

## **Knocking Down Walls in Political Science: In Defense of an Expansionist Feminist Agenda**

**Fiona MacDonald**

### **Feminism in Context:**

In Canadian society we are bombarded with mixed messages about the state of contemporary feminism. These messages include the notion(s) that feminism is “over” or in “crisis”; that feminism is “scary” and/or “irrelevant”; and, that feminism has more “battles” to fight (Murphy, 2013). The limited research on contemporary feminist identity also reveals tensions about the state of contemporary feminism. Findings indicate that while many young women approve of and support what can broadly be defined as “feminist” values and goals many of these same women reject the label “feminist” as part of their individual and/or collective identity (see Aronson, 2003; O’Neill, Gidengil and Young, 2008). This trend of, “I’m not a feminist but”, may be shifting in part due to recent events. The chilly climate feminism endured under the Harper administration has given way to a new administration that publicly highlights the importance of gender parity in our democratic institutions and a Prime Minister that publicly endorses a positive understanding of feminist identity.<sup>i</sup> In addition to this marked shift in both discourse and behavior at the level of national government, a large number of prominent items in news media over the last year are deeply and unavoidably connected to various feminist discourses and agendas.<sup>ii</sup> Unfortunately, there are no published findings on how many Canadians identify as feminists, let alone whether or not these identifications might be changing. Consequently it is not possible to track if, and how, recent events have impacted our thinking about feminism.

Tensions about the meaning, place, and implications of feminism are reflected in the discipline of political science as well. On the one hand, feminist political science has contributed many important accomplishments to the discipline. As Hawkesworth (2005) aptly observes, feminist political science has revealed many “omissions” and “distortions” that permeate dominant political science. Feminist political scientists have demonstrated the fundamental importance of gender as an analytical tool for understanding social and political relations amongst citizens and amongst citizens and various aspects of the state. Yet, in many ways, feminism remains marginal within the discipline as a whole as it remains largely relegated to “feminist” journals and non-requisite courses on “women” or “gender” (Hawkesworth, 2005; Waylen et al, 2013; Vickers, 2007; 2016 forthcoming). The marginal position of feminist political science is even more troubling when assessed comparatively alongside the fields of sociology, literature, history, and anthropology—fields that have been much more “revolutionized” as disciplines by the impact of feminist work (Silverberg, 1990; Vickers, 2016 forthcoming).

The confusion about the state of feminism in our society in general and the marginal place of feminist work in our discipline are not unrelated phenomena. In my experience as a graduate student and faculty member in departments of political science over the last fifteen years, many political scientists seem genuinely confused about what feminism is and how it may or may not relate to the field as a whole. This confusion can facilitate overly simplistic understandings of feminism that further marginalize the varied and complex approaches that fall under the feminist rubric.<sup>iii</sup> While this marginalization may be indicative of outright and purposeful resistance by some members of the discipline it is, at least, in part, facilitated by the fact that “feminist” political science has to date been done by “feminist” political scientists and taught in “feminist” courses, and, at least, in part, by the fact that the term “feminism” has many different meanings and interpretations. The variety of existing feminisms and the dominant perception that feminism is somehow in “crisis” begs the question, “What is the future of feminist political science?” This article offers one possible answer to this question by outlining and defending an expansionist agenda centered on challenging the male-female binary that has been upheld and replicated in the discipline to date. Such an approach draws heavily on the insights of intersectional analyses, transgender, queer and gender fluid articulations of identity, and requires that the field of political science investigate the varied and complex gendered experiences of “men”. Overall, this paper will argue that such an expansionist agenda is key to responding to the interrelated challenges presented by the perceived “crisis” of feminism and the ongoing “masculinity” of the discipline of political science.

### **Outlining an Expansionist Feminist Agenda:**

The previous section outlines two distinct yet interrelated trends regarding the state of contemporary feminism. The first being the vague but influential social perception of an “identity” crisis of feminism and the second being that the influence of feminism in the discipline of political science is siloed and, as a result, the influence of feminism in the discipline has somewhat stagnated. While these two trends have been cause for some alarm both within and outside of academic circles I suggest they also offer a context in which to explore new possibilities and opportunities to expand the feminist agenda in the discipline. Such an expansion is, I will argue, contingent on letting go of the hard won but arguably outdated notion that gender and politics is code for women and politics.

