

性別研究資訊

目錄

編者語

強權與抗爭

葉漢明	編者語	第一頁
蔡寶瓊 區潔珍	校園性騷擾研究	二
區潔珍 游黎麗玲	本港“婦女問題關注團體”調查簡報	五
區潔珍	一九九二年兩性角色交流會報告：工作環境中的性騷擾	六
陳錦華	房屋問題研究再定向	七
何書心	同學：記一個婦女中心的英語班（英文）	八
司徒伯紹	如何做一個今日男性？（英文）	十一
史德莎	男人看《鐵人約翰：一本關於男人的書》（英文）	十二
何漪蓮	書評——《兩個世界之間的華裔女作家》（英文）	十三
彭麗瓊	書評——《你就是不了解》（英文）	十五
葉漢明	編者語 （英文）	十六

徵稿

《性別研究資訊》是一份中英文的雙語通訊刊物，園地公開，歡迎有關性別問題的稿件如短文、報告、評論及消息等。來稿請寄香港中文大學香港亞太研究所性別研究計劃收。稿件請盡量以電腦磁碟形式投寄，並附上打印稿。本刊下期截稿日期為九三年一月一日。

葉漢明

本期一位作者提出：性騷擾問題存在已久，但到今天才成為公開討論的課題。這種遲來的討論，其實關乎一套人權、平等和公義的價值觀念在檢視兩性關係方面的應用，和近年世界的急劇變化不無關係，也預示了時代轉型期中新知識型構的建成。當然，傳統觀念在受到挑戰時並不會馬上消失，而既得利益者也往往為保持現狀而自衛頑抗。把性騷擾問題“邊緣化”的反應就是要抗拒兩性關係改變的潮流。根深蒂固的性別定型論和性別等級觀其實反映了現實世界的權力序列。性騷擾受害者所受的傷害是雙重性的，在侵犯者的背後還有一個支撐的制度。故在界定性騷擾問題時，須注意的不僅是個人，還有社會制度和權力結構。“性騷擾是個權力問題，而非性慾問題。”這是性騷擾問題研究者的共識。

要抵抗強權，就要結集鬥爭的力量、提高政治意識、建立聯繫網絡、加強組織和採取動員策略。本期一篇報導一個婦女英語學習班情況的文章，就提供了一個透過社區組織建立姐妹情誼紐帶和發揮婦女力量的例子。另一篇文章在介紹本港關注婦女問題的團體時，提及這類機構的政治化傾向和對提高婦女意識方面的影響。要爭取社會權利和地位，就要對公共政策的制定發揮影響力。本期一位作者指出香港的公共房屋設計和分配政策強化了男女不平等的狀況，他強調在房屋及城市問題的研究上，必須兼顧性別的向度。

從性別的角度去審視問題還可對一般成說作出檢討，因為不少說法只是兩性中較強勢的一方所提出的。認識兩性對事物的不同看法，是消除誤解和歧視的重要步驟。性別歧視現象當然關乎兩性的權力差距，但也和無知有關。本期所評的新書就涉及男女行為風格特點和對問題看法的比較。其中一本關於“男性形象”的書所揭櫫的就是近年興起的“新男性運動”理想，強調男子性格中可取的方面。一篇由本港一個男子聯誼會成員所撰的文章也有類似觀點。有關男女性情不同的問題卻頗具爭議性，例如，存在主義論者就反對人性不變之說，而着重人的“歷史性”。爭論不休的是：究竟人的特性在多大程度上是歷史和文化塑造成的？性別文化的差異又如何反映出社會的權力序列？有關問題的進一步深入探討仍有待開展。性別研究畢竟是個新闢的領域。在對抗強權的鬥爭中，我們是否還須對權力本身作出反思？現狀的真正的改善端賴人類自身的大徹大悟，否則，“權力腐敗”的鐵律仍將繼續發揮作用。

主編：葉漢明
編輯委員會：梁綺君、陸鴻基、葉漢明、蔡寶瓊、Tessa Stewart
出版者：香港中文大學香港亞太研究所性別研究計劃（主任：張妙清）

第四期（1992年9月）

校園性騷擾研究

蔡寶瓊、區潔珍

簡介

香港中文大學亞太研究所轄下的性別研究計劃，於今年夏季剛完成一項大學校園性騷擾的研究。參與研究的成員包括教育學院的蔡寶瓊、區潔珍，以及心理學系的張妙清、鄧素琴。這類研究在本港尚屬首次，因而在大學內外，都引起了很大的反應。（一九八三年一位美國管理及市場學教授曾在港進行一項類似研究，但對象則為就業青年。見《香港經理》1984年5月）

這項研究由九一年秋天開始，共分三個階段進行：

（一）搜集世界各地大學有關校園性騷擾的資料，包括研究報告、政策、處理程序，以及校方出版的宣傳教育單張；

（二）邀請本校的一些男女本科生及研究生，分組進行討論，藉此對這個從未在本地進行過的課題作一初步了解，及總結出一些有意義的指標和問題，供進一步設計問卷，以作調查研究之用。這程序在九二年一月內完成；

（三）在校內進行大型問卷調查，對象為本科生及研究生，主要量度他們對性騷擾問題的態度、經歷及見聞、對校方處理手法的期望等。這程序由三月開始，一直到五月底完成。（見表一）

表一：校園性騷擾調查工作日程

1991年9月	搜集文字資料：各地研究報告、各大學關於性騷擾問題單張、及處理個案程序
1992年1月	小組討論：男女同學各兩組
1992年3月	設計問卷及預試
1992年4-5月	派發問卷
1992年5月	整理資料及分析結果

各地大學對性騷擾的取向

我們通過搜集各地大學有關性騷擾資料發現，北美洲（包括美國、加拿大）、澳洲、紐西蘭等地，從八十年代中後期開始，已採取和確立一個十分清晰的立場和政策。首先，校方聲明性騷擾在國家法律之下，屬於性別歧視的一種，是不可以容忍的行為。其次，各地大學都有明文規定處理這類投訴的程序。這些程序大同小異，大體都是鼓勵受害者向校內一個獨立的委員會或其個別成員申訴，而委員會（有些大學稱之為聯絡員）在尊重投訴者意願及被投訴者權利的前提下，盡早阻止進一步的傷害。如投訴只是基於誤會，委員會或聯絡員會協助澄清；如有濫用權力或不公義的情況，也會在投訴者的同意下，考慮採取紀律行動或幫助投訴者採取法律行動。

當然，在校內成立正規處理性騷擾渠道，並不表示這問題就會完全解決以至根絕。正如強姦或非禮一樣，性騷擾對受害者似乎帶來雙重的羞辱：事件本身的傷害，再加上社會對受害者（通常是女性）的歧視。故此，受害者大多不願意出面投訴，寧願啞忍以迴避別人的歧視。不過，大學如果採取明確的政策及立場，至少能對受害者提供實際支持及精神鼓舞。

反觀香港的大專院校，不但不正面面對這個問題，而且還未展開有關的討論，可以說，在香港，性騷擾問題仍未“納入議程”，它尚屬一個十分邊緣的、看似無關痛癢的問題。正因如此，性騷擾所涉及的濫權、不公義及對人構成傷害的事實，也就一直不獲承認。

不過，即使本港大學校方願意面對性騷擾問題，這方面的進展也會有一定限制。香港沒有歐美、澳洲、加拿大、紐西蘭等國家所立的禁止性別歧視法案，故此，性騷擾在法律上最終是難以界定的。在這個環節上，目前香港婦女團體爭取要把《聯合國消除對婦女一切形式歧視公約》援引到本地的行動，可謂意義重大了。

對性騷擾的態度：兩性間的差距

在第二個研究階段裏，我們邀請了共十九位來自各個院系的男女本科生及研究生，按性別及級別分為四組，在一位同性導師引導下，討論他們對性騷擾問題的看法、經歷及態度等等。

雖然小組討論的目的是為大型調查問卷設計之準備，但因為交談方式使參與者可以較深入及全面地討論問題，而且在過程中能產生相互刺激、誘發新話題及思考的作用，故此這個階段的研究使我們獲得一些問卷調查所不能得到的資料。

總括來說，小組討論反映出兩性間對這問題的體會存在着極大的差距，導因實在於兩性在性騷擾方面經歷的差異。男性同學對這問題的態度很疏離，把它當作一件與己無大關係的事情來討論，故此執着於抽象的定義、概念等等。此外，不少男同學還表示不大願意討論這問題，因為通常的“騷擾者”為男性，故身為男性，自然在一定程度上感到有被指控的壓力。相反地，女同學從一開始就十分投入這個討論，雖然她們大多數沒有在校園內被性騷擾的經歷，但長久以來在公共交通工具上遭非禮的經驗或聽聞，以及由傳媒得知對非禮的報導，使她們容易掌握這個問題。不單如此，她們亦很能掌握受害者的反應及感受。一個最明顯的例子，是她們當中有人提出一個對投訴性騷擾的疑慮，就是擔心騷擾者的前途會受影響。這點與外國一些深入訪問受害者的發現完全吻合。可見香港的大學女生一向對性騷擾或類似問題有一定的接觸和思考。此外，部份男同學有一個擔憂，就是如果校方設

立處理性騷擾程序的話，可能出現男性講師、職員或同學受女同學誣告的情況。不過，從社會上歧視強姦、非禮，以至性騷擾受害人的一般情況，以及從女同學表示憂慮騷擾者一旦被揭發的話，前途會受影響的種種事實來看，男同學這個擔憂似乎稍嫌過慮了。

雖然兩性間對這個問題有着幾乎處於兩極的體會，但男女同學也有一個共通的理解，那就是性騷擾對他們來說，一定牽涉到權力差距和構成長期滋擾及傷害。因為權力不平衡的緣故，故此受害者往往不容易擺脫受騷擾的困境。

