

freedom has been bifurcated into “positive” and “negative” conceptions and members of the canon pigeonholed (by Berlin himself, as well as others) as exemplifying either the positive (usually Rousseau and Kant) or negative (usually Hobbes, Locke, and Mill) variety. This has been a mistake, according to Hirschmann, who seeks to show how this mistake has obscured a richer understanding of freedom found in each canonical thinker. To different degrees and in different ways, she shows how, from Hobbes to Mill, all of these thinkers understood freedom as both noninterference *and* self-mastery and grappled with the challenge of resolving the tensions that arise in light of the ways in which these two dimensions of freedom interact.

Concerning the second theme, social construction, despite the fact that few scholars today would deny that the idea of freedom is in some sense socially constructed, only Mill in his famous essay on “The Subjection of Women” is typically remembered as having recognized this insight. Before the twentieth century, most thinkers grounded their political theories on beliefs about the God-given and immutable nature of men, seen as born free, in a state of nature, possessed of rational capacities, and with a peaceful or warlike character. Such foundationalism, whether religious or naturalistic, placed (most of) these thinkers at a far distance from anything that could be recognized as social constructivism. Yet each was concerned, in different ways, with positive freedom and, thereby, the internal aspects of freedom. They all addressed the question of the kind of subjects that can enjoy freedom, and they all defined freedom in a manner suited to the particular way they wanted men to be. And they intended their theories to be read and adopted by men of power, who would fashion institutions and laws so as to ensure that such subjects of freedoms were created. In this, these thinkers, no matter how “foundationalist” their views of human nature, were alive to the complex relationships among individual freedom, the family, and citizenship, and thus to the importance of the social construction of freedom.

Hirschmann’s third and overarching theme is gender and class. Whereas few would deny that the thinkers she analyzes were influenced by their gender or their class, few would argue, as she does, that gender and class play central and defining roles in the way that each thinker approaches freedom. According to Hirschmann, one cannot understand what freedom means in these different approaches without understanding the gendered and class-based dimensions of their arguments. This is because women, the poor, or the working class were the real-world counterexamples against which freedom, which was enjoyed mainly by wealthy men, was conceptualized. The concept of freedom is constructed as male, in part, because those who lacked freedom were female. And freedom is elitist because the elite were, indeed, freer than the poor or the working class.

And so a second question about this book presents itself: why gender and class and not race? Racial inequality shaped the societies in which these philosophers lived, and some of these thinkers (e.g., Mill and Kant) evidently thought about the circumstances of nonwhites and non-Europeans. However, Hirschmann argues, in most cases little if any evidence exists that these philosophers used a “racial” model, as they used a “gendered” model, to construct the self who is (or could be) free. This is less because they were blind to racial diversity than because they lived in racially homogeneous societies and, thus, simply took race more or less for granted. Clearly, this is truer of some of these thinkers (Hobbes in particular) than others (Mill in particular). But the author offers good reasons to suppose that her book covers the most important grounds of freedom, and leaves to other scholars the task of uncovering additional “models” of how the subject of freedom has been understood and shaped in the modern world.

Gender, Class, and Freedom in Modern Political Theory is an impressive piece of scholarship. At its heart are the five chapters devoted to each philosopher, each of which is rich in detail and nuanced argument. The book covers a great deal of ground. At times, the detailed arguments and complex relations among Hirschmann’s three themes overwhelm a more generalist understanding of what the five different philosophers argued about freedom. In other words, this book is written for those who already understand, or think they understand, the Western canon. It promises to change how this canon is conventionally understood. And it delivers on this promise.

Feminist Agendas and Democracy in Latin America.

Edited by Jane S. Jaquette. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2009. 272p. \$79.95 cloth, \$22.95 paper.
doi:10.1017/S1537592709992970

— Stéphanie Rousseau, *Laval University*

Fifteen years ago, Jane Jaquette edited a landmark volume called *The Women’s Movement in Latin America: Participation and Democracy* (1994). It introduced many scholars to gender politics and feminism in this region of the world, and has remained a key reference in a growing body of literature on women’s mobilization. For that reason, the new volume under review generates high expectations, especially as it claims to “examine how Latin American women’s movements have responded to the dramatic political, economic, and social changes of the last twenty years” (back cover). In several respects, Jaquette has delivered another major contribution to the field, with nine high-quality case studies grouped under three sections: “Feminism and the State”; “Legal Strategies and Democratic Institutions”; and “International and Cross-Border Activism.” However, in her introduction and in her own chapter, Jaquette praises feminism’s institutionalization and

privileges state-centered strategies in ways that warrant more critical scrutiny.

