe campus" policies and programs like student escort services.

But we still have deans more concerned with their schools' reputations than with the safety of women on campus. They continue to discourage charges against men and women who would proceed with these changes—the recent sexual assault case at the University of Cape Breton University being an example.

The initial response from English Canada to the massacre was disturbing. We had a debate about the meaning of the murder. Lepine told us exactly what he was doing, yet there had to be a debate over its meaning.

But in English Canada, it's since been accepted that Marc Lepine was a symptom of a sickness in society. In women's movement there has even been accused of using this event for their own purposes. Overall, however, I'm encouraged by the response. But we have to be very careful that two things don't happen.

The first is that we get numb to the violence and not realize how profound the answers are to demand that the institution we're part of should defend us against violence. This is true of universities. A university is violence-free creating a harassment and violence-free campus. Women have to mobilize to make sure that that happens.

Often they get vilified, like they did at Queen's over the "no means no" campaign after a number of assaults on the campus. There was tremendous excitement around anti-sexism and anti-racism there, then an anti-politically correct student council got in.

Young people have to realize that there's always a backlash against social change. If you let it stop you, you'll never change anything. The notion that the women's movement had an easy ride until recently, and now there's a backlash, is nonsense. We've never had more support than we have now, both in the mainstream and in the movement. It was much more isolating to be a feminist in the 1960s and 1970s. This mythology that there was a massive movement back

then, and that everybody accepted it, is crap. The other thing, and something Rosemary Brown has said, is a slogan from the civil rights movement that goes like

"Universities are in many ways the last bastion of male chauvinism"

this: "Keep your eyes on the prize, and don't sweat the small stuff." One tragedy shouldn't keep us from pursuing the large goals.

Have you seen improvements for those women who have kept their eyes on the prize and, for example, joined university faculty?

It's terrible for them. Today, 17 per cent of full-time professors are women, compared to 13 per cent in 1970-71. I entered university in 1964, as part of the big, late 1950s wave of women entering universities. The hiring record in universities and community colleges has to be looked at more cynically, because women had a presence in post-secondary education for much longer than we've had in business or the professions.

Moreover, we've made even less progress in terms of positions of influence. Only 11.2 per cent of faculty with administrative responsibility are women. The same is true of women working at the staff level as registrars. Even if women registrars have the same job description as their male counterparts, they often have less responsibility than their male counterparts. The university is still an old boys' club.

If you look at tenure-track positions, you'd think they would be hiring 90 or 100 per cent women. But they're not. They're still not hiring the majority of women at tenure-track positions. Yet the most exciting academic work is being done by women.

1. David Black is a graduate student in Social and Political Thought at York, and a part-time instructor at Wilfrid Laurier University.

Crimming for exams.



Canada's #1 Candy Bar.