Jennifer Nelson

Feminist Utopia, Reproductive Technology, and Relationships of Difference in Contemporary American Feminism: A Reading of Octavia Butler's Feminist Utopias

Feminist utopian science fiction became a popular staple for theorizing political solutions to gender oppression during the contemporary feminist period between the late 1960s and the 1990s. Some of that literature, but by no means all, represented the solution to oppression – often epitomized as the »patriarchy« – as an erasure of sexual difference through feminist appropriation of reproductive technology. Although it was only one among many feminist utopian visions, this answer to the »gender/sex system of oppression« has come to typify contemporary feminist theorizing about gender, difference, and reproductive technology. This particular utopian perspective has been criticized, however, for being limited in its theoretical consideration of differences among women and how those differences are produced and reproduced through a system of interdependent relationships and systems of oppression other than sex and gender.[1]

In this article I examine the utopian fiction of Octavia Butler to argue that another part of a feminist conversation about reproductive technology and differences among women was put forth primarily by women of color who posed an alternative to the feminist utopian vision of a world without (sexual) difference.[2] This competing perspective initiated a fundamental shift in understandings about the significance of differences among women to women's liberation and feminism that profoundly shaped the contemporary feminist movement in recent decades. In order to distinguish this vision from what has often been termed as »mainstream« or white feminism, I will compare Butler's fiction to Sherri Tepper's *The Gate to Women's Country* (1988),[3] which exemplifies the version of feminism that has often falsely stood for all of American contemporary feminism: this is a version of feminism that prioritizes theoretical consideration of female difference from men and its association with the origins of patriarchy, while ignoring other forms of discrimination that also penetrate relationships among women, particularly racism, classism, and heterosexism.

Octavia Butler is the author of numerous science fiction novels and stories published in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s, including her first novel *Kindred* (1979), her Nebula prize-winning short story *Bloodchild* (1984), her *Xenogenesis* trilogy (1989) and her most recent *Parable* series, written in the 1990s.[4] Butler produced her fiction throughout the period when discussion by women of color of women's differences from one another was fundamental to feminist theory and activism (from the mid 1970s through the 1990s). Butler's work echoes these feminist theoretical articulations which analyze power relationships among women and confront hierarchy and domination as they become mobilized across multiple social technologies including race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and nationality.[5]

Throughout this period of contemporary American feminism, theoretical recognition of heterogeneity within the category woman pressed »mainstream« feminist activists to bring topics that addressed discrimination based on race, class, and sexual identity closer to the center of the movement. Issues such as ending poverty among women, the right to a living wage, the right to welfare, ending sterilization abuse, the right to bear healthy children out of poverty, the right to sexual expression and the right of lesbians to raise children in non-traditional families became impossible to ignore. Yet, it is essential to understand that this transformation was uneven; many early women's liberation activists were very conscious of women's differences before the »mainstream« movement made these into mainstays of feminist thought. For this reason, I believe that the transformation of women's liberation and feminism to incorporate an understanding of differences among women is best understood as a multiracial and multigenerational conversation about differences rather than a competition between two alternative strains of feminist thought.[6]

Before I read Tepper and Butler's works together to better understand the feminist »dialogue about difference« in recent decades, I would like to revisit the »equality vs. difference debate« (also called the »social constructionist vs. essentialist debate«), which has structured much of the theoretical and political discussion about differences among women. As Ann Snitow writes in her *Gender Diary*, »a common divide keeps forming in both feminist thought and action between the need to build the identity ›woman‹ and give it solid political meaning and the need to tear down the very category ›woman‹ and dismantle its all-too-solid history.«[7] This debate centers on the extent to which feminists should base their politics on their similarity to men (minimizing the relevance of biologically rooted sex/gender difference), or should emphasize their uniqueness from men (and similarity to each other) in order to accommodate (even celebrate) their differences from men. As feminist theorists have recently articulated, neither prospect is really tenable because both positions fail to theorize interrelated differences among women.[8]

Octavia Butler similarly deconstructs the »equality vs. difference« paradox throughout her fictional work produced from the 1970s to the 1990s. While other feminist utopian authors imagined that reproductive technology appropriated by feminists could best be used to erase differences (among the sexes) and thus create a society based on equality and sameness, Butler's characters embrace reproductive technology to create a much more ambiguous utopian

world in which difference is enhanced. Her work demonstrates how feminists of color initiated sophisticated conversations about difference(s), power, and equality from the 1970s through the 1990s. In doing so, they reshaped the utopian vision of feminism.

