

FEMINIST RADICALISM IN THE 1980's (I)

Angela Miles

Introduction

Many feminist radicals believe that men's dominance of women precedes the emergence of class domination and is the most profound condition of alienation, the deepest division of humanity within and from itself, upon which all other domination is built. If this is true the emergence of women acting consciously against their oppression holds the promise of a more complete challenge to domination than has ever been possible before. In so far as it articulates this challenge feminism represents, not only the interests of a new pressure group, but the potential for a new and broader progressive politics in general. A significant tendency of the women's movement has persistently claimed this large historical role for feminism. Its vision and forms of practice have, from the beginning, constituted a major break with the male defined world and politics. And it has presumed feminism to be a *politique entier* rather than a subcategory of any other politics.

The article published here is the second half of a longer monograph entitled *Feminist Radicalism in the Eighties* to be published by *CultureTexts* in Spring 1985. The first half of the monograph describes the history of this tendency of the women's movement from its inception. It thus traces the developments in theory and practice which laid the basis for the emergence, in the 1980's, of the kind of universal feminist politics that this tendency of the movement has always believed to be both possible and necessary. In this analysis special emphasis is placed on the emerging recognition of women's specificity rather than sameness with men as the basis for unique feminist values and a feminist vision which can:

FEMINIST RADICALISM

- Challenge male claims of universality;
- Transform and broaden male definitions of human nature and such classic progressive values as justice, freedom and equality;
- Give real substance to the notion of non-alienated man¹ and bring it, for the first time, from a distant abstract goal to a concrete guide to practice.

The part of the monograph which follows below describes the universal feminist politics that the recognition of women's specificity as well as equality has made possible and is developing today in theory and practice.*

The Theory

In 1970 in her book, *The Dialectic of Sex*, Shulamith Firestone attempted to develop the kind of dynamic, historical and materialist analysis of sexual oppression that marxism had provided of class exploitation. Since she argued that sexual domination precedes and underlies class domination her analysis was not intended to simply parallel or accompany marxist analysis but to transcend it in a "materialist view of [the whole of] history based on sex."² This new understanding would open the way for a more throughgoing attack on domination in which active and conscious women — feminists — would be central agents. In this theoretical project she articulated the presumptions and intentions of feminist radicals of the time who expected to "go further" than male radicals and the New Left had done in their struggle for liberation. Her claims for the significance of sexual oppression and the necessarily central role of feminism in any struggle against domination also reflect a deep underlying belief that has persisted among feminist radicals since that time.

But Shulamith Firestone, in those early days, without the subsequent lessons of feminist practice and without the specifically feminist values that have developed in the intervening period, could not fully realise her project. Without the alternative values that emerge when the specific nature of women's activity and characteristics are taken into account as well as women's status as an oppressed group, her critique had to remain partial. She could not challenge man's definition of liberation, authenticity, humanity, nature, society or alienation, or the shape of his knowledge, technology, and science. Rather, her challenges remained piecemeal and did not amount to a fully fledged alternative perspective.³

* Other publications in which I have analysed the political importance of the feminist recognition of women's specificity include: "The Integrative Feminine Principle in North American Feminist Radicalism: Value Basis of a New Feminism," *Women's Studies International Quarterly* IV, 4 (1981); "Ideological Hegemony in Political Discourse: Women's Specificity and Equality," in *Feminism and Canada*. Angela Miles and Geraldine Finn eds., Black Rose Books 1982.

ANGELA MILES

Her work must stand, like the practice of the period, as a courageous and creative statement of intent and of faith. Feminist radicals of that time defined the depth and breadth of the feminist project and did not flinch at the enormity of the task. Since that time many feminists have sustained the commitment to that task in their refusal to compromise in the face of apparent contradictions, painful political lessons, frightening uncertainty and insistent reductionist calls of other feminists.⁴ They have recognized the increasing variety of their personal, political, social and spiritual practice as important building blocks of an as yet unformed new politics. And, in fact, it is exactly this diversity of arenas and of participants that provided the ground for a specific female voice and female associated values to emerge.

This, in turn, has enabled the feminist critique of patriarchy to become an immanent critique which is at the same time a vision of the future and a basis for strategic development. This critique challenges marxism's claim to universality with a vision grounded in women's specificity and successfully addresses the question of the origins of domination itself in analyses that incorporate feminists' recognition of biology and psychology in a transformed and broadened historical materialism.

The question of the origins of domination has always been a more central question for feminists than for marxists. And the answer to this question is a crucially determinant factor in the shape of emerging politics. The fact that women's oppression is so deeply structured and rationalized in terms of their ability to give birth and that women's resistance is so immediately met by powerful socio-biological opposition means that feminists have dealt centrally with questions of biology. From Simone de Beauvoir, Juliet Mitchell and Shulamith Firestone's escape from biology to Susan Griffin and Adrienne Rich's embrace of biology, feminist theory has always explicitly recognized its importance.

Feminists' deep interest in the question why men* dominate each other and women has meant that they have also consistently included a psychological component in their analysis. Marxists who have addressed the psychological aspects of oppression have mainly asked why men* are psychologically vulnerable to domination. For they tend to presume that the question of why men* dominate is answered by the existence of surplus value. Some feminist analysis is satisfied with a similarly inadequate position, answering simply that men* dominate women and each other because they have the resources, or in order to protect their privileges. But unless one accepts the socio-biological or liberal notion of innately aggressive or competitive, acquisitive man* it must remain problematic why the existence of surplus or other resources for domination are actually used by some to dominate others.

Feminists faced with oppression by husbands, lovers, brothers and sons have been forced to deal with this question in ways that marxists have not. The result has been the attention to psychological factors evidenced by references throughout the literature to men's ego needs, fear of castration, womb envy, fear of women, birth envy and so on.⁵ In the absence of a fully fledged theory these biological and psychological insights were often reductionist and earned

FEMINIST RADICALISM

frequent marxist dismissal as idealist, psychologist or biologically determinist. But the biological and psychological themes represent a feminist awareness, based on lived experience, of the depth and complexity of relations of domination. Women's experience is a fine protection against the kind of economism that has bedeviled marxism and the psychological and biological themes have been important in the feminist reconstitution of theory beyond marxist materialism.

This feminist theory is neither monolithic nor complete but is beginning to emerge today in many forms and forums under the impetus of the increasingly complex practice of an expanding and diverse women's movement.⁶ Mary O'Brien's book *The Politics of Reproduction* and Nancy Hartsock's *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism* are two very different, yet surprisingly complementary works which clearly illustrate the nature of this new theory and the direction of its future development. The writers are both activists writing from questions that have arisen in their practice and that of others. They argue that theoretical work is essential to feminist political development and recognize at the same time that their own work, and indeed all theory, is ultimately rooted in practice. In fact the striking parallels which will become evident in their analyses, are eloquent testimony to this "living unity of theory and practice"⁷ since both authors were unaware of the other's work at the time of writing.