The book has a regional scope although the case studies cover Southern Cone countries, Peru, Venezuela, and Mexico (particularly the Mexico-U.S. border zone). Its last section provides crucial insights about transnational and regional activism, a component of women's mobilization that has grown in strength since the 1990s. In this section, Kathleen Staudt and Gabriela Montoya analyze the multiple sources of women's rights violations related to sexual exploitation, drug trafficking, and migration across the Mexico-U.S. border, as well as forms of joint activism between women from both sides. Virginia Vargas's important chapter on feminist activism at the World Social Forum (WSF) highlights the struggles sustained by feminists inside one of the most progressive mobilization spaces, to establish the legitimacy of feminism in the construction of "Another World." Teresa Valdés and Alina Donoso's piece analyzes the project *Índice de Compromiso Cumplido* (Index of Commitments Fulfilled) whereby women's organizations in eighteen countries of Latin America developed and used a methodology to report on states' compliance with their international commitments regarding women's rights. Taken together, these three chapters illustrate a diversity of strategies and organizational forms adopted by feminist activists in the region.

The national case studies presented in the first two sections of the book will be useful to scholars specializing on the politics of these countries. They address the role of Michelle Bachelet in feminist politics in Chile, the impact of electoral gender quotas in Argentina and Brazil, the relationship between feminist activism and the Bolivarian project of Hugo Chávez in Venezuela, the effectiveness of legal strategies to uphold women's rights in Argentina, international litigation based on local cases of violence against women in Brazil, and the work to engender the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Peru. The last chapter, authored by Jaquette, titled "Feminist Activism and the Challenges of Democracy," does not pretend to sum up the book, but neither does it advance a clear argument beyond attempting to develop a historical perspective on how key feminist themes such as "difference versus equality" or "autonomy" have evolved. Unfortunately, this chapter moves much too quickly and lacks a clear connection to the rest of the book.

In general, though, the chapters are excellent, all written by top feminist experts and academics, and providing up-to-date data and perspectives on feminist strategies and work in the region. Most are well balanced and highlight successes as well as limits. As noted above, aside from the chapter by Vargas, the book is centered on feminist strategies vis-à-vis the state or international institutions, with a strong focus on political institutions, the judiciary, and legal norms. The book demonstrates the success of feminist institutionalization since the third wave of democra-

tization, although with important limits due to states' lack of accountability and political parties' continuing marginalization of women. While the book nicely represents how most feminist activism has evolved in the last twenty years, it pushes aside a number of serious questions that feminist theory and practices have begun to tackle and that warrant further attention.

For example, in her chapter, Jaquette mentions in passing that domestic work has been off the hook of Latin American feminist agendas and that this precludes cross-class alliances (p. 212). While this is true, Jaquette does not talk about the very courageous work done by domestic workers themselves to organize and struggle for their rights at the national and regional levels. Could their demands be considered part of an alternative feminist agenda? How have "official" feminist organizations collaborated or reacted to domestic workers' campaigns? Addressing such questions would have broadened our vision of feminist change in the region. In the same vein, the critiques that have emerged among women's movements about dominant feminist organizations' weakness regarding their capacity to address class and ethnic oppression are not systematically discussed, except, for example, in footnote 4 of Jaquette's chapter, where indigenous movements are mentioned. Again, it would have been original and illuminating to include a piece on the agendas of indigenous women, even if they are not self-identified as feminists. Overall, the volume defines feminism narrowly, as a (largely) liberal and middle-class movement, whereas it could have entered the field of contestation within feminism and beyond feminism to identify new emerging trends.

Radical (autonomous) feminism, popular feminism, and indigenous women's activism are evoked in some chapters, such as Vargas's discussion of feminist dialogues within the WSF, but they are certainly worthy of much more in-depth analysis to reveal the contrasts and tensions faced by feminists who interact at the local, national, and regional levels with other women's movements or other civil society actors. From that point of view, the volume stops short of illustrating the diversity of subjects who claim to represent women and women's interests, and who pose serious challenges—practical, political, and theoretical—to dominant forms of feminist discourse and practice. Since the definition of what counts as women's interests and how to define gender equality/equity should be treated as open-ended questions only answerable through empirical research, Jaquette missed an opportunity to include studies of a much larger spectrum of social actors.

