

Gender Conscious

H. E. BABER

ABSTRACT *Integration has had a bad press in recent years. Feminists and spokesmen for racial and ethnic minorities express concern that the integrationist agenda requires women and members of minorities to divest themselves of features of their "identities" in order to approximate to a restrictive white male ideal which, they hold, should not be a requirement for fair treatment and social benefits. I argue that this concern is unwarranted and that "Integration" with respect to gender, as I shall understand it, is overall more conducive to the happiness of both men and women than what I shall call "Diversity".*

1. Social Salience: Integration and Diversity

Integration and Diversity may be understood as follows:

Integration (I): A state of affairs in which unchosen social affiliations such as gender, ethnicity and race are non-salient.

Diversity (D): A state of affairs in which unchosen social affiliations such as gender, ethnicity and race are socially salient, together with the affirmation that the cultures or "scripts" associated with these affiliations are equally valuable and that extrinsic benefits should not be contingent on individuals' adoption of the culture of some privileged group.

A property is socially salient within a community to the extent that members of the community take it to predict or explain beliefs, character traits, tastes or other socially significant psychological characteristics. Social salience is a matter of degree: it depends upon how many other characteristics it is thought to predict or explain, how important they are, how many members of the community believe it has this explanatory or predictive power and the degree of conviction with which they hold this belief.

Accent is salient: some accents are marks of social class, and are generally taken to predict socially significant characteristics associated with the class of which they are indicators. Handedness and eye-colour, by contrast, are non-salient.

The salience of a property does not arise from its visibility or noticeability. Freckles are highly visible but wholly non-salient. In many communities, by contrast, some invisible ethnic origins, occupations and avocations are salient: people have notions of what Germans and Italians, lawyers, librarians and academics, stamp-collectors and soccer fans are like.

Finally, for some properties which are salient to a given degree, the absence of these properties, or possession of other properties of the same category may be less salient or non-salient. People have notions about what used car salesmen are like; they don't generally have preconceived ideas about what veterinarians, geologists or copy-editors are like.

The question of whether I is preferable to D is that of whether, given empirical data and plausible assumptions about people's aptitudes, preferences and other psychological characteristics, we should prefer a state of affairs in which gender, race and ethnic origin are non-salient to one in which they are, to some degree, symmetrically salient.

Currently, neither I nor D is realized. Gender, race and ethnicity are not merely salient: they are enmeshed in a fabric of hierarchical relations and entangled with the allocation of power and prestige. Women, blacks and members of ethnic minorities are not only thought to be different from white males — they are thought to be inferior. Consequently, they are thought to have characteristics which are held to be undesirable, and characteristics which they are thought to have are devalued to the extent that they are associated with membership of these groups. Not only are women thought to be cowardly and irrational — characteristically female activities are devalued: sports are big business, skilled needlework is not.

D is not the way things are; neither is I. Arguably, however, as regards gender I is preferable to D: that is, a state of affairs in which sex roles have been eliminated is preferable to one in which sex roles, even if radically revised and equally valued, are maintained.

2. Why Integration is preferable to Diversity

It is an empirical question whether the integrationist ideal of a gender-blind society is in the interests of women. *Prima facie* it would seem that a social arrangement where gender was non-salient would benefit women. Intuitively, all other things being equal, rational, informed adults are better off insofar as they achieve desire-satisfaction and, consequently, when it comes to gender it would seem that Integration is in the interests of both men and women to the extent that it makes it easier for individuals whose preferences are not readily accommodated by their assigned sex roles to achieve desire-satisfaction.

Nevertheless, though there is a *prima facie* case for maximizing the scope of individual choice, a fully-informed, rational person may choose an arrangement which imposes restrictions on his activities. People join the army and religious orders. Sometimes, given a person's preferences, the benefits of restrictive arrangements outweigh their costs: it may be that sex roles provide benefits to women that outweigh the cost of those restrictions on individual liberty, so that women would not rationally choose to be liberated from their gender role.

