

strategies for change in women's lives. As research on women and higher education, Moss's empirical findings are somewhat bound by the specificity of the locality and the curricula that these women were pursuing. I had the impression that the interview material drew disproportionately on the women living off campus and of those with family responsibilities. How might findings differ if, for example, the study had involved higher proportions of younger women, a larger urban setting or type of institution, students from middle and higher income backgrounds, current international students, or those pursuing courses that required laboratory or field time, and not mostly classroom education, essay writing and exams? As a "book," this work retains the somewhat laborious style of a doctoral dissertation—densely written and extensive reviews of the literature, repetition in the structure of each chapter (what it will do, what it does, what it did), and, for current readers, the limitation that the literature reviewed is mostly from the 1990s or earlier. Nevertheless, it remains a useful contribution to the literature for widening understanding of the meanings of higher education for women, as well as for its attention to diversity among women and the complexities that need to be negotiated to make changes in educational systems that continue to present constraints of time and space.

Janice Monk
University of Arizona

Karen M. Morin and Jeanne Kay Guelke (eds.), *Women, Religion and Space; Global Perspectives on Gender and Faith* (Syracuse University Press, Syracuse: 2007), 216 pp.

First, a disclaimer: I am not a geographer. My interest in space as an analytic category is secondary to my interest in social and political critique, including feminist critique, of Judaism and Israel, and of human societies and their cultural history at large. It follows that I am impressed by the centrality of space as an analytic category not in itself, but only to the extent that it strikes me as a central concept that throws new light on the topic it deals with. Thus, I found that geographers such as Oren Yiftachel (1997) have indeed advanced the academic discussion of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict by standing previous research on its head and making the issue of space—the control of territory—the major prism for reexamining well-known facts. A different narrative has emerged and aroused new controversies.

Can the same be said about the present collection of articles, that bring the concept of space to the study of gender and religion? In all honesty, I think not.

When I weigh the Israeli–Palestinian power conflict against the men–women power conflict, I see a significant difference: whereas the former is about the control of a particular space, the latter is about something else, and the conflict over the control of certain spaces is merely an expression of that conflict, not its cause. This does not mean that space is not worthy of examination in the context of gender power conflicts, nor that it is not a central expression of that conflict; but I find it important to preface my account of the reading of this book with this distinction. And I should mention here that at least on one occasion my own research took me away from the gender-and-space conjunction as an explanatory angle, towards the ethnocracy-and-space conjunction. Puzzling over the inability of Israeli society to contain the group of Women of the Wall for so many years, I came to the conclusion that issues of control of the space in question (the Jewish prayer plaza in front of the Western Wall in Jerusalem) could only make sense if looked at through the prism of the Zionist–Palestinian conflict, and that once women try to assert their right as active partners in the fight over control of that space, their attempt to define the conflict as “women’s rights are human rights” is a non-starter, because in this case the territorial issue is a national issue and gender is subjected to it, rather than a category that stands alone (Shakdiel, 2002).

The articles gathered in the book under review cover a variety of locations—East Africa and South Africa, Jerusalem and Istanbul, Pakistan and the United States. Some of the research included here looks at contemporary societies, and some of it looks into the past, the era of colonialism and missionary work. All articles are packed with interesting accounts of women’s lives: I admit that I personally was intrigued above all by Jennifer Kopf’s account of Muslim women’s movements in colonial Tanganyika that were repressed by the German colonial regime by restricting their access to the sites of their worship, simply because this was new territory to me, and the pun is intended. But does the book offer an overall perspective on the title issue, about women, religion and space? Or at least, if the book’s editors organized the articles “by three distinct yet linked themes: women in colonial regimes, religion and women’s mobility, and new spaces for religious women” (p. xviii), are any new insights offered into each of those three themes? I am not sure.

One thought that occurred to me was the need to accentuate the disparity between the assumptions about public space as constructed by Western modernism, on the one hand, and traditional patriarchal societies, on the other hand. Indeed, this concern is mentioned by Anna Secor in her afterword to the book:

Why is freedom measured in terms of mobility instead of enclosure? ... Like religion, freedom is a discipline; it entails the internalization of particular modes

of moral conduct, a particular idea of the self, and a relationship to (secular or religious) law. If this is so, then it follows that when we aim to understand the broadest implications of religious ways of being for gendered, spatial practices, we need at once to examine the assumptions about freedom, choice and self-hood that we may bring to such an analysis (p. 155).

Unfortunately, I have not found this concern exposed in the articles of the book. What happens when modernist female researchers, nurtured by the axiom of public space as mixed space (and this includes, first and foremost, women sharing in the Knowledge that makes society run, be it the written Word, the Law or Science), such as Tovi Fenster, look at societies, such as Jewish ultra-orthodox urban neighborhoods in Jerusalem and elsewhere, where the ethos that reigns is the “unearned privilege” of males in the public sphere? Is this much different from the look of Western female tourists at the patriarchal land they tour, Pakistan, in Kathryn Besio’s article that details how restrictions on their dress and movements shape their learning experience in a new territory? Is it not also a dissonance between the very assumption of the divide between the public and the private that typifies liberal modernism, and the assumption that there can be no such divide because God and therefore His rules reign everywhere equally?

