

OXFORD READINGS

IN FEMINISM



# **FEMINISM** & **POLITICS**

**Anne Phillips**

OXFORD READINGS IN FEMINISM

---

# Feminism and Politics

---

Edited by

**Anne Phillips**

Oxford · New York

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

1998

**OXFORD**  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi

Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi

New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece

Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan South Korea Poland Portugal

Singapore Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

Introduction and Selection © Oxford University Press 1998

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

Reprinted 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
And you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

ISBN 978-0-19-878205-6

Printed in the United Kingdom by  
Lightning Source UK Ltd., Milton Keynes

OXFORD READINGS IN FEMINISM  
**FEMINISM AND POLITICS**

## Notes on Contributors

SUSAN C. BOURQUE is the E. B. Wiley Professor of Government and Dean for Academic Development at Smith College. Until 1994 she was chair of the Government department and Director of the Smith Project on Women and Social Change. Her most recent book is *The Politics of Women's Education*, co-edited with Jill K. Conway (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993). Dr Bourque received her Ph.D. from Cornell University.

TERESA BRENNAN is Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research, New York; she was previously Professor of Women's Studies at the University of Amsterdam. She is the author of *The Interpretation of the Mind* (Routledge) and *History after Lacan* (Routledge 1994), and the editor of *Between Psychoanalysis and Feminism* (Routledge).

JUDITH BUTLER is Chancellor's Professor in the Department of Rhetoric at UCLA. Her books include *Gender Trouble* (Routledge, 1990), *Bodies That Matter* (Routledge, 1993), and *The Psychic Life of Power* (Stanford University Press, 1997).

KIMBERLE CRENSHAW is Professor of Law at the Los Angeles Law School, University of California.

IRENE DIAMOND is Professor of Political Science at the University of Oregon. She is the author of many books and articles, including *Fertile Ground: Women, Earth and the Limits of Control* (Beacon Press, 1994) and *Feminism and Foucault: Reflection on Resistance* (Northeastern University Press, 1988).

MARY G. DIETZ is a Professor in the Department of Political Science, University of Minnesota. She is the author of *Between the Human and the Divine: The Political Thought of Simone Weil* and editor of *Thomas Hobbes and Political Theory* and has written essays on Machiavelli, Arendt, Habermas, patriotism, feminist politics, and the meaning of political action.

JEAN BETHKE ELSHTAIN is the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Professor of Social and Political Ethics at the University of Chicago. She is the author of many books, including *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought*. Books she has edited include *The Family in Political Thought*; *Politics and the Human Body*; and *Just War Theory*. Elshtain is also the author of over two hundred articles and essays in scholarly journals and journals of civic opinion. In 1996 she was elected a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. She also writes a regular column for *The New Republic*.

NANCY FRASER is Professor of Political Science at the Graduate Faculty of the New School for Social Research. She is the author of *Unruly Practices*.

Minnesota Press, 1989), the co-author of *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange* (Routledge, 1994) and the co-editor of *Revaluing French Feminism: Critical Essays on Difference, Agency and Culture* (Indiana University Press, 1992). Her new book, *Justice Interruptus*, was published by Routledge in 1996.

JEAN GROSSHOLTZ is a political activist and Professor of Politics and Women's Studies at Mount Holyoke College. She has written books on Philippine and Sri Lankan politics and articles on Southeast Asian politics, violence against women, the peace movement and global feminism.

NANCY HARTSOCK is Professor of Political Science at the University of Washington. She is author of *Money, Sex, and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism* (New York: Longman, 1983; Boston, Northeastern University Press, 1984) and many other essays in feminist theory. She is interested in the relationships between politics and epistemologies, and a collection of her essays on these issues, *The Feminist Standpoint Revisited*, will be published by Westview Press in 1998.

BERNICE JOHNSON REAGON, Distinguished Professor of History at American University and Curator Emeritus at the Smithsonian Institution, she is also a composer and recording producer. She resides in Washington, DC and continues to perform with Sweet Honey In The Rock, the African American female acapella ensemble she founded in 1973.