Both are concerned not merely to analyse women but to reanalyse the world and in the process to contribute to the reconstitution of radical theory and radical practice in general. Mary O'Brien seeks a "theoretical basis for a feminism which can transform the world . . . a feminist praxis which has as its aim the making of a future, which is the making of history."⁸ Nancy Hartsock seeks "to understand the gender as well as class dimension of domination⁹ (in) a retheorization of power . . . which could . . . lead toward the constitution of a more complete and thoroughgoing human community."¹⁰

Both writers proceed by demonstrating that all civilized thinking in its varied forms, from Greece through Hegel and Marx, advanced capitalism and Freud, Marcuse and the existentialists, has been organized around the unexamined assumption of an essential and hierarchical dualism. They identify this dualism as the hallmark of patriarchal thought and deny its previously unchallenged universalism in an immanent critique which argues that dualistic world views are grounded only in male experience. They reflect man's* condition, not the human condition.¹¹

But male ideology like bourgeois ideology not only masks/inverts but also creates/shapes reality. These feminists, then, deny that dualism is inevitable or essential to the human condition while recognizing that it has been men's* actual experience of that condition and has in fact shaped our world from the beginning of recorded time:

ANGELA MILES

The experience of the ruling group cannot be dismissed as simply false. This experience, because of the hegemony of that group, sets the dynamics of the social relations in which all parties are forced to participate (therefore) . . . a community grounded on a sexuality structured by violence, domination and death are (sic) made real for everyone.¹²

In locating the roots of dualism and domination in men's* lived experience of the world Mary O'Brien and Nancy Hartsock develop a materialist analysis of patriarchy. But theirs is a transformed materialism which incorporates and indeed privileges the relations of reproduction over those of production as the sight of a fuller and more developed analysis of the world. Mary O'Brien speaks of "two necessary processes in the experiential matrix of human nature . . . — the necessities to produce and reproduce"¹³ and criticizes the "one-sidedness"¹⁴ of Marx who ignored the latter. But hers is not a dualistic analysis which simply adds a parallel system of reproductive domination to Marx's picture as the socialist-feminist economic analyses have done. Instead, she "extends dialectical materialism to give a synthesized account of both poles of human necessity (in a) feminist theory of historical process which can transcend the unsatisfactory reductionism which has bedeviled male-stream thought."¹⁶ For Nancy Hartsock, too, an analysis encompassing reproduction provides a broader and more universal understanding than male theory and ideology can offer for "beneath the epistemological level of production . . . one encounters the epistemological level of reproduction . . . a level at which a more encompassing and insistent historical materialism may be created."¹⁷

Shulamith Firestone also insisted, against Simone de Beauvoir's acceptance of "a priori (dualistic) categories of thought and existence,"¹⁸ that these categories are not essential to human existence as such. Instead, she argued, they "sprang from the sexual division itself . . . Biology itself — procreation — is at the origins of dualism."¹⁹ For her, "the natural reproductive difference between the sexes led directly to the first division of labour . . . (But) the 'natural' is not necessarily a 'human' value"²⁰ and we can escape from it today.

By locating the original dualism in biology and accepting male/female dualism as natural rather than constructed, Shulamith Firestone accepted patriarchal dualism as a true reflection of the world and had to pose her struggle for liberation against biology and nature. Hers was, in the end, a biological rather than materialist analysis. In contrast current integrative feminist theory refuses to accept that dualism (male/female or any other) is natural any more than it is essential. Mary O'Brien and Nancy Hartsock explain the denial of human and historical status to reproductive activity and to women as a central expression, institutionalization and protection of a dualism which reflects only men's* experience of reality. In reclaiming reproductive activity as a human process which provides a material substructure of history they show that the "material base of dualism is not static, brute, unchanging, ahistorical or inhuman."²¹

Men's denial of reproduction and the female in a series of theoretical and institutionalized dualisms (between culture and nature, public and private,

FEMINIST RADICALISM

death and birth, life and necessity, mind and body, soul and flesh, emotion and intellect, subject and object) in fact "translates [and creates] *male* experience of separation . . . into a priori universal truth."²² But it is not a true universal, for women's different lived experience of reproduction, motherhood and the sexual division of labour offers the material basis for a more integrated relationship to the world and others, and the potential, in this historical period, of an alternative consciousness and struggle for a non-alienated world.²³

The grand re-visionings of human history and human struggle that Mary O'Brien and Nancy Hartsock present are closely argued in dialogue with the whole tradition of western political thought and major preceding feminist theory. It is impossible here to give any sense of the subtlety of their arguments or the complexity and depth of the detailed underpinnings of their meta-theory. Even so, the following schematic presentation will illustrate the radical and original nature of both critiques and the striking differences and similarities in these two attempts to build a feminist materialism which can sustain a universal feminist politics.

Mary O'Brien grounds men and women's different consciousness in their materially different experience of the process of reproduction. Men experience reproduction chiefly in terms of the alienation of their seed. While for women reproduction is an experience of mediated labour which situates them in time and integrates their biological, emotional and intellectual capacities.

Women's reproductive consciousness is continuous and integrative for it is mediated within the reproductive process. "At the biological level, reproductive labour is a synthesizing and mediating act. It confirms women's unity with nature and mother and child; but it is also a *temporal* mediation between the cyclical time of nature and unilinear genetic time. Woman's reproductive consciousness is a consciousness that the child is hers, but also a consciousness that she herself was born of a woman's labour, that labour confirms genetic coherence and species continuity."²⁴ Male reproductive consciousness on the other hand is splintered and discontinuous. The alienation of his seed separates him from natural genetic continuity so his is a consciousness of contradiction, of a series of opposites which cannot be mediated within the reproductive process. Men* must therefore act beyond reproduction to create artificial modes of continuity and to mediate these opposites.

The appropriation of the child (and women) is the almost universal mode of paternal mediation which creates:

paternity not as a relationship to the child but as a right to the child. The assertion of the right demands a social support system predicated on the forced cooperation between men* . . . It is the historical movement to provide this support system which transforms the individual uncertainty of paternity into the triumphant universality of patriarchy . . . The creation of a patriarchy is in every sense of the phrase, a triumph over nature.²⁵

ANGELA MILES

It is also the creation of private space separate from public space where men* "make the laws and ideologies which justify patriarchy"²⁶ and create principles of continuity in politics, art, religion and property that are under male control. In this they add to their first biological nature a second and supposedly superior nature which they make for themselves. Thus, both the dualisms structured into man's* world, between the public and private and the social and natural for instance, and the dualism of male modes of thinking "emerge from his real separation from the natural world and from species continuity."²⁷

The mysterious gulf which male-stream thought has found separating animal from human, appearance from reality, spirit from matter, necessity from freedom and so forth . . . can be materially grounded in real human experience.²⁸

For Nancy Hartsock the sexual division of labour in childbearing rather than birth underlies men's and women's different relation to the world. Women's reproductive labour provides the basis for an integrative sense of self. Their activity cannot easily be dichotomized into work and play, inner and outer or mind and body. It represents a unity with nature and involves processes of change and growth and a variety of relations with others from deep unity through the many levelled and changing connections mothers experience with growing children. In addition to this, the psychological development of women mothered by same sex caretakers reinforces their integrative sense of a self in connection with the world and others. While men* mothered by opposite sex prime caretakers, develop a separative sense of self that "sets a hostile and combative dualism at the heart of both the community men* construct and the masculinist world view by means of which they understand their lives."²⁹

Basing her analysis on the socio-psychoanalytic work of Nancy Chodorow and Dorothy Dinnerstein,³⁰ Nancy Hartsock argues that women develop their gender identity through identification with their mother while men must develop theirs in abstract difference from their mothers. This leaves men with a more fragile and separative identity which must be established and maintained over and against the other sex. Also, the nature of the oedipal crisis differs by sex:

The boy's love for the mother is an extension of mother-infant unity and thus essentially threatening to his ego and independence. Masculine ego formation necessarily requires repressing this first relation and negating the mother. In contrast, the girl's love for the father is less threatening both because it occurs outside this unity and because it occurs at a later stage of development.