While our courses, textbooks and conference panels on the topic of “women” and/or “feminism” are increasingly titled as courses, textbooks and conference panels on “gender” few political scientists have discussed the significance of this discursive shift for the discipline.<sup>iv</sup> This omission is perhaps best explained by the fact that, in many instances, the shift appears to be largely in title rather than in substance—that is, while the notion of studying “gender” includes many possible gender identities and experiences, few political scientists have taken up the full conceptual range in their work instead focusing more particularly on the gendered experiences of “women”. The emphasis on “women” has, of course, existed for many important

reasons. Given the masculinity of the discipline, creating opportunities to discuss women and politics is itself a significant accomplishment in feminism that must not be overlooked or undervalued. The discursive and physical spaces provided by political science courses, texts, journals, conferences, and other professional gatherings on the topic(s) of women and politics have been, and continue to be, important subaltern spaces for feminists in the discipline. Just as feminists in our larger society developed alternative publics in which to invent and circulate counterdiscourses (Fraser, 1997: 81) so too have feminist political scientists developed alternative spaces in which to invent and circulate interpretations and perspectives oppositional to mainstream political science. As Joni Lovenduski (1998) observes, feminist political science has worked to reveal and correct the biases of the discipline:

Early critiques of the masculine biases [...] were accompanied by excavations of lacunae, neglect, and sexism in Western political theory [...] These were succeeded by analyses of the reasons for the discipline's failure to deal with women as political beings and by systematic expositions of the ways in which political science and political theory were implicated in the exclusion of women from the public sphere [...] The criticisms of empirical political science showed a special concern with the neglect of women by traditional behavioural approaches, which, it was claimed, described a stereotype of women's political roles. Feminists outlined a research agenda that would challenge that stereotype by contesting both the way politics was practiced and the manner in which it was understood. (333-334)

These discursive spaces have been key to developing "women and politics" as a subfield as well as to developing important internal questions and critiques regarding the obligations, ethics, and issues of voice and appropriation implicit in academic feminism.

Arguably the most influential of these internal critiques are encapsulated in the approach of "intersectionality"—an approach first developed by legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw in the late 1980s to reveal the ways in which structures of power and privilege impact women asymmetrically, particularly along the lines of race. Crenshaw's work reveals and problematizes the implications of overlooking these intersections when conceptualizing and articulating injustice. From this perspective, identity politics is flawed not by its failure to "transcend difference" but rather the opposite, that is, its failure to fully engage with the realities of intragroup differences. For example, on the issue of "violence against women" Crenshaw argues:

[T]he violence that many women experience is often shaped by other dimensions of their identities, such as race and class. Moreover, ignoring difference within groups contributes to tension among groups, another

problem of identity politics that bears on efforts to politicize violence against women. Feminist efforts to politicize experiences of women and antiracist efforts to politicize experiences of people of color have frequently proceeded as though the issues and experiences they each detail occur on mutually exclusive terrains. Although racism and sexism readily intersect in the lives of real people, they seldom do in feminist and antiracist practices. And so, when the practices expound identity as woman or person of color as an either/or proposition, they relegate the identity of women of color to a location that resists telling. (1991: 1242)

Crenshaw's work has profoundly influenced feminist political philosophy and strategy (see for example Dhamoon, 2009; 2011). Within feminist political science the theory of intersectionality has become a foundational concept in feminist texts and course syllabi (see for example Newman and White, 2012; Waylen et. al, 2013). Yet, while feminist political science has been impacted by intersectionality analyses regarding the complex and varied relations amongst women, some of the most important lessons of intersectionality seem to have been overlooked in the discipline. Most notably, feminist political science has failed to critically engage with the categorizations that have been foundational to its existence and how these categorizations are themselves exclusionary to others. As the discourse of feminism has shifted to a discourse of "gender" feminism has become answerable to a wide range of identities and experiences that challenge the anchoring role "women" have traditionally played in determining the agenda. This is perhaps best exemplified by mainstream feminist political science's failure to deeply engage with the growing and varied articulations of gender in our larger societies that include transgender and gender-fluid identities and its failure to engage deeply with the varied yet often painfully restrictive gendered expectations and identities experienced by men. As discussed further in latter sections of this work, within contemporary feminist political science, few have spoken out about the fact that the category of gender has been dominantly constructed as an identity for "women".

