Women and Men Political Theorists

Enlightened Conversations

Edited by

KRISTIN WATERS

Women and Men Political Theorists

Enlightened Conversations

Edited and with Critical Introductions by

Kristin Waters

BLACKWELL PUBLISHING
350 Main Street, Malden, MA 02148-5020, USA
9600 Garsington Road, Oxford OX4 2DQ, UK
550 Swanston Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia

First published 2000

4 2008

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Women and men political theorists: enlightened conversations / edited by Kristin Waters.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Feminist theory—Political aspects. 2. Political science. I. Waters, Kristin.
HQ1190. W655 2000
320'.01—dc21

99-049054

ISBN 978-0-631-20979-9 (hb: alk. paper)—ISBN 978-0-631-20980-5 (pb: alk. paper)

A catalogue record for this title is available from the British Library.

Set in 10 on 11. 5 pt Sabon
by Kolam Information Services Pvt. Ltd, Pondicherry, India
Printed and bound in Singapore
by Utopia Press Pte Ltd

The publisher's policy is to use permanent paper from mills that operate a sustainable forestry policy, and which has been manufactured from pulp processed using acid-free and elementary chlorine-free practices. Furthermore, the publisher ensures that the text paper and cover board used have met acceptable environmental accreditation standards.

For further information on
Blackwell Publishing, visit our website:
www.blackwellpublishing.com

Women and Men Political Theorists

Acknowledgments

My own understanding of the canonical works of modern philosophy originates in the teaching and mentoring of the late William Lensing of Bard College, a philosopher who instilled in me respect for tradition and endless fascination with the ideas and arguments of modern philosophy. His knowledge and love of the discipline have been enduring gifts.

A handful of women in the Women's Studies Faculty Group at Clark University in the 1980s provided a new model of scholarship and collegiality. They introduced me to the practice of feminism, and changed my approach to academic endeavors. Pamela Wright's humor and intellect were radical forces. Cynthia Enloe, in myriad ways, created the model of teaching and working together in Women's Studies, a model characterized by immense energy, unbounded good will, and inventive techniques for creation *ex nihilo* – since the resources at that time were meager or nonexistent. She guided the Clark Women's Studies Faculty Group past the landmines and around the obstacles of curricular tradition. Serena Hilsinger's brilliance as we team-taught the first Women's Studies capstone seminar, using works from Aristotle, Wollstonecraft, and Mill alongside the works of Charlotte Brontë, Jean Rhys, and Michele Cliff, may have provided the original paradigm for audacious juxtapositions. Lois Brynes' eye-rolling challenge when I opined that there were no women writers to teach in Modern Philosophy provided some of the impetus to prove myself wrong. Zena Sochor's steady competence and consistent support provided a clear-eyed view of the demands of academic life, and a model of how to meet those demands with equanimity. She is greatly missed.

In the early to mid-1980s, I taught a traditional course in political theory in Philosophy at Clark, which served Political Science majors as well. Later, when I taught the course for the Government Department, my newly raised consciousness became frustrated with the standard texts and I was grateful for the departmental support and the freedom to teach the texts that I pleased. Then and there I cobbled together a set of readings that became the prototype for this book.

As a strong believer that faculty should occasionally become students again, those occasions when I did so myself geometrically increased my understanding in certain fields. I am especially appreciative to faculty who allowed me to attend their seminars: Ann Ferguson's *Feminist Theory* course at the University of Massachusetts, Lois Brynes' *Meadows and Wastelands* at Clark University, Evelyn Fox Keller's *Women and Science* at MIT, and Patricia Williams' *Women and Notions of Property* at Harvard University. These women and many, many others are pioneers in transforming the curriculum in many different fields.

In Lois Brynes' course, I had the privilege of meeting Diane Bell, who was then the Henry Luce Professor of Religion, Economics, and Social Justice at the College of the Holy Cross. This meeting was the beginning of a lively and ongoing dialogue about feminist theory, especially feminist epistemology. It was also the beginning of an outstanding collegial relationship. Diane is now Professor of Anthropology and Director of Women's Studies at George Washington University.

