

Susan Moller Okin: A New Zealand tribute ten years on

JUDITH GALTRY

Introduction

In January 2014, New Zealand's then Parliamentary Speaker David Carter announced his intention to undertake a review of Māori protocols in Parliament. The rationale, according to Carter, was that 'Parliament needs a protocol that is modern and acceptable to a diversified Parliament' ('Speaker calls for Māori protocols to be modernised', 2014). The review, undertaken with the guidance of Te Atiawa and other iwi, was in part prompted by an incident in July 2013 where two senior female Members of New Zealand's Parliament (Parliament's longest serving woman Member Annette King and her Labour Party colleague Maryan Street) were asked to move from the front bench during a powhiri (Māori ceremonial welcome) at New Zealand's Youth Parliament. They subsequently raised their concerns with the New Zealand Parliamentary Speaker as an issue for the New Zealand House of Representatives to consider (Borissenko, 2013). Some claim that such a review is long overdue ('A woman's place', 2014; 'Speaker's look at Maori rules overdue', 2014) coming as it does on the back of calls from various high profile New Zealanders over recent years for gender inclusiveness and equal treatment in civic spaces.

One New Zealander who doubtless would have been very interested in these debates is the late feminist political theorist Susan Moller Okin. Although Okin became an academic superstar in the United States where she spent most of her career, in New Zealand, her birth country, she remains relatively unknown.

Okin helped to pioneer the study of feminist political theory, breaking new ground in her various works, which included a large number of articles and several books. Her work received much international acclaim, especially in the United States, and was generally regarded as groundbreaking. But it was her 1997 essay *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* that proved most contentious. In this essay Okin explored the implications for women of the claims of some minority cultures to group rights.

Okin was a brave and independent thinker whose contribution to feminist thinking has been, I would argue, insufficiently recognised in her homeland of New Zealand. The year 2014, the tenth anniversary of her death in Lincoln, Massachusetts, thus seems a fitting time to pay tribute to her in New Zealand.

Background: Okin's early life in New Zealand

Susan Okin, née Moller, was born in 1946, the youngest of three daughters, in a state house in Auckland's wealthy suburb of Remuera. Her New Zealand mother became a fulltime housewife upon marriage, as was then the norm. Her Danish-born father worked as an accountant at Holeproof Woollen Mills. Susan was taught by her elder sister Catherine to read at a young age while convalescing from a childhood illness.¹ She attended Remuera Primary and Intermediate schools, followed by Epsom Girls' Grammar from 1959-1963. A high flyer and an academic all rounder, Susan was a prefect and the recipient of several prizes and awards including for

languages, English, history, music and art. In her final years at Epsom Girls' Grammar she was awarded a John Williamson Scholarship to assist girls with an excellent academic record to undertake tertiary study.²

Okin's academic career was stellar. Having graduated with a bachelor's degree in history from Auckland University in 1966, she was awarded a scholarship to attend Oxford University. There she completed an MPhil in politics in 1970, before going on to obtain a PhD in government at Harvard in 1975. For the next 15 years, she taught at Brandeis University, Massachusetts (Hoffman, 2004; Squires, 2004; Trei, 2004).

In 1990, Okin moved to California to take up the position of Marta Sutton Weeks Professor of Ethics in Society and Professor of Political Science at Stanford University, posts which she held until her death in 2004. Between 1993 and 1996 she was also director of Stanford University's Ethics in Society Program. At the time of her death, Okin was undertaking a one-year fellowship at Harvard University – as a recipient of the Marta S. Horner Distinguished Visiting Professorship at the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study.

Okin was the author of numerous articles and book reviews, as well as books on feminist political philosophy. These included *Women in Western Political Thought* (Okin, 1979); *Justice, Gender, and the Family* (Okin, 1989), and *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (Cohen, Howard & Nussbaum, 1999). During her career, she received various distinctions and awards for her scholarship and writing.

