

**Re-Reading the Economic-as-Social:
Feminist Poststructural Framings of the
Economic/Social Nexus**

by

Angela Barns

Women's Economic Policy Analysis Unit
Curtin University of Technology

Discussion Paper Number 18
July 2002

Women's Economic Policy Analysis Unit (WEPAU),
Curtin Business School, Curtin University of Technology
GPO Box U1987, Perth 6845.

<http://www.cbs.curtin.edu/research/wepau/>

Re-Reading the Economic-as-Social: Feminist Poststructuralist Framings of the Economic/Social Nexus

Angela F Barns

Introduction: ‘There’s no such thing as society’

In 1987 the British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, prophetically decreed that there was ‘no such thing as society’. In this single utterance, Thatcher sought to negate the mutuality, interdependence and interconnectedness between people and between people and their environments, which had sustained life on earth for centuries. Such a proclamation, in conjunction with the entrepreneurial rhetoric of economic rationalism, popularised by Ronald Reagan and his ‘neo-liberal musketeers’, ushered in an era of unprecedented antagonism and hostility towards relational experience (Rundle). Integral to both Thatcher and Reagan’s creation of a ‘free market’ utopia, was the commodification of social interactions, such that human relationships were viewed as the “by-product of economic transactions” (Rees 155). People were no longer considered in terms of their humanity but were categorized as “objects of utility” (Mullaly 28). Social beings became ‘economic agents’; self-interested individuals engaged in an endless pursuit to exert more power and control over another; to accumulate more capital, hence more credence than one’s competitor (Rees 155). Since this time, with the rapid growth of global capitalism, the economic has become the prime regulator and mediator of all social, cultural and political life, creating both an ideological chasm and an experiential divide between the economic and the social.

Whilst the demonisation and subsequent ‘out-casting’ of the social has been defined by many as an outcome of advanced industrialism and late capitalism, it is not a new phenomenon. Nor is this exiling of the social, un-gendered (Hewitson 139). Through the application of feminist deconstructionist critique it is apparent that the relegation of the social to the periphery of everyday life, is neither inevitable nor unmitigated. The economic / social divide is both a constituted and a constitutive discourse, constructed through and within a range of mutually inclusive and historically embedded relationships; a series of stories which speak of the polarization constructed between the ‘economic-as-objective-as-masculine’ and the ‘social-as-subjective-as-feminine’ (Hewitson 139). In deconstructing this seemingly impenetrable divide is to engage in a textual and contextual reading of the economic through the social, the cultural and the political, and through which, a re-reading of the social and the economic is produced.

Describing Deconstruction

In the decades following Jean Francois Lyotard's proclamation of the 'death of the meta narrative', the deconstructive analysis developed by the French social theorist Jacques Derrida became popular with feminist postmodernists and poststructuralists. Promoted as a means of dismantling the "destructive illusion" of truth (Olesen 225), feminists used deconstructive critique to perform a "close reading" (Howells 152) of the patriarchal world and the modernist certainty which has not only enslaved women, but Western thought, for centuries;

Deconstruction does read closely and minutely: it disentangles the knots and confluences of hasty or specious augmentation, it uncovers what may have been concealed, it focuses on marginalia and footnotes, in the expectation that what has been relegated to the margins may prove paradoxically central to a less parochial understanding of the text. (Howells 152)

In highlighting the interrelatedness and interdependency between discourses, contexts and people, feminist deconstruction provides a pivotal opportunity to emancipate 'the social-as-feminine-as-subjective' from its position as 'the other' to the masculine-as-economic-as-objective'. A re-reading which, in highlighting the importance of the social - of intimacy, reciprocity and mutuality - as integral aspects of everyday/everynight living, has the potential to re-orient the de-humanised global economy.

So Why A Re-Reading and Not A Reading?

To respond to such a question is to deconstruct the workings of language. As a noun, a 'reading' refers to a tangible object as in a physical text; as an adjective, it infers a way of understanding or absorbing material which is gained through some interaction with a text; and as a verb, it refers to the physiological act of viewing written text with the eyes or other means.