Do women want to be liberated from femininity? The most plausible guess is that some do and some do not. The question is whether the costs of sex roles outweigh their benefits to women — and men — who enjoy them. I argue that they do.

The conjecture that men and women would be better off in the long run in a genuinely sex-blind society is better than an educated guess. Numerous empirical studies suggest that many differences in the behaviour of men and women are a consequence of the differences in their life circumstances.

There is empirical evidence that the best predictors of behaviour on the job are not demographic characteristics of workers such as gender or race but the nature of the job: workers in unskilled, poorly paid, dead-end positions tend to be absent more often than employees with more desirable jobs, to quit more frequently and generally to exhibit less commitment to the job. Studies of male and female employees' absenteeism,

quit behaviour and the like strongly suggest that the difference in the male and female performance on the job in the aggregate is due precisely to the fact that proportionately more women than men are locked into boring, poorly paid positions without real opportunities for advancement, where commitment to the job does not pay.

Women have less incentive to make human capital investments in education and training which increase productivity since, given discrimination against them in the labour market such investments are less likely to pay off. Moreover, offers of firm-specific training are often at the discretion of employers and because women in the aggregate are more likely to quit, employers are reluctant to invest in them by offering them training which will be wasted if they leave the firm. Without such training women are likely to remain in positions with few prospects of advancement and therefore have less incentive to stay with the firm. Such feedback effects motivate statistical discrimination by employers which generate vicious circles: employers don't invest in women because women don't invest in work and women don't invest in work because employers don't invest in women [1].

By contrast, empirical studies suggest that when men and women are similarly situated, male and female behaviour tends to converge. Men and women in comparable positions behave similarly on the job. There is also evidence that in other social situations when men and women are treated similarly they behave similarly. Social psychologist Carol Tavris cites studies concerning male and female "communications styles" which suggest that where men and women occupy positions of comparable power they exhibit the same "communications styles" and, moreover, that when men occupy subordinate positions they exhibit what has been understood as characteristically female communications behaviour [2].

A broad range of other similar evidence suggests that even assuming that there are male/female differences which are innate or locked in through experiences in early development, men and women are far more similar as regards their *ceteris paribus* preferences than their choices and activities in response to different life circumstances might lead us to infer.

If this is correct then it seems likely that while a minority of men and women who are lucky enough to fit assigned male and female roles thrive in circumstances where gender is salient, a great many others, perhaps the majority, while able to adjust to their assigned roles, would be happier in circumstances in which such roles were not in force, and that a significant minority are so remote from the norms conventional notions of masculinity and femininity impose that they will be truly miserable in a society where such notions are widely accepted. Arguably, Integration, understood as a non-salient social arrangement with regard to gender, is in the interests of both men and women in the aggregate.

Currently, however, the received view favours Diversity. I shall argue in the sections which follow that arguments for *la difference*, whether from the right, as in Sommers' in defence of women's "fidelity to conventional gender roles", or from the left as part of a larger programme in support of "diversity", are less than persuasive.

3. Foes to Right of Us: Sommers' Argument

Christina Sommers argues that "gender feminists" who deplore the alleged fidelity of "most women" to conventional gender roles "do not like women":

[Gender] feminists sit in judgement on the majority of American women, and they disapprove of what they see.

The gender feminists are of course keenly aware that what women want is at odds with what the feminists believe they *ought* to want. One of the busiest areas in feminist theory is speculation about why women are so resistant to their own emancipation . . .

As a liberal feminist all I do promote is the right and liberty to live under the arrangement of one's choice . . . I particularly dislike it when *feminists* . . . make women feel that fidelity to conventional gender roles is tantamount to a betrayal of women. [3]

Rhetorical flourishes aside, Sommers' line of argument appears to be this:

1. The best possible social arrangement is one in which everyone, to the extent that satisfaction of his desires does not impede or set back the satisfaction of other people's desires, gets what he wants.
2. The fidelity of most women to conventional gender roles does not impede or set back the satisfaction of other people's desires.
3. Most women want to remain faithful to conventional gender roles.
4. Therefore, the best possible social arrangement is one in which the majority of women remain faithful to conventional gender roles.