CATHARINE A. MACKINNON is a lawyer, teacher, writer, activist, and expert on sex equality. She has been Professor of Law at the University of Michigan Law School since 1990, and is Visiting Professor of Law at the University of Chicago Law School. She is currently representing *pro bono* Croatian and Muslim women and children victims of Serbian genocidal atrocities seeking remedies under international law.

Her recent publications include *Toward a Feminist Theory of the State* (Harvard, 1989) and *Only Words* (Harvard, 1993). Forthcoming works include *In Harm's Way: The Pornography Civil Rights Hearings* (with Andrea Dworkin, Harvard, 1998) and *Sex Equality* (Foundation, 1998), a legal casebook.

JANE MANSBRIDGE is Professor of Public Policy at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University. She is the author of *Beyond Adversary Democracy* and *Why We Lost the ERA*, editor of *Beyond Self Interest*, and co-editor, with Susan Moller Okin, of *Feminism*, a two-volume collection.

SUSAN MOLLER OKIN teaches in Political Science and in the Ethics in Society Program at Stanford University. She is the author of *Women in Western Political Thought* (1979, 1992), *Justice, Gender and the Family* (1979) and articles on topics ranging from feminist theory to the ethics of nuclear deterrence policy.

CAROLE PATEMAN is Professor of Political Science, UCLA and Adjunct Professor in the Research School of Social Sciences, Australian National

University. Her books include *Participation and Democratic Theory* and *The Sexual Contract*.

ANNE PHILLIPS is Professor of Politics at London Guildhall University. Her publications include *The Politics of Presence* (1995), *Democracy and Difference* (1993), *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* (co-edited with Michèle Barrett, 1992) and *Engendering Democracy* (1991).

ROSEMARY PRINGLE is Professor of Women's Studies at Griffith University. Her publications include *Transitions: New Australian Feminisms*, which she co-edited with Barbara Caine (Allen and Unwin, 1995) and *Sex and Medicine* (forthcoming Allen and Unwin, 1998).

DEBORAH L. RHODE is Professor of Law and Director of the Keck Centre on the Legal Profession at Stanford University. She is the author of *Justice, Gender and Speaking of Sex* and was a former Director of Stanford's Institute for Research on Women and Gender. She is currently President Elect of the Association of American Law Schools.

VIRGINIA SAPIRO is the Sophonisba P. Breckinridge Professor of Political Science and Women's Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and directs the American National Election Studies. Her books include *The Political Integration of Women* (1983), *Women in American Society* (1998) and *A Vindication of Political Virtue: The Political Theory of Mary Wollstonecraft* (1992).

CHRISTINE SYLVESTER's recent work on feminist international relations appears in US, Australian, Finnish, Swedish and German journals. She has also completed a study of 'women', 'production' and 'progress' in Mashonaland, Zimbabwe, and has several projects underway on art, gender, development and international relations. She is at the National Centre for Development Studies, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, Australian National University.

CHANDRA TALPADE MOHANTY teaches feminist and anti-racist studies at Hamilton College, Clinton. She has co-edited *Third World Women and The Politics of Feminism* (Indiana University Press, 1991) and *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures* (Routledge, 1997).

SOPHIE WATSON is a Professor in the Centre for Urban Studies in the School for Policy Studies at the University of Bristol. Her recent publications include (with P. Murphy) *Surface City: Sydney at the Millennium* (Pluto Press) and *Postmodern Cities and Spaces* (edited collection with K. Gibson, Basil Blackwell).

IRIS MARION YOUNG teaches ethics and political theory in the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs at the University of Pittsburgh. Her most recent book is entitled *Intersecting Voices: Dilemmas of Gender, Political Philosophy, and Policy* (Princeton University Press, 1997).