Shulamith Firestone is perhaps the most well known contemporary feminist theorist/women's liberation activist to imagine a utopian resolution to patriarchy centered on the feminist appropriation of reproductive technologies that would hypothetically erase sexual difference in her *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* (1970)[9]. Because of its tremendous popularity in the early 1970s, this text is often cited as being representative of »second wave« –particularly the radical feminist sub-group of the »second wave« – understandings of how to resolve the dilemma of difference and end patriarchal oppression. Firestone posited that an end to patriarchy depended on women's »seizure of control of reproduction: not only the full restoration to women of ownership of their own bodies but also their (temporary) seizure of control of human fertility.« Firestone anticipated that in the future mechanical reproduction would end »natural« childbirth and babies would be produced in artificial wombs – outside of women's bodies. She predicted that, »The reproduction of the species by one sex for the benefit of both would be replaced by (at least the option of) artificial reproduction: children would be born to both sexes equally, or independently of either, however one chooses to look at it.« With this revolutionary technological advance, women would finally be able to achieve equality with men, she argued, because their bodies would no longer be the location for childbearing or sexual difference. Women would be equal to men, because they would have become the same as the standard (man). Firestone does not say, however, which women would control reproductive technology or if domination among women (or among men) would cease to exist.[10]

Sherri Tepper in *The Gate to Women's Country*,[11] published nearly two decades after Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex,* invokes a similar theoretical framework to structure her feminist utopia. Tepper's utopia is set after a man-made disaster (nuclear war) has destroyed nearly all of civilization. In order to prevent another massively destructive war Women's Country has created a sex segregated society, structured by a set of laws which limit all conflict among towns to hand to hand combat in order to prevent any recurrence of all-out war. The towns of Women's Country are small and divided into women's walled villages and all male garrisons situated just outside the walls of the towns. The men's garrisons are ostensibly situated there to protect the women in the towns from attacks by neighboring towns.

Tepper's novel is based on a presumption that women and men are essentially different and this difference has been the source of massive destruction and domination. She represents men as inherently/biologically more prone than women to aggression, violence, and the desire to dominate others. Blame for worldwide devastation is laid at the feet of men and their biological tendency to escalate violence and dominate those in society labeled »different.«

As in Firestone's *The Dialectic of Sex,* Tepper's utopia hinges on the technological manipulation of biologically determined sex characteristics – rooted in the reproductive body – which will minimize (if not erase) sex-linked differences between men and women. Women,

however, will not cease to bear children in Women's Country. Rather, in order to prevent re-establishment of the patriarchy and potential escalation of violence into another nuclear holocaust, leaders of Women's Country are engaging in selective breeding. This process is going on without the knowledge of most other citizens of the country.

Leaders of Women's Country allow no warriors from the garrisons to father children, although all warriors believe they do. Women from the towns of Women's Country and warriors from the garrisons may engage in sex during festivals held periodically throughout the year. But women are given contraceptive patches on their arms that prevent pregnancy. None of the women who have sexual intercourse with warriors actually get pregnant by these men. They are inseminated artificially at a later date with the sperm of a man (called a servitor) who has refused to join a garrison and become a warrior. Thus, only men who have chosen to renounce violence are selected for breeding.

Given this perspective – that sexual difference is responsible for violent destruction – it is of little surprise that Tepper peoples her utopia with women and men who are of the same cultural, ethnic and racial background. Difference itself seems suspect in her utopia. The only significant difference between people is sex and gender, and all difference associated with sex will eventually be neutralized through selective breeding.

In her *Xenogenesis* (1989) trilogy,[12] Octavia Butler offers an alternative utopian vision that embraces the notion of negotiation of power among different yet mutually dependent groups (species), who need to develop a relationship of symbiosis (a coalition) in order to survive. In this series Butler explores how struggle and conflict among groups of radically different peoples locked into a symbiotic – and unequal – relationship can ultimately be resolved (tenuously) through negotiation and the creation of coalition. In *Xenogenesis* the weaker party uses her/his mutually dependent relationship with the stronger party to negotiate increased power. By the end of the series Butler has created a new utopian society in which differences coexist both within one community and within the identity and third-sex body of a human/alien hybrid individual; thus, Butler does not represent utopia as the erasure of differences. Equality, she illustrates, can subsist with difference.