Therefore girls, but not boys, retain both parents as love objects. Their gradual emergence from the oedipal period takes place in such a way that empathy is built into their primary definition of self,

FEMINIST RADICALISM

and they have a variety of capacities for experiencing another's needs or feelings as their own. Put another way, girls, because of female parenting, are less differentiated from others than boys, more continuous with and related to the external [and internal] object world.³¹

The fact that men's* sense of self is constructed against a mother who threatens their very being, shapes both the structures and world views of both capitalism and patriarchy in a deep-going hierarchical dualism. Masculinity is attained by escaping from the female world of the household and daily life into the masculine world of politics and public life. And this experience of two opposed worlds — one abstract, valuable and unattainable, the other concrete, demeaning yet necessary "lies at the heart of a series of [gendered] dualisms — abstract/concrete, mind/body, culture/nature, ideal/real, static/change — the first of each pair associated with the male and the second with the female."³² Women's material life experience leads on the other hand to a world view to which dichotomies are false. Her relationally defined existence, experience of bodily boundary challenges and daily activity leads her to value the concrete and everyday life, to sense a variety of connectedness and continuity with other people and the natural world and to oppose dualism of any sort.

Clearly the material base of male supremacy that O'Brien and Hartsock are exploring is not restricted to narrow economic or production activity, for it recognizes the biological and psychological also, as material realities. This is a necessary revision if women's life experience is to contribute to our understanding of the world and if women are to be recognized as historical subjects. Thus these two theories have built on earlier feminist work to achieve with others a sea change in progressive political theory.

Yet the huge intent of their work ensures that it is both enormously impressive and necessarily only a beginning. The inclusion of women as defining actors on the historical stage involves a total transformation of the basic structuring premises of all earlier theory — including the feminist arguments for women's inclusion in the male half of a divided world. Mary O'Brien and Nancy Hartsock among others have shown us that this must be done and they have developed guidelines for its achievement. But both are quick to point out that their work represents "the mere shadow of a theory,"³³ "an anticipatory exploration"³⁴ which merely "opens a number of avenues for future work."³⁵

They have clearly shown "in a still abstract way (that) the *general* relationship between the biological substructure and social superstructure of reproductive relations"³⁶ is a dialectical, historical and material relationship of key importance and that it is not enough to say only that the public realm moulds the "social relations of reproduction, for the forms of the public realm itself have material roots in the reproductive process."³⁷ The historical significance of the social relations of reproduction and the sexual division of labour can no longer be in doubt. But the long term careful research required to analyse the actual

ANGELA MILES

historical relations between the two realms and to identify the dynamic of gender as well as class struggle as it has shaped history remains to be done: "The outlines, though not the substance, of an adequate theory of power grounded at the epistemological level of reproduction are now visible if only hazily."³⁸ What is required now is to undertake within the new integrative theoretical framework, the kind of detailed analysis of historically specific material interests and struggles that socialist-feminists have done so well within a less adequate framework. In the process, of course, our theoretical understanding will increase and the theory itself will be developed and altered. The framework is in place to allow us to pursue the necessary analytical synthesis of the individual and collective, psychological and social, economic and cultural, class and gender, but the task has only begun.

Socialist-feminists, in their uneasy position between feminists and marxists, have clearly articulated the need for this synthesis and have claimed to represent its best hope. Zillah Eisenstein spoke for many when she said: "Marxist analysis is the thesis, radical feminist patriarchal analysis the antithesis, and from the two comes the synthesis of socialist-feminism."³⁹ But the economism of their approach and their tendency to address marxist rather than feminist questions⁴⁰ has meant that, despite their fine research, socialist-feminist theoretical achievement has largely been limited to a static dualistic analysis of two parallel systems of domination. Where socialist-feminists speak of bringing aspects of existing marxist and feminist analysis together in a composite theory, integrative feminists speak about standing marxism on its head. They see feminism's relation to marxism more like Marx's relation to Hegel or marxism's relation to liberalism. As Catherine MacKinnon phrases it: "Feminism stands in relation to marxism as marxism does to classical political economy: its final conclusion and ultimate critique."⁴¹

Catherine MacKinnon is referring here to the practice as well as the theory of feminism, for integrative feminists have a strong sense of the historical significance of the women's movement and feminism as praxis.⁴² For them the revolutionary character of feminist theory reflects and contributes to the realization of the revolutionary potential of women's struggle in this period. Without the practice the theory could never develop, yet the theory is essential to that practice. Neither springs autonomically from women's experience. The female standpoint is not identical to the feminist standpoint which is achieved in struggle and requires both theory and practice, both of which, in turn, require each other.⁴³

It was, in fact, that earlier practice that laid the basis for the emergence of integrative feminist theory. And feminist practice in the 1980's has continued to fuel and to benefit from integrative theoretical development. Until we see today, certain tendencies of the women's movement whose practice is beginning to resemble the universal politics this theory calls for.

This universal feminism retains the early sense of a new non-hierarchical, liberatory politics in the making and the commitment to varied, autonomous, non-sectarian and non-vanguard practice that will enable this new politics to emerge ever more fully. But this is now more firmly buttressed in theory. The

FEMINIST RADICALISM

demonstration that "a feminist perspective grounded in female experience does exist"⁴⁴ helps feminists understand women's ability to work in supportive, non-hierarchical, process-oriented ways as the result not only of women's unambivalent interest in ending hierarchy, but also of women's more integrated and relational life experience, consciousness and psychological development. The sense that women will play a central role in liberatory struggle no longer rests only on intuition or the simple demonstration of women's oppression but is supported by the new analysis of women's structural position and material experience and interests.

Feminism's original, deeply radical, liberatory vision is also maintained and developed. The early opposition to all domination and the determination to build a struggle against alienation that includes its roots in gender as well as class has been strengthened by analyses which demonstrate the common origins of all domination in masculine dualism.

