Working Out: New Directions for Women's Studies. Eds. Hilary Hinds, Ann Phoenix, and Jackie Stacey. 1992. London and New York: RoutledgeFarmer, 2012. P/bk 208 pp. ISBN 0-75070-044-0. Price $62.00.

New Frontiers in Women's Studies: Knowledge, Identity, and Nationalism. Eds. Mary Maynard and June Purvis. 1996. Oxford: Taylor & Francis, 2013. P/bk 256 pp. ISBN 0-7484-0288-8. Price $58.00.

It has been a little over twenty years since Hinds, Phoenix, and Stacey published this work on the future of Women's Studies, but many essays here are still relevant. Claims that the discipline is "vulnerable to cut-backs and marginalization" in universities are as true in 1992 as they are today, and the editors are primarily concerned with providing essays that respond to theoretical developments as well as how Women's Studies is practiced inside and outside the classroom (1). The book is organized into four sections: the first emphasizes praxis and politics, the second commonalities and differences, followed by "international feminisms" (what we would call "transnational feminism" or "global feminism" today), and finally ending with essays that address theories and methods.

Some of the concerns raised are unsettling in that the early 1990s is often considered the beginning of Third Wave feminism; for example, in Maureen McNeil's essay, "Pedagogical Praxis and Problems: Reflections on Teaching about Gender Relations," she worried that the proliferation of feminism in the university also meant its dilution. She appealed for "more open forums of feminist pedagogy" that addressed power dynamics in the classroom, encouraged students to understand feminism outside their own current experiences, and the creation of assignments that exposed rather than reinforced intersectionality (19). McNeil was anxious about the endless specification and sensitivities regarding diversity in language, and that concern has only heightened in our politically-correct culture and the post-modern approach to feminist language post-Third Wave.

Many of McNeil's concerns have been addressed in feminist scholarship, although that is not always the case. In Deborah Philips and Ella Westland's article, "Men in Women's Studies Classrooms," the authors used qualitative sociological methods to determine how to better allow for men's experiences and presence in female-dominated Women's Studies

classrooms. While their findings showed that some men were engaging in feminist scholarship, there was still a huge disparity between genders. Philips and Westland argued that Women's Studies must be cognizant of the difference of experience, yet did not offer many solutions on how to address this issue. Nevertheless, this is still a relevant question that is rarely discussed in current feminist scholarship, which is to the detriment of Women's and Gender Studies as a whole.

I am surprised by the lack of attention given to queer theory and gender differences; it is also troubling that the only sexual delineations are the binaries hetero- and homo-sexual. Fortunately race and ethnicity is regarded as far more diverse, with essays accounting for Australian, British, European, Middle Eastern, African-American, African, and Caucasian experience. Muslim women are included as the subject of one essay, but without any other religion present it is difficult to perform any comparative analysis. The book also feels a bit disjointed, because the articles either use sociological methodology and case studies, or are less formal, employing personal ruminations on feminism in the classroom. Much of the data complied here feels dated, but many of the initial questions and conclusions are still debated and discussed in the field.

The collection of articles in New Frontiers in *Women's Studies: Knowledge, Identity and Nationalism,* published four years later, has a more updated approach on the future of Women's Studies: they are concerned with global challenges to the "boundaries of a hegemonic white and Western Women's Studies," the parameters of feminist knowledge, and the "new frontier" of the discipline that directed "attention to women's experiences of migration and nationalist struggles, together with the consequences of these for their sense of self, worth, and identity" (1). Now widely considered transnational feminism, this was nevertheless an innovative and "under-researched" area in the mid-1990s. The book is separated into two parts: the first seven articles refer to anti-racism, postcolonialism and feminism in China, post-communist countries, Edwardian England, and the Czech Republic; the second section is comprised of six articles detailing Sikh women in England, Irish women, women activists in India, and East German women.

One of the best essays in this collection is June Purvis' article on English suffragettes, "Reassessing Representations of Emmeline and

Christabel Pankhurst, Militant Feminists in Edwardian Britain: On the Importance of a Knowledge of our Feminist Past." These women were previously written into a liberal framework that ignored their feminist approach to politics and their sophisticated analyses of male dominance. Purvis reclaims their motivations and calls for current feminists to recognize these women as acting within a feminist paradigm that questioned why they have hitherto been situated outside of that paradigm. There are still too few scholars reclaiming feminist foremothers in time periods outside the twentieth century, and thus we are less "aware of the way in which the stories on which we rely for knowledge about key feminist figures in the past have been socially constructed and culturally produced" (89).

The access the Internet provides, as well as the ubiquity of girl power slogans and ideals (from Girl Scouts to the Spice Girls), has afforded most of the Western world a familiarity with feminism and feminist goals, however watered down. A distressing problem with this familiarity is the idea that we are in a post-feminist era in which Women's Studies work has been completed. While many of these articles listed here seem dated in terminology or scholars referenced, they still hold valuable questions for current and future feminist scholars to grapple with.

Karen Smyth
Saint Louis University