The original book proposal was hatched at Clark Psychology professor Rachel Falmagne's breakfast table, in conversation with Linda Nicholson of the State University of New York (Albany), both of whom have provided ongoing encouragement. Cynthia Enloe gave me guidance in structuring the proposal. I have received helpful comments from Robert Douglas, Lewis Gordon, Alison Jaggar, Richard Schmidt, and Karsten Struel. Many other people have read and commented on versions of the chapter introductions: Diane Bell, Debbie Fisher, SunHee Gertz, Ed O'Reilly, Dan Shartin, and Karen Turner. I have also received generous support from Ann Bookman, and from Gene McCarthy, who gave me access to his personal library of African American literature. SunHee Gertz provided guidance throughout. The assistance of Mary Boliver has been invaluable.

When Part VI was in crisis, it was Professor Carol Conaway of Holy Cross who argued that Frederick Douglass was an original philosophical thinker whose work had been seriously ignored, and deserved inclusion in the volume. Lewis Gordon of the Pembroke Center at Brown University originated the suggestion of pairing Anna Julia Cooper with John Stuart Mill, noting the connections between Cooper's "What Are We Worth" and Mill's *Utilitarianism* and *Political Economy.* I've benefited from a number of conversations with both Carol and Lewis over the course of the project.

The proposal and several chapters of this book were written as part of a project while I was Visiting Research Professor in Women's Studies at Clark University. I wish to thank the generosity of this program for providing the opportunity for research, and especially Joanne Ljungberg for encouragement over the years. Blackwell Publishers provided me with a grant to support the completion of this project, for which I am very grateful. At Blackwell, Susan Rabinowitz found merit in the original proposal, Ken Provencher helped to shepherd the manuscript through the process, and Margaret Aherne provided skillfull and cheerful editing.

A number of libraries have provided resources, including the Truro Public Library at Cape Cod, Massachusetts, and especially the Goddard Library of Clark University and the Dinand Library at Holy Cross. In finding the writings of Mary Astell, I am especially thankful to the Watkinson Library at Trinity College, Hartford, the Shakespeare Folger Library in Washington, D.C., and the American Theological Library Association of Evanston, Illinois.

Three books in particular set the stage early for this work, and I am grateful to their authors for having written them. Dale Spender's *Women of Ideas and What Men Have Done to Them, From Aphra Behn to Adrienne Rich* should be essential

reading for anyone interested in women in western thought. Details of the lives and work of hundreds of women writers appear on these pages. In particular, this is where I first read about Mary Astell and Matilda Joslyn Gage. In contrast to Spender's more popular (but nonetheless scholarly) work is Alison Jaggar's *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. This book transforms western political theory and should be assigned reading for every modern political theory course. One ignores it at one's peril. It provides in exquisite detail all the major arguments of modern political theory, from Locke to Rawls, by way of Rousseau, Marx, Engels, Mill and other major writers, and the feminist critique. The third major influence was Patricia Hill Collins' *Black Feminist Thought*, which created a sea change of thinking about feminist political theory, and especially about the contributions of Black women and of epistemology.

Any undertaking of this kind, above and beyond other professional duties, absorbs substantial time and energy which, in my case, might otherwise have been devoted to my family life – a devotion which I take very seriously. It is one thing to ask those who are close to you to make space for a few evenings here and a few weekends there, but to request special dispensation for the better part of two years stretches beyond the limit of what one can reasonably request. I have had the good fortune to be sustained by the tolerance, care, and intelligence of my husband, Ed, and the companionship, humor, and affection of my extraordinary family including Ed, and our children, Colin and Jiaqi.

Contents

Introduction

Non-traditional interlopers to the practice of political theory-building are faced with a history that is full of lacunae, loose ends, and false starts, one that is incomplete and perplexing. New approaches include various forms of feminism, area studies, and post-colonial theory. These newer theories may well lack the elegance of traditional studies or canonical works, which are marked by a penchant for internal consistency with systems rather than by a resonance with historical events. But what these new theories lose in elegance they often make up for in vigor. Fueled by the vitality of new material, fresh conceptual tools and the excitement of discovery, new approaches are gaining scholarly recognition and a place in the curriculum.