Alternatively, to re-read a text, suggests a more cyclical and recursive relationship between the reader and the text, than is indicated through the uni-dimensionality and linearity of, 'to read'. The act of re-reading is an act of deconstruction. Re-reading invites the reader to play with the text; to assume a range of different positionings, interpretations and understandings of both themselves as readers and as creators of text (Shiach 372). The reader as the subject and the text as the object are freed from traditional conventions regulating the reader-text relationship. According to Shiach the reader is not a 'passive empty vessel', inert until 'she-he' is filled by the text as an external source of pre-determined knowledge (372). Rather, as

Ballaster, Beetham, Frazer and Hebron claim ‘the reader’ in re-reading is always engaged with the text as a “knowing and aware subject” and experiences both the act of reading and the content of the text, in relation to their own meanings, positionings and experiences, and, the text’s language and context (4-5). Within this notion of reader-text engagement, the text also becomes a subject, as opposed to an object of communication; a subject in relation to its implicit connection to an author and a subject in terms of being both created and creative and re-created. A text is a subject with ideas.

Re-Reading the Social Back into the Economic

Applying the principles of re-reading to the persistent notion of the economic as *the* prime reference for interpreting and mediating all life, the social, cultural and political underpinnings of the economic and the gendered nature of its directives are made overt. As feminist economist Gillian Hewitson proposes, in analyzing ‘economics-as-text’, consider the social, cultural and political overtones and inherent gendering in the language used to describe the practices undertaken by women and men in the everyday: supply and demand, production, reproduction, consumption and accumulation. Consider the inherently gendered social, cultural and political framings of the contexts and spaces within which such activities occur: the family, household and the public domain. Consider the social, cultural, political and gendered implications embedded within the outcomes of economic activities: profit, sustainability, environmental disaster, affluence, poverty, global and cultural dominance.

The dialogical character of this ‘re-reading’ process and its unraveling of the social / economic synonymy further confirms that the dichotomy constructed between the economic and the social is a social construction. As Hewitson proposes, the dichotomy is constructed and perpetuated through the consensus of a collective, embodied consciousness, namely, the shared meanings created and re-created through the interactions of female and male subjects. These meanings, when positioned within re-reading’s re-construction of the ‘divide-as-text-as-subject’ allows for a new reading of the social / economic divide to be forged. A reading that was always and remains, a story telling discourse or what another feminist economist, Diana Strassman refers to as ‘an interpretive community’, constructed through fluid and dynamic historical, cultural, economic and social discourses and stories of power and oppression (Olesen 225). Yet, in exposing the ways in which the social and the economic each traverse the ‘imaginary’ divide, the blurred boundary between the economic and the social a further question arises. How is it that this notion of a divide, of separate spheres, became and continues to remain a dominant feature within everyday life?

Contextualising the Economic / Social Divide

Using feminist deconstructionism to explore this question, two further but interrelated features arise. Firstly, in seeking to understand the social / economic divide it is necessary to deconstruct the language used in creating and transmitting the meanings within which and through which such polarizations are produced and re-produced. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, in deconstruction it is necessary to consider 'language in context' or the way in which "each word tastes of the context and contexts it has lived its socially charged life" (293). A process which reveals the actors through whom and discourses within which, language is created, creates, and, re-creates the language of the divide.

Naming the Divide

In deconstructing the language of the social and economic divide both in terms of its conceptualisation and the impact of its application, Dorothy Smith's "name-look-recognition" model is both appropriate and pertinent (97). Although not specifically framed within deconstructionist discourse, Smith's relational model is in keeping with deconstructionism's commitment to explicating the ways in which people produce "the object world among us and for each other" (97). Smith asserts that a subject's understanding of an object is produced through the three-way relations between the subject-object-subject. This process of 'naming' - reading, understanding and knowing - objects is particularly valuable in exploring how the social's separation from the economic was and remains, such a dominant feature of everyday living.

Within the traditional process of 'naming' the economic / social divide, the subject-object relationship can be defined as the: rational male (subject) referring to the social (object), as unrelated to and unnecessary for economics' functioning. Yet, according to Smith (1999) the naming of the object is left incomplete, unsubstantiated without the accountability of the second subject (another rational male) (115-16). Through the second subject's acknowledgment of the first subject's (rational male) particular reading of the object (the social as unrelated and irrelevant to the economic) the reading / naming of the object is confirmed, completed and perpetuated. The presence of the second subject (an other) also reinforces the relational or social aspect of our efforts in reading, understanding, finding out about, naming and/or recognizing "a world in common"; as such the process of naming an object is in itself a social act (Smith 109).