### **Challenging the Binary through Transgender Articulations:**

Yet, while political science lags behind in examining the full range of questions on gender, politics, and citizenship, our larger societies—communal, provincial, national, and international—are increasingly discussing the complexities of gender identities and experiences that challenge the traditional binary of masculine and feminine. This shift is perhaps most notable in the increased space occupied by articulations of non-binary gender identities in popular media. As Isaac West observes:

Whatever the actual number may be, trans people are increasingly visible and vocal— so much so that one *New York Times* columnist predicted that 2010 would 'be remembered as the year of the transsexual' [...] More than just the subjects of exploitative documentaries and talk shows, trans people

are more respectfully and affirmatively represented in popular culture. Whether these representations enable trans people to live their lives more openly or whether greater numbers of visible trans people generates increased media interest, trans people are less and less an invisible gender minority in public cultures. (2013: 14)

The history of feminism and trans people, particularly trans women, has often been “troubled” and “antagonistic” both at the academic and activist level (Connell, 2012: 857). As Raewyn Connell observes, “At first the women’s liberation movement paid no attention to transsexual women, though some were in the ranks” (859-860). This disregard soon gave way to profoundly negative representations of trans women in some high profile and influential feminist works.<sup>v</sup> In the decades since these hostile engagements, however, a number of societal shifts have occurred so that “by the 1990s the terms “transgender” and “trans” have been increasingly used to refer to a “growing range of nonnormative identities, from ‘androgynous’ to ‘genderqueer transboi’ ” (862). Similarly, Viviane Namaste defines “transgender” as:

[A]n umbrella term used to refer to all individuals who live outside the normative sex/ gender relations—that is, individuals whose gendered self-presentation (evidenced through dress, mannerisms, and even physiology) does not correspond to the behaviors habitually associated with the members of their biological sex. A variety of different identities are included within the ‘transgender’ label—cross dressers, or individuals who wear the clothes associated with the ‘opposite’ sex, often for erotic gratification; drag queens, or men who usually live and identify as gay men, but who perform as female impersonators in gay male bars and leisure spaces; and transsexuals, or individuals who take hormones and who may undergo surgery to align their biological sexes with their gender. (2000: 1)

One of the most significant challenges to the antagonism between feminism and trans articulations of gender came from Judith Butler’s *Gender Trouble (GT)* first published in 1990. In *GT* she directly challenges the notion that feminism can, or should, be based on any notion of shared identity, strategic or otherwise and highlights the implicit and unstable exclusions constituted by the category of “woman” (1990: 4). Instead, Butler argues for a feminism that is freed from the notion that its politics must be based on a common identity. Gender, Butler tells us, is not a stable signifier but is rather an identity constituted and/or subverted through performance. As, Connell notes, Butler’s theory of gender performativity is based on transvestite drag performances as the “key example” behind her argument that subversive performativity could be the basis of a radical gender politics (861). While Butler’s work continues to change the conversation as feminists continue to respond to her call to “trouble” gender, both Connell (2012) and Namaste (2000), have expressed concern about the limits of Butler’s work for trans politics due to its “appropriation of transsexual and transvestite experience” and its failure to engage with the “economic realities of drag and prostitution, the gender-specific character of violence, and the devastation of transsexual women’s lives by HIV (Connell, 2012:

862). For Namaste queer theory “as it is currently practiced” must be rejected, both theoretically and practically for these reasons. Namaste argues:

Although the violation of compulsory sex/gender relations is one of the topics most frequently addressed within queer theory, this body of knowledge rarely considers the implications of an enforced sex/gender system for the people who have defied it, who live outside it, or who have been killed because of it. (9)

The materialist critique of Butler specifically and queer theory more generally reminds us that while these accomplishments in popular culture and academic discourse must not be underestimated, much work remains to be done in the world of gender politics writ large. For Connell, feminist social science is a “vital resource” for gaining insight into the complexity and “work” of transsexual politics:

The multidimensional structuring of gender relations certainly includes gender symbolism, but it also involves authority relations, the economy, and emotional attachment and separation [...] Therefore as transsexual women make their way through gendered social landscapes, their practices are necessarily much more than identity projects. (865)

Namaste (2000) and Connell (2012) underline the significance of material politics for transgender people, a politics that ranges from social institutions, to economy, to health and constructions of the family. These realities lead Connell to argue that despite the antagonisms and complexities implicit in the relationship, transsexual women have an interest in supporting feminist causes to create a just gender order. For Connell, “collective struggle” is important in reaching the necessary gains, particularly when it comes to questions of material justice such as housing, health, safety, income and education. She argues:

Transsexual women are a small group, and most are not in a strong social position; the traumas of contradictory embodiment and transition, and the effects of discrimination and contempt cannot be waved aside. Support from other feminists is the most strategic resource to empowering transsexual women”. (874)

The increased visibility of transgender politics is an opportunity to expand the feminist political science agenda and re-energize other feminist politics that have been pushed to the margins such as those engaged on issues of class (hooks 2014). The varied recognition and material issues included in trans politics bring questions of gender justice to the fore in new and imperative ways. For example, transgender citizens have worked to reveal the everyday disciplinary and discriminatory nature of spaces such as public restrooms structured along the traditional binary of men and women. These politics have been the result of strenuous advocacy—often at the level of individual trans children and their families.<sup>vi</sup> Their work has revitalized discussions about the gendered nature of public space and public policy and has also

highlighted how structures of gender discipline affect all gender identities, albeit asymmetrically.

In highlighting the opportunity for alliance(s) between trans and feminist politics I do not want to suggest that feminism, in political science, or other disciplines or communities, simply add “other” gender issues to the existing agenda. As Kimberley Manning recently argued:

A feminist university does not call for the inclusion of marginalized others (such as women, racialized minorities, and sexual minorities) into a pre-existing hierarchy, but rather disrupts and reshapes the forces of knowledge production, the relationship between teaching and learning, and the means by which creative output is measured and valued. (2016)

Feminism itself must change if its advocates want to be accountable to the many gender constituencies that exist. As Namaste argues, “transsexuals are continually and perpetually erased” both in the cultural and institutional world and in much of the research world (2000: 2). If feminist political scientists want to continue their role as experts and/ or advocates on “gender” the agenda must expand to reflect the shifting political and social context. An expansive response need not be co-opting or reductive but can speak to the complex yet fundamental role gender plays for all citizens in a society and can work to reveal new alliances and area of study in which feminist political science can play a vital role within the discipline as a whole. We can, and must, continue to discuss “women” in a variety of ways and through a variety of means, but we must also make room to discuss the contested and relational nature of gender. As Joni Lovenduski reminds us, gender is not just reflective of categories or identities, it is also fundamentally relational and “is expressed in relations that are embodied in the sexual division of labour, compulsory heterosexuality, discourses and ideologies of citizenship, motherhood, masculinity, and femininity” (1998: 335). An expansionist feminist agenda prioritizes relationality as a central lens in thinking, talking, writing, and doing gender.