Okin was interested not in abstract theory for its own sake but rather in the theorising of reality (Satz & Reich, 2009). Her key intellectual claim was that gender issues should be central and not, as had previously generally been the case, peripheral to political theory. In her first book, *Women in Western Political Thought*, which examined the classical theories of Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau and Mills, Okin asked whether 'the existing tradition of political philosophy can sustain the inclusion of women in its subject matter [on the same terms with men] and, if not, why not?' (p. 4).

Her 1989 book *Justice, Gender, and the Family* is a critique of modern theories of justice (Okin, 1989). According to Okin, traditional political theory has been written from a predominantly masculinist perspective. A primary concern for Okin was the way in which sexist values continue to be reproduced and promulgated through the socialisation of children within the family setting. For this book, Okin was a co-recipient of the American Political Science Association's Victoria Schuck Award for the best book on women in politics.

But it is her last significant and perhaps best known piece of work, *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* that is the main focus of this article. Of all her work this piece was arguably the most controversial, and inspired not only acclaim but also significant debate and criticism.³

Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?

Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women? began as an essay by Okin originally published in the October/ November 1997 issue of *Boston Review* (Okin, 1997). It was later revised and reprinted in 1999 as the feature essay in an edited collection (Cohen, Howard & Nussbaum, 1999), and it is this 1999 publication that is referenced here (as *Multiculturalism*).

In this essay, Okin (1999a) posed the central question: 'What should be done when the claims of minority cultures or religions clash with the norm of gender equality that is at least formally endorsed by liberal states (however much they continue to violate it in their practice)?' (p. 9).

Moreover, queried Okin, are the conflicts between the feminist commitment to gender equity and the wish to support customary practices of minority cultures irreconcilable? According

to Okin, in the context of liberal democracies, a focus on maintaining cultural diversity should not be at the expense of supporting unequal and unjust gender roles.

Okin outlined various oppressive gendered practices in many traditional cultures, such as female genital mutilation, polygamy, and punishing women for being raped (including through forced marriage). She addressed women's greater likelihood of being subject to violence and their lesser access to education and political participation. She noted:

I think we – especially those of us who consider ourselves politically progressive and opposed to all forms of oppression – have been too quick to assume that feminism and multiculturalism are both good things which are easily reconciled. I shall argue instead that there is considerable likelihood of tension between them – more precisely, between feminism and a multiculturalist commitment to group rights for minority cultures (Okin, 1999a, p. 10).

Okin (1999a) argued that those liberals who support certain oppressive gendered practices as intrinsic, or even essential, to a particular minority group's cultural traditions mistakenly regard other cultures as 'monoliths' and fail to recognise that, as with the dominant culture, minority cultural groups 'are themselves gendered, with substantial differences of power and advantage between men and women' (p. 12).

In line with her previous work, in *Multiculturalism* Okin (1999a) pointed out that traditional political theorists tend to overlook the importance of the private sphere as the 'context in which persons' senses of themselves and their capacities are first formed and in which culture is first transmitted – the realm of domestic or family life' (p. 12). It was her contention that the distribution of responsibilities and power at home has a major impact on who can participate in the public sphere, which is where a particular culture's rules and regulations are made.

Okin's *Multiculturalism* essay received much attention, including both acclaim and criticism. In 1999, Princeton University Press published an edited anthology based on and commencing with this essay (Cohen, Howard and Nussbaum, 1999). This anthology included fifteen contributions (all but four of which had been published earlier in the *Boston Review*) from leading international thinkers on feminism and multiculturalism.

In this anthology the responses to Okin's argument are wide ranging. Some agree with Okin that liberal feminism's egalitarian principle pertaining to gender is paramount and that all cultures are capable of such change. For instance, Katha Pollitt (1999), feminist columnist for *The Nation*, notes that as a latecomer to the debate, she had a 'hard time understanding how anyone could find these [Okin's] arguments controversial.' (p. 27). Like Okin, Pollitt rejects the notion that it is up to particular cultures to determine their own specific practices relating to gender. According to Pollitt, the very essence of feminism is its questioning of tradition.