It seems to me that the unavoidable clash between modernism and patriarchy is experienced differently when looked at from within, by members of the society that struggles to balance the two poles. Both Banu Gokariskel, looking at veiling in Istanbul, a city that rocks between Ata Turk’s secularism and the present-day return to public expression of Islam, and HaeRan Shin, writing about Korean immigrant women to Los Angeles, manage to nuance better the issue of women’s agency as they face these dilemmas. Another instance of this nuancing I found in the chapter by the book’s editors, Jeanne Kay Guelke and Karen M. Morin, that describes the lives of missionary American women in the past as they created their own notion of space (and dress), which is neither the notion of their home community nor the notion of the one they came to change.

Another issue caught my attention in passing. Toward the end of the introduction, the editors point to a potential subject for further research: the recent shift of US female voters toward “moral values and homeland security policies with religious foundations” (p. xxxi). Work that has been done worldwide around the UN Security Council decision no. 1325, that demands the inclusion of women in all levels of policymaking around security issues, shows that the reality of women’s lives shapes for them a different understanding of the concentric geographical spaces—international, national and private home (D’ayef, Abramovitz and Eyal, 2007). They do not experience insecurity on all these “fronts” as inherently separate—let

the army worry over wars, let the police worry over safety in our streets, let me worry about my private home. Rather, women experience insecurity first and foremost at home and, if given a voice, demand a realignment of both home and foreign policies so that they and their dependents in the unequal societies of this world (children, the elderly, the sick) feel safer. I can only rephrase the above suggestion of the authors: it is time to reinforce 1325 by rereading women's call for policy change as a call for change in the dominant concept of spatiality.

I want to conclude with a note of frustration concerning the inadequate dealing with my own religion, Judaism, in this book. The inaccuracies of halachic details are numerous, but what is more important, I feel that the vast amount of research that has come out in the past decades about women and Judaism (Adler, 1998; Ross, 2004) is not taken into account, and I am referencing here only two prominent works. Closely related to feminist research is the recent work on Jews and the body (e.g., Boyarin, 1997). There is also a vast body of scholarship on Judaism and space, as distinguished from the accepted Western cultural notions of space: one popular work is Heschel's (1951) book on the Sabbath as a temple in time as opposed to space.

It would be interesting to link this literature with a complementary research question, following the well-trodden route of anthropologists Mary Douglas (*Purity and Danger*) and Sherry Ortner (male/female, culture/nature): if spirit is holier than body, and the world of matter at large, then space is in and by itself a contaminated dimension of reality. Jewish religion has dealt with this problem in the past by sanctifying space, spiritualizing it against itself, pretending it can do it by concentrating the impure materialism on women and then excluding them from the sancta. Can feminist Judaism reverse this trend? Will it do this by uprooting the negative view of space altogether, or by keeping the space–time dichotomy as is and spiritualizing all women? Come to think of it, these are not questions relating to Judaism only, but to all religions.

References

- Adler, Rachel. (1998). *Engendering Judaism: An Inclusive Theology and Ethics*. Philadelphia/Jerusalem: The Jewish Publication Society.
- Boyarin, Daniel. (1997). *Unheroic Conduct*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- D'ayef, Amani, Abramovitz, Dorit, and Eyal, Hedva. (2007). *Security and Resilience for Whom? Feminist Perceptions of Security*. Haifa: Isha LeIsha (Hebrew, Arabic and English).

- Heschel, Abraham Joshua. (1951). *The Sabbath: Its Meaning for Modern Man*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Ross, Tamar. (2004). *Expanding the Palace of Torah*. Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press.
- Shakdiel, Leah. (2002). "Women of the Wall: Radical feminism as an opportunity for a new discourse in Israel." *Journal of Israeli History: Politics, Society, Culture* 21(1–2):126–163.
- Yiftachel, Oren. (1997). "Israeli society and Jewish-Palestinian reconciliation: 'Ethnocracy' and its territorial contradictions." *Middle East Journal* 51(4):505–519.

Leah Shakdiel
Sapir College

Edna Gorney, *Exploited and Protected: Ecofeminist Theory of Nature, Culture and Society in Israel*
(Pardes Publishing, Haifa: 2011),
146 pp. (Hebrew).

The ways we understand nature (and the world) prescribe the way we treat it, and these ways of understanding are ideological. Gorney's engrossing account deconstructs some common understandings of nature that were crucial in determining praxis in the first few decades of the Israeli state. She couples them with the dominant Zionist ideology to show how the latter shaped the former. Gorney reads into the dominant national ideology in an effort to bring to the surface marginal and alternative ways of thinking about and behaving toward nature that did not prevail.

The two parts of this book mesh the allegedly conflicting discourses and treatments of nature—exploitation and protection—into a dialectical alignment in two ways. First, exploitation and protection are seen as entangled, as two sides of the same coin—dominating nature. Second, they are seen as political acts, driven from a certain ideological foundation. Examining discourses and treatments of nature in this way allows for different kind of questions to be asked, questions about the conceptual paradigm from which actions and decisions regarding nature are being made. These questions untangle the equating of "scientific" with "objective" in pursuit of ideological underpinnings. Within this structure of argumentation, Gorney also squarely positions her own scientific gaze within the prism of ecofeminism.

In the first part of her book, Gorney insightfully analyzes and compares two narratives