The second subject's acknowledgement (or disagreement with, as the case may be) of the object is achieved through the recognition of the object's (the social as at the periphery of the economic) existence, and/or composition. That is, the object consists of a number of definable

characteristics, which produce a standardized representation of the object, which is recognizable, hence, knowable by another. What is both innovative and interesting within Smith's model is the possibility of the subject arriving at 'naming' without the backing of the second subject. In such instances, the first subject enters into a dialogue with her localized context - looking outside the object-as-text (discourse) - to identify features in the landscape, landmarks, events, people, and/or institutions that confirm or perhaps even refute her ability to name and/or affirm the object's 'truthfulness' and legitimacy.

Tracing the Divide

Implicit within this process of 'naming', as noted above, is the critical role played by context in confirming an object's name and status. Whilst the surety and authority emanating from capitalist governments' espousal of neo-liberal rhetoric has dominated the political agenda of the Western world for the past few decades, such power is not and has never been, absolute but is contextual (Gibson-Graham 121-23). From a range of archeological, historical, anthropological and sociological sources it is apparent that different conceptualizations of the social and economic have, and remain, inextricably linked with a particular community's wider ontological and epistemological understandings.

As a starting point for re-tracing the divide between the social and the economic, it is necessary to explore those spaces in time and place within which everyday life was not ordered by the strict division of activities as economic, social, cultural or political. In Rosalind Miles' re-storying and re-feminising of human evolution and the dawn of civilisation (sic), the solo performance of 'Man' and the role of the economic, 'Man-as-Hunter', is not only problematised but its primacy is usurped by what Miles refers to as the "reality" of the dawn story (19); "in reality ... woman was quietly getting on with the task of securing a future for humanity – for it was her labour, her skills, her biology that held the key to the destiny of the race (sic)" (19). As Miles contends, not only is the privileging of the male and the economic (man-as-provider) unrealistic within the ecological, geographical and temporal context, but it ignores the complexity and interdependence between women and men, the social, economic, cultural and spiritual necessary for human survival.

The feminist anthropologist, Judith Brown continues with the project of re-storying and re-feminising the social and the economic in her exploration of 'tribal', 'peasant' or pre-industrial communities. Brown contends that social relationships were the key to survival, facilitating the formation of integrated communities, maintained through the holistic connection between the social, which included ceremony and ritual, and the economic,

incorporating systems of production and exchange. Regarding the latter, it was “social relationships, not abstract laws of supply and demand, that fixed values” (Morris xii).

The recursive relationship between the social and the economic remained relatively intact within Ancient Greek and Roman societies, where the philosopher Aristotle, coined the term ‘economicus’ (Spiegel 25). According to Aristotle, economics referred specifically to the “management of the household which encompassed not only the provision of food and consumption of commodities but was responsible for overseeing the continuation and reproduction of social, cultural and spiritual traditions” (Spiegel 25).

With the advent of feudalism and the agrarian economy’s gradual instatement as the foundation for a more formalized and ordered European society, social relationships remained central to everyday life; underpinning the rights, responsibilities and obligations, both between and within classes (Cipolla 76).

It was the Enlightenment’s promotion of rational rather than religious and spiritual thought and the subsequent establishment of science as the overarching epistemological discourse, that the divide between the social and the economic first became apparent. The ability to reason, to think rationally and logically became the prized currency. As the population of Europe expanded and more complex technologies were invented, communities became more formalized and institutionalized. According to Emma Rothschild the increasing economic power and social position of the predominantly male merchant class prompted the development of more widespread and complex systems of production and exchange; systems of accounting which emphasized the economic and the financial whilst relegating the social to the margins.

This privileging of the economic and the financial was further bolstered by the work of the 17th century French philosopher Renee Descartes and his “culture of dissection” (Snider 1). In his infamous ‘Treatise on Man’ (1629-33), Descartes (cited Snider 1) argued that the mind and body were separate and autonomous entities; that the body was a machine made up of different mechanisms which could function both independently and as a whole. The mind was non-body dependent; that is, it did not require physicality to prove or ordain its existence. As such the two were “separate orders of being” (Snider 1).