### **Theorizing “Men” in Feminism:**

Thus far I have argued that the increasing societal challenges to the traditional gender binary offer an important opportunity for political science: an opportunity to reconsider how we think, talk, write and teach about gender and an opportunity to challenge the binary as a discipline. A central component in challenging the way the binary is upheld in the discipline is an investigation into masculinity. Until recently, political science has been virtually silent about the gendered identities and experiences of men. The consequences of this silence should not be underestimated. As Elisabeth Gidengil noted in her 2007 Presidential address to the *Canadian Political Science Association*:

All too often [...] gender is being treated as being synonymous with women, but gender is a part of the identity of women and men alike. Indeed it may well be time to start moving beyond a simple dichotomous conception of gender [...] If we always enquire why women differ in their political behavior and political orientations from men—rather than the other way around—we risk subtly perpetuating the assumption that male behavior is the norm. When we ask why women differ in their political behavior and political orientations from men, *men are implicitly serving as the yardstick*. (Emphasis added. 819-820)

While the argument Gidengal makes in her address is focused on the need to challenge a monolithic understanding of women in the “gender gap” literature specifically, her comments about our continued, if often unintentional, reinforcement of a monolithic notion of men as a neutral standard in feminist political science is revealing for the entire discipline. As political science has maintained this male standard of measurement in research so too has it maintained the masculinity of the discipline in general. Unpacking the gendered identities and experiences of “men” and how they relate to the gendered identities and experiences of “women” is key to revolutionizing the discipline as a whole.

Discussing men as “gendered” in any complex way is, to date, very rare in the discipline. One exception is Rainbow Murray’s recent work on men and political representation (2015). Murray observes that while there is an extensive literature that examines and measures the interests of “women” and a further emerging literature that highlights the complications of such an approach (most obviously the risks of essentialism), the topic of “men’s interests” fails to appear at all. She states:

It is assumed that men do not suffer from gender oppression, and have their interests well met given their over- representation within positions of power. However, these assumptions neglect the fact that men are also heterogeneous and subject to great diversity of identities and interests” (2015).

Murray’s main objective is to reveal how gender analyses of “men” reveal new insights about our theories of political representation by highlighting the fact that the diversity of men is “seldom reflected within male elites” and that a number of policy areas have a “distinctive gendered impact on men” including “health, education, war, crime, paternity and employment” (2015).

Murray’s work highlights an important omission in the field of political science but also within feminism more broadly. An omission that was also raised in Emma Watson’s 2014 *HeforShe* speech at the United Nations<sup>vii</sup>. Watson’s speech touched on an important difficulty confronting contemporary feminism—that is the role, or lack thereof, for men in feminism. While the campaign slogan and website promoted by *UN Women* suggests the appropriate role for feminist men is in advocating for, or on behalf of, women, Watson’s speech went beyond that notion to explore the

relational aspect of gender identities. When Watson stated, “if men don’t have to be aggressive in order to be accepted women won’t feel compelled to be submissive. If men don’t have to control, women won’t have to be controlled” (Watson, 2014) she shifted the focus from women and men as oppositional gender categories to women and men as gender identities and gender experiences constituted by one another.

This relational aspect is also highlighted by Susan Faludi’s work. Her desire to better understand the gendered experiences of American men led her to observe meetings for a domestic violence support group (Faludi, 1999: 7). In reflecting upon her experience she asks:

What did I expect to divine about the broader male condition by monitoring a weekly counseling session for batterers? That men are by nature brutes? Or, more optimistically, that the efforts of such a group might point to methods of managing or even ‘curing’ such beastliness? Either way, I can see now that I was operating from an assumption both underexamined and dubious: that the male crisis in America was caused by something men were *doing* unrelated to something being done to them, and that its cure was surely to be found in figuring out how to get men to *stop* whatever it was. (Faludi, 1999: 7)

Faludi’s work reminds us of the importance of including “men” in our gender analyses not simply as agents of behavior but also as subjects to the disciplinary power of what it is to be a “man.” Holmgren and Hearn (2009) make a similar call to adjust the focus of our gender(ed) lens:

[M]uch of what men do is not seen as ‘about gender’, related to gender equality or about making gender relations and gender divisions more or less equal or unequal – in fact it is not seen as political activity at all. Much of men’s practices, in public and in private, are commonly not seen as gendered. They are often done, perceived and felt as (if they were) ‘normal’. They are not usually gender-conscious activity: they ‘just happen’!” (404)