中大性騷擾問題：觀念、經歷及建議

第二階段小組討論完成後，我們就著手設計一份準備向全校同學派發的調查問卷。問卷除包括簡單的個人資料外，共分幾個部分：

- （一）對兩性的相對地位、行為規範等的態度；
- （二）對性騷擾問題的態度；
- （三）性騷擾的界定；
- （四）對中大校園內性騷擾情況的聽聞或親身經歷；及
- （五）對校方應採取行動之建議。

問卷調查在大概一個多月內完成，問卷主要通過學院的月會或週會、以及在宿舍內派發。受調查的同學約佔整體學生的一成，男女分佈與全校的男女比例也相若。（見表二）

表二：填答問卷者資料

類別		女	男	總數
本科生	學生總數	3,655 (50.3%)	3,612 (49.7%)	7,267 (100%)
	填答人數	382 (50.7%)	372 (49.3%)	754 (100%)
	填答者佔學生總數比例	10.5%	10.3%	10.4%
研究生	學生總數	453 (37.6%)	751 (62.4%)	1,204 (100%)
	填答人數	33 (39.3%)	51 (60.7%)	84 (100%)
	填答者佔學生總數比例	7.3%	6.8%	7.0%

因篇幅所限，本文只摘要地列出這次問卷調查的主要發現。首先，從結果中可見，男女生對性騷擾問題的認同有一定差距。整體來說，男女同學均不同意性騷擾只是婦解分子刻意製造出來的問題、只是兩性追求和互為欣賞的表現，或只是兩性相處的人際交往問題、甚或只是受害者的過敏反應而已。但一如所料，女生較容易承認這個問題的存在。（見表三）

表三：對性騷擾問題的態度

計分方法：	
非常不同意	1
有點不同意	2
沒有意見	3
有點同意	4
非常同意	5

	女 (平均值)	男
1. 男女都有機會受到性騷擾，但女性會把問題過份渲染。	2.3	3.1
2. 所謂「性騷擾」只是「受害者」對兩性相處的過敏反應而已。	1.6	2.1
3. 對一個能夠充分掌握人際交往技巧的人來說，所謂「性騷擾」問題根本不會發生。	1.7	2.0
4. 性騷擾問題其實源於兩性對男女相處採取不同的尺度。	2.7	3.2
5. 所謂「性騷擾」只是婦解分子刻意製造出來的問題。	1.5	2.1
6. 大部分所謂「性騷擾」行為只是兩性追求的表達手法而已。	1.8	2.1
7. 大部分所謂「性騷擾」行為只是男性欣賞女性的表現而已。	1.4	1.9
8. 目前校園性騷擾問題似乎並不存在的原因，是因為受害者啞忍而不作投訴。	3.2	3.1
9. 性騷擾與追求戀愛對象這兩類行為可以很容易地分辨開來。	3.9	3.7
10. 「性騷擾」的產生，不能歸咎於女性的衣著或姿態性感。	3.0	2.6

此外，我們發現對男女兩性平等的態度與承認性騷擾問題的真實性有正面相關性，即愈接受女性地位應與男性相若者，就愈覺得性騷擾問題確實存在。

至於有關中大校園內性騷擾的經歷，其情況如下：（見表四）

表四：校園內經歷的性騷擾

甲、曾經成為其他同學以下行為的受害者	女生	男生
	(百分比)	
撫摸性器官	0.6	1.1
強逼對方進行性行為	0.6	0.3
向對方提出性行為要求，作為給予某種利益的條件	0.8	0.3
親吻	1.4	0.6
按著或撫摸對方的腿部	2.6	1.9
發出有性含義的信件／電話	1.4	0.3
不適當地出示與性有關的材料（例如：幻燈片、照片、海報、單張等）	8.8	1.4
不必要的凝視，或作出性含義的動作／姿態	15.3	4.5
不必要的接近對方的身體	23.8	5.6
攔腰	6.5	2.5
按著或撫摸對方的手	7.7	2.5
搭肩、執手	24.2	4.5
以某一性別的身體或其他特徵為話題	17.9	11.7
講低貶某一性別的話題／笑話	22	11.1
不適當地向對方傾訴極私人的生活或感情問題	8.8	1.9
多次向對方提出約會要求以致對方感到厭煩	13.2	1.7

流觀點或感受這一點，女同學一般仍支持，但與男同學相較則較有保留。這結果我們在小組討論階段中早已發現：女同學歡迎同性之間討論性騷擾問題，俾能學習如何應付類似事件；但她們多不願意在異性面前討論這類問題，覺得有一定的壓力，大概她們不願意接受她們的性別多為受害一方這事實，又或者是受害者的經歷本身就是一種恥辱。不過，較少人（尤其是男同學）支持的，是校方設立獨立單位處理投訴的建議：68.8%女同學支持，而只有57.1%男同學同意。這點我們在小組討論階段也有相類的發現。

表五：對校方介入性騷擾問題的意見

	是		否	
	女	男	女	男
1. 所謂『性騷擾』只是個人問題校方不必介入	14.9	22.3	81.9	74.4
2. 應該在校內舉辦座談會或講座以引起關注。	74.1	66.3	21.8	28.4
3. 校方應舉辦講座，提供避免或應付性騷擾的方法。	80.0	77.4	15.9	18.4
4. 在校內舉辦座談會，讓男女同學交流觀點或感受。	77.2	81.9	18.9	14.5
5. 校方應設立獨立單位，處理性騷擾投訴。	68.8	57.1	26.7	37.6

結語

研究完成後，校外，尤其是報界十分感興趣，採訪的要求源源不絕。至於參與研究的個別成員，在院系同事之間也受到一定的關注，甚至是壓力。有一些同事表示支持，但也有同事（尤其是男性同事）表示這研究根本不應進行，認為對校譽有損，或根本就是“無事生事”。更普遍的反應，就是不作正面討論，而只以訕笑、譏諷的態度處理，使研究者無從答辯，其後果是把整個研究摒除於嚴肅討論之外，使整個問題“邊緣化”。

至於我們這個研究小組的態度是始終如一的，即“性騷擾”這課題，並不是無緣無故地冒升的，它一定是源於某一些社會轉變，包括價值觀念的轉變。“性騷擾”是一個頗新的概念，但這並不表示某一性別的成員借助某些地位（如上司、教授、講師等）所賦予的權力，通過言語或行動貶抑另一性別的現象在以前並沒有出現。相反地，這情況可能長久以來已存在，只是等到今天“人權”、“平等”這些價值觀念被廣泛地應用，以致用於檢視兩性關係這環節裏，才有人開始展開“性騷擾”這個課題的討論。

很多人批評“性騷擾”這概念是十分主觀的，沒有“客觀”的定義。我們則認為，這概念並非“主觀”；較為正確的說法是，它繫於一套關於人權、平等、公義的價值觀念。任何科學研究都是建基於某一些價值的，“性騷擾”研究所立足的，正是以上這些觀念。

蔡寶瓊是香港中文大學教育學院講師

區潔珍是香港中文大學教育學院導師

乙、曾經成為教職員以下行為的受害者

女生
男生
（百分比）

撫摸性器官	0.6	
強逼對方進行性行為	0.2	
向對方提出性行為要求，作為給予某種利益的條件	0.4	
親吻	0.6	
按著或撫摸對方的腿部	1.6	
發出有性含義的信件／電話	0.8	
不適當地出示與性有關的材料（例如：幻燈片、照片、海報、單張等）	1.0	
不必要的凝視，或作出性含義的動作／姿態	4.7	2.2
不必要的挨近對方的身體	10.4	1.1
摸腰	2.4	
按著或撫摸對方的手	3.7	
搭肩、執手	11.0	1.4
以某一性別的身體或其他特徵為話題	5.1	2.8
講低貶某一性別的話題／笑話	11.0	3.9
不適當地向對方傾訴極私人的生活或感情問題	3.9	1.1
多次向對方提出約會要求以致對方感到厭煩	4.3	11.4

一如所料，女生受這問題困擾者較男生為多，而且困擾之源多是同學而非教職員。不過，源於後者的騷擾也有發生。除了統計數字外，我們也邀請答卷者用文字寫下自己的經歷或感受。從部分同學的文字中，我們發現以下幾種情況：

（一）有男同學和極少數女同學不贊成進行這個研究，原因是他們並不承認性騷擾是個嚴重的問題，或根本否認有這問題存在；

（二）相反地，有少數受害者（多為女性，但亦有男性）對這研究表示極大支持，甚或覺得安慰，因為作為受害者，他們在被羞辱之餘，還得不到友人和同學的同情。故知道校園內有人確認這問題的存在並作出調查，這個事實本身已使他們感到十分鼓舞；

（三）有個別男同學指出校園內有男性同學間性騷擾的情況發生，主要是半戲謔性的觸摸對方性器官。這個發現是我們始料不及的。可能的解釋，是男性青少年間以玩弄、恥笑同性性器官，作為建立自己男性的、有權威的身份地位的手段。這是一個男性為權力中心的社會之“副產品”。

至於對校方介入性騷擾問題的意見，我們從下列表五可見，女同學一般較支持校方的介入，但對舉辦座談會，讓男女同學交

本港“婦女問題關注團體”調查簡報

區潔珍、游黎麗玲

前言

今日香港，兩性平等的觀念，似乎已被社會大眾普遍認同。然而，若深究社會實況，類似下述的真實個案，在草根階層仍屢見不鮮：

“一位主婦由於家用不足，必須在打理家務及育兒之餘，擔任外發工以補貼家用。她的雙重貢獻——持家及賺取生計，並未得到丈夫的認同，反而常遭抱怨：取回來加工的貨品，堆得房子凌亂不潔。她只好盡量在丈夫下班抵家前完成工作，收拾整齊，這種趕忙的生活，為她添了不少壓力。趕工時，更只好在丈夫及孩子入睡後，走到家門外，通宵達旦地在戶外工作。”