The first step for theoretical development in reclamation projects such as this one is to *create a space* for new work. Marginalized views have been left out of traditional political narratives, a practice that feminists label "silencing" or "erasure." When mainstream scholars refuse to acknowledge the existence of alternative works, or devalue them, or ridicule their authors, existing works can simply disappear. This anthology makes a step toward bringing non-traditional political theory into the discourse. It is one element in the larger international endeavor to transform traditional curricula.

Throughout the modern period, from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, men and women have engaged in a dialogue about issues in political theory. But part of that dialogue has been occluded – the voices especially of women and minorities, and of others who have opposed the dominant ideologies. Women political thinkers have written, not just about women and "women's issues," but about all the central issues of political theory. Mary Wollstonecraft wrote about citizenship and inequality; Mercy Otis Warren addressed the dispute between republicanism and federalism. Like John Stuart Mill, African American Maria W. Stewart addressed how free speech and action affect liberty. Shifting focus from the central subject – in this case modern democratic man, striving for freedom and the good of society – to the "other," variously identified, is alone a monumental task. Writers from the margins

have long observed the failures of a substitutional approach. A simple shift to the modern democratic woman, or the Black man striving for freedom and liberty, is likely to obliterate genuine structural differences between marginal and centrally located groups. Only through a careful understanding of non-traditional philosophical and historical sources can a more complete – less partial and distorted – view of political philosophy be attained.[1] Only through an understanding of the particular historical and social conditions of disempowered groups can their own political circumstances be acknowledged and honored.

Standpoint epistemologies privilege the theoretical frameworks generated from different social locations as the starting point for knowledge about politics and everyday life.[2] They require an openness to different ways of structuring problems, to admitting new concepts and new connections, to allowing topics that we thought were "not political theory" to be considered as such. This is because the easiest way to remarginalize different thought is to exclude it definitionally: "This isn't politics, isn't philosophy, isn't literature." As Patricia Hill Collins argues:

> Curriculum operates very much like "theory" does in the academy. Like the Curriculum, theory cuts both ways. Social theory in particular can serve either to reproduce existing power relations or to foster social and economic justice.[3]

Groups other than the dominant ones must be recognized for producing and authorizing theory. The challenge is to find ways to address both new, or newly available, material, and also to draw connections with traditional work so that the classical and newly considered works together can produce a coherent understanding, one which furthers rather than impedes interpretations of political theory that promote a just society.

This anthology pairs major political writings of men and women in the modern period, providing substantial primary source material for study in research and in political theory courses. The book is intended to create bridges in several directions. It links women and men writers of the seventeenth through the twentieth centuries, ending the typical occlusion of certain texts and recreating the dialogues that took place, historically, over issues in political theory and practice. The book also bridges concepts by contemporary writers, especially feminists, and concepts by earlier women and feminist writers. It aims to clarify the conceptual lineage of political ideas, and in some cases reveal a continuity of thought. Finally, it connects contemporary feminist writers and traditional theorists by exposing a body of critical literature that contests modern liberal theory. The concepts of liberty, government restraint, social good, civic virtue, and the role of the state are contested but shared in this bringing together of minds.

The Introduction to Part I provides slightly more historical grounding than later chapters because the historical events in seventeenth-century England set the stage for the versions of western political theory under discussion here. John Locke and Mary Astell were both major participants in the intellectual ferment of their times. I have included some detail about Locke's and Astell's lives, and in general I have followed the principle that where current access to information about a writer's work is limited by the small quantity of available secondary literature, more material should be provided than in the chapters where there is substantial secondary literature available to the reader.