Lightning Source UK Ltd.  
Milton Keynes UK  
UKOW04f0941211014

240412UK00001B/30/P





# Contents

<i>Notes on contributors</i>	vii
Introduction ANNE PHILLIPS	1
<b>I. Feminism and Political Studies</b>	
1. Politics an Unnatural Practice: Political Science Looks at Female Participation SUSAN BOURQUE AND JEAN GROSSHOLTZ	23
2. Homeless in International Relations? 'Women's' Place in Canonical Texts and Feminist Reimaginings CHRISTINE SYLVESTER	44
3. Feminist Studies and Political Science—and Vice Versa VIRGINIA SAPIRO	67
<b>II. Feminism and Political Theory</b>	
4. 'Mere Auxiliaries to the Commonwealth': Women and the Origins of Liberalism TERESA BRENNAN AND CAROLE PATEMAN	93
5. Gender, the Public, and the Private SUSAN MOLLER OKIN	116
6. Feminism and Democracy JANE MANSBRIDGE	142
<b>III. Interests and Representation</b>	
7. When are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women VIRGINIA SAPIRO	161
8. Beyond Interests in Politics: A Comment on Virginia Sapiro's 'When Are Interests Interesting? The Problem of Political Representation of Women' IRENE DIAMOND AND NANCY HARTSOCK	193
9. 'Women's Interests' and the Poststructuralist State ROSEMARY PRINGLE AND SOPHIE WATSON	203
10. Democracy and Representation: Or, Why Should it Matter Who our Representatives Are? ANNE PHILLIPS	224

# **IV. Identities and Coalitions**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 11. Coalition Politics: Turning the Century                  | 242 |
| BERNICE JOHNSON REAGON                                       |     |
| 12. Feminist Encounters: Locating the Politics of Experience | 254 |
| CHANDRA TALPADE MOHANTY                                      |     |
| 13. Subjects of Sex/Gender/Desire                            | 273 |
| JUDITH BUTLER  |     |

# **V. Equality and Anti-Discrimination**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 14. Difference and Dominance: On Sex Discrimination  | 295 |
| CATHARINE MACKINNON  |     |
| 15. Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex:<br>A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination<br>Doctrine, Feminist Theory, and Antiracist Politics | 314 |
| KIMBERLE CRENSHAW  |     |
| 16. The Politics of Paradigms: Gender Difference and<br>Gender Disadvantage  | 344 |
| DEBORAH L. RHODE   |     |

# **VI. Feminism and Citizenship**

- |  |     |
|--|-----|
| 17. Antigone's Daughters   | 363 |
| JEAN BETHKE ELSHTAIN   |     |
| 18. Context Is All: Feminism and Theories of Citizenship                                 | 378 |
| MARY G. DIETZ  |     |
| 19. Polity and Group Difference: A Critique of the Ideal of<br>Universal Citizenship     | 401 |
| IRIS MARION YOUNG  |     |
| 20. From Redistribution to Recognition? Dilemmas of<br>Justice in a 'Post-Socialist' Age | 430 |
| NANCY FRASER   |     |

- |              |     |
|--------------|-----|
| <i>Index</i> | 461 |
|--------------|-----|

# Introduction

Anne Phillips

Feminism is politics. Yet, judging from its impact on either theory or practice, feminism has been less successful in challenging 'malestream' politics than in the near-revolution it has achieved elsewhere. We are living through a time of major transformation in sexual relations: transformations that can be measured in the global feminization of the workforce, the rapid equalization between the sexes (at least in the richer countries) in educational participation and qualifications, and a marked increase in women's self-confidence and self-esteem that is probably the most lasting legacy of the contemporary women's movement. The changes cannot be attributed to feminism alone, and are often ambiguous in their effects; but even if the reshaping of gender relations is partial and deeply problematic, it would be hard not to notice this as a period of significant change. In politics, by contrast, it still seems like business as usual. Certainly, the politics portrayed to us via the daily newspapers and television accounts remains overwhelmingly masculine in personnel and style; while in some parts of the world, women face direct attacks on recently achieved civil rights by parties and governments resisting the implications of sexual equality.