Dawn, the first book of the series,[13] opens with Lilith (first rebellious wife of Adam and bearer of demon children in Jewish mythical tradition) an African American woman, held captive by alien beings called Oankali on a living alien spaceship. While in captivity Lilith's expression of stoicism and intelligence so impress the Oankali, a race of gene-trading beings whose very genetic code transforms regularly, they choose Lilith to lead the first group of humans back to a nuclear holocaust devastated Earth. But the Earth the humans return to is no longer the one that they left, nor their own. Over hundreds of years (captive human lives have been extended), the Oankali have rejuvenated Earth so that it can support life again, but it is now populated with alien hybrid plants (genetically engineered for optimal survival on Earth) that will be used to facilitate Oankali species goals. The Oankali plan to genetically engineer a new hybrid race (Oankali-human) through a »technological« amalgamation of their genes with human genes.

But this amalgamation will not result in a homogenization of difference like the utopia illustrated in Tepper's Women's Country. Rather than pose equality and difference as binary opposites, Butler's utopian framework embraces the idea of *equality in difference*. She creates a narrative in which the achievement of equality between two groups necessitates both transformation through struggle and the maintenance of difference. As groups of interdependent »peoples« negotiate relationships of power, they are always becoming »other« from themselves through a kind of social exchange (gene trade) that is analogous to political coalition, while they remain distinctive from each other as well.

The most basic element of the Oankali being drives them to manipulate and incorporate the genetic diversity of other species in order to »evolve.« Basically, to survive as a »people« the Oankali need to »technologically« engineer biological hybrids by combining their reproductive materials with those of other species – they literally become an »other« again and again by genetically combining with another species. This definitive aspect of their existence causes them to delight in all difference and diversity in the universe. Diversity needs to exist for the Oankali to exist. But the Oankali are also very acquisitive; they need to collect diversity in order to integrate it into their own evolutionary history. Butler leaves the reader unsure whether the Oankali »gene-trade« is really an exchange or more accurately a form of colonization and domination.

Thus, in the Oankali, Butler creates figures replete with contradictory and paradoxical associations that illustrate the instability and relational quality of power among different groups. On the one hand, the symbols associated with the Oankali connect them with the oppressed or »othered.« For example, by linking the Oankali with Medusa, Butler allies them with »othered« feminine power. Oankali bodies are covered with snake-like tentacles that echo Medusa's snake infested hair. The tentacles make Oankali particularly fearsome looking to humans. Medusa too, was horrifying to look at, yet she also embodied female wisdom. The Oankali, like Medusa, are both fearful to look at and incredibly wise, as they have stored memories of eons of Oankali history and collected biological data and information from every planet they have encountered.

Butler also invokes Medusa to draw a parallel between the mythic figure's African origins and the Oankali's representation as racial »other.« Libyans worshipped Medusa as the serpent goddess (again feminine), who was representative of the cycles of time, birth and destruction, and purification through transformation. The Libyan Medusa symbolized creation, destruction and rebirth; the Oankali create (themselves), destroy (themselves as they were) and recreate (themselves again) through their gene trade with other species. Among the Libyan Medusa's many incarnations, she was represented with spiralling hair and snakes coiling around her body.

The Oankali have also colonized Earth only after a nuclear holocaust has nearly destroyed every living thing on the planet. At first the Oankali believe that humans have committed global mass suicide, which makes them reluctant to elect humans as »gene-trading partners.« Through closer observation, however, the Oankali learn that humans have a fatal genetic flaw

that makes extinction of the species nearly inevitable. The Oankali believe that human gene structure combines ancient tendencies toward hierarchical domination with a highly developed more recently acquired intelligence. This is a fatal combination because human intelligence is ultimately put in service of domination, which leads to global techno war. The Oankali believe that they have saved humanity by breeding with those who have survived; they think that they are giving humanity another chance by manipulating and appropriating their genetic code.