Part II introduces the work of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and Mary Wollstonecraft. Because the underlying principle for the volume as a whole is to find pairs, or in the case of Part VI, a *set* of writings that resonate with each other, themes offer a better match than strict chronological ordering. Rousseau's writings preceded Wollstonecraft's by several decades, but his influence on her was profound. Her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, which appears in Part II, was published two years *after* her *Vindication of the Rights of Men*, which appears in Part III, but intellectually the former is the partner of Rousseau's work while the latter is the partner of Burke's *Reflections*. The reader is therefore introduced to Wollstonecraft's second *Vindication* first, which, as long as the chronology is understood, makes for a more logical set of pairings.

Wollstonecraft's iconoclastic, even scandalous, life has been subject to intense scrutiny over time, and even capitalized on by political theorist and popular novelist William Godwin, to whom she was married for less than a year before her death. In his *Memoirs of the Author of a Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, he found a best-seller that earned him a substantial sum for a number of years.[4] I have refrained from saying much about Wollstonecraft's personal life, for the very reason that it has so often overshadowed her political theory. But I also encourage the interested reader to undertake a responsible study of her fascinating life through some of the better biographies – *after* reading her political treatises.[5]

Issues of federalism and anti-federalism had not loomed large for me prior to doing the research for this text. But as I read more about Mercy Otis Warren, it sparked in me an interest in James Madison and the *Federalist Papers* as well. These issues seemed to me so alive today in the disputes between conservatives and liberals in the United States, but also in some of the issues taken up in the current debates about European union, and the efforts worldwide to achieve new nationhoods based on ethnicity. Curiously, these disputes are often characterized as "political" rather than "philosophical," meaning that they are partisan and not intellectually substantial. I think a careful look at Warren and Madison's work against a contemporary framework will reveal otherwise and show that issues of the nature and extent of local or regional autonomy have important implications in political theory.

The pairing of John Stuart Mill and Maria W. Stewart found in Part V was the one that sparked my interest in this project. The identity of topic and disjunction of circumstance were irresistible. Although they never met, like Locke and Astell, and Wollstonecraft and Rousseau, I could imagine Stewart and Mill engaging in conversation – in a heated dialogue about topics of common interest.

I discovered in my research that in the nineteenth century numerous African American men contributed to political theory in the United States, and have been ignored or forgotten: Martin Delany, Alexander Crummell, Henry Highland Garnet, and David Walker are a few.[6] Frederick Douglass was an obvious choice for this volume because his substantial writings are extensively collected and there is a (too) small but available secondary literature on his work. It was my original intent to include some of the writings of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, until I remembered Matilda Joslyn Gage, a more substantial intellectual (as opposed to activist) than Stanton or Anthony. As I began to think of Part VI in late twentieth century terms – in terms of a matrix of oppression structured initially by attention to race, gender, and class – the logic of combining Douglass, Gage, and Karl Marx seemed compelling. In these writers the three sorts of oppressions, all of central

concern in the mid-eighteenth century, are juxtaposed to reveal the complexities of simultaneous and overlapping systems of domination.

In the final chapter I had thought to include something other than a second selection from Mill. Cooper's prose is so extraordinarily strong and rich that Mill's seems mechanical in contrast, and the connections were not immediately obvious, as they were with Stewart. But the intellectual connections became more apparent. The two shared an interest in liberty for African Americans, education, equality for women, and utilitarian theory. Both had a vision of progress for humanity fueled by similar ideals.

I remain convinced that political theory will be taught in a completely different way in the future; that this collection, which is now innovative and ground-breaking, will appear obvious decades from now. I look forward to the day when the more obscure among my selections will command a substantial secondary literature and serve up many competing volumes – scholarly editions heavily annotated with collations from different editions, student volumes with standardized spellings, usages, and clear explanatory notes. For now we must be content making use of the available primary source material.

There is a symbiotic relationship between theory and practice – between how we think and what we do. Perhaps even more than we typically understand, theory informs practice and contributes to the creation of social institutions and everyday actions. The oppositional writings in the modern period have contributed, not just to theory and practice in politics, but also to science, social science, and humanistic studies. By embracing new sources and their theories we have the opportunity to reassess the canon – in a sense to breathe new life into the old narratives and to create new ones. This book should contribute to that project in political theory, and perhaps provide a model for work in other disciplines as well.