Many feminist radicals today are not only *against* domination they are *for* the integration of life that they have discovered is essential to liberation — the end of male dualism and the establishment of a community whose basic organizing principles are connection and co-operation rather than separation and opposition: Mary O'Brien has expressed it thus:

Feminism presents and represents a fundamentally different experience of the relation of people and nature than that posed by male dualism. It insists, further, that the principle of integration can form the basis for a political praxis which is rational, humane and far more progressive than any genderically one-sided praxis, including Marxism, can ever be.⁴⁵

And Nancy Hartsock echoes the sentiments:

(Women's) experience of continuity and relation with others, with the natural world, of mind and body — provide (sic) an ontological base for developing a nonproblematic social synthesis, a social synthesis that need not operate through the denial of the body, an attack on nature, or the death struggle between the self and other, a social synthesis that does not depend on any of the forms taken by abstract masculinity.⁴⁶

The articulation of this integrative vision is at the same time a fuller expression and exploration of a radical alternative feminist vision of the good life phrased in terms of positive values and not just opposition — the values of continuity, creativity, birth, co-operation, nurture, daily life, the body and nature. It calls for a:

celebration of the life in life rather than the death in life,⁴⁷ . . . a move from war against nature and against life to policies of integration with nature and life,⁴⁸ . . . (the creation) of a unity of the individual and the species with nature (which) becomes a relation of co-operation to which neither nature nor time

ANGELA MILES

appear hostile⁴⁹ . . . and that celebrates . . . the unity of cyclical time with historical time in the conscious and rational reproduction of the species.⁵⁰

In this process:

the body — its desires and needs, and its mortality — would not be denied as shameful but would be given a place of honour at the centre of theory. And creativity and generativity would be incorporated in the form of directly valuing daily life activities — eroticizing the work of production and accepting, the erotic nature of nurturance.⁵¹

This gives substance to the abstract commitment to end domination and alienation and indicates clearly the depth and direction of change required. The integrative set of values and broad general analyses provide no immediate blueprint or programme of action, and indeed they cannot for the “future is not the product of the mind but the product of praxis, the product of theory and action.”⁵² But they enable feminists to envision the general shape and direction of desirable change. They provide a perspective from which to assess strategy and tactics and to develop a practice that is liberatory in the fullest sense.

This is clearly no longer a “feminism of the pseudo man”⁵³ which accepts patriarchal dualism and leaves women’s lives and work invisible in a one-sided project of female access to the more valued male side of the dichotomies. It is not a feminism in which “the need for individual escape from the prison of the private realm has taken precedence over the need to destroy collectively the artificial barriers between public and private.”⁵⁴

It is, instead, a feminism which places at its centre a revalued female world. It is a feminism whose vision is not the entry of women into man’s world but “the reintegration of men in general in the harmony of people and nature.”⁵⁵ It asks women not simply to leave the private realm but to “struggle to transform and integrate public and private, and in doing so to transcend the alienation of one from the other.”⁵⁶ For this feminism “the integration of women on equal terms into productive processes is a necessary but not sufficient condition of liberation. Liberation also depends on the reintegration of men on equal terms into reproductive process.”⁵⁷ This is not a simple exchange of activity in two pre-existing equal and unchanged realms, it is an integrative transformation of life in which reproduction is privileged and “the human possibilities present in the life activity of women (are generalized to) the social system as a whole (raising) for the first time in human history, the possibility of a fully human community structured by a variety of connections rather than separation and opposition.”⁵⁸

This new specifically feminist vision is clearly a vision of general liberation which presumes to speak to and define the shape of progressive politics in general. It requires and supports the development of a feminist practice beyond women’s issues and the articulation of a feminist perspective on all issues and the whole of society. And this politics is emerging within feminism today, fueled as much by the opportunities and requirements of practice as theory, and

FEMINIST RADICALISM

articulated ever more consciously in the challenge of debate with opposing political tendencies.

The Practice

As the women's liberation movement has gained strength and brought power to increasing numbers of women, the diversity of participants both in developed industrial nations and the Third World has increased to include more women in disadvantaged groups and to enable those already involved to articulate new areas of vulnerability and difference. This has contributed tremendously to feminist strength in a number of ways. The struggle over diversity and its articulation has been a challenging and painful one from the very early days of the movement and it continues to be so. But it differs today in several significant respects. The criticism and struggle in the early period more often came from non-feminist women with prior loyalty to black or native or working-class groups, who denied the possibility and desirability of unity and sisterhood across these divisions. Today it comes much more from feminists in these groups who see this struggle as a necessary part of building a genuine unity. The pain and anger and fear are still there but the process is recognized as a shared one, and it represents an attempt by those involved to share in defining feminism rather than to deny it.⁵⁹

This has become possible because significant numbers of women from many more diverse groups are becoming feminist defined and because others, like Jewish feminists, with a long preceding history of feminist activism have also begun to define their specificity from within the movement in the name of feminism. The hope is that women's lack of psychological dependence on alterity and separation, relational sense of self and ability to acknowledge and deal creatively with emotion, combined with our very real shared oppression, will enable us to survive these divisions to build a stronger sisterhood.⁶⁰ And this seems to be borne out in practice where feminist radicals have recognized the importance of these struggles and have shown a consistent willingness to face the personal and political risks involved.

It seems today, that the articulation of increasing types and levels of difference has not narrowed self-defined groups of women but revealed ever richer networks of cross-cutting specificities. As black, disabled, lesbian, old, Jewish and working-class feminists find their voices women are discovering the richness of their shared specificities. It is becoming much more difficult for political groupings to build high walls between insiders and outsiders based on single reified characteristics of their participants. Because deep-going links with "outsiders" who share other important aspects of self are becoming more clearly evident.⁶¹ This has meant that, unlike earlier periods, the current exploration of diversity has not, in general, been phrased in vanguard terms or in terms of mere tolerance.

Many feminist radicals are committed to building a movement which does not merely tolerate difference but celebrates it as a source of creative tension in the necessary struggle to redefine unity beyond sameness. Audre Lourde has

shown that "Only then does the necessity for interdependence become unthreatening."⁶² This exploration of diversity could only be undertaken in a context where the potential for sisterhood is recognized and valued even though it is not automatic but has to be built. The affirmation of women's commonality in integrative feminist theory is clearly a reflection of this growing sense of potential unity and as such, an important contribution to the exploration of diversity. But it has been attacked in the name of diversity in a number of debates which raise important political questions.

Some have read the theoretical focus on specificity grounded in the sexual division of labour, reproduction and female mothering as a denial of lesbianism. The reply that all women (and men) are shaped by these arrangements and that the analyses therefore apply to lesbians and non-mothers as well as others fails to convince some. They deny that lesbians and non-mothers share this with other women and persist in the view that theory based on reproduction excludes these women and is therefore partial.⁶³

Other critics do not deny that reproductive arrangements are a shaping force on all women, but argue that when these analyses fail to incorporate an explicit examination of heterosexuality as an institution they are partial and, ultimately reactionary: "feminist research and theory that contributes to lesbian invisibility is actually working against the empowerment of women as a group."⁶⁴ In her much cited article "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience," Adrienne Rich makes this point with reference to four key feminist texts,⁶⁵ two of which Nancy Hartsock uses to develop the socio-psychological part of her analysis of gender differences. She argues that analyses that do not explicitly problematize heterosexuality or document the extreme measures used to keep women apart and to enforce sexual relations with men, are implying that heterosexuality is "natural" and this amounts to collaboration with patriarchy's need to keep the deeply radical and subversive fact of lesbianism invisible. Her point is an important one and it was startling to realize in 1980, when her article first appeared, that so much central feminist theory did not incorporate enforced heterosexuality into its analysis. As she points out, this is even more disturbing when the theoretical framework could encompass it, as is the case with the works she discusses. She is not arguing that this theory is based on a presumption of heterosexuality that necessarily precludes any critical examination of it. Rather she is pointing to an important political weakness in feminism that has prevented this theory from being fully developed. Adrienne Rich, whose book *Of Woman Born*⁶⁶ focused on motherhood as a political institution, recognizes the relevance of reproduction to all women including lesbians. But she argues that sexuality also, especially sexual orientation, is a political institution and must be included as a central aspect of any feminist analysis. This does not necessarily invalidate the integrative theory that has developed since then but it does suggest urgent areas for further development toward an ever more comprehensive theory which recognizes diversity as well as shared patterns of domination and commonality. This debate and these criticisms, in published work and in working relations, will surely be a major source of new insights and theoretical development.

