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I read this book with interest—both professional and personal. First, the professional: I am studying ideas of fertility and infertility since the turn of last century as well as the role of women in the reproductive sciences over the course of the 20th century. Second, the personal: I am the mother of two, a 4-year-old son and a 18-month-old daughter. For both reasons I was looking for voices regarding the female experience of combining motherhood and academic work in science.

In 2006, Emily Monosson, a toxicologist, writer, and mother, posted on the American Association for the Advancement of Science listserv a quotation she pulled from the New York Times from a woman expressing the difficulties of balancing a career and motherhood. Though Monosson initially felt she was outing herself, she posted the quotation along with a note seeking other women’s opinions because she felt desperate to know she was not alone in her struggles to balance motherhood with a scientific career. The responses, Monosson wrote in her 2008 book, were “immediate, enthusiastic, and emotional” (2). Though some of the women who responded were uncomfortable about publicly discussing their difficulties, many of the women “felt that by posting their comments to the list, they might encourage others to come forward, initiating a broader discussion about combining motherhood and a career in science” (3). Monosson’s decision to take some of the stories the women told on the listserv and publish them in a book was to illustrate the variety of ways women have combined these two roles—for example, through the traditional academic tenure-track route, through part-time academic positions, through working at government agencies, through teaching in secondary schools, and through volunteering—and to initiate, as many of the women also desired, a broader discussion of what it means to be a career scientist. Contributors to the book, Monosson writes, “volunteered their own stories with the intention of empowering others to speak out not just about their struggles and concerns for the future but also about personal and professional successes achieved while balancing family life and a life in science” (19). Many of the women express in their stories their desire for a mentor, a woman who can serve as a role model for how to balance work and motherhood—much like Monosson sought when she sent out her original posting on the listserv.

The book is divided into four sections, with each section a decade, beginning with the 1970s and ending with the 2000s. Each decade contains stories from women who came of age in their scientific careers during that decade. The women tell their stories briefly, and, distressingly, their stories are largely the same—nearly all express the frustrations of working within the structures of academia and the continued covert and even overt sexism surrounding women’s choices to become mothers. Sadly, the narratives change little even as the decades advance. As Aviva Brecher, who received her Ph.D. in 1972, notes in her essay, it is “astonishing” that women are still asking “the same questions about how to successfully manage and blend careers in science with the demands of motherhood and family life that we struggled to solve thirty years ago” (Brecher 2008, 25). Indeed, some of the stories could swap decades, such as the story from a woman who lost her postdoctoral position when she became pregnant—only the year was 2006, not 1976 (Wesley-Hunt 2008).

Tellingly, the overwhelming majority of these women either are not working in academia or, if they are, they are not in “traditional” full-time, tenured or tenure-track positions. A few are adjunct, several work in government positions or in secondary schools, and some cull together work from grants on their own or continue working in the sciences as volunteers. Part of this perhaps stems from who responded
to Monosson’s initial call on the listserv; perhaps part is also because of the desire expressed by Monosson as a reason for this book: to initiate a discussion about what a successful career in science looks like outside of the traditional tenure-track route. As Monosson describes, the essays she has collected from women with science careers inside and outside of academia provide a broader “and more inclusive definition of success (beyond attainment of tenure) in science,” and such a definition “might lead to a more inclusive and perhaps more welcoming scientific community” made up of people in a variety of roles (9). By challenging the traditional tenure-track route as the only definition of success, Monosson and the women whose voices are collected in this volume define themselves as successful, too—albeit successful in ways typically not valued because they are not accompanied by numbers: the size of a grant, the number of publications, the counted heads of graduate students and postdoctoral fellows.

While the structure of academia comes under a good deal of deserved scrutiny in this book (and arguably the critiques leveled here could and should be extended to most of the work world), the book is not without its own flaws. To begin with, there is an underrepresentation of single mothers. All but two of the women with children have spouses—very supportive husbands, I might add—and all are heterosexual (two women who are single and do not have children were included in the book because they are the daughters of a woman in the book). In addition to the majority of the contributors being married and heterosexual, nearly all have biological children. Indeed, even the mother who did adopt has biological children as well. A more inclusive set of voices from more single mothers, lesbian mothers, and adoptive mothers, for example, would have strengthened the book and revealed diversity of choices and strategies. Additionally, since the book is calling for the discussion of how to make careers in science—and academia more generally, I would add—more accessible, attainable, and successful.
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Bioethics is in need of contemporary literary metaphors; soma is not so much overused as it is out of date, no longer reflecting our present worries. So it is that the Wellcome Trust’s Book Prize in Medicine in Literature is not only an appropriate new endeavor for an organization committed to medical humanities and public engagement but also a
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