Notes

1 See the introduction to S. Harding and M. Hintikka, *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, and Philosophy of Science* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1983).

2 See Sandra Harding's *The Science Question in Feminism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986) and *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991) for thorough and thoughtful discussions of standpoint epistemologies.

3 Patricia Hill Collins, *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998), p. xi.

4 William Godwin, *Memoirs of the Author of a Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (London: J. Johnson and G. G. and J. Robinson, 1798).

5 Eleanor Flexnor, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Biography* (New York: Coward, McCann and Geohegan, 1972), Emily Sunstein, *A Different Face* (New York: Harper and Row, 1975), Claire Tomalin, *The Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft* (New York: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1974), Ralph Martin Wardle, *Mary Wollstonecraft, A Critical Biography* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), Gary Kelly, *Revolutionary Feminism: The Mind and Career of Mary Wollstonecraft* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996), and Godwin's *Memoirs* are some of the many biographies. All must be read with a critical eye.

6 See for example L. Litwack and A. Meier, eds., *Black Leaders of the Nineteenth Century* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1991), and J. H. Bracey, Jr., A. Meier, and E. Rudwick, *Black Nationalism in America* (New York: Bobbs Merrill, 1970).

PART I

Sources of Political Authority:

JOHN LOCKE AND MARY ASTELL

Absolute Arbitrary Power, or Governing with *settled standing laws*, can neither of them consist with the ends of Society and Government.[1]

***Locke*, Two Treatises of Government**

In 1649, seventeen-year-old John Locke was a pupil at London's Westminster School, when, within earshot of the students, crowds let out an audible gasp as King Charles I was beheaded. It is difficult to imagine what kind of impact the king's execution would have had on a young man. In Locke's case, popular imagery suggests a person who nursed a lifelong dislike of strong measures, one who applied logic and common sense to difficult problems, including those of a political or metaphysical kind. Whatever diverse forces contributed to the formation of Locke's intellect, the result is clear. He is credited with creating the most enduring Enlightenment legacies – liberal political theory with its reverence for freedom and equality – and its progeny – liberal constitutions and representative governments adopted worldwide.

During the 1640s, Great Britain endured years of civil war. Pitting Oliver Cromwell's republicans against the supporters of monarchy and King Charles I, the rival sides fought over issues of religious toleration and the seat of sovereignty. One source of the dispute lay in the failure of the official Anglican church to tolerate dissenting Protestant views including the more radical sects such as the Levellers, Quakers, and Diggers.[2] A second source was Charles' refusal to submit to parliamentary power, which led Parliament to declare sovereignty for itself. Exasperated by the king's internal deceptions, reversals, and duplicitous dealings with foreign powers, the House of Commons tried Charles I and found him guilty of treason for "levying war against parliament and the Kingdom of England." Charles' execution signaled that the civil wars were drawing to a close, but as a central theme of political inquiry, concerns about the sources of political authority were just gathering momentum in western Europe.

After the beheading of Charles I and the ultimate defeat in battle of Charles II, Oliver Cromwell ruled as Lord Protector. During that time Britain was a Commonwealth, but one that was a military state; the ideals of republicanism were suborned

to despotism in one of history's sadder democratic experiments. As one consequence, moderates on both sides seemed to accept the restoration of the monarchy in the person of the exiled Charles II in 1660. In the period that followed, the upper classes of London society immersed themselves in the great wit, plays, and poems of writers such as John Dryden, Alexander Pope, and Aphra Behn.[3]

During these times, Locke had an indifferent career at Christ Church, Oxford – not fond of the scholastic "hog shearing" (hair-splitting arguments) – studying meteorology, botany, and then medicine. Of this period, Locke scholar Peter Laslett says he was "urbane, idle, unhappy and unremarkable."[4] In 1666, Locke's fortunes changed when he met Anthony Ashley Cooper, later to be first earl of Shaftesbury, one of the most prominent and politically powerful men of his time. Locke performed a bizarre and apparently miraculous surgical operation on this ailing aristocrat. In doing so he found a patron and transformed his own prospects. Moving into Shaftesbury's residence, Exeter House, he acquired through this connection a number of political appointments including secretary of the colony of Carolina, for which he wrote a constitution.