At the same time, the Oankali are coded as colonizers of Earth and subjugators of humanity. They plan to »technologically« mix their genes with human genes to blend a hybrid species that will in essence take over the planet and make humanity (in its current form) extinct. Eventually, this hybrid group will »colonize« (or trade with) another species on another planet. The Oankali have kept humans captive for centuries to study them and choose a small coterie of individuals who will »help« them in their goal of »colonization« of the planet and, eventually, the universe. At once the Oankali are colonizers of Earth, consumers of humanity's identity, exploiters of human genetic uniqueness as a species, as well as humanity's saviours and teachers about the value of difference.

The Oankali's contradictory position as colonizers and saviors causes Lilith great consternation when she finally overcomes her fear and forms a voluntary family with them in the early days of the »colonization«/coalition building (she and her Asian American lover Joseph are the least xenophobic of the humans). At first, Lilith views the Oankali as her captors and thinks that what the Oankali plan to do with humanity is akin to the use of reproductive technology to breed livestock. After she learns of the Oankali's plans she thinks to herself: »Experimental animal, parent to domestic animals? Or (…) nearly extinct animal, part of a captive breeding program? (…) Was that what she was headed for? Forced insemination. Surrogate motherhood? Fertility drugs and forced ›donations‹ of eggs? Implantation of unrelated fertilized eggs. Removal of children from mothers at birth.«[14] As an African American woman, Lilith is keenly aware of the forced reproductive manipulation black women underwent in American history, from forced breeding during slavery to forced sterilization and exploitation as surrogate mothers in the twentieth century. Her protests against the Oankali plans reflect this knowledge and perspective.[15]

Yet, Lilith needs to overcome her own xenophobic tendencies in order to see that transformation into an »other« through »reproductive technology« is the only hope for the survival of humanity. Lilith learns that the continuation of society depends upon a process of embracing difference and diversity in coalition with an »other« and constantly becoming »other« from oneself. After her decision to accept the Oankali mandate to embrace difference and transformation through genetic manipulation, she becomes the first bearer of a hybrid Oankali/human child. Lilith's decision to participate in the inevitable extinction of pure »humanity« is partly attributed to her position as a black woman who, as a racial minority, is more open to accepting »racial/species« difference. Her sexual relationship with an Asian American man belies any belief in racial purity on Lilith's part. She ultimately concludes that those sub-

sequent generations of hybrid Oankali/human children, her own children, will not yearn for a »pure« form of humanity (species or race). They will be the multi-racial/species progeny of this blending and will embrace their heterogeneous identities within an ever-changing social and cultural context. Difference will become located within the individual body – as well as the social body – as multi-species hybrids become the norm.

In the second book of the *Xenogenesis* series, *Adulthood Rights*,[16] a human/Oankali hybrid, Lilith's son Akin, teaches groups of humans and Oankali that each must negotiate power in their relationship with the other to ensure mutual survival. While some humans have voluntarily chosen to create communities and families with Oankali, other groups of humans have rejected the idea of mixing. They insist on remaining purely human. The humans who resist intermixing with Oankali set up their own communities when they get to Earth, but they find they are unable to reproduce without the Oankali. They have been »sterilized« until they bow to the Oankali mandate to breed a hybrid generation. They will not be pursued after they have fled the Oankali/human settlements, or forced to mate with Oankali, but they will be left to die out as a sterile race of people. The Oankali take steps to prevent human reproduction because they believe that it is futile to allow the humans to populate the earth with another generation of individuals who will again destroy themselves. Some humans would rather remain sterile and die out than mix with »aliens.« Their xenophobia will doom the species to extinction.

It is not just humans who need to shed their xenophobic biases toward another species, however; the Oankali learn from the humans as well. Although the Oankali have »good« intentions for sterilizing the humans who resist (to prevent another nuclear holocaust), Butler represents their decision to do so as misguided at best and certainly immoral. Through the teachings of the human-Oankali hybrid Akin, the Oankali learn that all decision-making power about human-Oankali destiny needs to be shared with the humans; they need to build a coalition. Akin convinces his Oankali relations to create a habitable refuge for the »resistors« (those humans who will not mate with Oankali) on Mars and restore their reproductive capacity. The Oankali learn that to truly appreciate difference in all of its manifestations, some individuals within a species must be able to choose *not* to »integrate« – even if this means that they risk extinction.