In its demand for equality for women, feminism sets itself in opposition to virtually every culture on earth. You could say that multiculturalism demands respect for all cultural traditions, while feminism interrogates and challenges all cultural traditions ... fundamentally, the ethical claims of feminism run counter to the cultural relativism of group-rights multiculturalism (Pollitt, 1999, p. 27).

Pollitt (1999) suggests that those who support the supremacy of the multicultural ideal at all costs are often seduced by 'the appeals Third Worldism makes to white liberal guilt... The cultural rights argument works best for cultures that most Americans know comparatively little about: cultures that in our ignorance we can imagine as stable, timeless, ancient, lacking in internal conflict, premodern. But where on the globe today is such a society?' (pp. 28-29).

In a similar vein, another contributor to *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* – Yael Tamir, then Professor of Philosophy at Tel Aviv University – argues that:

[A]n approach that is grounded in the right of individuals to pursue their lives the way they see fit must support individuals who wish to reform their tradition and change their lifestyle as much as it ought to support individuals who wish to retain their traditional way of life. ... It should therefore defend individuals against

pressures to conform and protect their choices to reform their tradition or even exit the community altogether. The opposite is true for an approach that is motivated by the desire to defend endangered cultures. Such an approach must favor conservative forces over reformist ones, even at the price of harming some individual interests. Obviously multiculturalism that is grounded in the former approach is friendly to feminism, while that which is grounded in the latter is not (Tamir, 1999, p. 50).

Another essay that identifies the problems inherent in reconciling the ideals of feminism and multiculturalism is that of Yale University Law Professor, Robert Post (1999). According to Post, 'Okin's essay reminds us ... that distinguishing between enabling and oppressive cultural norms is a fundamental challenge of liberal multiculturalism, a challenge that has yet to be successfully confronted' (p. 68).

By contrast, other contributors stress the need for liberalism and feminism to make greater efforts to accommodate various cultural values. These include essayists who argue that asserting the supremacy of liberalism's egalitarian principle (including in relation to gender) constitutes a form of intolerance and universalism that refuses to acknowledge cultural difference (e.g. al-Hibri, 1999; Honig, 1999; Kymlicka, 1999; Parekh, 1999). For instance, multicultural theorist and philosophy professor Will Kymlicka claims that liberalism is often complacent about its own shortcomings:

Okin worries that the currently fashionable attention to multiculturalism is obscuring the older struggle against gender inequality. This is true of some multiculturalists, just as it is true that some feminists have been blind to issues of cultural difference. But it would be a mistake – in both theory and practice – to think that struggling against gender inequality within ethnocultural groups requires denying or downplaying the extent of injustice between groups. These are both grave injustices, and liberalism's historic inability to recognize them is rooted in similar theoretical mistakes. The same attitudes and habits of mind which enabled liberals to ignore the just claims of women have also enabled them to ignore the just claims of ethnocultural minorities. We have a common interest in fighting these liberal complacencies (Kymlicka, 1999, p. 34).

Yet, others argue that Okin's analysis was not far reaching enough in that it extended only to gender and not to other constraints that serve to oppress individuals within particular cultures (Raz, 1999; Sassen, 1999). For instance, according to Sassen (1999), a focus on group rights should be rejected whenever a group exerts constraints of any kind, not just those of gender, on its members.

The book ends with a rebuttal by Okin (1999b), which clarifies, adjusts, and extends her original position.

The publication of *Multiculturalism*, in both essay (1997) and book form (1999a), caused a stir in academic circles. In an essay posthumously published in 2005 – one year after her death – Okin claimed that her work on multiculturalism and feminism had often been misunderstood and variously described as 'arrogant' or even 'militantly insensitive' (Okin, 2005: 69). Through this work, she had, she attested, become 'the person who stepped into something of a political minefield (some might say, the one who threw a verbal 'grenade' into a simmering discussion)' (Okin, 2005: 69).⁴ Describing some of the ways in which her work had been distorted, Okin (2005) lamented that readers often assumed that she believed that her question *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (the title of her essay) 'has a simple, affirmative answer', despite considerable argument that would suggest otherwise (p. 71).