FEMINIST RADICALISM

Other critics have questioned, not just the basis on which commonality is claimed for women, but the attempt at this stage to try to determine a basis. They argue that it is wrong to undertake the task of defining women's common voice before many groups of women have found their own voice. This, they say, is premature theorizing which may impose a shape on feminism that is foreign to less advantaged groups of women who are bound to be slower to develop the autonomy and power to share in its definition. They do not deny the role of theory but warn against theorizing a general feminism before the basis has been developed in practice.

Others have gone even further to reject the theoretical project itself rather than just its timing. They suggest that to attempt a general theory may be to inherit the worst of patriarchal totalizing tendencies. And they argue that not only masculine claims to universality but all universal claims must necessarily be false. By its very nature feminism must remain open and recognize its limitations and this must preclude any claim to any general truths:

The desire to claim for feminist theory the greatest universality truth, comprehensiveness, etc., I think participates in the authoritarian or totalitarian view of theory. As feminists we should criticize any claims to completeness and universality on the part of theory. We should insist instead that any discourse is partial and perspectival.⁶⁷

Mary O'Brien and Nancy Hartsock clearly recognize that their theory is not complete. But they do claim, and I claim too, that it and other integrative theory reveals inadequacies in earlier theory and opens the way to a fuller understanding of reality than any earlier theory. It is *more complete* in important ways than other theories, or at least it provides the framework to move toward a fuller understanding of the world. Integrative feminist theorists presume that this is a possible and desirable goal of theory. Other feminists disagree.

Only the barest hints of this debate have yet appeared in print. But these questions about the role of theory and how much understanding it is healthy to desire and to claim will emerge more fully as feminist theory with some claim to universality gains more influence. The debate will probably be one of the most important in the next few years. It may well also make major contributions to the more abstract radical theoretical debates around similar questions, that are currently raging in non-feminist circles, outside any movement context and without the discipline and inspiration of practice.

A specifically feminist critique of liberalism has developed in recent years which goes well beyond the early radical and socialist feminist point that women's liberation will require change in social structures and not just in women's attitudes and legal rights. This has been an important aspect of feminism's articulation as a politics beyond liberal or socialist pressure for women. Mary O'Brien's analysis of paternity as the first property right and Nancy Hartsock's analysis of exchange relations as one patriarchal variant of society⁶⁸

ANGELA MILES

are two of many theoretical contributions to this critique which continues to develop as the women's movement wins liberal reforms and discovers their limitations in practice:

- the threat to introduce legislation enabling no fault divorce without recognizing the specific economic vulnerability of women and children in divorce;
- equal marriage and property rights in family assets which ignore men's business, educational and professional assets and women's long term unpaid and impoverishing economic contribution in the home;⁶⁹
- judges' alacrity in awarding equal consideration to fathers' custody rights and denying women's rights to alimony;⁷⁰
- a legal redefinition of rape as sexual assault which is intended to defuse punitive attitudes toward the victim but actually hides the fact that rape is not a gender neutral crime but a sexual crime of men against women.⁷¹
- law reform in the U.S. which recognizes women's individual rights to abortion on the ground of the right to privacy without acknowledging that women have no power in private life and that the private realm is precisely the institutionalization of men's domination of women.⁷²

With the recent introduction of a Charter of Rights and Freedoms which guarantees sex equality in Canada, the limitations of liberal reform which ignores women's specificity and presumes sameness has become startlingly clear and the feminist critique has gained new urgency.⁷³

This critique highlights women's specific oppression rather than the specific psychological development, consciousness and values that I focused on earlier in this paper. But both aspects of women's condition are crucial to the integrative feminist claim of women's central political role and feminism's historic importance in this period. It is a theory and a politics built from both women's oppression and women's potential strength. The two are held in critical tension as two truths of women's condition, both of which point to the necessity and possibility of major social change. Although they are not necessarily contradictory these two factors are a difficult dialectic to theorize and to live. It is especially difficult because integrative feminism is faced on every side by the pull of two simple and alternative reductionisms that either reduce women to victims or romanticize women's traditional activity.

There are feminists who make the latter reduction and analyze women's specificity in ways that tend to obscure the need for a mass collective struggle for major social change. The work of Jean Bethke Elshtain and Betty Friedan⁷⁴ for instance, mutes the fact of male domination and defends or fails to question structural and ideological dualism. In their theory the recognition of the value of women's work and women's admirable personal qualities definitely weakens the claim of subordination; the assertion of the value of womanhood tends to undermine the claim of equality and, of course, liberation. And the Right Wing, too, is militantly emphasizing women's specificity, defined (as self-sacrifice, dependence and privilege) in ways that disguise and reinforce oppression.

FEMINIST RADICALISM

These reactionary uses of women's specificity increase feminist awareness of the risks involved in any acknowledgment of a difference that has been used to rationalize and institutionalize women's subordination. And they make for a sceptical reception by many, of integrative feminism's claims to reveal a deep liberatory potential in women's specificity.

Some critics, like Iris Young, recognize the synthetic and "subversive intent" of integrative feminism but deny that its attempted synthesis of women's specificity and oppression has been realized. She goes on to suggest that, failing this, what she calls "gynocentric feminism" may be "reinforcing gender stereotypes, accommodating the existing structures" and giving aid and comfort to the "stance of moral motherhood."⁷⁵

A much wider attack comes in both theory and practice from those who do not distinguish between integrative feminism and the "anti-feminist feminism"⁷⁶ that glorifies traditional womanhood at the expense of recognizing women's oppression. This criticism makes no distinction between the essentialist and idealist glorification of women's nature and the historical materialist analysis of women's specificity and oppression which can ground liberatory struggle. It is particularly evident in the criticism of the integrative feminist theory developing in the context of women's increasing involvement in the struggle for peace. Much of this criticism utterly repudiates any acknowledgement of women's difference as capitulation to patriarchal definitions and domination:

To our way of thinking, the notion that 'women's qualities' are somehow better than 'men's qualities' is in basic opposition to the theory of feminism. Feminist theory states that the potential for all qualities — from aggressiveness to nurturing — exists within each person. But under a system of male supremacy, certain traits are deemed 'masculine' and others, 'feminine.' Since gender is not innate but is socially constructed the goal of feminism is to eradicate the categories of 'masculine' and 'feminine'. An appeal to women's distinctive characteristics only reinforces these categories . . . Focusing as it does on men's and women's character traits, the movement ignores the structural aspects of male supremacy . . . Historically, the notion of women's difference has been one source of our oppression and, in the current context, extolling it traps us once again in the male supremacist system.⁷⁷

The absolute denial of any male/female differences, or at least the denial that they should feature in feminist theory, is a part of a more general resistance to the emergence of feminism as a universal politics as opposed to a politics of women's issues. In debates in a number of areas the denial of women's specificity is clearly related to a militantly narrow definition of feminism.

The "sexuality debate"⁷⁸ that appears today to be largely spent but has raged furiously in the women's movement in the last few years is one example of this.