婦女面對的不合理處境，當然不止於此。在此情況下，本港關注婦女問題的各個組織，究竟如何開展它們的工作呢？本文嘗試指出有關團體的發展概況及存在困難。

調查方法

筆者於一九九〇年夏季著手進行研究，至一九九二年春季完成調查報告。

調查的對象，集中在關注婦女權益及婦女覺醒、推動兩性平等的本地團體。根據香港中文大學亞太研究所性別研究計劃於八九年十一月編製的《香港婦女組織通訊錄》的分類，計有婦權組織、婦女研究組織、服務性婦女組織、基層婦女組織、專業婦女組織、外籍婦女組織及婦女福利／聯誼組織等七類。筆者初步估計，前四類應與本研究的調查對象的關係較密切，後三類則似無關係。為求客觀，上述七類組織均曾發給問卷。

發給前四類組織的問卷共16份，收回13份，回收率令人滿意，達81.3%，發給後三類的問卷共65份，收回11份，回收率只有6.9%，但亦在意料之內。

就收回的問卷作初步分析後，我們再甄選一些活躍的團體進行訪問，受訪者共11個。此外，亦積極搜集各團體的有關刊物，如年刊、特刊、研究報告、活動宣傳單張、會訊等，藉以進一步了解各團體的主張及活動詳情。

本地“婦女問題關注團體”的發展路向

梁麗清在《昨日、今日、明日——婦進與婦運》（刊於新婦女協進會88-90年度會刊）一文中，曾建議本地婦運可朝本地化、多元化、羣衆化及政治化四大方向發展。據調查顯示，有關團體已正在實踐這些理想，而且還有“合作化”的特色。且分述如下：

一、本地化

世界各地的婦女運動雖均致力於爭取平等，但由於理念的不同，使“女性主義”（Feminism）也衍生不少派別，形成論爭。

本地關注婦女問題的團體，在組織策略上與西方社會不盡相同，並不大執着於以鮮明的理論派別作為團體的指導思想，只就具體事件進行爭取兩性平等的活動，這種務實作風，是婦女運動的“本地化”特色。

換言之，有關團體能合作與否，與派系分歧關係不大。如有關團體在爭取“夫婦分開評稅”行動中出現頗大爭論，爭論關鍵不在派別分歧而在階級問題。中產階級婦女爭取夫婦分開評稅，目標是去除因合併報稅帶來的損失，因為合併報稅使課稅率提高；但對於低收入婦女而言，總入息在免稅額以下者十分普遍，若獨立報稅，便不能盡用免稅額，以致比合併報稅所付出的稅款還要多。

即使與中產階級婦女組成的“爭取夫婦分開評稅”聯合委員會，也認為這是一個經濟問題，否決了“新婦女協進會”爭取刪去稅務條例中含有性別歧視字眼的建議。這種實事求是多於標榜婦女意識的作風，可說是“本地化”的一個具體例子。

二、多元化

由於本地關注婦女問題的團體並不強調在主義上尋求共識，只就個別事件進行合作，謀求兩性的平等；因此，“多元化”自然便成為這些團體的一項發展特色。下表的分類及團體舉隅，可反映“多元化”的特點：

關注 主要範圍 工作取向	廣泛地關注婦女問題	具特定的關注點/具特定關注點，亦關注一般婦女問題	時間性
學術取向	• 中文大學性別研究計劃（1985-）		
社會運動取向	• 香港婦女協會(1947-) • 新婦女協進會(1984-)	• 香港婦女基督徒協會（1988-） • 香港婦女勞工協會(1989-) • 香港職工會聯盟婦女事務委員會(1990-)	永久性組織
服務取向	• 香港基督教女青年會（1920-） • 香港中國婦女會(1938-) • 屯門區婦女會(1976-) • 香港婦女協會婦女中心（1985-） • 香港明愛筲箕灣婦女發展計劃(1988-92)	• 和諧之家(1985-)	有限限組織

由於篇幅所限，以下將會從上表各類中，各選取一例加以說明。

以學術為主要工作取向的，只有中文大學“性別研究計劃”。它在一九九〇年後隸屬於亞太研究所，旨在對變遷中的亞太區華人社會兩性角色及活動情況，進行跨學科的研究及資訊推廣工作，以期促進婦女發展及兩性平等。

以社會運動為主要取向的，可分為兩類。一類廣泛關注婦女問題，如“新婦女協進會”透過豐盛的出版工作、科學的調查研究及基層推廣工作，致力促進婦女發展、兩性平等及推廣意識培育。另一類團體除關注一般婦女問題外，亦有特定的關注對象，如“香港婦女勞工協會”除積極對政治、社會及婦女事務提出意見外，亦為爭取婦女勞工權益而努力。

三、合作化

雖然各團體沒有一個主義上的共識，工作取向及關注範圍亦呈多元化，但它們常就個別的社會、政治或婦女事務，滙集力量，發表聯合聲明或組成聯合行動委員會，以發出更有力的聲音，如：爭取夫婦分開評稅、反對輸入外地勞工、爭取幼兒服務、爭取設立婦女中心等，均做得有聲有色。值得注意的是，十二個婦女團體已合作撰成《香港婦女實況簡介》，促請政府成立工作小組，深入研究如何改善婦女當前的不合理處境。

此外，一羣從事婦女工作的社工，組成“婦女工作社工聯席會議”，就工作理論及技巧進行內部交流，每月進行定期的、有主題的聚會，對“婦女問題關注團體”的合作及了解，發揮着積極的作用。

四、政治化

婦女一直被排拒在傳統中國社會的政治系統以外，對影響婦女地位及權益的政策，並無發言機會。婦女在政治上提出女性的聲音，不單是一種覺醒，也可進而在制度層面去改善婦女的處境。

近年來，本地的婦女團體日見政治化。常就個別的政治事務，結成組合不同的聯委會，如：婦女支援愛國民主運動聯委會、婦女關注基本法聯委會、女選民培育計劃聯委會等，發表聲明及採取相應的行動。後者更推出一系列婦女政綱，以提高候選議員對婦女權益的關注，並培訓婦女成為思考獨立的選民。

五、羣衆化

本港婦女運動的發展，雖仍處於一個由知識分子帶動的階段，但基層婦女的主動參與趨向，已漸見端倪，如：

- 香港婦女勞工協會的八個執行委員中，有兩位是勞工；而三十個工作人員（包括執委）中，有六名是家庭主婦，十人具小學教育程度，十二人具中學教育程度。可見基層婦女扮演領導角色的發展趨勢是存在的。
- 香港明愛筲箕灣婦女發展計劃的宗旨之一，便是扶植基層婦女自行組織婦女團體，結果促成以草根階層婦女作領導骨幹的筲箕灣婦女聯會的誕生，至九二年更改組成一獨立機構——東區新婦女聯會。
- 新婦女協進會一直熱心於培訓基層婦女作領導骨幹，如曾協助麗閣邨居民協會舉辦培訓課程，更充任由該課程的畢業學員組成的婦女組的顧問，繼續協助探討組織方向。

以服務取向爲本的團體，也分兩類。一類是關注一般婦女問題的組織，如“香港婦女協會婦女中心”。香港婦女協會初期致力於體制改革工作，如：爭取修訂婚姻法（廢除一夫多妻制），至八十年代則發展至直接的、社區的服務，繼而設立和諧之家及婦女中心。婦女中心旨在爲婦女提供一個紓解壓力的系統，設有學習班、資料庫及輔導服務，並且關注社會政策對婦女的影響，作出研究並提出意見。另一類則爲有特定關注對象的服務團體，如由香港婦女協會推動成立，後演變成獨立機構的“和諧之家”便是。這是個專爲被虐婦女而設的庇護中心，使有關婦女能尋求力量、自信及資源，了解自身的權益，重過遠離暴力威脅的生活。

上述提及的均爲永久組織，另一類是非永久的、以服務取向爲本的團體如“香港明愛筲箕灣婦女發展計劃”。它只持續三年半，旨在建立婦女自主及互助精神，強調社工與基層婦女共同開拓爲婦女而設的發展性服務，著重推動婦女參與社區、社會及婦女事務，並組織以基層婦女爲骨幹成員的、永久性的婦女團體。

以上的舉例，可反映出不同組織各有其特定的取向，工作性質可謂多元化，但它們致力於“兩性平等”的基調，則是相當一致的。

存在困難

本港關注婦女問題的團體的發展，由歷史的角度看，可分爲兩個階段。萌生於四十年代或以前的組織，多由上流社會的婦女策動成立，主要從事救助貧苦婦女的工作，亦致力於消除當時歧視婦女的社會建制。至八十年代，始進入第二階段，由一羣知識分子引進西方的女性主義，組成“新婦女協進會”，倡議婦女意識的提高、爭取兩性平等，並由此掀動出好些關注婦女問題的團體出現。

細看各團體的成立，多集中在八十年代中後期，會齡仍很輕，而且多面對一共同問題——財政困難。

前表列述的十二個團體中，除了五個有穩定的財政來源外，其餘均面對資助不穩定或財力匱乏問題，甚至雖爲公益金成員的“和諧之家”，也表示有財政困難。而且其中一個團體在成立最初的九個月內，一個發起人甚至要辭去自己原有工作，充當義務幹事，可見問題的嚴重性，也可見爲理想而付出的代價委實不輕！

區潔珍是**香港中文大學教育學院**導師

游黎麗玲是**香港中文大學教育學院**高級講師

一九九二年兩性角色交流會報告：

工作環境中的性騷擾

區潔珍

第二屆兩性角色交流會，於本年六月六日在香港中文大學校園舉行，主辦機構——香港亞太研究所性別研究計劃——今年以“工作環境中的性騷擾”爲大會主題，希望爲學術界、決策階層和社會團體，就兩性關係提供一個交流和討論的機會。