This argument is unsound because empirical evidence suggests that (2) is plainly false and because (3) is ambiguous so that, if given the interpretation which would make the argument go through, it is also false.

(1) is plausible only if getting what one wants in this context is understood to mean getting what one would choose *all other things being equal*. Some states of affairs in which everyone gets what he wants are less desirable for all concerned than others and therefore do not represent the *ceteris paribus* best possible outcomes for everyone. Not all equilibria are optimal and sometimes, even if everyone gets what he chooses, it might be better for all concerned if everyone chose differently.

As regards (3), however, given the empirical evidence cited above, it seems unlikely that most women would choose to "remain faithful to conventional gender roles" *all other things being equal*. In light of the well-documented convergence of male and female behaviour in circumstances where men and women are similarly situated, even if, as Sommers claims, "most women" voluntarily and in full knowledge of all relevant information choose to remain faithful to conventional gender roles, it seems unlikely that their choices reflect their preferences *all other things being equal*. Rational egoists often choose to pursue goals that they do not, all other things being equal, prefer because they recognize that the odds of achieving their most preferred outcomes are low, the opportunity costs high, and the concomitants of success prohibitive. Arguably, a great many women who rationally choose traditional roles, in the work place and in the home, are making the best of a relatively bad thing.

In short, (1) is plausible only if we understand getting what one wants as getting what one wants *all other things being equal*. However (3) is plausible only if we understand getting what one wants to mean getting what one wants *given his life circumstances, the choices of others and the options which are, for all practical purposes, available to*

him. “Wanting” is ambiguous and, if (1) and (3) are read in the most plausible ways, Sommers’ argument fails.

In addition, (2) is false. While women’s “fidelity to conventional gender roles” by devoting themselves to child care at the expense of their careers or, to use examples Sommers later cites, by swooning over Rhett Butler, starring in elaborate white weddings or exhibiting a proclivity for “wickedly high heels” does no direct harm to other women, some activities which do no direct harm severely set back the interests of others when they are widespread and constitute the common practice. Consider the phenomenon of herd immunity. As a consequence of the misuse of the primary drugs for tuberculosis by a significant minority of individuals in treatment, resistant strains of the TB bacillus have evolved which have rendered this medication ineffective for other patients. In cases like this, while no individual’s misuse of medication does direct harm to anyone else, the widespread abuse of these drugs does harm and seriously sets back the interests of innocent parties.

Swooning and dressing up are relatively innocuous but there are many actions in fidelity to conventional gender roles which, while individually harmless, to the extent that they are visible and widespread, confirm conventional notions about how women can be expected to behave, lock in customs that restrict women’s options and severely set back the interests of women who do not wish to participate in the gender fidelity of female brand loyalists. If, for example, the majority of women in the labour force take extended maternity leaves or quit their jobs, visibly pregnant job applicants will not be taken seriously. If the majority of working mothers exhibit high rates of absenteeism in order care for their children working mothers will be shunted off to the “mommy track” and deprived of the opportunities they might otherwise have had were they males or childless females. Women who behave in these ways undermine the credibility of integrationist working women.

As it is in the labour force, so it is in the social sphere: individually innocuous actions in fidelity to conventional gender roles when they are widespread and expected disadvantage women who do not wish to play the game. If, for example, the majority of women engage in conventional seduction routines, where “no” means “maybe” or “later” then, with good reason, women who say “no” and mean it will not be taken seriously. The situation is comparable to Knights and Knaves puzzles where Knights always tell the truth and Knaves always lie, and where players who know that there are large numbers of Knaves in the population will, with good reason, be skeptical about the sincere avowals of Knights. Knaves involved in conventional seduction routines undermine the credibility of Knights who wish to be taken at face value.