ANGELA MILES

Feminist sado-masochists and others have argued that the majority of feminists are wrong to see this form of sexuality and pornography as an undesirable and particularly extreme reflection of patriarchal sexuality and the relations of domination that we are committed to ending. They deny that women as a group have a shared interest in opposing this or any other kind of sexual practice and define this view as an attempt to define and deny women's sexuality and to enforce a particular sexual code that is every bit as oppressive as traditional "morality." In making this argument they presume that there can be no real basis for assessing or defining values as a community. Their notion of "liberty" is limited to the narrow and negative removal of all constraints on individual 'freedom'. Thus, for them, feminism has no value content and no vision of the new society. They refuse the idea that women's sexuality, although influenced by repressive patriarchal society, is nevertheless less violent and death associated than men's, and that feminists can use this potential to create and define new sexual relations that are life affirming.⁷⁹ And this refusal involves a narrowing of feminism's vision and project.

Feminist links to wider groups of women including those more disadvantaged and those in the Third World and rural areas has led to the growth of national and international networks around an impressive variety of concerns. Some are built around classic women's issues such as female sexual slavery and women's studies. Others, however, show the transforming influence of women from more intact traditional communities with acute concern for economic and survival issues. Both their material need and their experience of women's relatively uninterrupted culture and central (though subordinate) role in community life have strengthened feminist awareness of women's specificity and women's potential to play a central role in social change. This has been an important contribution to the growth of an international women's development network and a practice in this area which goes much further than women's incorporation in an existing process to challenge and redefine the process and development itself.⁸⁰

Women's increasing involvement in the question of peace has also resulted in the growth of an international feminist network which is not simply joining the pre-existing anti-war struggle but is redefining that struggle in broader integrative feminist terms. This perspective recognizes the centrality of dualism and women's oppression to all violence including war, and women's necessarily central role in defining and making the struggle for peace.⁸¹ Resistance to feminist claims to represent a new and specifically female voice against war and the hope of a more radical struggle against it, is resistance to the idea of feminism as a universal politics. Those who argue against the claim that peace politics must be a feminist politics presume that any activity beyond women's issues narrowly defined is necessarily dilution and co-optation. They read the integrative claims of feminist development politics or peace politics as abandonment of feminism. And they mistake the integrative feminist hope of developing a general liberatory struggle for a faint hearted denial of feminism in the name of humanism. It is important to insist that women's liberation and equality is a sufficient end in itself. We make this struggle unapologetically and

FEMINIST RADICALISM

boldly for ourselves and require no further justification. But if feminism *is* the hope of the world we must say that too, not to justify ourselves or to apologize, but because it is *true* and important.

Current attacks on ecological feminism, integrative feminism, development politics and the anti-pornography campaign all deny that women's specific material experience can ground a new vision of liberation and a redefinition of progressive politics. They are all essentially arguments for a narrowly defined feminist politics. And they represent resistance to the early stages of the emergence in practice of a universal feminist politics. The resistance is testimony to the growing strength of this politics which in the last few years has emerged as a clear, though not fully self-defined, tendency of feminism.⁸²

The debates outlined here have all been major challenges which appeared at times to threaten that development. They continue as divisions in the movement, but no longer appear to threaten the survival of integrative feminism whose rapid development continues partly under their salutary pressure. For they keep ever present the very real dangers of forgetting women in the struggle for humanity and of affirming women's value at the cost of recognizing our oppression. They keep integrative feminists aware of the still partial nature of our politics and force us to defend and develop it more fully and more consciously.

Conclusion

This paper has stressed the deeply radical nature of feminism, its success in sustaining and transforming that radicalism over the years, and the hope this brings for future progressive struggle. This is true, but it is only one aspect of the reality we face and we create. The debates and challenges described here are more painful and destructive, and our doubts more debilitating, than I have been able to convey. Our failures are more numerous and more deeply felt than I could describe here.

Another paper could have focused on the enormous struggle that lies ahead, the obstacles and unknowns we face: For instance, (1) The change in women's self-image in North America has been impressive and awareness of women's oppression continues to grow. We can claim enormous success in changing consciousness, but very little, if any, real improvement in women's material situation has resulted. (2) The radical spirit of some tendencies of our movement has deepened. But at the same time the impact of feminism on ever wider sectors of the population has diluted its message. Thus our very effectiveness may have disadvantages as well as advantages. (3) It is one thing for integrative feminism to open the way for a universal redefinition of progressive struggle. But that general liberatory struggle must be made eventually by men as well as women. To do this men must recognize a struggle defined partly in feminist terms as their own. Is this likely?

Ours is not an easy struggle in either personal or political terms and it has undoubted costs. It is not always an experience of triumph or certainty or joy,

ANGELA MILES

nor even of hope. But it is occasionally all this and it is this strand of our reality that I have explored here — the shape of our vision and the basis of our hope. It is as real as the other and as important.

Sociology and Anthropology
St. Francis Xavier University

Notes

1. In this article the word "man" and the male pronoun are never used as generics. In cases where there may be some ambiguity an asterisk will be added to the word man* or men* to remind the reader that it refers to the male sex only.
2. Shulamith Firestone, *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*, Morrow, 1970:5.
3. Nevertheless, even in her work the alternative values and potential for a more human future that women represented surfaced intermittently as a sub-theme: "The Nightmare (of 1984) is directly the product of attempting to imagine a society in which women have become like men, crippled in the identical way; However, we are suggesting the opposite: Rather than concentrating the female principle into a 'private' retreat, into which men periodically duck for relief, we want to rediffuse it — for the first time creating a society from the bottom up." Firestone *op. cit.*, 210.
4. It has been no easy thing for integrative feminists to maintain this commitment against all the powers that ruling groups in an alienated society can bring to disillusion activists, their liberatory vision and defeat liberatory practice. In this context well meaning liberal, radical, socialist and lesbian reductionist tendencies have flourished in the movement. It is very important that the account presented here of integrative feminism should not be read as an account of the whole movement. Other tendencies are large and represent entirely different but co-existing viewpoints than the one presented her.
5. The puzzle "why?" is so persistent an accompanist for these concerned to analyze domination in private life and personal relationships that psychological speculation and comment can be found in all but the most determinedly narrow economic and descriptive writing. In some work psychological factors are among the main supporting pillars of the argument. See, for instance, Barbara Deming, "Remembering Who We are," *A Feminist Quarterly* IV, 1 (1977); Phyllis Chesler *About Men*, Simon and Schuster, 1978. In other work psychological speculation creeps into analyses focused elsewhere. See, for instance, the many references in early feminist work to H.R. Hays *The Dangerous Sex: The Myth of Feminine Evil*, Simon and Schuster 1966, and the psychological aspects of Adrienne Rich's argument *op. cit.*, 1976 and even Shulamith Firestone's *op. cit.*, 1970.
6. My own Ph. D. thesis for the University of Toronto, "The Politics of Feminist Radicalism: A Study in Integrative Feminism," 1979 is one example of this type of theory. The variety of new work currently contributing to emerging feminist ecological and peace perspectives is another instance. Catherine MacKinnon's brilliant analysis of sexual oppression, developed in critical dialogue with liberal and marxist theory and practice, is yet another. See her *Sexual Harassment of Working Women*, Yale University Press, 1979, and "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An agenda for Theory," *Signs* VII, 3(Spring 1982) and "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence," *Signs* VIII, 4(Summer 1983). Sandra Harding is developing a theoretical framework very similar to Nancy Hartsoc's whose work will be used here, with Mary O'Brien's to provide a focus for the examination of the nature of this new

FEMINIST RADICALISM

theory: Sandra Harding, "What is the Real Material Base of Patriarchy and Capital?" in *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, South End, 1981. Sandra Harding also edited a collection of feminist writing with Merrill B. Hintikka entitled *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science*, D. Reidel, 1983 which like the collection *Feminism in Canada*, Angela Miles and Geraldine Finn eds., Black Rose, 1982 is designed to highlight the originality and diversity of developing integrative theory.