隨著女性在各職業階層參與率的提高，工作場所中出現的性騷擾問題也愈多。這個存在已久的問題，即使在歐美社會，也只是近十年來才成爲一個被討論的議題。在香港，“性騷擾”仍是個尖銳而備受爭議的題目，而且討論才剛剛開始，問題不但未有結論，還經常出現流於情緒化的論爭。因此，討論和交流是有必要的，因爲唯有積極面對問題，從而開展理性的討論，才有達致共識的希望。這也是選擇“性騷擾”作爲交流會主題的原因。

當天大會在性別研究計劃主任張妙清對交流會作簡介、立法局議員劉健儀致開幕詞後，便正式開始。交流會由中文大學心理學系講師鄧素琴主持，共分爲專題演講和公開討論兩部分。

專題演講的講者分別來自學術界、決策階層及社會團體，包括：中文大學性別研究計劃的蔡寶瓊、西北航空公司人力資源部的經理王綺蓮、婦女關注性侵犯聯委會的梁麗清和香港職工會聯盟婦女事務委員會的鄧燕娥。

梁麗清以“性騷擾問題：概念與爭論”爲題，首先對“性騷擾”這個概念作出詮釋，並以具體個案說明工作場所的性騷擾是個相當普遍的現象，據婦女關注性侵犯聯委會的調查研究顯示，百分之八十五的受訪女性在兩年內均曾受到性騷擾，可見問題不容忽視。可惜現行法律對性騷擾缺乏一個清楚的界定，而大眾對性騷擾也存在種種誤解，因此目前最重要的是爲受害者提供法律保障，並致力提高社會大眾的醒覺。

鄧燕娥接著談中下層女性在工作間的遭遇，講題是“她們的故事：小白領與藍領女工的個案”。由一個郵務員，一個工廠女工的遭遇，反映受害者往往只能選擇辭職一途來避開對她們作出

性騷擾的上司，政府和一般機構均沒有制訂法例去保障受害人，甚至爲工人爭取福利的工會，在目前也沒有視“性騷擾”爲一個應該討論的議程。

王綺蓮以“公司的回應：處理性騷擾的政策和程序”爲題，介紹西北航空公司對性騷擾的政策。該公司的政策，實有推廣至所有工作間的價值。該公司是一間美國機構，而美國的聯邦法例中有就業機會平等條款，性騷擾是歧視的一種，故該公司在支持就業機會平等的大前提下，制定了性騷擾的政策。該公司透過職員手冊及張貼通告，向職員介紹性騷擾政策，列舉例子向同工說明甚麼是性騷擾的行爲，並提供申訴途徑。

最後一個專題演講是：“學院中的陰霾：大學性騷擾問題初探”，由蔡寶瓊報導一個在中文大學進行的“校園性騷擾研究”的初步結果。由於這類研究在本港尚屬首次，故在大學內外都引起了很大的反應。至於研究的較詳細結果，可參閱本期另文的報導（見：蔡寶瓊、區潔珍“校園性騷擾研究”）。

專題演講結束後，在進入公開討論前的一段休息時間，大批在座的記者，一湧而上，紛紛向四位講者進行較深入的訪問，或另約採訪日期，情況熱烈，大有欲罷不能之勢，以致公開討論的環節亦稍受阻延，可見報界對這次大會的主題相當關注。

雖然當天在惡劣天氣的打擊下，影響了與會的人數，但公開討論時，台下發言仍相當踴躍。有的向不同講者提出進一步的問題，有的發表個人對性騷擾的看法。大家都同意性騷擾不單涉及兩性角色問題，其實也是一個權力和文化問題。兩性間權力的不平等、傳統文化對女性自我形象的扭曲，都是問題的根源。

是次交流會不但爲學術界、決策階層及社會團體就兩性角色的種種問題，提供一條溝通的橋樑，更爲與報界就性騷擾問題的交流，孕育了一個良好的開始。

房屋問題研究再定向

陳錦華

目前大部份的房屋問題研究及城市研究都只集中於一些經濟的向度（Dimension），不少研究都指出房屋系統可以強化社會階級的不平等情況，但卻忽視了其他向度如性別、種族等的不平等現象。這些研究似乎假設了只要是同一階級，即使性別、種族不同的人在房屋系統裏所受的待遇都是均等的。顯然，這個假設有很多漏洞，即使是同一階級、甚至在同一家庭內，男性與女性所享有的權力、財富、發展機會等亦可以相差很遠。因此，我們應該對傳統房屋研究的方向再審視，必須加入性別、種族等向度才可以更全面了解社會不平等的現象。

很多人會大惑不解，何以房屋可以影響性別不平等？房屋並非單是四面牆壁、磚頭、石屎，其實無論從房屋的設計、政策的制定、房屋資源分配等各方面都可以反映出傳統社會重男輕女的意識，這個按照傳統父權概念發展出來的房屋系統，會進一步強化性別不平等。

“家居理想”與房屋設計

房屋及城市設計受傳統父權意識影響深遠。大部份設計都基於一個“家居理想”（Domestic Ideal）的模式。在這個理想底下，家居與工作應盡量分開，理想的家居要遠離市區的煩囂，而且一家一主，戶戶獨立，與鄰居隔絕，不受騷擾，使一家之主下班後可以在這個“天堂”紓解工作的疲勞。但似乎忽略了的是：對

男性而言，家居可能是“天堂”，對女性而言卻是工作的場所。所以在家居理想下出現的房屋、社區設計使女性面對很多困難。

第一個問題是屋邨的地點與社區設施問題。現時無論公營或私營房屋，越來越多房屋座落在偏遠的新市鎮，入住後，很多家庭主婦都被迫與親朋戚友減少接觸，減弱了原先互相支持的網絡。換言之，婦女需要獨力照顧家庭，家務的担子會越來越重。

加上很多新市鎮的設計都出現失調現象，很多社區設施都不足夠，例如小學學位不足、幼兒服務缺乏等，都會使婦女的担子加重。

同時，遷入新市鎮亦會嚴重影響婦女的社交生活，因爲很多新市鎮的交通服務都不足，婦女出外參與社會活動或出外工作的機會相應減低，有些婦女更被迫放棄工作，或減少社交活動，生活圈子進一步局限在家庭範圍內。

第二個重要的問題是房屋設計對婦女的影響。首先、不少公共屋邨的設計都不大注意治安及安全問題，這個情況在舊型屋邨更爲明顯。大部份罪案的受害人都是婦孺，因此婦女被迫減少出外、減少單獨行動，或盡量避免經過一些僻靜的地方。這樣無形中規限了婦女的生活方式。

另外，現時屋邨設計強調“一家一主”、“獨立單位”的發展，假設婦女獨自照顧所有家務如煮食、清潔、育兒等，這些設計往往缺乏公共空間，不利於發展鄰舍互助網絡及集體照顧的模式。

“家庭意識”與房屋資源的分配

傳統的“家庭意識”（familial ideology）亦是影響房屋資源分配的重要因素。公共房屋的分配主要是以家庭作爲一個單位，但這個“正統家庭”的定義卻極爲狹隘，只是局限在正統的核心家庭及與上一代同住的主幹式家庭，而且似乎假設了家庭是一個和諧的單位，夫婦各爲其份。但這個假設並不附合現實，很多家庭並非如想像中穩定、融洽。例如九〇年的離婚個案有五千五百多宗，比十年前高出一倍有多。

換言之，有很多婦女並非居於一些“正統”的家庭內，這些婦女的住屋需要往往被忽視了。最明顯的例子就是被虐待的婦女，她們住住因爲不能找到合適的居所及有關服務而被迫回到有暴力傾向的丈夫身邊，繼續受害。另一些被房屋系統忽視的婦女就是單親家庭的婦女，現時房屋政策並不體恤單親家庭所面對的特殊困難，不會提供任何優惠以協助這些家庭解決問題。除此之外，公屋政策似乎亦認爲單身、二人家庭並非“正統”的家庭，所以這些家庭亦受到歧視，他們入住公屋的機會很低。因此，很多婦女都無可選擇地依靠一個“正統”家庭才可以解決住屋問題。這樣亦進一步強化了婦女從屬於家庭的情況。

在私人樓宇資源分配方面，性別不公平的情況更爲明顯。現時大部份家庭仍然重男輕女，私人房屋要交給下一代時，大都傳給兒子，而女性所得的資源相對地少得多。尤其是在一些傳統的鄉村，直至目前爲止，女性仍然不能獲分配或承繼丁屋。

結語

以上指出房屋設計及房屋資源分配對女性的不公平只是一鱗半爪，必須更進一步研究及討論才可揭示房屋系統如何強化男女不平等。但首先我們要重新檢討房屋及城市研究的方向，使這些研究同時兼顧性別的向度，否則這些不平等的情況只會永遠被隱藏起來。

陳錦華是**香港理工學院應用社會科學系**講師

CLASSMATES

A REPORT ON TEACHING ENGLISH AT THE WOMEN'S CENTRE, OCTOBER --- DECEMBER, 1991

Susanna Hoe

As I was preparing to write this report, Peggy, who helps us with cleaning and ironing two mornings a week, came to discuss with me the English class that she has recently joined. Her intervention in my thoughts was entirely relevant because the way she is being taught is diametrically opposed to everything I am trying to do with my class.

Peggy is from the same social milieu and of about the same level of competence in English as the Chinese women whom I teach once a week for one and a half hours at the Women's Centre, Lai Kok Estate, Kowloon. As those conversant with the education system know, written English learnt in a English medium school tends to be better than that in a Chinese medium one, where Peggy, and 70% of my students went some years ago; (she left school at 15 and is now 34). But oral and aural English is fairly uniform in all but the top English medium schools because of the size of classes and tendency for even teachers to take the easy option and speak Cantonese. Technically Peggy and my students are lower intermediate. They have (rusty) passive knowledge but lack confidence.