Okin (2005) explained that it was only 'after something of a struggle, I finally agreed with the editors of the Boston Review to call my essay *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?*' and that she 'had already chosen the far more neutral title of *Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions* for the longer and more philosophical version of the same argument that was to appear in *Ethics*' (pp. 71-72).⁵ Looking back, she regretted that she had not 'vetoed the more provocative title, avoiding the impression created even by posing in such a stark and simple

form a question that is not only complex but that one cannot answer in any depth without taking account of the particular context in which it is asked' (Okin, 2005: 72).

Ruth Abbey (2011), in a sympathetic overview of Okin's theory, supports Okin's own belief that her views on women in relation to multiculturalism had sometimes been misunderstood and misrepresented and points out ways that Okin's controversial essay might be better understood.⁶ This perceived misrepresentation of her work, whether inadvertent or, at times, deliberate, must have been frustrating and hurtful for Susan, particularly as it coincided with a difficult personal period in her life.

Okin's final years: A focus on women and economic development

Okin died in March 2004 from unknown causes. In the years immediately preceding her death, she had faced various personal and professional challenges. Not only had her essay *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* met with significant criticism, but her marriage to American Robert Okin, with whom she had had two children (a son and a daughter), had ended.

Increasingly, Okin turned her attention to the situation of women in poor countries in relation to economic development. She became a strong supporter of the Global Fund for Women, a grant-making foundation supporting women's advancement among the world's least developed nations (Trei, 2004).

In January 2004, several weeks before her untimely death, Okin travelled to India as a member of the Global Fund for Women's delegation to the World Social Forum in Mumbai. As part of this extended trip to India she toured the slums of Mumbai and Delhi. During the trip, Okin wrote:

My view of Mumbai's and Delhi's slums has been transformed from seeing them (from the outside) as totally destitute and sordid places, where no one could possibly lead a decent or hopeful life, to seeing them as poor, but vibrant, communities, where, with well-directed help from the outside, many people can improve their living conditions and hope for a better life for their children (as cited in Squires, 2004, unpaginated).

Despite this tribute to the human spirit's strength in adversity, inevitably Okin also would have been exposed to the often bleak reality faced by many women in India. For instance, in an essay published in the *New York Review of Books* in 2013, world renowned economist Amartya Sen describes the situation of women in India as a 'mixed truth', with significant gender disparities, including those of 'missing women and boy preference' (Sen, 2013).

Okin's writing focused on women in minority groups in liberal democracies, nevertheless her experiences with women and development may have strengthened her conviction that certain critiques of her *Multiculturalism* essay were culturally relativist, and even apologist, with regard to certain practices that served to discriminate against and harm women.

During the final months of her life based at Radcliffe, Okin sought to advance her earlier work on gender, economic development and women's rights. She was also reportedly planning to investigate the topic of evolutionary biology from a feminist perspective (Trei, 2004). On 8 March 2004 – four days after her untimely death – Susan had been scheduled to give a public talk on her work for International Women's Day at the Radcliffe Institute. Instead, it is reported that colleagues and friends met to commemorate her life (Trei, 2004).

In honour of Okin

In academic circles, news of Okin's sudden death was greeted with sadness and shock. Fellow feminists suffered a profound sense of loss for a clever and brave academic who dared to speak about issues avoided by many of her contemporaries. A range of obituaries was published, in-

cluding in *The Harvard Crimson* (Hoffman, 2004), *The Guardian* (Squires, 2004), and *The Stanford Report* (Trei, 2004) and, in New Zealand, in Auckland University's alumni newsletter *Ingenio* (2004). In each of these, Okin was praised for her intellectual brilliance, her scholarship, her courage and the breadth and depth of her work. For instance, Jane Mansbridge, Adams Professor of Political Leadership and Democratic Values at Harvard University, noted that Okin's 'interest in women in the least-developed countries extended beyond the bounds of scholarship' and was 'path breaking' and 'courageous' (as cited in Hoffman, 2004, unpaginated).