7. Mary O'Brien, *The Politics of Reproduction*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1981:91.
8. *Ibid.*:4.
9. Nancy Hartsock, *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*, Longman, 1983:151.
10. *Ibid.*:12.
11. As Mary O'Brien puts it: "The problems of alienation, of separation of man* from nature and from continuous time . . . are problems of *dualism* which is the persistent motif of male philosophy. Under this general category we find a whole series of oppositions which haunt the male philosophical imagination: mind and body, subject and object, past and present, spirit and matter, individual and social." *op. cit.*, 34.
And for Nancy Hartsock: "Dualism, along with the dominance of one side of the dichotomy over the other, marks phallogocentric society and social theory. These dualisms appear in a variety of forms — in philosophy, sexuality, technology, political theory, and in the organization of class society itself." *op. cit.*, 241.
12. Hartsock:178. Catherine MacKinnon makes this point particularly eloquently. Her two articles "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State Pt. I and II" cited above provide a detailed examination, focused on the legal system, of the process by which "men *create* the world from their own point of view which then *becomes* the truth to be described." *op. cit.*, 1982:537, emphasis in the original.
13. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 169.
14. *Ibid.*, 169.
15. *Ibid.*, 13.
16. *Ibid.*, 62.
17. Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 259.
18. Shulamith Firestone, *op. cit.*, 8.
19. *Ibid.*, 7-8.
20. *Ibid.*, 9-10.
21. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 188.
22. *Ibid.*, 175 emphasis in the original.
23. Therefore both theorists develop immanent critiques which at the same time articulate alternative values and a vision of the way forward. For Nancy Hartsock women's point of view forms "the basis of a specifically feminist materialism, a materialism that can provide a point from which to both critique and work against phallogocentric ideology and institutions." *Op. cit.*, 247. For Mary O'Brien too the female standpoint makes possible a "constructive critique" out of which grows "not only some understanding of the origins and development of the fact and ideology of male supremacy, but also the rudiments of a feminist theory which will have descriptive and strategic value." *Op. cit.*, 12.

ANGELA MILES

24. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 59. emphasis in the original.
25. *Ibid.*, 53-54.
26. *Ibid.*, 56.
27. *Ibid.*, 64.
28. *Ibid.*, 126.
29. Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 240.
30. Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*, University of California, 1978; Dorothy Dinnerstein, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise*, Harper and Row, 1977.
31. *Ibid.*, 238 bracketed words added.
32. *Ibid.*, 241 bracketed words added.
33. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 63.
34. *Ibid.*, 16.
35. Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 262.
36. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 57.
37. O'Brien, *Ibid.*, 92.
38. Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 159.
39. Zillah R. Eisenstein, "Critique and Commentary," *Quest: A Feminist Quarterly* III, 3(1976/77): 63.
40. I have discussed the difference between marxist and feminist questions and its significance for theoretical development in two articles: "Economism and Feminism: Hidden in the Household, a Comment on the Domestic Labour Debate," *Studies in Political Economy* II; "Dissolving the Hyphen: From Socialist-Feminism to Feminist Feminism," *Atlantis* IX, 2(Spring 1984).
41. Catherine MacKinnon, *op. cit.*, 1982:544.
42. Mary O'Brien, for instance, makes the same point as Catherine MacKinnon with specific reference to feminism as a historical force: "The establishment and growth of feminism as the progressive force in history constitutes a world turned upside down," *op. cit.*, 197.
43. Nancy Hartsock makes this distinction between the female standpoint and a politically conscious feminist standpoint clear: "Women's lives, like men's, are structured by social relations that manifest the experience of the dominant gender and class. The ability to go beneath the surface of appearances to reveal the real but concealed social relations requires both theoretical and political activity (p. 261). The liberatory possibilities present in women's experience must be, in a sense read out and developed. . . . A feminist standpoint may be present on the basis of commonalities with women's experience, but it is neither self-evident nor obvious" (246).
44. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 194.
45. *Ibid.*, 166.
46. Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 246-47.
47. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 209.
48. *Ibid.*, 201.
49. *Ibid.*, 210.

FEMINIST RADICALISM

50. *Ibid.*, 209.
51. Hartsock, 259.
52. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, 209.
53. *Ibid.*, 91.
54. *Ibid.*, 191.
55. *Ibid.*, 209.
56. *Ibid.*, 209.
57. *Ibid.*, 210.
58. Hartsock: 247. See also the ringing manifesto of Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English: "We refuse to remain on the margins of society, and we refuse to enter that society on its terms . . . The human values that women were assigned to preserve (must) expand out of the confines of private life and become the organizing principles of society . . . The Market, with its financial abstractions, deformed science, and obsession with dead things — must be pushed back to the margins. And the 'womanly' values of community and caring must rise to the center as the only human principles." *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women*, Anchor/Doubleday, 1979:324 emphasis in the original.
59. *The Furies*, a lesbian feminist group, initiated one of the first dialogues around class, race and other divisions among their members and feminists in general. And lesbian feminists have continued to play a central role in the exploration of difference. Their struggle to develop a shared lesbian identity and community has given them a courage and strength they are using to continue to deal with difference. And they bring to this process a knowledge, gained from experience, of the necessity and value of doing this.

A survey of such newspapers as *Off Our Backs* and *Broadside* and feminist journals such as *Sinister Wisdom*, *Signs*, *Feminist Studies* and *Heresies* will show that awareness of diversity among women and commitment to the political process of exploring that diversity and its implications has become a major cultural and political theme in the women's liberation movement. For a very small sample of references from the growing literature which illustrates the variety of writing on this see: Adrienne Rich, "Disloyal to Civilization: Feminism, Racism and Gynophobia" in *On Lies, Secrets and Silences*, W. W. Norton, 1979; Audre Lorde, *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*, The Crossing Press, 1981; Evelyn Toronto Beck, *Nice Jewish Girls: A Lesbian Anthology*, Persephone Press, 1982; *Yours in Struggle*, Ellie Bulkin, Minnie Bruce Pratt and Barbara Smith, Long Haul Press, 1984.
60. There is a well developed feminist literature on group process and the political meanings and use of emotions such as anger, rage, fear, shame and guilt. These are not individual, abstract, "how to" manuals, but are written from the depth of practice for use by thousands of others who are participating in the same struggles. One recent article which makes clear its context in movement political debates is: "Guilt and Shame in the Women's Movement: The Radical Ideal of Action and Its Meaning for Feminist Intellectuals." Berenice Fisher, *Feminist Studies* X, 2(Summer 1984).
61. The collection *Nice Jewish Girls: A Lesbian Anthology*, *op. cit.*, particularly illustrates how attention to additional specificities brings, not a narrowing of identity but a sense of wider connection through cross-cutting networks of specificity. These are Jewish lesbians, some of them black, some American, some Israeli, some mothers, some not, all of whom are exploring their connections to the wider Jewish and wider lesbian groups as well as others. This increases awareness of the diversity, and the importance of dealing with it, within the group "lesbian" and therefore among all women.
62. Audre Lorde, "The Master's Tools will never Dismantle the Master's House" in *This Bridge Called My Back*, Cherrie Maraga and Gloria Anzaldúa eds., Persephone press, 1981, p. 99, cited also by Nancy Hartsock, *op. cit.*, 262.