The power of Descartes theory of dualism in relation to the social and the economic, relates to the values bestowed upon the concepts positioned on either side of the dichotomy. Rather than the values being ‘equal’ in terms of validity, status, power, authority and legitimation,

one side of the divide was promoted as the truth whilst the opposite side was defined as the inferior, the less valuable, or what in the 1940's Simone de Beauvoir referred to as 'the other'. Such value-based separation was constructed using dualistic language such as good / bad, right / wrong. In applying this practice of 'othering' to the social / economic dichotomy, social, social relationships, with their connotations of subjective experience and relational knowing, were the antithesis of the rationality and objectivity of economics.

Out casting the Social-as Female

Coinciding with the diminishing respect and reverence for the social with its subjective connotations and the rejection of nature-as-spiritual, engendered through the privileging of science, differences in gender became more institutionalized and women and men's roles more formally separated (Ahmed 52). This growing intellectualization of gender and the increased focus on biological difference as the pre-cursor of women's and men's abilities, was further promoted by Descartes' mechanistic view of the 'body-as-matter' and the 'mind-as-intellectual'. This mind / body separation was such that women's capacity to bear and nurture children defined her as body - matter, predisposed to the emotional and the subjective. Man's inherent connection with the mind, facilitated by his lack of female reproductive 'potential', was linked with the natural ability and capacity for reasonable and rational behaviour. Linking this to Elisabeth Grosz's notions of embodiment, masculinity as the disembodied objective mind was promoted as superior to femininity as the embodiment of the feeling body / subjectivity.

This reductionism led to, and in many ways allowed for, the conquest, control and eventual captivity of many women. According to Judy Lowan, the rapid development of more efficient and effective methods of manufacturing products enabled through the increasing capabilities of artificially powered machinery meant that relationships with the social, the emotional and the subjective were considered useless, even primitive (sic). In this age of ingenuity, emotion and subjectivity were also regarded as barriers to the creative logic required to generate new and more improved methods of production. Within this later conceptualization of men as inventors of masculinised machinery, the presence of women and children as 'factory workers' and machine operators was in keeping with the notion of women as both physiologically (with their assumed dexterity) and psychologically suited to less challenging, mundane and monotonous work.

Within this era of advanced commodification, more innovative and sophisticated methods of accounting and managing finances became increasingly necessary. Employing algebraic logic and mathematical equations to issues of production and exchange, and as feminist economist

Gillian Hewitson depicts, economics was promoted as the singularly most accurate means of both knowing and predicting the industrial world; the 'real' world of men. With its privileging of the empirical and the logical, economics, was viewed as the embodiment of masculine objectivity and rationality. Hence, was born 'homo economicus' - the 'rational economic man'. Whilst industrial progress was heralded as the key to the future, 'homo economicus' was its tool – it was through economic man and the application of economic methods that progress could and would be achieved in all aspects of life (Hewitson 8-9).

The relegation of both women and the social to the domestic margins was given further legitimacy by the 'father' of economics, Adam Smith (cited Pujol 16). According to Smith, social reproduction's implicit link with biology, nature and the realm of the feminine, meant that it lacked the production and exchange value intrinsic to economic definitions. Having no economic value, women's reproductive whether biological or domestic, alongside the broader activities of social life, became invisible, as did the women whose days were spent in domestic slavery, imprisoned by the walls of domesticity. Never before had there been such a pervasive purging of all that was feminine, subjective and social.

Resurrecting the Social in Economics

Since this time, the social has undergone various resurrections within the Western political agenda - although such re-births must be seen within context. The prioritizing of the social is often viewed as the last hope – a spark of light when the 'real' measures of economic accounting have failed. According to Alison Alexander inherent within this privileging of the social, even as a last resort, is the resistance of women. Consider the pivotal role that social relationships, in the form of physical, nutritional and emotional support networks, typically generated by women, played during the Great Depression of the late 1920's and 1930's when the inevitability of death, both financial and physical, was not only a possibility for many thousands of people, but was a reality. Consider the role that women played in not only maintaining families and communities during war-times but their singular role in reviving and stimulating growth in war-time Western economies. Consider the Golden Age of the 1950's, when women's supposed implicitness with the social, and in specifically their roles as wives and mothers, was promoted as a critical element in post-war reconstruction programs.