Because, like members of visible minorities, most women cannot opt out of being female or “pass”, widespread fidelity to conventional gender affects all women and to integrationist women inflicts significant harm.

4. Foes to the Left of Us: “Feminist” Arguments for Diversity

The “gender feminists” to whom Sommers alludes provide additional arguments for *la difference*. However, whereas Sommers defends the right of swooning women in wickedly high heels to be titillated by the marital rape scene in *Gone With the Wind*, her foils, the “gender feminists,” are more likely to concern themselves with promoting

the interests of earth mothers avid for ready access to nursing babies on the job. So, for example, Alison Jaggar writes:

Women's reproductive functions may mean that women have needs for pregnancy leave, maternity services and arrangements for easy access to their nursing babies . . . the liberal insistence on 'formal' equality, which comes from viewing people as abstract individuals, makes it easy not only to ignore these varying needs but even to claim that satisfying the needs of a certain group would amount to 'reverse discrimination.' [4]

Like Sommers, Jaggar and other conventional feminists assume that women have biologically based preferences, indeed "needs," which differ from those of men. Unlike Sommers, however, conventional feminists wish to support programmes of preferential treatment for women in order to accommodate women's allegedly distinctive needs and sensibilities.

Conventional feminists recognize that "formal equality" under the law has not secured genuine equality for women. They recognize that even where civil rights legislation is enforced, where regulations are gender-blind, and where purely merit-based criteria are used in decisions concerning admission to academic programmes, hiring and promotion, women remain at a disadvantage.

Unlike traditional feminists, who support preferential treatment programmes in the interests of eventually achieving Integration, a state of affairs in which such programmes will no longer be necessary, conventional feminists believe that policies promoting Diversity are most likely to bring about genuine equality for women. The following is a reconstruction of what I take to be one of the crucial arguments which purports to show, more generally, that Diversity is morally preferable to Integration:

1. Policies of preferential (or different) treatment for women and members of racial and ethnic minorities in the allocation of educational opportunities, jobs and other social benefits in a given range of cases, C, are justified only if either (a) the application of criteria based purely on merit as conventionally understood fails to bring about fair treatment for women and members of traditionally disadvantaged minorities in C or (b) D is morally preferable to I.
2. Policies of preferential (or different) treatment for women and members of racial and ethnic minorities in the allocation of educational opportunities, jobs and other social benefits in a given range of cases, C, are justified.
3. The application of criteria based purely on merit as conventionally understood has succeeded in bringing about fair treatment for women and members of disadvantaged minorities in C.
4. D is morally preferable to I.

There is evidence to suggest that many advocates of D buy the premises of this argument in the facile assumption by Jaggar and writers following her that "Liberal Feminists" and other advocates of Integration who reject (4) oppose affirmative action and other policies of preferential treatment and hold that "formal equality" under the law is sufficient to serve the legitimate interests of women and members of traditionally disadvantaged minorities.

In fact many traditional liberals who reject (4) support affirmative action and other programmes which discriminate in favour of women and members of traditionally

disadvantaged groups. Jaggard and others appear to assume that the denial of (4) entails the denial of (2). This would be correct if (1) and (3) were true. However, arguably, (1) is false and (3) is at best questionable for a variety of cases where gender and colour-blind criteria for the allocation of social benefits can and have been applied.

Consider (1), which implies that the only justifications for preferential treatment are either considerations of fairness or the moral superiority of D to I. There is no compelling reason to accept (1), indeed there is a variety of other reasons traditional liberals have cited in support of preferential treatment programmes other than an interest in achieving “diversity.”