ANGELA MILES

63. See Carol Anne Douglas' thoughtful review of Mary O'Brien's *Politics of Reproduction. Off Our Backs*, February 1982.
64. Adrienne Rich, "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Experience," Antelope Publications, 1982:19-20. First published in *Signs* V, 4(1980).
65. The four "ovular" feminist works criticized are: Nancy Chodorow, *The Reproduction of Mothering*, University of California Press, 1978; Dorothy Dinnerstein, *The Mermaid and the Minotaur: Sexual Arrangements and Human Malaise*, Harper & Row, 1976; Barbara Ehrenreich and Deirdre English, *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts' Advice to Women*, Anchor/Doubleday, 1978 and Jean Baker Miller, *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, Beacon Press, 1976.
66. Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born: Motherhood as Experience Institution*, W. W. Norton, 1976.
67. Iris Young in personal correspondence, 6 July 1984.
68. O'Brien, *op. cit.*, and Hartsock, *op. cit.*
69. On this and the previous point see *Love, Marriage and Money: An Analysis of Financial Relations Between the Spouses*, Louise Dulude, Advisory Council on the Status of Women, March 1984.
70. *Ibid.*, also Carol Brown, "Mothers, Fathers, and Children: From Private to Public Patriarchy," *Women and Revolution*, Lydia Sargent ed., South End, 1981.
71. See Leah Cohen and Constance Backhouse, "Putting Rape in its (Legal) Place," *MacLeans* 93, 26(June 3, 1980) for a discussion of this particular legislative proposal. For a general discussion of rape from women's point of view see: Catherine MacKinnon, "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: Toward Feminist Jurisprudence," *Signs* VIII, 4(Summer 1983). In this article and others including its sister piece, "Feminism, Marxism, Method, and the State: An Agenda for Theory," *Signs* VII, 3(Spring 1982) the author develops one of the most fully argued and original radical feminist critiques of patriarchal liberalism.
72. See: Catherine MacKinnon, "The Male Ideology of Privacy: A Feminist Perspective on Abortion," *Radical America* XVII, 4(July/August 83).
73. Kathleen Lahey makes this point and argues it in explicitly integrative feminist terms in "Equality and Specificity in Feminist Thought," unpublished, Faculty of Law, University of Windsor, 1984.
74. Jean Bethke Elshtain's book *Public Man and Private Woman*, Princeton University Press, 1981 and her many articles in radical journals and the more popular media, and Betty Friedan, *The Second Stage*, Summit 1981 are only two of the best known examples of this type of approach.
75. Iris Young, see, "Humanism, Gynocentrism and Feminist Politics" forthcoming *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy* in which she includes a discussion of Nancy Hartsock and Mary O'Brien's work as Gynocentric feminism. Quotations are from pages 31-32.
76. Judith Stacey used this phrase to refer to Jean Bethke Elshtain and Betty Friedan's work, in "The New Conservative Feminism," *Feminist Studies*, IX, 3(Fall 1983).
77. Terrie Mehlman, Debbie Swanner, Midge Quant "Obliteration as a Feminist Issue: a position paper by the Radical Feminist Organizing Committee," *Off Our Backs* XIV, 3(March 1984), originally published in the committee's newsletter *Feminism Lives!* Winter 1983 a version published also as "Pure but Powerless: A Women's Peace Movement" in the Toronto Feminist newspaper *Broadside*, July 1984. Letters following the piece in all three journals develop the debate fairly fully.
78. For feminist critiques of pornography and the sex industry and violence in sex see: Kathleen Barry, *Female Sexual Slavery*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1979; Laura Lederer ed., *Take Back the Night; Women on Pornography*, N.Y.: Quill, 1980; Susan Griffin, *Pornography and Silence: Culture's*

FEMINIST RADICALISM

Revolt Against Nature, N.Y.: Harper and Row, 1982; Andrea Dworkin, *Pornography: Men Possessing Women*, Penguin/Putnam, 1981; Susan Cole, "Gagged, Bound and Silenced: Confronting Pornography," *Broadside*, November 1981:10-11.

For "feminist" criticisms of this critique see: *Heresies*, Sex Issue, 12(111.4) especially the article by Pat Califia; Samois Collective, *Coming to Power: Writings and Graphics on Lesbian S/M*, published independently, no date; Deirdre English, Amber Hollibaugh, Gayle Reuben, "Talking Sex: A Conversation on Sexuality and Feminism," *Socialist Review* 58 (XI,4) July/Aug 1981:43-62; Anne Snitow et al., *The Powers of Desire: The Politics of Sexuality*, N.Y. Monthly Review Press, 1983.

For powerful rebuttals of these critiques phrased in terms of an affirmation of feminist values and vision see: Dorchon Leidholt, "Lesbian S & M: Sexual Radicalism or Reaction," *New Women's Times* July/Aug 1982:17-21; Robin Linden, Darlene R. Pagano, Diana E. Russell, Susan Star eds., *Against Sadoomasochism: A Radical Feminist Analysis*, Frog in Well Press, no date; Kathleen Barry "Sadoomasochism: The New Backlash to Feminism," *Trivia* 1, (Fall 1982:77-92). One report of this controversy in practice which shows how widely feminists opted for the integrative value position is "Controversy Develops over Lesbian S&M Group," *Boston Gay Community News* November 13, 1982 — only one out of ten women's groups voted to allow a lesbian S & M group to use the Cambridge Women's Centre for meetings.

79. Mary O'Brien *op. cit.*, and Nancy Hartsock *op. cit.*, both develop analyses that show the association of aggression, control and death with sex is a specifically male association in patriarchal society. Although, as the dominant group they shape the sexual relations that women must participate in and be to a certain extent shaped by.
80. See, Peggy Antrobus, *Equality, Development and Peace: A Second Look at the U.N. Decade for Women*, Women and Development Unit, Extra Mural Department, University of the West Indies, Barbados, 1983.
81. See, Ynestra King, "Feminism and the Revolt of Nature," *Heresies* XIII (1981) and other articles; Barbara Roberts, "No Safe Place: The War Against Women," *Our Generation* XV; Berit Ås, "A Materialistic View of Men's and Women's Attitudes Towards War," *Woman's Studies International Forum* V, 3(1982); Pam McAllister ed. *Reweaving the Web of Life: Feminism and Non-Violence*, New Society, 1982.

For criticisms of this perspective as unfeminist see the literature cited in note 78 above, *Breaching the Peace*, Only Woman Press, 1983.

82. I have called this tendency of feminism "integrative feminism". Others have called it ecological feminism or global feminism, and still others have made the politics and the theory in one particular area without becoming aware of it as part of a tendency encompassing a wide variety of apparently unrelated practice and theory.