Politics as pursued in academic departments is also surprisingly untouched, for while the literature on gender and politics or feminist political theory has grown from a few seminal articles into a rich diversity of work, 'feminism and politics' is still treated as a discrete object of study of interest only to those inside it. Sociologists have always included the family among their objects of study. Literary critics have never been able to avoid women writers. Students of politics, by contrast, have taken this as referring to a domain of public power from which women are largely absent. In one of the early discussions of feminism and politics, Joni Lovenduski noted that 'there was never any way that the modern study of politics could fail to be sexist' for 'women usually do not dispose of public power,

belong to political elites, or hold influential positions in government institutions'.<sup>1</sup> The very definition of the subject matter has made politics peculiarly intransigent to feminist transformations.

This relative intransigence has had one—rather unexpected—result: that the feminists who once sighted politics everywhere are not particularly enthused by the study of politics, and are far more readily engaged by work in cultural studies or philosophy or film. Michèle Barrett has written of a 'turn to culture' in recent feminism that has shifted the words/things balance away from the more materialist preoccupations of the social sciences (their preoccupation, as she puts it, with 'things') and towards the cultural salience of words. 'Feminism sells best as fiction', and even in the more academic literature, 'the rising star lies with the arts, humanities and philosophy'.<sup>2</sup> This turn to culture need not be construed as an anti-politics; indeed, Barrett suggests that the later preoccupations could help us towards a better account of subjective political motivation and open up space for a more explicitly ethical politics. But the effects can be somewhat perplexing for feminists studying on politics courses or researching in areas normally associated with political science or political theory. I remember rushing out to buy a new collection of essays published under the title *Feminists Theorize the Political*,<sup>3</sup> a collection packed with fascinating essays, but organized, as it turned out, around confirming or contesting the value of poststructuralist theories. It can be hard to know what to do with this in a world where 'the political' still conjures up images of governments and elections and parties: should feminists simply refuse to engage with this dreary universe, or do we have to engage in order to transform?

In the stories we tell ourselves of the development of feminist thinking, we often construct histories that demonstrate a movement from naïvety to sophistication, a progression from simpler to more complex beliefs. It is sometimes suggested, for example, that feminists began their explorations with a relatively uncomplicated notion of 'filling the gaps', and only later moved on to more conceptually challenging questions. Joan Scott describes feminist historians in the first years of the contemporary women's movement as setting out to establish women's presence and participation through history—as making visible what was previously ignored.<sup>4</sup> Such work perhaps began as a relatively simple process of historical recovery, but when 'the questions of why these facts had been ignored and how they were now to be understood were raised, history became more than a search for facts'.<sup>5</sup> Accounts of feminism and politics often make similar points. Virginia Sapiro writes in

Chapter 3 of an initial period when 'most work was of the "add women and stir" or compensatory variety', while a recent collection on feminism and politics suggests that '(e)arly efforts to explore women's participation in the traditional political arenas were basically descriptive or mapping exercises',<sup>6</sup> and that it was only as the limitations of this became apparent that feminists embarked on a paradigm shift that more fundamentally questioned the categories of analysis.

These histories do convey something of the growing sophistication of feminist thought, but there is a troubling neatness to their pattern, and as applied to feminist thinking about politics they underestimate one crucial feature. Contemporary feminism developed out of a period of radical disillusionment with the post-war political settlement in North America and Europe, and both its language and forms of organization were significantly influenced by the radical sub-cultures from which it emerged. Earlier generations of feminists had often employed a vocabulary of women's equality or women's emancipation. The activists of the contemporary women's movement typically talked of 'women's liberation', and David Bouchier has suggested that this phrase originated in sardonic reference to the way women were treated in liberation movements for black or Third World peoples.<sup>7</sup> Many of those who read the new feminist literature or marched in the women's-movement demonstrations were experiencing their first involvement in politics, but a significant minority came from a prior engagement with new-left or civil-rights politics. They came, that is, with a conception of politics that was already at odds with the dull routines of political parties, or the backstage manoeuvrings through which public policy is made. In the formative years of the contemporary women's movement, the 'politics' that feminists were contesting was already a deviation from conventional norms.