Many supporters of affirmative action advocate policies of preferential treatment for women and members of disadvantaged minority groups in order to lift families out of poverty. Currently, members of racial minorities are disproportionately represented amongst the very poor and the high proportion of female-headed households in the US contributes significantly to poverty amongst children [5]. The presence of a large ethnically defined underclass and a high proportion of children whose economic status diminishes their chances of becoming productive adults are detrimental to the interests of all members of the community. Many jobs do not require any special qualifications and can be done equally well by almost anyone. Preferential treatment for women and members of disadvantaged minorities in hiring for such positions does not undermine efficiency, and traditional liberals have supported this policy in the interests of improving the economic status of women and members of minority groups.

There are other positions where minority status may constitute a qualification for employment. In some areas with large minority populations, police officers have found it difficult to secure co-operation from minority communities when members of the minority group were unrepresented or seriously under-represented in the police force: police have actively recruited members of minority groups in order to function more effectively.

(1), therefore, is false.

Now consider (3). Unless “fairness” in the allocation of social benefits is simply understood as the strict application of merit criteria, it is not clear that (3) is true either. In many cases where merit-based criteria are applied in hiring and in admission to educational programmes, women and members of minority groups come to be assessed on the basis of merit after having been unfairly disadvantaged in acquiring the skills requisite for their positive assessment. It is not clear that the adoption of purely merit-based assessment criteria in such cases brings about what we should regard as a fair outcome — unless we simply *define* fairness in this context as the strict application of purely merit-based criteria.

Moreover, the under-representation of women and members of minority groups in a range of positions in business and the professions causes feedback effects that motivate statistical discrimination by employers. This puts all members of traditionally under-represented groups at a disadvantage. Markets, in particular the labour market, are not perfectly efficient. The effect, and primary *de facto* purpose of affirmative action is not to put less competent candidates for employment, promotion and admission to training programmes at an advantage but to minimize the disadvantage women and members of minority groups face and to ameliorate ongoing discrimination that cannot be eliminated by market forces or passive non-discrimination regulations. A traditional liberal who denies (4) may consistently advocate affirmative action and other programmes

intended to serve the interests of women and members of racial and ethnic minorities in order to secure what might be understood as a fair outcome.

If this is correct then (3) is probably false and (1) is certainly false.

5. The Costs and Benefits of Diversity

D has substantial costs. Nevertheless, even if gender diversity understood as a modification of existing norms is undesirable, it does not follow that gender diversity as such is. If Integration is to be understood as the non-salience of gender rather than conformity of both men and women to a male norm, then to make a fair comparison Diversity ought to be understood as the salience of gender resulting in a difference of expectations and options, not necessarily the difference that currently obtains or any close variant on it.

There may be benefits to Diversity as such. First, there are costs attached to unrestricted choice. People may be swamped by the range of choices available to them or make choices which are detrimental to their interests. The costs of deliberation may outweigh the benefits.

Nevertheless, while unrestricted choice may not be worth it where the consequences of one's choice are short-term and of little significance, when it comes to choosing one's profession or other long-term life options where large amounts of utility at stake, the cost of deliberation and research is more likely to pay off. As far as the worry goes, that in the absence of any gender-based restrictions an individual's choice of life options may swamp them with a bewildering range of choices, the danger is remote: even in the absence of restrictions based on gender, individuals' options are significantly restricted by their native aptitudes, life circumstances and choices they make early in life.

Again, while people sometimes choose professions or life-options unwisely, assigning roles or restricting career options according to gender is likely to be considerably less conducive to utility and social efficiency than individual choice, since empirical evidence suggests that gender is a poor predictor of aptitudes and other psychological characteristics. There is, for example, a small average difference in mathematical performance by gender which we may assume is biologically based [6]. Consequently, restricting the engineering profession to males only would be more efficient than restricting it to females only. But because the average difference between males and females is small, restricting that option to males only is far less efficient than making the option available to both men and women.

A more serious worry is the concern that in the absence of some restrictions on individual choice there will not be a sufficient number of people to fill socially necessary roles. There may be some jobs which can be filled only if gender-based restrictions are imposed. For example, it has been noted that we get choirboys because it's an option for young males and not young females: once it becomes an option for all, the number of choirboys goes down catastrophically [7]. Similarly, in a number of other roles and occupations traditionally reserved for males, men and boys leave when females gain *entrée*.