In the Miner's Strike of 1984-5 in England, women's presence on picket lines and their formation of a Women's Support Group provided an invaluable source of social and economic assistance and support at a time when both the family's and the community's survival was threatened (Bloomfield 158-159). The Women's Support Group "was (a) community of spirit rather than place, a social rather than a physical nexus" (Samuel 6).

Feminising the Economic as Social

Despite the implicit connection between the social and the economic underpinning these post-war policies, such activities were still regarded as economic in motivation and outcome. Not until second wave feminism, in the 1960's and 1970's, did the subjugated positioning of the social with its implicit connection with women and the private sphere, receive particularised political attention. Women argued that the social sphere was not the natural or normal domain for females and whilst women's roles were subject to emancipation, there was a call from feminists arguing that the social focus should include a re-evaluation and re-presentation of men's traditional roles in society.

Within this era of broad-based change, 'the social', whilst recognized for its ability to 'humanize' capitalist barbarism, was also subjected to widespread criticism as a space within which widespread injustices were perpetrated. Incorporating issues regarding domestic violence (Mooney), the appalling conditions of Indigenous peoples (Bourke, Bourke and Edwards), the desperate need for income support and the lack of women and other minority group's educational and workplace opportunities (Hancock), there was a growing realization by governments and the public alike, that the West's obsession with the economic had encouraged, even facilitated, some of the greatest atrocities in the Western context. Although change was protracted, there was a gradual introduction of 'women-friendly' policies, such as anti-discrimination legislation and affirmative action programs, and the partial recognition of the recommendations for equality advanced by the international Wages for Housework Campaign. By the 1980's 'the social' had been returned to its position as implicit within the 'the economic' and 'the personal' was now 'the political'.

The Social / Economic Now

Journeying through the decades to the current Western political context, the social, once again holds a precarious position on the political agenda. Whilst within Australia, both the Liberal and Labor parties have toyed with the ideas promoted through 'The Third Way', 'social democracy' and 'social capital' such attention has been relatively benign (Scanlon 4). According to Ian Winter, a close reading of the Coalition's so-called social policies reveal that the Howard government's interests in 'community development' have been motivated by its potential to facilitate the self-sufficiency and individual economic stability essential for the realisation of his neo-Thatcherite fantasy.

A glance at the lives of many women and men, the continued experience of poverty and violence and the lack of equitable access and opportunity, illustrates all too blatantly, that the social's inclusion on Western political agendas, is typically focused on the economic returns

exacted from social outcomes. In many instances, the re-focus on the social and the community frees capitalist governments to continue in their drive for global corporatisation, the broad-based dismantling of the welfare state, and the promotion of the market as the mediator and regulator of life within a globalised context. Furthermore, as Angela McRobbie aptly reports, a closer exploration of the literature relating to theories of ‘The Third Way’, reveals a masculinisation of the social and a corresponding denouncement of feminist principles.

Conclusion: The Economic as Social

In tracing the contextual history of the economic / social divide, in exposing its relationships with essentialist notions of femininity and masculinity and subjecting such a discourse to a process of deconstruction, a re-reading of the social and the economic has been achieved. In exploring the historical and contemporary terrain, it is obvious, despite the supposed ‘wisdom’ of numerous malestream texts and discourses, that economics is not a distinct field of thought or practice. Rather, economics is both constituted within and reliant upon its interactions with other discourses, particularly the social, for not only its meaning but its perpetuation. In viewing the social as embedded within the economic, and the economic as imbedded within the social, this integrality becomes reality. As this re-reading identifies, there is an implicit relationship between local social reproduction, such as the establishment and maintenance of communities, families and partnerships, and the development and maintenance of economic systems, such as those within the family, community, nation-state and the global economy. It is the relationships between ‘the social’, the economic, the personal and the political that despite the continual attempts by neo-liberals and neo-classical economists to undermine and ignore the social, “economics (is) a social system”; a multi-scripted, dynamic and fluid interplay between women and men, within a context of social relationships and cultural stories which tell of the “embeddedness of economic action in networks of relations and the intertwining of economic with non-economic motives” (Granovetter 256).