'The personal is political' is probably the best-known slogan of those early years, but the key point about this is that it was directed primarily at socialist or radical men. It signalled a move away from the contestations between capital and labour that had preoccupied generations of Marxist activists, and questioned the radicalism of those new social movements that were themselves extending the meaning of politics, but rarely to the point of including who did the housework or who typed the leaflets or who had the power in bed. It also, of course, queried that more academic literature on politics which looked to states or interest groups or rational individuals and failed to spot women in any of these places. But 'the personal is

political' derived most of its force from arguments within radical politics, for it was in this context that the preoccupations with sexual equality were most consistently sneered at as a trivial diversion. The feminism of the 1960s or 70s issued a potentially devastating challenge to both conventional and radical understandings of politics. There was no naïve early moment before anyone paused to ask what was wrong with the way politics was conceived.

The problem, if any, was that 'politics' was subjected to such devastating criticism that it threatened to dissolve as a distinct category of analysis. The notion of power as ubiquitous is often attributed to Michel Foucault (and feminists have indeed made much use of Foucault in analysing the power of discursive practices or challenging what Rosemary Pringle and Sophie Watson in Chapter 9 term 'essentialist' notions of the state), but feminists were already acting on a more relational understanding of power long before any of them cited Foucault's work. Representations of masculinity and femininity were seen as forms of control over women just as effective as the nineteenth-century legislation that had denied them the vote; and the regulation of sexuality—including what many have described as 'compulsory heterosexuality'—was seen as a central mechanism in sustaining sexual inequality. Politics was power, power was everywhere, and politics was no longer much different from anything else.

Against this background, feminist thinking on politics has often been characterized by a double movement towards both critique and recuperation. In her influential analysis of *Public Man, Private Woman*, Jean Bethke Elshtain traced the different ways that distinctions between public and private have operated in the traditions of Western political thought: sometimes as a sharp demarcation that allocated certain kinds of people to the realm of politics and others to the realm of the household; sometimes as a differentiation within each individual between the public language of reason and the private language of sentiment; always as a thoroughly gendered analysis that sought to protect politics from contamination by the private sphere. In one particularly evocative sentence, Elshtain suggests that 'politics is in part an elaborate defence against the tug of the private, against the lure of the familial, against evocations of female power'.<sup>8</sup> The implication, it might seem, is that the barriers should be finally torn down—but Elshtain is equally critical of what she views as a total collapse of public and private in radical feminist thought. Against the starker interpretations of 'the personal is political', Elshtain wants to recapture both the centrality of the family and the

importance of politics *per se*. She objects, that is, to the over-politicization of childrearing that understates the importance of a permanent relationship between child and caring adult; she also objects to the depoliticization of 'politics' that discourages feminists from addressing issues of citizenship or political authority. If we are to reconstruct the public/private divide so that it no longer silences or marginalizes women, we must first comprehend its recurring power.

Elshtain's own reconstruction has proved particularly contentious within feminism—she is associated with what Mary Dietz describes as a 'maternal feminism' that looks to the values and practices of mothering as the basis for a more ethical polity—but that [double imperative towards critique and recuperation has remained a defining characteristic.] Feminists have developed and deepened their critical assessment of the various ways in which politics is conceived. They have increasingly combined this, however, with a calling back to politics, stressing the insights feminism can bring to the theorization of public power. Some of this recuperates the more self-evidently 'political' preoccupation with women's underrepresentation in decision-making assemblies; some of it focuses on the complex dilemmas that arise in developing legislation for sexual equality; much of it involves a retheorization of citizenship that takes feminist issues right to the heart of the public domain.

In many ways, the theoretical debates then replicate the tension between 'reformism' and 'utopianism' that has been played out on more practical terrain. Should women be trying to get into politics? Or setting their sights on much higher goals? Many have warned against uncritical assimilation of traditional social-science methodology: the dangers, for example, in presenting women as just another interest group, or the impoverishment of understanding that comes with the preference for quantitative over qualitative analysis in contemporary political science.<sup>9</sup> Others, meanwhile, have warned against wholesale repudiation of traditional research methods, arguing that feminism has a distinctive approach to politics but not a unique methodology, and that feminists should avoid attacks on 'male' rationality or science *per se*.<sup>10</sup> Feminism is necessarily subversive, but there is no unified position on the kind of subversion required.]