Significantly, however, there are no traditionally female roles or occupations in which women or girls leave when males get in, as has been the case, for example, in the

nursing profession. Moreover, males have rarely sought to enter traditionally female occupations.

The reason generally given for this is that being male-identified confers prestige on a role. In the case of occupations, the entry of women often comes at a time when the job is being “de-skilled” and tends to drive down wages, since women have fewer options in the labour market and so can be got to work for less pay. Where the prestige and pay attached to a job are secure, the entry of women does not put off men. Although almost half of all medical students in the US are now women, medical school applications by men have not declined catastrophically.

If this is correct then it is unlikely that we should see males fleeing from roles which females entered if male and female roles were equally valued. Diversity is by definition a state of affairs in which all other things being equal male and female roles are equally valued. It precludes attaching prestige or perks to male roles in order to attract men and boys, the mechanism which, in real world cases, makes the exclusion of females a selling point. Consequently, the promotion of Diversity would actually undermine the efficacy of excluding females from a role in order to recruit males.

It might be that even if male and female roles were equally valued it would still be difficult to attract members of one sex to certain roles without excluding members of the other sex. Choirboys might simply prefer to occupy an exclusively male role quite apart from any special prestige attached to it through the exclusion of girls. In such cases, however, we might ask whether the value of recruiting members of one sex for a given role outweighs the cost of imposing such restrictions.

There is some value to having choirboys. A few people can tell the difference between boy choirs and choirs of girls or trained adult women singing straight tone. Many more simply like to *see* boy choirs. The benefits however may be outweighed by the costs, for example, the exclusion of girls from cathedral schools or from music scholarships and from opportunities for musical training. Castrati used to be very popular but most people do not think the benefits of having them outweighs the cost of castrating boys before they are capable of informed consent. The cost of restricting choir positions to boys, including the potential loss of some talented female musicians is, intuitively, nothing nearly so great as the cost of castrating prepubescent boys, but it still has to be figured in.

It is hard to come up with convincing examples of socially needed roles that would probably not be chosen by an adequate number of individuals in the absence of gender-based restrictions. Educating girls and eliminating barriers to labour-force participation for women tends to lower the birthrate but it is unlikely that gender integration would reduce it catastrophically. Excluding females from some positions tends to facilitate the recruitment of males but if being male-identified did not confer prestige or other benefits on a role it is unlikely that it would have this effect — or that, in the case of some roles, we should have a special interest in recruiting males or be concerned that females were over-represented.

6. Why Diversity Sells

Diversity is easier to sell to the general public than Integration. Most people want things to “look right”: they want politicians, newscasters, sales people, hairdressers

and others with whom they do business to look the part. As consumers, both women and men expect receptionists in high-gloss firms to be pretty young women and sales personnel who deal in electronic merchandise to be men. They do not notice sex-segregation unless they are actively seeking positions which are earmarked for members of the opposite sex, and are not inclined to fight other people's battles.

Diversity represents an attempt to retain the appealing features of gender and ethnicity and to affirm many of the characteristics and, what Anthony Appiah calls "scripts", conventionally associated with racial, ethnic and gender identity, while eliminating the negative assessment associated with them. Even if this could be done, however, many individuals regard the ascription of characteristics to them in virtue of gender or ethnic identity, as inherently undesirable, however highly valued these characteristics may be. So Appiah writes:

An African-American after the Black Power movement takes the old script of self-hatred, the script in which he or she is a nigger, and works, in community, to construct a series of positive black life scripts . . . What demanding respect for people *as blacks* or *as gays* requires is that there be some scripts that go with being an African-American or having same-sex desires: there will be expectations to be met; demands will be made. It is at this point that someone who takes autonomy seriously will want to ask whether we have not replaced one kind of tyranny with another. If I had to choose between Uncle Tom and Black Power, I would, of course, choose the latter. But I would like not to have to choose. [8]

For many women *la difference* as such is oppressive. If I had to choose between an academic position where, as the departmental woman, I was expected to "do feminism", and the range of boring, dead-end, women's jobs in the service sector I would certainly choose the former. But I would like not to have to choose.