It was a time of plots and counter-plots. The change of power from Charles II to James II created an atmosphere of uncertainty. Shaftesbury's newly formed Whig party was determined to remove James from the throne, by act of Parliament or by force. Shaftesbury, imprisoned in the Tower for several months in 1681, was then implicated in the Rye House assassination plot and fled to Holland in 1683, where he died soon after. A close associate of the Shaftesbury circle and Whig party politicians, Locke found himself in a dangerous position. By royal order he was removed from his position at Oxford, where in later years "the developed originality of his thought menaced the curriculum."[5] After the great burning of books in the Bodleian Library Quadrangle, the last ever in England, Locke left Oxford for ever and also sought refuge in Holland. His fortunes changed again when, in 1688, James was permanently deposed, and replaced on the throne by his Anglican sister, Mary, and her husband, William of Orange. Locke and his Whig associates had helped to arrange this "Glorious Revolution" and Locke himself escorted the new queen as they sailed from Holland to England.

> **[Locke] went much further towards revolution and treason than his earlier biographers knew, anxious as they were to present him as a man of unspotted personal and political virtue.[6]**

Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* were published anonymously in 1689, and for centuries were taken as a *post facto* defense of the Glorious Revolution. But in the 1960s, Laslett argued that these texts were written in the dangerous days between 1679 and 1683, as Shaftesbury and political philosopher Algernon Sidney were imprisoned in the Tower for their Whig activities. Laslett notes that lists of books in Locke's library, made as he moved from place to place, included with his political texts a volume entitled *Morbus Gallicus* (literally "the French disease" – syphilis, in the xenophobic phraseology of English physicians). Laslett posits that this title was a double-entendre code for another "French disease" – despotism, and that the book was in fact the *Two Treatises*, disguised to protect Locke from the fate of his patron. Published during the Whig ascendancy, this political tract would have been written a decade earlier when the same views were clearly treasonous. The text may have been sanitized to mask its origins, and some of its "philosophical", that is, highly general

character, would have derived from the expurgation of political particulars relating to anti-Jacobite maneuvers. One vital feature of Laslett's claim is that Locke, long characterized as the father of liberalism, the philosopher who was above the politics of his day, was in fact deeply enmeshed in Whig plotting and politics.

Locke's *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* was published in the same year, and along with the *Two Treatises* is accorded high standing in western thought. Soon after these publications, Locke went to live in the home of Sir Francis and Lady Damaris Masham (daughter of Neo-Platonist Ralph Cudworth) where he continued to write and to be visited by such luminaries as Isaac Newton and Samuel Clark. He died there in 1704.

[Mary Astell was] "wholly wrapt up in Philosophical Metaphysical & Theological & indeed all kinds of Divine Speculations... [whose] life and doctrine [were] exactly conformable unspotted and all of a piece."[7]

George Ballard

As pleased as Locke had been about the installation of Mary and William of Orange as queen and king of Great Britain, so to such a degree was Mary Astell appalled as she grew to understand these politics. From the point of view of representative government, William and Mary were elected, in the sense of chosen by representatives to lead the nation. An act of Parliament made legal the "settlement" of the crown. From the point of view of a hereditary monarchy, James II, deposed from the throne, was the true hereditary heir.

Mary Astell's father was a Newcastle coal merchant, a member of the Guild of Hostmen which had many privileges in controlling the burgeoning industry. Linking medieval economic arrangements with emerging modern capitalism, the coal industry in England presents a fascinating case of hereditary power in a merchant's trade.[8] The Hostmen, whose charter was granted by Elizabeth in 1600, mingled with the upper social classes. Coal interests in Newcastle supported the crown in the civil wars, and for the elite, Charles I had become a martyr figure. He was not, as the Dissenting view would have it, an inept, duplicitous traitor willing to sell his country to other countries in order to maintain absolute power.