The compromise made by the Oankali to allow humans to maintain a group of genetically distinctive individuals is an important part of the utopian vision created by Butler. She does not recreate a wholly integrated society that would eventually lose its heterogeneity through blending. Rather, the fictional members of the society embrace difference by both creating mixed species progeny and encouraging the maintenance of separate species. For Butler, these contradictory impulses need to exist side by side to avoid the kind of homogenization that occurs in Tepper's feminist utopia. Unlike Tepper or Firestone, who represent the view that equality can only occur through the erasure of the (female) body's sexual difference (or at least the erasure of the significance of sexual difference located in the body), Butler envisions a utopia in which equality can exist in difference – even when that difference is located in something that seems as intractable (or essential) as the sexed, reproductive, raced or »species« body. The

sexed body, the reproductive body, the raced body, or the »species« body does not need to be erased to build political coalition among different groups. At the same time, I don't believe that Butler puts forth the idea that the raced, sexed or »species« body is unchangeable. Rather, she represents bodies as historically changeable, inevitably so, but change does not necessitate homogenization.

Butler's theoretical framework generated in her utopian science fiction from the mid-1970s to the 1990s closely resembles feminist theory recently produced on relationships of power and difference among women by thinkers such as Marilyn Frye,[17] Norma Alarcon,[18] Gloria Anzaldua,[19] Chandra Talpade Mohanty,[20] Uma Narayan,[21] and Chela Sandoval.[22] The work of these feminist theorists – many of whom are women of color themselves – has been informed by the activism of women of color, lesbians, working class women and white women concerned with issues of difference and power among women. As a result of their attention to the importance of differences among women, and how difference structures differentials of power, they have pushed feminism beyond the »equality vs. difference« debate in order to understand equality in difference. Equality will ideally be formed in coalition building – which necessitates conversation, struggle, and conflict – across differences. But this can only happen after relationships of unequal power between groups of women are fully recognized. Alternatively, if we continue to ignore differences, basing equality on sameness, we reinforce the position of some women as »other« than the mainstream standard for sameness.

In conclusion, I turn to Marilyn Frye in order to connect this discussion of utopia to political debates about the relevance of feminism to different groups of women. The question of feminism's relevance often hinges on whether feminism can address all of the contradictory political needs and demands of the very heterogeneous and unstable category »woman«; in other words, has feminism become obsolete now that we live in an historical period in which it is impossible to act politically based on any kind of singular or homogeneous understanding of the identity woman?

Frye answers this question well. She argues that women do not need a stable identity position from which to organize as feminists. Homogeneity within the category is not essential for a coalition politics. Rather coalition feminism requires individuals and groups to build common cause around relationships that will include sameness and difference, equality and inequality.[23] Feminism must be forged within a fluid definition of political mobilization in which we abandon the notion of any kind of unity within the category of feminist or woman and any notion that equality rests on being the same. Feminisms and women who identify with multiple and heterogeneous identity positions forged in social relationships among women are the present and the future of a politics that remains »woman« centered but does not exclude multiple vectors of difference that compound gender.[24] As Alma Garcia explains in her work on Chicana feminism, »Chicana feminists criticized white feminists who believed that a general women's movement would be able to overcome racial differences among women.«[25] Women who find common political cause will unite and will forge a workable coalition politics, but they cannot expect all women to join them, nor can they expect, or even desire, a poli-

tics to erase or transcend all differences among women. Feminism itself will transform as those who mobilize in the name of feminism(s) define and redefine their agendas along lines of difference forged in relationships of common cause. This process is one of struggle, conflict, negotiation, and recognition/celebration of the proliferation of differences.

Notes

1 Gayle Rubin first used the terminology gender/sex system in her groundbreaking 1975 article *The Traffic in Women*. This article is a good example of how much of »white,« »mainstream,« or »hegemonic« American feminist theory took the »sex/gender system« as the primary vector of difference. Gayle Rubin, The Traffic in Women: Notes on the ›Political Economy‹ of Sex, in: Rayna Rapp Reiter, ed., Toward an Anthology of Women, New York 1975, 157-210.