Diversity sells because it is a relatively effective conservative strategy which, in the teeth of persisting prejudice, provides immediate relief to some women and members of racial and ethnic minorities. Myths about the effectiveness of allegedly distinctive female "management styles," for example, have helped women get jobs in middle management. Nevertheless, it locks in stereotypes and scripts which grate against individual identities formed by innate characteristics, life histories and membership in professional, vocational, religious, political and ideological subcultures that cut across racial, ethnic and gender classifications. While Diversity is currently the received view [9], empirical evidence suggests that Integration is preferable.

H. E. Baber, Department of Philosophy, University of San Diego 5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110, USA

Acknowledgment

I am grateful for comments by Stephen Clark and by participants at the Pacific Society of Christian Philosophers and Pacific Society for Women in Philosophy at which earlier versions of this paper were presented.

NOTES

- [1] FRANCINE D. BLAU and MARIANNE A. FERBER. (1986) *The Economics of Women, Men and Work* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall pp. 229, 254. Blau and Ferber refer to KENNETH ARROW, The economic dimensions of occupational segregation: comment 1 in *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1, no. 3, pt. 2 (Spring 1976), pp. 233–37. See also FRANCINE D. BLAU and LAWRENCE M. KAHN, Race and sex differences in quits by young workers, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 34, No. 4 (July 1981), pp. 563–77 and W. KIP YISCUSI, Sex differences in worker quitting, *Review of Economics and Statistics* 62, No. 3 (August 1980), pp. 388–98. For similar findings with respect to sex differences in absenteeism, see PAUL OSTERMAN, Sex discrimination in professional employment: a case study, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 32, No. 4 (July 1979), pp. 451–64.
- [2] CAROL TAVRIS. (1992) *The Mismeasure of Woman* (New York, Simon & Schuster), p. 63. See also pp. 197 ff.
- [3] CHRISTINA SOMMERS. (1992) Do these feminists like women? *APA Newsletter on Feminism and Philosophy*, 91:1, pp. 85–87.
- [4] ALISON M. JAGGAR (1983) *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* (Totowa, NJ, Rowman and Allanheld) p. 47. This catalogue of female “needs” is bizarre. Women do not need to have babies. Women who have babies do not need to breast-feed them. Women who breast-feed their babies do not need access to them throughout the working day.
- [5] Approximately one fourth of American children live in poverty, where the poverty line which qualifies families for state aid is defined in terms of family size and the cost of providing a “thrifty diet” and minimally adequate housing for family members in their place of residence.
- [6] Gender differences in mathematics performance: a meta-analysis: Part 2 of 2Ó, in *Association for Women in Mathematics Newsletter*, vol. 21, No. 4 (July–August 1991), pp. 20, 23.
- [7] The example is from Stephen Clark in correspondence.
- [8] ANTHONY APPIAH. (1996) Race, culture, identity in *Color Conscious*, K. Anthony Appiah and Amy Guttmann, eds. (Princeton, Princeton University Press), pp. 98–99.
- [9] This is at least true in the US where, in addition to numerous civic celebrations of ethnic holidays, including CINCO DE MAYO, Kwanza and St. Patrick’s Day, bilingual education and massive sales of Mars/Venus books, cassettes and other merchandise, a number of school districts have established separate schools for blacks, Hispanics and homosexual adolescents in the interests of promoting “self-esteem.” At my oldest child’s school there were separate assemblies for white, black, Asian, Hispanic and Philipino students. In the US, Diversity is not merely a preoccupation of a minority of academics in lit crit. and related disciplines, but a central dogma of the civic religion.