The *HeforShe* campaign as constructed by *UN Women* demonstrates a missed opportunity to initiate a change in the conversation in popular culture. While the campaign is promoted as a “solidarity movement for gender equality” the role offered to men in this pursuit is not one in which their gendered experiences are explored but rather one of “support” that can be demonstrated by clicking on an “I agree” icon on the *HeforShe* website which states: “*HeforShe* is a solidarity movement for gender equality that brings together *one half of humanity in support of the other half* if humanity for the benefit of all” (emphasis added. UN Women). This approach does not challenge the gender binary in any fundamental way nor does it speak to the many gender identities that fall outside the traditional male-female constructions of gender. While this campaign is disappointing for those of us interested in expanding the feminist agenda Watson’s speech also provided some insight into a larger agenda. Watson stated:

Men—I would like to take this opportunity to extend your formal invitation. Gender equality is your issue too. Because to date, I've seen my father's role as a parent being valued less by society despite my needing his presence as a child as much as my mother's. I've seen young men suffering from mental illness unable to ask for help for fear it would make them look less "macho"—in fact in the UK suicide is the biggest killer of men between 20-49 years of age; eclipsing road accidents, cancer and coronary heart disease. I've seen men made fragile and insecure by a distorted sense of what constitutes male success. Men don't have the benefits of equality either. We don't often talk about men being imprisoned by gender stereotypes but I can see that that they are and that when they are free, things will change for women as a natural consequence. (2014)

Watson's speech is an important call for action, not just to those unfamiliar with feminism but also to those of us working as feminists. bell hooks makes an even louder call for action in demanding that feminists take up new audiences and new priorities, both academic and non-academic. hooks argues (2014):

Patriarchal masculinity teaches men that their sense of self-identity, their reason for being, resides in their capacity to dominate others. To change this males must critique and challenge male domination of the planet, of less powerful men, of women and children. But they must also have a clear vision of what feminist masculinity looks like. How can you become what you cannot imagine? And that vision has yet to be made fully clear by feminist thinkers male or female [...] No significant body of feminist literature has appeared that addresses boys, that lets them know how they can construct an identity that is not rooted in sexism. (70)

As feminist political scientists, educating ourselves and others in the discipline in comprehensive non-binary understandings of gender and the politics that accompany these understandings, is an exciting opportunity to transform the discipline. Moving away from the traditional binary also provides new insight into the gendered nature of the discipline as well as new tools and critiques with which we can challenge this reality. As bell hooks (2014) argues, "feminism is for everybody."

### **Moving Forward: Cautions and Constraints**

While the possibilities for feminism and the discipline outlined above offer the potential to transform our thinking about what it is to be "gender conscious" this opportunity also comes with real risks for "women" whether they identify as feminist "strongly", "softly", or not at all<sup>viii</sup>. We have already seen the interests of women framed by various governments as "special interests" (Collier, 2009: 174)

and in Canadian federal politics many policies and institutions that feminists claimed and constructed are no more (Jenson, 2009: 175). A number of feminist scholars have issued strong warnings about this positioning and have worked to highlight the dangers that come with a discursive shift away from “women” to gender neutral terms (Bashevkin, 1998; Collier, 2009; Jenson, 2009). Collier highlights such a shift in Ontario with the Liberal governments announcement of a \$60 million Domestic Violence Action Plan. “Although the funding increase was welcomed, a continued use of the gender neutral-term ‘domestic’ violence instead of violence against ‘women’ disappointed advocates and, again, reflected wider trends that were making women more and more invisible” (2009: 175).

These cautions should be heeded seriously as we expand the feminist agenda. The possibility of the co-optation and de-politicization of gender politics is precisely why feminism remains a central lens through which to consider contemporary gender politics. Opening the door to an expanded agenda can work to reinforce the importance of feminist scholarship and activism as vital to any effort to understand and/or respond to the complex socio-political questions of the day and in so doing can work to eliminate barriers that have kept feminism siloed in the discipline. Feminism is not a bounded special interest in society nor a bounded subfield that can be tacked on to an apriori discipline that remains unchanged. Feminism is about revealing, understanding, and contesting the power of sexism and oppression in our society and that means understanding that while the impact of gender is not symmetrical it is universal. And, this universality holds the potential to knock down walls and form new alliances both within and outside the discipline.