Peggy is one of eight women who are each paying \$100 for 8 lessons given by a Chinese man. When I asked her if he was a good teacher, she replied, "He is very young." She brought me the handout outline of her second lesson. It began,

Lecture Two,

2.1. Review of the Previous Lecture; 2.2. Grammar - Tense; Tense can be simply divided into three parts; 2.2.1. Present Tense ... [followed by descriptions of the different forms, and some new ones, of the present tense and some examples]; 2.2.2. Past Tense ... ; 2.2.3. Future Tense ...; 2.3. About the Surroundings --- Sports (followed by columns of different sporting activities).

All that was included in lesson 2. Of the 14 examples given for the tenses, 2 were about a man by name, 4 talked of "he"; none contained a woman or a female pronoun. The list of 11 sports included only one in which Peggy was --- or might be expected to be --- interested: swimming. The tense examples did not relate to the sporting coda of the lesson.

Peggy's teacher --- a rather young man, perhaps a university student trying to earn a few dollars --- is, by any standards, old-fashioned. Anyone schooled in the rudiments of teaching English today would eschew the purely grammatical approach. The tense explanations, for example, describe concepts that Peggy would probably not

even be familiar with in her own language, and are, anyway, questionable. A trained teacher today would teach in one lesson probably only one aspect of the present tense, not necessarily mentioning the tense by name, and any handout would be an exercise or notes tailored to the competence of the students in English. At least the male character used as an illustration was Chinese; one mark to Peggy's teacher!

While I was shocked by the trials that Peggy was expected to undergo, she was calm and philosophical about it and I tried my best not to shake her confidence in her teacher; but I wish she could come to my class!

It is axiomatic that today anyone teaching English to Chinese students in Hong Kong will, as far as possible, use Chinese and Hong Kong examples. But, taking into account the femaleness of women students, even in a women only class, is not natural here, or elsewhere, if the availability of published literature here or in Britain is anything to go by. Even a mixed class should, but does not, have an even balance between male and female characters and pronouns. And it is as important for male students to be taught within a context of female characters treated with equality as it is for female students to feel comfortable through identification.

Thus, at the Women's Centre in October 1991 I started a 12 Week term from scratch, devising my own women-centred material and my own women-centred style of teaching. I called it "women-centred" rather than "feminist" initially so as not to provoke the executive committee of the Women's Centre. The word "feminist", even among "progressive" Chinese women in Hong Kong, is not always acceptable --- for they have to face outwards into a society with a continuing patriarchal tradition. Ironically, when they learnt of my "sensitivity" the executive committee thought it rather quaint!

But, in another sense, women-centred is more appropriate. My "Classmates", as the Director of the Women's Centre sweetly calls them, are rather different from the university-educated, feminist professional women with whom I agitate. They are working or lower middle class married women who have given up work outside the home to have children, and who are taking English lessons to give themselves something to do once a week, or to help their children with their homework. Women-centred seems, somehow, to suit them better.

That is not to deny that the classes are meant to raise the consciousness of the Classmates in a feminist sense, not only from my point of view, but also from that of the progressive women of the Women's Centre and my own group, AWARE (Association of Women for Action and Research) which is attached to it. And that raised consciousness of themselves as women has more purpose than future personal fulfilment of the women concerned. We are not ashamed to admit that hopes for political participation at all levels is bound up in this exercise of empowerment.

There is, therefore, more to women-centredness than women characters in examples, a concentration on female pronouns, and on women's activities with which the Classmates can identify. As important is the relationship between the women themselves, and between them and me as their teacher. Sisterhood is the order of the day. We have to know each other and trust each other enough to build from our core outwards and onwards to an unfamiliar, even alien, world and our possibilities there for the future. This goal is not an expatriate/neo colonial exercise, I should make clear; but the request of Chinese women concerned for the future of Hong Kong. As for the method, I am feeling my way forward with it, lesson by lesson.

The use of the Classmates' English, rather than their Chinese, name was both an advantage and a disadvantage. Firstly, it made it possible for as a non-Cantonese speaker to get to know 20 women by name fairly quickly --- an essential part of the communicating process. The Englishness of their names also gave them link with the language they were learning and with the outside world where English is still the language of power. On the other hand, they felt strange with their English names, many of which had probably not been in use since they were handed out by their teacher at school or by their father (usually not their mother) for outside use. It made them slightly awkward, too, in relating to each other.

Using names, treating the women as individuals, is a first important step, but how does one build up trust? When I was doing the TEFL certificate course at the British Council in 1990, I was impressed by one teacher I observed. She was teaching her class the words for members of the family and had brought in a pile of photographs of her family as teacher's aid. Her lesson was marvellously slick, interesting and involving and afterwards I congratulated her adding, "I do envy you; I have such a funny family that it would be impossible to use my family members to illustrate a lesson." "Don't be silly," she replied. "So have I; none of those were my family."

What a clever technique, I thought then. But, when I came to teach my women I had to reject it. Every thing had to be real and true between us, or else how could we build up trust and move forward. So I taught them about "divorce", in a society where it is still not commonplace, certainly in their milieu. And they learnt about my 3 stepchildren, one of whom has a wife, but no children yet, and about the two widowed mothers of two only children (my husband and me). It worked!

After one lesson when I had played a tape of a discussion between an interviewer and my husband about a Christmas trip to England, a Classmate asked me what we were doing for Christmas. "But you heard it on the tape," I replied. "You mean that was the truth?" she asked, her eyes lighting up. "Of course," I replied. "Everything is." I saw it sink in.

This attempt to make everything real produces logistical difficulties, of course, but can also provide unique windows to the outside world. In the BBC English books which I use as a rough guideline, an early lesson deals with people from all parts of the world; and in a TEFL class in Britain, the students are likely to come from everywhere. But in a class of Chinese women from the same city, suburb even, that variety is more difficulty to introduce. I did so with a map of the region and learning the names of countries and people, finally homing in on the Philippines. When I then introduced a tape of an interview between me and the Philippine woman who works as a domestic helper in the flat next door to ours, I was not only able to introduce the wider world, but also the problems of Philippine migrant workers. This is particularly important in a society which looks down on Filipinos. Soon I hope to do a similar interview with 2 Vietnamese refugees of my acquaintance --- for the Boatpeople, too, are much disparaged here.

The search for reality is not one way: me as teacher facilitating the Classmates to gain a broader perspective on life, one which may or may not lead to a flowering of possibilities for them and advantages to Hong Kong's political culture. My experience, too, has been enriched. I've been teaching by the seat of my pants --- a complete novice, apart from lessons taught as part of my course, and constantly making mistakes: misconstructing lessons, misjudging the Classmates' capacity, failing to explain concepts, running out of time. But I did make one intuitive leap.

Quite early on, I asked them to write their "story". I wanted to know about their work before they were married, about their husbands and their work, about their children, their likes and dislikes. In terms of language, it was of considerable value: it taught me much more about their passive knowledge than I could otherwise learn. I learnt, for example, that about half the class was familiar with the past tense, and the other floundered about in the present when discussing their past. One or two wrote a proper biography, using the language with a flexibility and daring they would never attempt orally; but it waits to be drawn out and makes them invaluable leaders for eliciting vocabulary.

But the stories were even more riveting from a sociological point of view; from this exercise I gained family and work data about 20 women that would be difficult and perhaps pointless under other circumstances. That data is helpful to us as a feminist group working on behalf of Hong Kong women and it gives me as an expatriate an unforeseen entree into the lives of Chinese women among whom I don't usually have the chance to move.

The Classmates, with 2 exceptions, all fall within the 30-40 age group. The other two are 45 and 46, my age. Swapping ages allows them to put me, too, into a useful pigeonhole. I would be sorry if they treated me with respect --- which they inevitably do because I am their teacher --- because I am an expatriate; I can tolerate it because I am older!

Only 2 of the women are childless; as am I. That too is useful because it may be that they mind about childlessness; so on examples where childlessness, as contrast, is useful, I use myself as well as them as an example. Those with children all have 2 or 3, except the 46 year old who has six daughters.

Eight out of 20 worked in a factory of some sort before they were married. This is interesting to know in a city state where factory work for women is increasingly difficult to find --- as factory work moves into China. If the Classmates decided to go back to work when their children are older, they would find factory work difficult to come by. English should allow them more job scope and satisfaction.

Perhaps the most interesting, and distressing, finding is their views on their life at home. Nearly all of them still has an outside job (as a slimming treatment operator who comes to the class on her afternoon off). Under the headings, likes and dislikes, 16 out of 20 gave one or more aspects of housework as the only dislike in their life. Five of them dislike cooking, the basis of their home-making. Only 4 have likes outside the home (singing --- Chinese opera --- sport, swimming and English and art lessons). Likes in the home are as limited as listening to the radio. The dissatisfaction with housework/homemaking, when read in conjunction with a recent tragic finding is, sobering. "Mothers are the main offenders in cases of child abuse," it was claimed in November 1991 by Priscilla Lui, Director of Against Child Abuse. She suggested that "most offenders were full-time housewives who had little or no support from their husbands." (*South China Morning Post* 22 November 1991.)

The problem is mainly that the nuclear family is rapidly replacing the extended family with its network of support and, within the nuclear family, the father is often absent and difficult to communicate with. Supporting evidence for this trend --- though not overtly for child abuse --- comes from my Classmates. One wrote, "He goes to work in the early morning and comes back at the mid-night." Another wrote, "He works on shift duty and has to work outdoor. He cannot help me in doing the housework. I don't like washing dishes." There was no mention in any of the "stories" of other relatives.