This critique also relates to the centrality given to feminist strategies targeting the state, political institutions, and the law. Is democracy relevant to feminist agendas only through its official, central institutions? Certainly, decentralization and social policy reforms that have been extensive in Latin America in the last fifteen years have led

to very different political participation dynamics by women. How has that affected feminist agendas and practices? Gioconda Espina, in her chapter on Bolivarian Venezuela, touches on these issues in a very interesting fashion. But aside from her chapter, it goes largely unaddressed. Another crucial aspect related to democracy under neoliberalism is the repression of protest activities, mostly those of the poorest sectors in rural areas or urban shantytowns. Women are very involved in street protests in several countries. Many women leaders have emerged at the municipal or sectoral levels, often as part of protest activities and not only as a result of electoral gender quotas. How have feminists responded to these developments; how does that change the way feminists strategize to lobby the state? *Feminist Agendas and Democracy in Latin America*, unfortunately, fails sufficiently to address these questions. All the same, it is a very useful collection of works, and it nicely reveals the vitality of feminist movements and networks in Latin America.

Feminist Interpretations of Alexis de Tocqueville.

Edited by Jill Locke and Eileen Hunt Botting. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2008. 384p. \$75.00 cloth, \$35.00 paper.

Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Writers.

By Penny Weiss. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009. 232p. \$55.00.
doi:10.1017/S1537592709992982

— Wendy Gunther-Canada, *University of Alabama at Birmingham*

In 2009, we celebrated the thirtieth anniversary of the publication of the pioneering study of women and political thought, Susan Moller Okin's *Women in Western Political Theory* (1979). This foundational text was soon followed by Jean Bethke Elshtain's *Public Man, Private Woman: Women in Social and Political Thought* (1981), which continued the analysis of woman as a figure in the writings of classical and modern theorists whose work comprises the canon of political philosophy. The intervening decades have seen efforts to further theorize the subject position of women in the canonical texts highlighted by the Pennsylvania University Press "Re-Reading the Canon" series, edited by Nancy Tuana, which has grown to include volumes focused on most of the major classical, medieval, and modern thinkers. Yet as Nancy Hirschmann and Kirsti McClure, the editors of the recent volume *Feminist Interpretations of John Locke*, provocatively ask, where are the women?

For centuries, it has seemed that the "woman question" in politics has been unequivocally answered with the assumption that women have been silent on political issues. The "private woman," as she has been categorized, fulfills the ancient Periclean maxim that females should not speak on matters of public debate concerning governance. Such facile categorizations are invalidated by the emerging and

ample evidence of women's active contribution to political discourse from antiquity to the late middle ages. Women writing on politics and society gained solid discursive ground from the early modern era through the Age of Enlightenment and became persistent critics of gender injustice to the present day. Yet to date, there has been little sustained scholarly discussion of how women political writers helped to define the categories and commitments of political theory, and how their ideas have contested and contributed to the divergent intellectual traditions associated with liberalism and communitarianism. Even the origins of feminist political theory have been relatively ignored in the attempts to highlight pioneering authors whose works, when studied, are typically situated among their male canonical counterparts but only rarely analyzed within the context of other women writers who came before them or were their contemporaries. Such conventional research obscures the bountiful and complex argumentation of women writing on authority, power, obligation, contract, virtue, rights, and duties. Our understanding of good government is impoverished by the absence of women's philosophical treatments of the relationship between monarchical absolutism and patriarchal authority in the household. A vibrant and inclusive understanding of democratic citizenship benefits from the carefully detailed accounts of women writers who make problematic the segregation of society by sex and race, contest rank and class divisions, and denounce the compartmentalization of human life into gendered and separate spheres.

In *Canon Fodder: Historical Women Political Writers*, Penny Weiss provides a theoretically sophisticated and rhetorically playful examination of the work of our philosophical foremothers that crosses centuries and cultural boundaries. If the origins of theory lie in the critical observation of the world around us, we gain fresh theoretical perspectives from the minute "brushwork" of Sei Shonagon's *Pillow Book* as she considers "laughter and anger" in the Imperial Court of Japan. Christine de Pizan's *Book of the City of the Ladies* requires us to look closely at ourselves as we wonder with Christine why learned women do not rely on their own judgment and experience regarding the capacity of females for virtue and wisdom rather than embrace the derogatory characterizations of their sex in the books of famous men. Mary Astell's *Serious Proposal to the Ladies* and *Some Reflections on Marriage* focus our attention on men's jealous guardianship of the tree of knowledge and the jeopardy of binding unequal partners in an indissoluble marriage that corrupts them both and places at risk the eternal salvation of the woman's soul. Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* illuminates membership in an expanded political community when read alongside her earlier *Original Stories Drawn from Real Life*, providing a vivid representation of girlhood at odds with Jean-Jacques Rousseau's depiction of girls as dolls within *Emile*. Anna Julia Cooper's *A Voice*