Meanwhile Professor Joanne Martin, Harvard Graduate School of Business, noted that Okin's contribution had been to highlight the 'need to think differently about the complexity of gender issues' from an international perspective (as cited in Trei, 2004, unpaginated).

Influential political blog *Crooked Timber* also noted Okin's passing: 'She [Okin] was a courageous voice, both in person and in her work. She spoke out against injustices wherever she saw them, often saying publicly what other people were only thinking privately. Her scholarship reflected her sense that political theory must reach out to public concerns, both in the United States and abroad.' (Crooked Timber, 2004, unpaginated).

In February 2005, almost a year after her death, a memorial conference in honour of Susan Moller Okin was held at Stanford University.⁷ In 2009, as a result of this conference, an edited collection by Stanford University academics Debra Satz and Robert Reich was published containing twelve articles by various prominent feminist and political philosophers recording and assessing Okin's significant contribution to political theory (Satz & Reich, 2009). Beyond being a celebration of Okin's life, the book's expressed aim was to continue to build on and advance her work.

The twelve essays are divided into various themes – rethinking liberal theory, gender and the family, feminism and cultural diversity, and development and gender – which reflect the breadth of Okin's work. Contributors include renowned theorists and philosophers such as Alison Jaggar, Cass Sunstein, David Miller and Iris Marion Young, among others.

Okin and developments in New Zealand

Okin left New Zealand in the 1960s. Although she remained in touch with family and friends, she was geographically separated from a number of important national debates. Regarding the topic of work and family reconciliation, she would not have witnessed at close hand, or been part of, the drive for improved childcare provisions, paid parental leave, or the introduction of the Domestic Purposes benefit. It is likely, though, that she would have supported the broad direction of these changes.

But in contrast to her theorising on multiculturalism and gender, Okin did not appear to engage with, and may well have missed, the debates about biculturalism. Summarising some aspects of this history in New Zealand's online Te Ara Encyclopaedia, Janine Hayward (2012) notes that from the time of colonisation until the 1980s New Zealand was a monocultural society governed by Pakeha values. Since the 1980s, there has been a 'Māori renaissance [which] has led to a renewed emphasis on biculturalism, based on the partnership established between Māori and the Crown by the Treaty of Waitangi' (Hayward, 2012: 1).

One effect of this, according to Hayward, was a change in the way the state 'responded to Māori, in a more bicultural direction.' (p. 2). Hayward notes that:

As a result, by 2011 most New Zealand government departments had a Māori name. Traditional Māori ceremonies such as mihi (welcomes) and poroporoaki (farewells) were often performed at official functions, and tangi (bereavement) leave was provided. Māori words, symbols and concepts were commonplace inside and outside the government and public sector (Hayward, 2012: 2).

Based on her landmark essay *Multiculturalism*, certain aspects of these changes may have troubled Okin. For instance, how would she have regarded the incident during Waitangi Day 1998 whereby Helen Clark, the then Leader of New Zealand's Labour Party (in Opposition), was reduced to tears by local Ngapuhi elder Titewhai Harawira challenging a male elder on the apparent double standard inherent in allowing Clark, a Pākehā, to speak on the marae at Waitangi when Māori women were not permitted to do so? (Keane, 2014).

Or, for that matter, in 2005 probation officer Josie Bullock's dismissal by the Department of Corrections and her subsequent complaint in 2008 to the New Zealand Human Rights Review Tribunal that, on account of her sex, she was not permitted to sit in the front row alongside male colleagues during a Department of Corrections' *poroporoaki* (Māori farewell ceremony)? (*Corrections Confirms Dismissal*, 2005; *Sexist treatment 'detrimental'*, 2008). Or, in 2006, the walkout of a *powhiri* (Māori welcome ceremony) at a Child, Youth and Family facility by National Party Member of Parliament, Judith Collins, and two female colleagues (Anne Tolley and Paula Bennett) following an incident when Collins and Tolley were rebuked for sitting in the front row? (Crewdson, 2006). Or, as described earlier, the 2013 protest by two female Members of Parliament (Annette King and Maryan Street) regarding their treatment in New Zealand's Youth Parliament?