2 Other feminist science fiction novels that would fit well into this argument but are not examined in this paper are Marge Piercy, Woman on the Edge of Time, London 1979; Ursula K. LeGuin, The Left Hand of Darkness, New York 1969; Joanna Russ, The Female Man, Boston 1975; and Joan Slonczewski, A Door into Ocean, New York 1986.

3 Sheri S. Tepper, The Gate to Women's Country, New York 1989.

4 Octavia Butler, Kindred, New York and Boston 1988; idem, Bloodchild and Other Stories, New York 1998; idem, Xenogesis (Dawn, Adulthood Rites, Imago), New York 1997; idem, Parable of the Sower, New York 1998; idem, Parable of the Talents, New York 2001. I don't want to essentialize or reify Butler's racial identity. Yet, I do think that it is important that she is an African American woman writer. As Patricia Hill Collins points out in her discussion of Black feminism, the experience of racial discrimination is important to an articulation of a feminism that puts women of color's priorities first.

5 See Norma Alarcon, The Theoretical Subject(s) of This Bridge Called My Back and Anglo-American Feminism, in: Gloria Anzaldua, ed., in: Making Face, Making Soul/Haciendo Caras, New York 1990, 356-369; Gloria Anzaldua, Borderlands: The New Mestiza=La Frontera, San Franscisco 1999; Judith Butler, Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, New York 1990; idem, Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of »Sex,« New York 1993; Patricia Hill Collins, Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment, New York 2000; Teresa de Lauretis, Technologies of Gender: Essays on Theory, Film and Fiction, Bloomington 1987; Cherrie Moraga and Gloria Anzaldua, eds., This Bridge Called my Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color, New York 1981; Uma Narayan, Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism, New York 2003; Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Anna Russo and Lourdes Torres, eds., Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism, Bloomington 1991; Chela Sandoval, Methodology of the Oppressed, Minneapolis 2000; Joan Wallach Scott, Only Paradoxes to Offer: French Feminists and the Rights of Man, Cambridge 1996.

6 Wini Breines, What's Love Got to Do with It? White Women, Black Women and Feminism in the Movement Years, in: Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society 27/4 (2002), 1095-1134; Toni Cade Bambara, The Pill: Genocide or Liberation, in: The Black Woman: An Anthology, New York 1970, 162-169; Patricia Robinson, Poor Black Women's Study Papers in: ibid., 189-197; Frances Beale, Double Jeopardy: To Be Black and Female in: ibid., 90-100; Barbara Omolade, It's a Family Affair: The Real Lives of Black Single Mothers, New York 1986; Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell-Scott, Barbara Smith, All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies, New York 1982; bell hooks, Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism, Boston 1981; idem, Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center, Boston 1984; and Collins, Thought, as in note 5, among others, were influential in transforming US-mainstream feminism in the 1970s and 1980s.

7 Ann Snitow, A Gender Diary, in: Marianne Hirsch and Evelyn Fox Keller, eds., Conflicts in Feminism, New York 1990, 10-43.

8 Marilyn Frye, The Necessity of Differences: Constructing a Positive Category of Women, in: Signs. Journal of Women in Culture and Society 21/4 (1996), 991-1010.

9 Shulamith Firestone, The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution, New York 1970.

10 Ibid., 11.

11 Tepper, Gate, as in note 3.

12 Butler, Xenogenesis, as in note 4.
13 Butler, Dawn, as in note 4.
14 Ibid., 58.
15 Butler's novel Kindred (1979), as in note 4, is in part about a woman forced into sexual relations with her owner during antebellum slavery.
16 Butler, Adulthood Rights, as in note 4.
17 Frye, Necessity, as in note 8.
18 Alarcon, Subject(s), as in note 5.
19 Anzaldua, Borderlands, as in note 5.
20 Mohanty et.al., World, as in note 5.
21 Narayan, Cultures, as in note 5.
22 Sandoval, Methodology, as in note 5.
23 Frye, Necessity, as in note 8.
24 Nancy Hewitt, Compounding Differences, in: Feminist Studies 18/2 (1992), 313-327.
25 Alma M. Garcia, The Development of Chicana Feminist Discourse, in: Lois West, ed., Feminist Nationalism, New York 1997, 533-534.