This is the setting into which Mary Astell was born, in 1666, during the restoration of the Stuart monarchy, Parliament, and the Church of England. High social position was small comfort to Astell and her mother. When Astell was twelve her father died, leaving the family to rely on the generosity of other Hostmen. Under the tutelage of her uncle, Ralph Astell, an Anglican curate who was eventually expelled from his position because of drunkenness in the pulpit, Mary Astell showed an early aptitude for study, reading Milton and Spenser, and learning the theories of the Cambridge Platonists, including Ralph Cudworth. Against Thomas Hobbes' *Leviathan*, these philosophers argued a spiritualist metaphysics and rationalist philosophy which posited a mystical union of faith and reason.

As a young woman Astell became deeply depressed about her material circumstances.[9] She had no dowry. Her pride and her class consciousness persuaded her not to marry into another, "lower" social class, or to become a governess or teacher.

Nature permits not me the common way,
By serving Court, or State, to gain
That so much valued trifle, Fame[10]

Thus she mused in one of the many poems she wrote throughout her life. She was acutely aware of her lack of opportunity, an awareness which only heightened as the years passed. But maturity led her to change her views – that not "Nature," but *society* kept her from fully developing her extensive talents. Astell was extremely pious throughout her life. She took her joy from intellectual activity, which was deeply entwined with her Anglican faith. Her material needs were sparse, but real.

Since Henry VIII had "dissolved" the monasteries in the 1540s and created himself head of the Anglican church, there were no longer cloistered places where women like herself who had few financial resources could go to live a quiet, studious life. She mourned this loss, at first privately and then publicly in her first published writing, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*. But before she could put pen to paper to argue her views she had to make for herself a suitable position in the world in the absence of any social institution designed for that purpose. And she did a most extraordinary thing. Astell gathered what funds she could, left her mother, and took the stagecoach to London. Desperately in need of a patron, she wrote a plea to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who had just been released from the Tower. Astell's intelligent support of Anglicanism must have appealed to the Archbishop, who gave her money and contacts and, according to her biographer Ruth Perry, may have provided her with an introduction to her future publisher, Rich Wilkin, who was "a resolute champion of monarchy."[11]

The Reflector is happily of the Feminine gender[12]
***Mary Astell*, Some Reflections upon Marriage**

In spite of her ongoing financial difficulties, Astell pursued her philosophical labors, which "suited her abstract mind . . . [and] satisfied her abstemious and intellectual character."[13] Another unsolicited letter propelled her as a participant into the world of philosophical and political discourse. This time she wrote to John Norris, a renowned Platonist whom she admired "as the thinker who criticized Locke for relegating God to an unimportant role in the way human sensations build into ideas."[14] She boldly sparred with Norris, beginning a spirited correspondence centering on "her belief in the immaterial intellect, which had no gender and was the essential feature of human nature," which Perry interprets as "at the heart of her feminism . . . fed by her highly politicized sense of power relations between governments and constituencies."[15]

By 1694 she had published *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*, her closely reasoned plea for a women's college, and in the next year her correspondence with Norris, *Letters Concerning the Love of God*, came into print. *A Serious Proposal* was critiqued by Lady Damaris Masham, who at an earlier time might have applauded her work. But by that time, Locke was residing in Lady Masham's household and her sympathies to views like Astell's had diminished. About this time Astell also published *Some Reflections upon Marriage*, in which she develops a novel and compelling argument against the dissolution of marriage contracts and of civil government.

At the turn of the century Astell became a lively participant in the pamphlet wars of the day, engaging in dispute with Daniel Defoe and with Addison and Steele. Their journal *The Tatler*, which provided a high-profile forum for political and literary ideas, referred to Astell as "Madonella." In quick succession she wrote several more lengthy pamphlets: *Moderation Truly Stated, A Fair Way with Dissenters and Their*