Given her aversion – regardless of culture or setting – to the assigning of different roles and responsibilities to women and men, Okin may well have objected to protocols that prevented women participating on the same terms as men during various ceremonies and public events, especially those occurring in the civic space of Parliament. For, as previously discussed, she was critical of the assumption that feminism is easily reconciled with certain traditional cultural practices that treat women and men differently, claiming that there was 'considerable likelihood of tension between them' in the context of liberal democracies (Okin, 1999a: 10). For, in these latter contexts, despite continued sex discrimination, there at least exists, according to Okin, a set of agreed and publicly recognised values that can be used for addressing such injustices. Okin may well have also refuted the 'separate but equal' argument that is sometimes put forward to explain and justify different but complementary roles for women and men (see Johnston who canvasses some of these arguments with relevance to the New Zealand context).⁸ She argued that 'feminists – anyone, that is, who endorses the moral equality of men and women – should remain skeptical' of these types of claims lest women's lesser roles be seen as 'synonymous with tradition[s]' (Okin, 1999a: 11).

Pertinent to the time of her writing, Okin (1999a) observed that in most liberal democracies there was an increasing demand for special group rights for minority cultures, whether these be 'indigenous native populations, minority ethnic or religious groups, and formerly colonized peoples (at least, when the latter immigrate to the former colonial state)' (p. 11).⁹ Underpinning these claims is, according to Okin (1999a), the alleged threat of 'cultural extinction' on the grounds that certain roles and practices are so fundamental to a particular culture that their loss or elimination is a step towards cultural annihilation (p. 20).

But she was dismissive of the proposal that in order to ensure cultural survival, 'such groups – even illiberal ones, that violate their individual members' rights, requiring them to conform to group beliefs or norms – have the right to be "left alone" in a liberal society' (Okin, 1999a: 11).

Suppose, then, that a culture endorses and facilitates the control of men over women in various ways (even if informally, in the private sphere of domestic life). Suppose, too, that there are fairly clear disparities in power between the sexes, such that the more powerful, male members are those who are generally in a position to determine and articulate the group's beliefs, practices, and interests. Under such conditions, group rights are potentially, and in many cases actually, antifeminist (Okin, 1999a: 12).

Other theorists examining how to address the problem of ‘minorities within minorities’ have similarly proposed that within minority groups attention needs to be given to vulnerable groups, such as children, women or others, to ensure that any protections extended to the wider minority do not disadvantage ‘internal minorities’ or reinforce inequalities within them (e.g. Eisenberg and Spinner-Halev 2005; Song, 2014).

Okin’s emphasis was on ensuring gender equality and individual rights. In a review of Okin’s essay *Multiculturalism*, Walker (2000) claims that it is in those countries with a strong legal focus on individual rights where women’s rights have been most strongly defended. With specific reference to New Zealand, public policy specialist David Bromell (2008) in his book entitled *Ethnicity, Identity and Public Policy: Critical perspectives on multiculturalism* similarly argues that the state’s main priority should be on protecting individual rights and addressing inequalities as opposed to privileging particular groups of whatever type or status. Although Bromell does not specifically address gender, his argument nevertheless has implications for gender in the context of liberal democracies such as New Zealand.

Debates relating to where women can sit or whether they can speak in certain ceremonies, particularly those held in public and civic spaces, such as the New Zealand Parliament or various government agencies, doubtless would have been greatly enriched had Okin been able to participate in them. If she had done, she would have had to engage with the added complexity of the intellectually challenging intersection between biculturalism, multiculturalism and gender. Based on her writings, most likely she would have welcomed the New Zealand Parliamentary Speaker’s announcement in early 2014 that Parliament’s ceremonial protocols are to be reviewed. Nor is she likely to have confined her critique to these protocols. Okin was always very clear about the shortcomings of ‘mainstream culture’ regarding the treatment of women. For central to all her work was the belief that ‘most cultures have as one of their principal aims the control of women by men’ (Okin, 1999a: 13).