---

FEMINIST CRITIQUES OF POLITICS

---

So what, if anything, characterizes feminist critiques of politics? Most of the arguments share three common starting-points: that existing definitions are saturated with gender; that this saturation has worked in such a way as to legitimate women's lack of political power; and that much of the process depends on a particular way of conceiving of the public-private divide. We might think that women are less visible in politics simply because they do less politics than men. The complacent version of this (described by Susan Bourque and Jean Grossholtz in Chapter 1 as 'the assumption of male dominance') raises no awkward questions about women's lesser visibility, and simply takes it for granted that men will do politics while women tend the children and home. The more critical version views this state of affairs as a consequence of the sexual division of labour in employment and carework, and focuses its energies on combating the structures of sexual inequality that make it so hard for women to enter the political domain. The literature on feminism and politics often includes this last point—the idea, that is, that society is structured in such a way as to keep women politically marginal—but it always looks to the additional power of the categories in making women less politically visible. Notions of political rationality, for example, often derive from a 'masculine' paradigm that disdains what it perceives as the more gossipy preoccupations of women. This can have very direct political effects, in making it harder for women to win recognition as serious candidates for political office, or harder for groups campaigning around what are seen as women's issues to win recognition as serious actors on the political stage. It also has more indirect consequences in turning the public domain into what Elshtain in Chapter 17 describes as 'amoral statecraft'—emptying out of politics what are regarded as more feminine (read 'soppy') concerns.

Distinctions between public and private play a central role in this critique. Most feminists now query the tendency to dissolve *all* distinction between public and private—'women, just as much as men, need privacy for the development of intimate relations with others, for the space to shed their roles temporarily, and for the time by themselves that contributes to the development of the mind and of creativity' (Okin, Chapter 5)—but all argue that the boundaries should become more permeable, and that changing the way we view



them gives us new insight into the processes of political exclusion. The point here is not that the literature on politics has ignored the public-private divide. In many formulations of liberalism, this demarcation appears as the first line of defence against tyranny, reminding expansionist governments of the dangers of establishing state control over the 'private' workings of the economy, and securing to individual citizens their rights to decide for themselves what religion, if any, to practise, or what books, if any, to read. In socialist arguments, by contrast, the demarcation is often seen as reinforcing tyranny, encouraging us to believe that political equality is secured despite all the gross inequalities in social and economic life, discouraging the notion that democracy is as relevant in the workplace as in the regulation of political life. Political theorists have talked often enough about the public-private divide, but one of the key points made by feminists (most notably in an article by Carole Pateman)<sup>11</sup> is that their arguments proceed as if the distinction refers only to that between state and economy, or state and civil society. They fail to register that 'public-private' refers to not one but two distinctions; they gloss over that further distinction that differentiates both state and civil society from the deeper privacy of the domestic sphere.

This suppression has had serious consequences for political thought. When political theorists cast the veil of deep privacy over relations in the domestic sphere, this makes it much easier for them to perform the sleight of hand that turns the innocent-sounding 'individual' into a synonym for 'male head of household'. It also enables them to presume that arguments about equality or justice do not apply to the relationship between wife and husband or between parent and child. Feminist scholarship has established the complex and often quirky consequences of this in the writings of classical political theorists, and re-examination of the history of political thought has proved one of the most exciting developments of the 1980s.<sup>12</sup> That the 'great thinkers' suffered from various degrees of misogyny or sexual evasion is not, perhaps, so suprising. More unexpectedly, feminists have been able to demonstrate a continuing slippage between 'the individual' and 'the male head of household' even in contemporary writers like John Rawls.<sup>13</sup>

The implications for normative political theory are profound. At their most obvious, they require us to extend into the domestic sphere questions previously considered relevant only to the public arrangements between citizens: to ask why those who regard freedom as the capacity to give or withdraw consent still hear rape