## References:

- Aronson, Pamela. 2003. “Feminists or Postfeminists? Young Women’s Attitudes toward Feminism and Gender Relations.” *Gender and Society* 17: 903-922.
- Bashevkin, Sylvia. 1998. *Opening Doors Wider: Women’s Political Engagement in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Collier, Cheryl N. 2009. “Violence against Women or Violence against ‘People’?: Neo-liberalism, ‘Post-neo-liberalism’, and Anti-violence Policy in Ontario and British Columbia.” In *Women and Public Policy in Canada*, ed. Alexandra Dobrowolsky. Oxford University Press.
- Cossman, Brendan, Shannon Bell, Lisa Gotell and Becki L. Ross. 1997. *Bad Attitude/s on Trial: Pornography, Feminism, and the Butler Decision*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Connell, Raewyn. 2012. "Transsexual Women and Feminist Thought: Toward New Understanding and New Politics" *Signs: Journal of Women and Culture in Society* 37: 857-881.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. 1991. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color" *Stanford Law Review*, 43: 1241-1299.

Dhamoon, Rita. 2009. *Identity/Difference Politics: How Difference is Produced and Why it Matters*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dhamoon, Rita. 2011. "Considerations on Mainstreaming Intersectionality." *Political Research Quarterly*, 64: 230-243.

Faludi, Susan. 2000. *Stiffed: The Betrayal of the American Man*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*. New York: Routledge Press.

Gidengil, Elisabeth. 2007. "Beyond the Gender Gap: Presidential Address to the Canadian Political Science Association Saskatoon, 2007" *Canadian Journal of Political Science* 40: 815-831.

Hawkesworth, Mary. 2005. "Engendering Political Science: An Immodest Proposal" *Politics and Gender* 1: 141-156.

Holmgren, Egeberg Linn and Jeff Hearn. 2009. "Framing 'Men in Feminism': Theoretical Locations, Local Contexts and Practical Passings in Men's Gender-Conscious Positionings on Gender Equality and Feminism". *Journal of Gender Studies*, 18: 403-18.

hooks, bell. 2014. *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics* (Second Edition). New York: Routledge.

Jenson, Jane. 2009. "Writing Gender Out: The Continuing Effects of the Social Investment Perspective." In *Women and Public Policy in Canada*, ed. Alexandra Dobrowolsky. Oxford University Press.

Lovenduski, Joni. 1998. "Gendering Research in Political Science." *Annual Review of Political Science*. 1: 333-56.

Manning, Kimberley. 2016. "What Defines a Feminist University?" <http://www.concordia.ca/content/shared/en/news/main/stories/2016/03/08/defining-the-feminist-university-kimberley-manning.html> (March 8, 2016).

Murphy, Devon, 2013. "Feminist Movement's Future In Question After The Third Wave."

[http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2013/06/24/modernfeminism\\_n\\_3471768.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2013/06/24/modernfeminism_n_3471768.html)  
(April 18, 2016).

Murray, Rainbow. 2015. "Too Much Presence? Men's Interests and Male Intersectionality." <http://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/116506c2-67f0-478e-a087-2f19c76d51af.pdf> (June 2015).

Namaste, Viviane. 2000. *Invisible Lives: The Erasure of Transsexual and Transgendered People*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newman, Jacquetta and Linda A. White. 2012. *Women, Politics and Public Policy* (Second Edition). Don Mills: Oxford University Press.

O'Neill, Brenda, Elisabeth Gidengil and Lisa Young. 2008. "Examining Feminist Identification and Gender Related Attitudes." Paper prepared for delivery at the Canadian Political Science Association Meetings, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, June 4-6, 2008.

Silverberg, Helene. 1990. "What Happened to the Feminist Revolution in Political Science?: A Review Essay". *The Western Political Quarterly* 43: 887-903.