What is certain is that, whatever her position on any particular issue, Okin would have clearly, compellingly and eloquently described it in a manner that was uniquely her own. Okin was a clever, original and courageous thinker who attempted to address wide ranging concerns that continue to have resonance for contemporary feminism. The tenth anniversary of her death is a chance to honour her contribution and to build on and expand her work here, in her home country of New Zealand.

DR JUDITH GALTRY is an Adjunct Research Fellow at the Australian National University, Canberra and lives on the Kapiti Coast, near Wellington.

Notes

- 1 Personal communication with Susan’s sister, Janice May, Auckland, 28/2/14.
- 2 Personal communication with Epsom Girls Grammar’s Archivist, Christine Black 29/1/14 and with Susan’s school friend Jessica Beever, 19/2/14.
- 3 Alison Jaggar (2009) divides Okin’s intellectual contribution into three decades involving three distinct themes, with this last one entitled ‘The Decade of the 1990s: Oppose Patriarchal Cultures!’.
- 4 Feminist political theorist Alison Jaggar in her 2009 essay on Okin, reported that in personal communication, Susan had told her that her work on women and multiculturalism ‘had been misrepresented more than anything she had ever written’ (p. 168).
- 5 Published by the University of Chicago, *Ethics* is a journal that (according to its website) ‘publishes scholarly work in moral, political, and legal philosophy from a variety of intellectual perspectives, including social and political theory, law, and economics.’
- 6 See Warriner (2013) for a review of Abbey’s book.
- 7 *Toward Human Justice: A Conference Honoring and Examining the Work of Susan Moller Okin.*

18/1/2005. Stanford University. <https://ethicsinsociety.stanford.edu/events/conferences/toward-human-justice-a-conference-honoring-and-examining-the-work-of-susan-moller>

- 8 In a report entitled *Maori women Confront Discrimination: Using International Human Rights Law to Challenge Discriminatory Practices*, Auckland Law Faculty Professor Johnston (2005) notes, ‘For the purposes of my discussion, I assume that the restriction on where women sit during poroporoaki proceedings, and the denial of women’s speaking rights on marae, constitutes discrimination under the Women’s Convention. I acknowledge, however, that this may not be the case if (as some Māori men and women argue) men and women’s roles on the marae are seen as complementary and having different but equal status.’ (p. 24).
- 9 In contrast to certain other theorists (e.g. Kymlicka, 1995), Okin did not distinguish in this essay between the situation of indigenous peoples as colonised minorities and that of ethnic and religious minorities in the context of liberal democracies.