For our last lesson, the Classmates read their stories --- which we had corrected by working through a compilation of slips at an earlier lesson --- into the tape recorder, so that they had the chance to hear their own voices speaking/reading English. Afterwards we had a party at which a feature was not a Christmas carol --- which seemed inappropriate among women who are mostly non-Christian --- but the ditty "I'm a little teapot short and stout." I had some evidence that this also existed in Cantonese. So it does, to the tune of "Frere Jacques", the French words of which I wrote up on the board to general amazement! As we started to break up, a Classmate came to tell that, after all, she would not coming to lessons next term.

Why not? I had to ask. "It's my son, he disturbs the class too much." she explained. It was true he was a bit disruptive but, I thought, only to his mother, one of the best students. "Of course he doesn't. He only disturbs you and you mustn't let him," I retorted. We quizzed another class mate. "Yes, he does," she declared roundly. "He's afraid of her," said the mother. "I said I'd tie him up if he didn't behave," boasted the classmate (a mother of 2). "He doesn't want to come anymore; he wants me to himself at home," declared the mother miserably.

The social worker/Director, Linda, and a member of the executive committee who had attended the party, rallied round and we tried to discuss the issue with the mother. "You mustn't give in to him on this; he'll manipulate you for ever." "Just try once more after a gap of a few weeks before you make a final decision." Were two of the arguments we put forward, and I asked, "Have you talked to your husband about the problem?" "Oh, no," she protested, "I can't talk to him about such things."

I thought she had been persuaded to try just one more time; that she would bring the 3 year old and continue to benefit from what the lessons had to offer: an afternoon out of the flat, sisterhood, English language, and empowerment. But no, at the first lesson of the new term, last week she was absent. And one joy of my 12 weeks with the Classmates went with her.

Most of the regulars signed up for the second term. It was only at that late stage that I discovered how much the Classmates are paying the women's centre for their lessons --- \$300. I hope they think it worth it in a culture where money and its value count for much. I have forgone any fee but the pressure now to provide value in terms of straight English teaching is increased by the knowledge of how much these non-earning women pay for my services.

One of the Classmates has brought two sisters and a niece to join us, that's a good sign. I cannot be sure what the first 12 lessons have done for their English, but we are beginning to feel like a team, and that's a step forward as far as my ulterior motives are concerned.

Susanna Hoe is a historian, and author of the book *The Private Life of Old Hong Kong: British Women in the Colony, 1841- 1941* (Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1991).

CALLING FOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The Editorial Board of *Gender Studies: News and Views* welcomes any submission of essays, reports, reviews as well as information on gender issues. Please send your contributions (Chinese or English) to us, preferably in the form of floppy disk (indicating word-processing software) plus a hard copy, to the Gender Research Programme, Hong Kong Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, CUHK, Shatin, Hong Kong. Deadline of submission for the coming issue is 1 January, 1993. Tel: 609-7061 Fax: 6035215

WHAT IS IT FOR ME TO BE A MAN TODAY ?

Graeme Stuart-Bradshaw

This is the question a dozen of so men have used to examine their gender roles, and their relationship to being a man. In so doing topics on sexuality, intimacy, brutalisation, alcoholism, father, mother, fatherhood, power and feelings have been explored among others.

Much to the intrigue of women who ask "what is it a group of men together talk about?" --- it is neither women, sex as a conquest, nor sport, work nor symbols of success. We do not bounce off each others egos, seek to dominate nor even have created a leader. The men of this group relate to their mates as feeling human beings, ready to listen, willing to give support. We talk about relationships mostly, the stuff of being human.

The area first we claimed for ourselves was permission to feel and be honest. The earliest discussions soon brought up a struggle with the brutalising process of "becoming a man" as it was, and still often is. Whether put into a boxing ring, for father's approval, or just the mechanics of school yard macho, whether war or business there is a school of hard knocks men are supposed to weather in their initiations. It's not complained of.

However, the emotion we seem to feel most commonly is the grief at inadequate relationships with our fathers. The degree of intimacy with fathers has been found to shape and mould so much of our lives. One man put in the fighting ring by his dad to toughen him up is just now overcoming fear of intimacy with his wife, and just starting to perceive that the world is not out to beat him down. He still has an empty relationship with his dad. For the sons of alcoholic fathers there is the anguish of the best times being times when they shared a drink, that substance which tore their life apart emotionally.

I think this grief is the main thing that comes up to be healed as men come together honestly. The "men's movement" also picks this up in major books e.g. *Iron John* (Robert Bly) and *Fire in the Belly* (Sam Keen).

Some men have explored the need to release themselves from mother, her holding and withholding. In so doing a man claims back this anger and his power to be living his own dream, and overcomes fear of committed relationships with women. As Sam Keen points out, we men need to break cleanly from the feminine to fully become ourselves.

Anger and power are two forces we as men have to focus well. To be without them is not to feel wholly men. There have been discussions as to how individuals have sought to regain and have this power. Passion in sexuality is one way. Willingness to lead, to take a stand, another. Development of the intellect, also.

Generally the evolution from authoritarianism to being authentic is recognised as the mark of the "new manhood". The self-authority theme is well explored in the concept of the "Wild Man" in *Iron John* (representing individualism/warriorhood), teaching the boy to become king. (Just as

the women's movement has explored its archetypes, we find meaning in the ancient roles e.g. warriors and kings.)

Fatherhood has taken on a new potency for all members of the men's group. After discussions in the group, fathers seek to heal relationships with sons especially. The importance of father and son having time together alone --- call it an initiation if you will; where the older man imparts his world view, pride and solidarity into the young man seems to be one outcome.

We men certainly find a new respect in being a man through the activities of the men's group. Each of us has deepened our relationships with men. Many feel a deep relief not to have to share what are unsharable feelings with women. There is a kind of feeling men share which is very tacit but gut wrenching. Bly calls it "shuddering". We men often shudder silently when feeling sad. And it seems to me perfectly good to feel in this way, though it is different from "breaking down" and crying very deeply and does not appear very emotional. I am coming to the conclusion that it's a man's way, and is honest and true for him. Recently at a funeral of a loved community figure --- he was my father --- the quiet solidarity of men feeling, "shuddering", damp eyed yet stoic, had a deep and true silence to it. In their hearts they knew what he meant to them, their grief was true-felt.

My father, a farmer, also has given the example of husbandry and steward to me, and from me into the group, these concepts particularly masculine, of caretaking, protecting, seeing over into the future seems to me to be the greatest thing we men need to reclaim. During the Industrial Society we lost our stewardship even to point of taking us out of our husbanding and fathering roles. Community leaders need now to take the role of stewardship seriously in their everyday decisions, our future survival depending on it.

It has been said in the group what an honour it is to be talking with fathers about fathers, leading to deeper understanding of what "Dad" is. We men are gaining a new respect for men, men who take on their roles and responsibilities in relationships, in community and in family with a strong sense of authority, of stewardship, and of fathering.

Yet we dare to be intimate and balance our strength.

This is the "post historical man" emerging. You won't be seeing soppy sensitive wimps as feminism seemed to want some time back. What you will be getting is honest, powerful, loving men. And of course that's what whole men have been all along.

Graeme Stuart-Bradshaw, B.Sc., Dip.Ed., N.D., Dip.Hom., Naturopath and Homoeopath, is working with his wife Susanne, a therapist, in their wholistic health consultancy here in Hong Kong. He is a member of Hong Kong Men's Group.

A Man's View on Robert Bly's *Iron John: A Book About Men* (Reading: Addison-Westley Publishing Company, 1990)

An interview with Reinhardt Widera by Tessa Stewart on his reading of the book.

✱ Tessa Stewart
◆ Reinhardt Widera

✱ What has your reaction been on reading this book, which has sparked off a lot of debate in the States regarding issues of male identity today? Did it give you any insight or ideas to follow up in terms of how you would like to be as a man?

◆ To be honest, very little. What I treasure about the book is that this is a writer who interests himself a lot in his role as a man. I appreciate the fact that he is contributing something to the discussion of gender roles in society. I also appreciate the fact that he is trying hard to establish an undistorted, unpretentious image for men. He comes up with a lot of ideas about this; but at the end of the book, I felt I was left hanging in the air, and the book did not contribute much to my own idea of being man in different social contexts, such as marriage, male to male relationship, or with myself.

✱ Is this because you found you already had some similar ideas, or because your ideas are very different?

◆ I think one reason is because this book is very much restricted to a clientele in North America. Robert Bly is very much aiming at well-educated well-off men in their mid-30's to 40's, and there are many references to specific features of North American society. At one point he tries to categorise what the past three decades have contributed to the image of men, and I find this doubtful in that it is tied so closely to the American contexts. However, he does talk about the importance of having male-male relationships which have real meaning, which I would agree with. He also points to a lack of male parenting figures or mentors, which I would extend to both genders now that women are also increasingly absent from the home.

✱ So what kind of a different quality is Bly talking about American men needing to have in their male to male relationships?

◆ Well, that's another thing I do not necessarily agree with in this book. He's talking about the development that men went through in the States in the 80's --- I cannot agree with this approach that human development can be split into decades, but for tidiness sake we will accept it here --- he's saying that in the 80's men were taught by feminist women to be soft and to deny their maleness, and he's trying to tell American men to allow their inner violence to come out. He says if one recognises it, it can be very positive: to lift one's arm to hold a sword can involve being very decisive, not necessarily being cruel.

✱ So this is the area the American women's movement has particularly objected to?

◆ Right, and this is also one part I cannot easily relate to because I am not opposed to the women's movement. This book really establishes an image of men as opposed to the supposed desired image of men developed by the women's movement in America, and I cannot agree with this primarily contrasting image developed about the two different genders.