UN Women. 2015. "Heforshe." <http://www.heforshe.org/en> (2015).

Vickers, Jill. 1997. *Re-inventing Political Science: A Feminist Approach*. Halifax: Fernwood Press.

Vickers, Jill. 2016 (Forthcoming). "Can We Change How Political Science Thinks? 'Gender Mainstreaming' in a Resistant Discipline: Presidential Address delivered to the Canadian Political Science Association, Ottawa, June 2, 2015" *Canadian Journal of Political Science*.

Watson, Emma. 2014. "Speech by UN Women Goodwill Ambassador Emma Watson at a special event for the *HeForShe* campaign", United Nations Headquarters, New York, 20 September 2014.

<http://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2014/9/emma-watson-gender-equality-is-your-issue-too> (September 20, 2014).

Waylen, Georgina, Karen Celis, Johanna Kantola, and S. Laurel Weldon. 2013. *Oxford Handbook on Politics and Gender*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

West, Isaac. 2013. *Transforming Citizenships: Transgender Articulations of the Law*. New York: New York University Press.

---

<sup>i</sup> Recently, at the World Economic Forum's Annual Meeting, Prime Minister Trudeau stated, "'We shouldn't be afraid of the word feminist. Men and women should use it to describe themselves any time they want'" ( see [www.weforum.org](http://www.weforum.org) 2016).

<sup>ii</sup> These news items include but are not limited to the Jian Ghomeshi alleged sexual assault(s) and cover up scandal (see <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ex-cbc-radio-host-jian-ghomeshi-pleads-not-guilty-to-sexual-assault-charges-1.3252077> for an overview), the Dalhousie Dentistry School "Gentlemen's Club scandal (see <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nova-scotia/dalhousie-releasing-report-on-dentistry-facebook-scandal-1.3083091> for an overview), and the ongoing review of a Federal Court judge for allegedly "berating" a victim of sexual assault. (see <http://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/canada-judge-judicial-review-robin-camp-1.3311574> for an overview).

<sup>iii</sup> For instance, citing Knopff and Morton 1992, and Cairns 1991 as specific examples, Cossman, Bell, Gotell, and Ross (1997) argue that mainstream discussions of "feminism" and the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms reduce Canadian feminism to a discussion of one political actor and, by doing so, one political position. More specifically, the argue: "the dominant argument in mainstream texts is that Canadian feminists (i.e. LEAF) have been the most successful Charter actors—an argument that would be seen as exceedingly naive by most feminist analysts" (Cossman et. al, 1997: 105).

<sup>iv</sup> One notable exception is Joni Lovenduski. In her article "Gendering Research in Political Science", Lovenduski (1998) observes that feminist political science "has undergone a significant, if incomplete, shift in method from the use of a dichotomous category of sex to a more complex and sometimes slippery category of gender" (350). A shift, Lovenduski argues, that is, "incomplete" in part, "because many feminists are reluctant to give up on biologically determined categories of man and woman" (350-351). Overall, Lovenduski argues, feminist political science needs to engage the concept of gender, "but must also retain the use of the dichotomous variable of sex" (336).

<sup>v</sup> Connell (2012) provides an overview of some of the most antagonistic of the "feminist" accounts of trans women most notably Mary Daly's discussion of transsexuality as a "necrophilic invasion" of "women bodies and spirits" and Janice Raymond's depiction of transsexual women as "parodies of femininity and male invaders of space" (860).

---

vi For example, in 2014, as a direct result of trans advocacy, the Vancouver school board passed a policy amendment that included directives to address children by the name that corresponds with their self-identified gender, to avoid sex-segregated activities and to allow children to use the bathroom of their choice.

vii While Watson received significant criticism in social media for speaking from a place of white socio-economic privilege this criticism reflects the difficulty feminists confront when doing feminist work. See <http://www.papermag.com/emma-watson-bell-hooks-conversation-1609893784.html> for a shared interview with Emma Watson and bell hooks on these challenges.

viii See O'Neill et al. (2008) for a discussion of measuring feminist identification using this sort of typology.