References

- A woman’s place. (2014, February 8). *New Zealand Listener*. Editorial (unnamed), p. 5.
- Abbey, Ruth. (2011). *The Return of Feminist Liberalism*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press.
- al-Hibri, Azizah Y. (1999). Is Western patriarchal feminism good for Third World/minority women? In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 41-46). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Borissenko, Sasha. (2013, July 18). Youth Parliament: Gender segregated Powhiri ‘wrong’. *Scoop online*. <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO1307/S00226/youth-parliament-gender-segregated-powhiri-wrong.htm>
- Bromell, David. (2008). *Ethnicity, Identity and Public Policy: Critical perspectives on multiculturalism*. Wellington: Institute for Governance and Policy Studies, Victoria University of Wellington.
- Cohen, J., Howard, M. & Nussbaum, M. (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Corrections Confirms Dismissal. (2005, Oct. 18). Department Of Corrections Press Release. *Scoop online*. <http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/PO0510/S00149/corrections-confirms-dismissal.htm>
- Crewdson, Patrick. (2006, May 7). MPs refuse to take a back seat. *New Zealand Herald*.
- Crooked Timber. (2004, March 3). Susan Moller Okin. <http://crookedtimber.org/2004/03/08/susan-moller-okin/>
- Eisenberg, Avigail & Spinner-Halev, Jeff (2005). Introduction. In Eisenberg, Avigail & Spinner-Halev, Jeff. (Eds.), *Minorities within Minorities: Equality, Rights, and Diversity* (pp. 1-18). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayward, Janine. (2012). ‘Biculturalism’, *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*, updated 9-Nov-12. Retrieved from *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.
- Hoffman, Ella. (2004, March 11). Feminist theorist dies at 57. *The Harvard Crimson*.
- Honig, Bonnie. (1999). My culture made me do it. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 35-40). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Ingenio. (2004). University of Auckland Alumni News. Autumn.
- Jaggar, Alison. (2009). Okin and the challenge of essentialism. In D. Satz & R. Reich (Eds.), *Toward a Humanist Justice: The Political Philosophy of Susan Moller Okin*. (pp. 166-180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, Kerensa. (2005). Maori Women Confront Discrimination: Using International Human Rights Law to Challenge Discriminatory Practices. *Indigenous Law Journal* 4, pp. 19-69. Retrieved from Women’s Human Rights Resources Database.
- Keane, Basil. (2014, March 19). ‘Ngā rōpū tautohetohe – Māori protest movements - Waitangi Day protests’. Retrieved from *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kymlicka, Will. (1999). Liberal complacencies. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 31-34). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1979). *Women in Western Political Thought*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1989). *Justice, Gender, and the Family*. New York: Basic Books.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1997). Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women? When Minority Cultures Win Group Rights, Women Lose Out. *Boston Review* 22: 2–28.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1998). Feminism and Multiculturalism: Some Tensions. *Ethics* 108 (4): 661–684.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (1999a). ‘Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?’ In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp.9-24). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Okin, Susan Moller. (1999b). Response. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 117-131). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Okin, Susan Moller. (2005). Multiculturalism and Feminism: No Simple Questions, No Simple Answers. In A. Eisenberg and J. Spinner-Halev (Eds.), *Minorities within Minorities: Equality, Rights, and Diversity* (pp. 67-89). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Parekh, Bhikhu. (1999). A varied moral world. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 69-75). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Pollitt, Katha. (1999). Whose culture? In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 27-30). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Post, Robert. (1999). Between norms and choices. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 65-68). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Raz, Joseph. (1999). How perfect should one be? And whose culture is it? In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 95-99). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Sassen, Saskia. (1999). Culture beyond gender. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 76-78). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Satz, Debra & Reich, Robert. (2009). Introduction: A critical introduction to the work of Susan Moller Okin. In Satz, Debra & Reich, Robert (Eds.), *Toward a Humanist Justice: The Political Philosophy of Susan Moller Okin*. (pp. 3-12). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, Amartya. ((2013, October 10). India's women: The mixed truth. *New York Review of Books*. <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/2013/oct/10/indias-women-mixed-truth/>
- Sexist treatment 'detrimental' but no damages, *Stuff online*. 19/3/2008. <http://www.stuff.co.nz/national/323894/Sexist-treatment-detrimental-but-no-damages>
- Song, Sarah. (2014, Spring). Multiculturalism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/multiculturalism/>.
- Speaker calls for Maori protocols to be modernised. (2014, January. 4). *New Zealand Herald*. http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11181096
- Speaker's look at Maori rules overdue. (2014, January 7). Editorial. *New Zealand Herald*. http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=11182103
- Squires, Judith. (2004, March 26). Susan Moller Okin: Academic who defined the terms of feminist political theory for three decades. *The Guardian*.
- Tamir, Yael. (1999). Siding with the underdogs. In J. Cohen, M. Howard & M. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?* (pp. 47-52). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Trei, Lisa. (2004, March 9). Susan Okin, feminist political theorist, dead at 57. *Stanford Report*. <http://news.stanford.edu/pr/2004/okinobit310.html>
- Walker, Brenda. (2000, Summer). Book Review of 'Is Multiculturalism Bad for Women?' by Susan Okin. *Social Contract Journal*, 10(4).
- Warriner, Jennifer Anne. (2013). Review of Ruth Abbey: *The Return of Feminist Liberalism*. (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2011). In *Hypatia: A Journal of Feminist Philosophy*. Hypatia Reviews Online (HRO). <http://hypatiaphilosophy.org/HRO/review-archive>