✱ So, Bly's talking about the men in 80's being "pressured" to be soft and to deny their traditional masculine qualities, and you're saying that you don't feel you personally are soft, that you are able to have the kind of male to male relationships he's talking about, and that also you are able to be decisive and masculine?

◆ I supposed so, though I don't even try to draw such a clear cut image of myself or of men in general.

✱ So what Bly is trying to do is to wrestle with this concept of masculinity today, but you're saying you just see yourself as an individual, neither male nor female only (though obviously a man), but you're not concerned with how male you are.

◆ Right, and I don't have any inhibitions about how I am. He really seems to feel an urge to justify his maleness, which I think is mainly due to the development of the kind of gender discussion that America has gone through in the last decade.

Reinhardt is a German lecturer who has just left the Chinese University's German Department after completing a five year term as a visiting lecturer. He has also worked in the U.S..

Tessa Stewart is a personal, marriage and family counsellor resident in Hong Kong.

(The book *Iron John: A Book About Men* can be borrowed from the Gender Research Library.)

Amy Ling, *Between Worlds: Women Writers of Chinese Ancestry* (London & New York: Pergamon Press, 1990)

Elaine Yee-lin Ho

The Athene Series, in which Amy Ling's book is published, is described by its publisher as "An International Collection of Feminist Books". The series articulates women's studies in a number of different areas, and focuses on women's issues that have received scant attention in established academic discourses.

The women writers in Amy Ling's book experience double or even triple marginalisation. They are women who are born or have lived for a long time among overseas Chinese communities, especially in the United States. Regarded in many ways as exiles from traditional Chinese culture, their supposed exile status ironically does not protect them from the harsh structures of Chinese patriarchy which often persist in their individual families. Throughout the first half of this century, they were also victimized, like the men, by racist immigration policies, the underclass of a silent and ostracized ethnic minority on American soil. Historically, according to Ling, American perceptions of Chinese women are often mediated by stereotypical images that are widely disseminated through the media and forms of literary activity both inside and outside of academia. Though the writers in Ling's book challenge these images in themselves and their writing, for a long time their marginalised social position has hampered access to a wider readership. At the same time, they have been largely ignored by traditional literary criticism which deals only with texts by writers of Anglo-American or European ethnicity, and by scholars of Chinese literature because their linguistic medium is English.

book review

Amy Ling focuses on the political oppression of Chinese women on American soil and their distorted representation as the historical contexts of her own study. Though she does not openly confront the issue of traditional academic neglect, the fact that the book has been written and published is a crucial, and in many ways, a first, attempt at intervention. Before Ling, Kai-yu Hsu and Helen Palubinskas's *Asian-American Authors* (1972, 1976) profiled a number of writers and gave them a group identity; Elaine Kim's *Asian American Literature* (1982) continued to situate writers of Chinese descent among those of other Asian communities. More recently, *The Nature and Context of Minority Discourse* (1990) edited by Abdul JanMohamed and David Lloyd theorizes the burgeoning textual pluralities of ethnic minority groups in the United States and some other Third World countries. These publications represent the increasingly vocal interventions by writers claiming their legitimate place in American cultural-literary discourse long perceived as "white"-dominated.

None of them, however, focus on women writers, and specifically, those from the Chinese community. Amy Ling's book stands as a monument to the considerable achievement of three generations of Chinese-American women writers who refused to be silenced by conditions of extreme adversity. It begins with the Eurasian Eaton Sisters, Edith Maud Eaton (1865-1914), who wrote under the Chinese pseudonym Sui Sin Far, and Winnifred Eaton (1875-1954). Edith was born in England, and Winnifred in Montreal, Canada, and both lived most of their life in the west, beginning their writing careers at times of severe proscriptive laws against the Chinese population in America. The socio-cultural conditions have improved somewhat for the émigré writers of the next generation, both those who published patriotic books on China during the Second World War, and others who left China after 1949. They include Han Suyin, Helena Kuo, Sze Mai-mai, Chuang Hua, Eileen Chang, Maria Yen, Diana Chang, Hazel Lin,

Virgina Lee, Bette Bao Lord; Nien Cheng. Jade Snow Wong, Maxine Hong Kingston and Amy Tan bring the survey of writers up to the present.

The list of writers discussed or referred to in Ling's book is pretty exhaustive, and it is admirably supported by a full bibliography in which women writers who have published books in prose in the United States are named alphabetically, and each of their works given a one- or two-line summary. Future researchers who wish to concentrate on writers within a specific time-frame or study their work by thematic or other approaches will, no doubt, thank Ling for her painstaking and scholarly work. Ling is quick to spot striking images and figurative moments from the texts, and tries to focus her discussion of a writer around them. This imparts a critical edge to the largely descriptive summaries of the writers' life and work.

The outline of the chapters - five in number plus an "Introduction" - is roughly chronological in that it begins with the Eaton sisters and ends with a more recent generation. But this is doubled up with a thematic approach so that, for instance, Sze Mai-mai's *Silent Children* (1948), is discussed in Chapter 3 under "World War II Novels and Autobiographies: The Patriotic Stance", while her *Echo of A Cry* which actually appeared earlier (in 1945) is reserved for the next chapter as an example of autobiographical writing by "The Cosmopolitan Émigré". The works of Han Suyin also appear in two different chapters: *Destination Chungking* (1942) shares the same category as Sze's *Silent Children*; much later, in Chapter 5, several of Han's other books are discussed under the heading, "Writing Colonialism". Readers who are looking for individual continuities will not really be able to glean much from Ling's doubled structure. At the same time, the chronological outline becomes destabilized as writers from different generations find themselves in thematic company with each other.

This complicated, and at times, confusing, structure, arises from the

need to write a history of the subject, one which underlines how individual writers can be seen to share the common bondage of their sex, as of their race. This, in turn, is crucial to Ling's political project of imagining a solidarity front of Chinese-American women writers against patriarchal and racist discourses. At the very heart of the matter, the persuasiveness of this history and of Ling's political argument entails a problematic issue of definition. Who is a Chinese-American woman writer? Ling is very aware of this problem, and, to her credit, takes the commonsensical, and in the end, possibly the only viable position on this: her book will deal with women writers who are partly or wholly of Chinese descent and who have published in America. Place of birth or long-term abode is not a consideration.

This, however, elides the question of highly differentiated backgrounds, especially between women writers who are born and have lived most of their lives outside China, and whose consciousness of their own identities is shaped by intercultural tensions, and émigré writers whose formative years are spent within China. For the first group of writers, like the earlier Eaton sisters or more recently, Maxine Hong Kingston, the pressing need to challenge and subvert conditions of sexist and racist oppression in the United States itself fuels their writing and creative imagination. The motto, 'Righting Wrongs by Writing Wrongs', which Ling adopts for her writers (and, of course, herself) is, in this respect, particularly apposite. It is repeated frequently in the book - too often, in fact, so that it smacks of sloganeering, and is in danger of losing the vigour of its initial assertion. There is also no question that Ling herself - who has lived in America since the age of six - empathizes with this group of writers; her enthusiasm for the Eaton sisters and Maxine Hong Kingston is eloquent testimony of her perception of her own community of belonging.

But in the case of the other group of writers, the émigrés, Ling's political stance of writing against sexism and racism in America becomes much more difficult to argue. For most of these

writers - as the cumbersome chapter title "Focus on China: Stances Patriotic, Critical, and Nostalgic" tacitly admits - the United States, its inequities and its racial-cultural tensions is, more often than not, a non-issue. Around the time of the Second World War, in particular, the US was China's ally, and a refuge for the writers displaced by military conflict in the Asian sphere. The subversiveness of their writing, and hence the force of Ling's political argument, is considerably diluted at precisely the moment of the book - the middle chapter - when the reader expects the argument to gather momentum. Ling herself admits, 'For Edith Eaton, assertion of her Chinese ancestry had meant fighting against the current; for the writers of the 1940s, however, to focus on China and their Chinese ancestry was, so to speak, to go very much with the flow.' (56)

Ling is very much aware of the problem of definition. But the questions, 'How does one define a Chinese American? At what point does an immigrant become an American?' (104), are not explicitly asked until Chapter 4. Ling's response to these questions is to say, '...the feeling of being between worlds, totally at home nowhere, is at the core of all the writers in this study and, consequently, of the books they write.' (105) This is a credible response, and an insightful one, but in terms of the political project of the book, it is damaging. For what it implies is the absence of a focal cultural and political orientation among the writers that undermines Ling's own argument for a common front of writing against sexism and racism in the United States. Some attempt to theorize the shared concerns of the women writers is made in the final chapter which has three sections: "Writing Racism and Oppression", "Writing Sexism", and "Writing Colonialism". This unfortunately involves repeating material she has already used in the earlier chapters, especially in relation to the Eaton sisters and Maxine Hong Kingston. In the last section, when Ling observes that Han Suyin is a 'writer with the most passionate and lifelong dedication to righting wrongs on an international scale...' (170), one sees a clearer, but

also belated attempt to situate specific American concerns in a global context. Ling also tries to extend the common front against oppression to include writers of other ethnic groups with the United States, noticeably African-American women writers. Here again, the absence of differentiation which underpins the book's political stance also paradoxically undermines its rhetorical efficacy. The opening sentence of the book already hints at this problem: 'Like Alice Walker, but from a different cultural background, I too have felt compelled to go "in search of our mothers' gardens," and this book is the fruit of my search.' (xi) There are historical and qualitative differences between the African-American and the Chinese-American woman writer's experience of subjugation and racial discrimination. Some sense of this difference, as of the common bond, would have strengthened Ling's arguments for her cause.

It would be fair to say that some of the problems of Ling's book are the legacies of history. Changing historical conditions should entail differentiation among the writers she surveys, and between them and those from other minority groups. This is inevitably in conflict with the pressing contemporary need to produce a common resistance to enduring structures of oppression and marginalisation of ethnic minority writers in the US. *Between Worlds* represents a serious attempt to grapple with this conflict. Its weaknesses highlight the problems of minority discourse that at once calls for plurality but also runs the risk of erasing differences within itself.

Elaine Y.L. Ho is a lecturer of the Department of English, The University of Hong Kong.



**Deborah Tannen,
YOU JUST DON'T
UNDERSTAND
(New York: Ballantine Press,
1991)**

Rebecca Pang

When two people from different cultural backgrounds are in communication, we somehow expect some misunderstandings. Perhaps at the back of our mind, we usually expect differences in cross-cultural communication because of our cultural assumptions. But we are often less prepared for differences when we communicate with people who grew up in the same culture and speak the same language. And, it is more frustrating when we experience misunderstandings in close relationships.

It is interesting when Dr. Tannen says that men and women actually grow up behaving in very different ways, and therefore, when they come to have communication, sometimes they are just like people who try to communicate across two different cultures.

One of the basic differences, as Dr. Tannen points out in the book, is that men tend to focus on "independence" whereas women tend to focus on "intimacy" when they come to establish relationships. This explains why women enjoy verbalising their thoughts and feelings with people they are close to and very often they also like to build up their friendships by sharing each other's secrets. But if we look at men's friendships, we notice that they are hardly built upon the sharing of thoughts and feelings. Men are more likely to keep an "independent" image and detach themselves emotionally from their male friends.

This difference matches with the results of one of Dr. Tannen's research projects. The results show that women are often able to name at least one female friend when asked if they have any best friends, apart from their male partners. But men often cite their wives or girl-friends when asked the same question. After that, many men name other men with whom they play sports, but with whom they never have a heart-to-heart talk.

It is interesting to see that most men actually do enjoy sharing their thoughts and feelings with women, but not with men. I wonder if it goes with the fact that men need to keep an "independent" and "capable" image in society.

This basic difference then leads to different functions of conversations revealed in men's and women's talk. Dr. Tannen describes the difference as "report-talk" employed by men and "rapport-talk" employed by women. That is to say, "rapport-talk" is the glue that holds relationships together for women whereas "report-talk" is a means to preserve independence and maintain status for men.

The best example of "report-talk" cited by Dr. Tannen is men's enthusiasm for telling jokes when they have an audience and they never refuse any invitation to do it; whereas women prefer a small audience if they want to tell jokes and they often feel uncomfortable at telling jokes in front of people they don't know well. That is consistent with the theory of women's "rapport-talk", which says that women only display their verbal performance within an "intimate" group. Additionally, if we recall any conversations with our female friends, we will probably notice that the topics are often about "relationships". But for men, they are more likely to focus on sports or politics.

Since the functions and content of conversations between men and women vary, the conversational style between the sexes is not the same. As further argued by Dr. Tannen, more men feel comfortable with "public speaking" while women feel comfortable with "private speaking". That probably explains why women often complain that their husbands have nothing to say at home but that they always enjoy talking "non-stop" outside the family.

With such clear and analytical background information, Dr. Tannen is able to offer useful insight into re-defining the "power" game between men and women. For the past few decades, many researchers have been trying to exemplify the inequality between the sexes by demonstrating that men were more dominant and they tended to interrupt more at meetings. With their research results, some of the researchers, such as Don Zimmerman, even concluded that men intentionally excluded women from conversations and they didn't treat women as equal participants.

However, this approach towards conducting research is questioned by Dr. Tannen. She criticised those researchers for jumping to a conclusion too quickly without understanding the basic difference between men and women and failing to offer a positive solution to the problem of inequality.

In fact, Dr. Tannen argues that although men do most of the talking, that "does not necessarily mean that men intend to prevent women from speaking." On the contrary, they may assume women are equals who are free to take the floor. If women don't do it,

it is because of the difference between men's and women's styles, not necessarily because of the dominance of men.

In this case, Dr. Tannen encourages women to speak up without being invited, or to begin to speak without waiting for what seems a polite pause. That strategy seems to redress the imbalance, without putting the blame on men for intentionally locking them out!

If we study the author's analysis of the relationship between men and women carefully, we will not misinterpret her intention as asking women to disguise themselves as "pseudo-men". In fact, she encourages men and women to try to understand each other's styles. As she suggests in the book, "many women could learn from men to accept some conflict and difference without seeing it as a threat to intimacy, and many men could learn from women to accept interdependence without seeing it as a threat to their freedom." In other words, she is calling for both men and women to make more adjustments and accommodation.

On the whole, I found the book fascinating and extremely positive in bridging the gender gap. It is not only a book for husbands and wives or boy-friends and girl-friends, it is also a book which answers many problems in interpersonal relationships. With all the lively examples, the author successfully makes "linguistics" an interesting and practical subject.

The only worry that I am left with after reading the book is how much one needs to adjust to and accommodate the opposite sex. Yes, we understand there are some different conversational styles between men and women and we know we should learn how to accommodate to each other's style. But how can we measure who is more ready to change and who is actually "waiting" for the other person to change in order to fit his/her style?

I think sometimes the contention between the sexes lies with the problem of finding a yardstick to measure who actually makes more adjustments. It is particular true for intimate relationships in which only the two people know exactly what is happening when things have gone wrong.

Having said that, I do share the author's view --- "If you understand gender differences, you may not be able to prevent disagreements from arising, but you stand a better chance of preventing them from spiralling out of control."

Rebecca Pang Lai King teaches at the British Council. She also presents and writes the materials for a business English radio programme for R.T.H.K..

Table of Contents

Yip Hon Ming	Editorial (Chinese)	P.16 1
Choi Po King, Au Kit Chun	Project on Sexual Harassment on Campus (Chinese)	2
Au Kit Chun, Betty L.L. Yau	Survey of Women's Concern Groups in Hong Kong: A Brief Report (Chinese)	5
Au Kit Chun	Report on the 1992 Gender Workshop on Sexual Harassment in the Workplace (Chinese)	6
Chan Kam Wah	A New Dimension in the Study of Housing Problems (Chinese)	7
Susanna Hoe	Classmates: A Report on Teaching English at the Women's Centre, October - December, 1991	8
Graeme Stuart- Bradshaw	What is It for Me to Be a Man Today?	11
Tessa Stewart	A Man's View on <i>Iron John: A Book About Men</i> by Robert Bly (An interview with Reinhardt Widera)	12
Elaine Y.L. Ho	Book review on <i>Between Worlds: Women Writers of Chinese Ancestry</i> by Amy Ling	13
Rebecca Pang	Book review on <i>You Just Don't Understand</i> by Deborah Tannen	15

Chief Editor: Yip Hon Ming

Editorial Board: Choi Po King, Equeen Leung,
Bernard H.K. Luk, Tessa Stewart,
Yip Hon Ming

Publisher: Gender Research Programme,
Hong Kong Institute of Asia-
Pacific Studies, The Chinese
University of Hong Kong
(Co-ordinator: Fanny M. Cheung)

Logo Design: Janice Wan

EDITORIAL

POWER AND EMPOWERMENT

Yip Hon Ming

Not until to date has the age-old problem of sexual harassment received some public attention, said an author in this issue. This belated development can be viewed as a response to the appeal for a redefinition of men-women relationships based on the principles of human rights, social equality, and justice along with the drastic and dramatic changes of the world in recent years. Being presaged here is the making of a novel construct of knowledge encompassing the discourse of gender equality in the wake of the coming of a new epoch. Facing this challenge, traditional values will not simply die away; and it is natural that vested interests will take a defensive stand for the status quo. To marginalize the issue of sexual harassment is one way to resist the trend of change in relations between the sexes. Deep-rooted perceptions of sex stereotyping and stratification actually reflect the power order in the real world. As there is a supporting system behind the sexual offenders, the harassed are virtually double victims, suffering from both their harassers and the social institution. In identifying the problem, therefore, the social system and power structure should be taken into account in addition to personal factors. As the consensus among researchers on the subject asserts, sexual harassment is an issue of power, not lust.

In the struggle against manipulative control by the powerful, the powerless need to resort to strategies for empowerment such as networking, mobilization, organization, and the heightening of political awareness. In this issue, an exercise of empowerment is introduced in the account of an English class at a women's center. In the report on a survey of local organizations concerned with women's issues, the authors mention the trend of politicization of these groups and their role in cultivating women's political consciousness. To attain social rights and status, influence must be exerted on public policies. In this connection, the article on gender discrimination in Hong Kong's public housing design and distribution maintains that the gender perspective should be taken into consideration in the studies of housing problems, and in the field of city planning.

In the light of a gender approach, some widely-accepted theories may be subjected to severe test as they are always imposed by the dominating gender. An important step to eliminate discrimination and prejudice is to recognize and to understand men and women's different ways of looking at things. To bridge the gender gap, a book under review in this issue encourages men and women to try to understand each other's styles. Discrimination can be explained by power differentials; but it is also a result of ignorance. However, controversies remain centering around the concept of so-called gender traits. This issue offers a review of a controversial book on maleness and a report from a member of a men's group in Hong Kong which echoes similar ideas. This ideal of the "new manhood" has become the theme of the recent "men's movement." While activists of the movement are advocating the positive side of masculinity, arguments about how men and women differ in nature will continue. In total opposition to the view of a changeless human nature is of course the existentialist standpoint emphasizing human being's "historicity." Relevant debates are expected to go on for some time. To what extent is human nature moulded by history and culture? How do cultural differentials between men and women reflect the power stratification in our society? Further explorations are yet to be made in the open area of gender research. On the other hand, in continuing our daily struggle against power domination and abuse, should we also make time to ruminate critically on power *itself*? Only with the true awakening of the human race can a bona fide transformation of the world take place for the better, or else, the iron law "power corrupts" will be in operation perpetually.