References

Ahmed, S. *Differences That Matter: Feminist Theory and Postmodernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Alexander, Alison. *A Wealth of Women: Australian Women's Lives From 1788 to the Present*. Sydney: Duffy and Snellgrove, 2001.

Aveling, M., and Damousi, J. eds. *Stepping Out of History: Documents of Women at Work in Australia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1991.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Ballaster, Ros., Beetham, Margaret., Frazer, Elizabeth and Hebron, Sandra. *Women's Worlds: Ideology, Femininity and the Woman's Magazine*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1991.

Bourke, Colin., Bourke, Eleanor., and Edwards, Bill. *Aboriginal Australia: An Introductory Reader in Aboriginal Studies*. St. Lucia (Queensland): University of Queensland Press, 1998.

Brown, Judith. "A note on the division of labour by sex." *American Anthropologist* 72 (1970): 1073-1078.

Cipolla, Carlo. M. (ed.) *The Fontana Economics History of Europe, Volume 1: The Middle Ages*. London: Fontana, 1972.

de Beauvoir, Simone. *Le deuxième sexe*. Trans. H. M. Parshley New York: Vintage, 1989.

Derrida, Jacques. *Positions*. London: Athlone Publishing, 1987.

Duby, Georges and Perrot, Michelle. eds. *Images of Women in Art*. London: Tauris Parke Books, 1992.

Finley, M. I. *The Ancient Economy*. 2nd Ed. California: University of California Press, 1985.

Granovetter, M. "The sociological and economic approaches to labor market analysis: A social structural view". *The Sociology of Economic Life*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1992. 233-63.

Gibson-Graham, J.K. *The End of Capitalism (as we knew it): A Feminist critique of Political Economy*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Volatile Bodies: Towards a Corporeal Feminism*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin, 1994.

Hancock, L. ed. *Women, Public Policy and the State*. South Yarra: Macmillan, 1999.

Hewitson, G. *Feminist Economics: Interrogating the Masculinity of Rational Economic Man*. Cheltenham (England): E. Elgar Publishing, 1999.

Howells, C. "Jacques Derrida", Elliott, Anthony and Turner, Bryan, (eds.), *Profiles in Contemporary Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications, 2001. 151-161.

Lown, Judy. *Women and Industrialization: Gender At Work in Nineteenth-Century England*. Cambridge, England: Polity Press, 1991.

Lyotard, Jean Francois. *La Condition Postmoderne*. Trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

McRobbie, A. "Feminism and the third way". *Feminist Review* 64 (2000): 97-8.

Miles, R. *The Women's History of the World*. London: Harper Collins, 1993

Mooney, Jayne. *Gender, Violence and the Social Order*. Basingstoke (England): Macmillan, 2000.

Mullaly, Bob. *Structural Social Work*. (2nd edition). Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Olesen, Virginia. "Feminisms and qualitative research at and into the millennium". Eds. Denzin, Norman and Lincoln, Yvonna. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2000. 215-255.

Pujol, Michele. *Feminism and Anti-Feminism in Early Economic Thought*. Aldershot (England): Edward Elgar Publishing, 1992.

Rees, S. "Interpreting and defining humanity". *Advances in Social Work and Welfare Education*. Perth: University of Western Australia, 1994. 155-167.

Rothschild, Emma. *Economic Sentiments: Adam Smith, Condorcet, and the Enlightenment*. London: Harvard University Press, 2001.

Rundle, G. "The Opportunist: John Howard and the Triumph of Reaction". *Quarterly Essay*, 2001. 1-65.

Samuels, R., Bloomfield, B., and Boanas, Guy. *The Enemy Within: Pit Villages and the Miners' Strike of 1984-5*. London: Routledge and Keagan Paul, 1986.

Scanlon, Christopher. "From third way to Plan B – reconstructing the ALP". *Arena Magazine* December (2001): 4-6.

Shiach, Morag. *Feminism and Cultural Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Smith, D. *The Everyday World As Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Milton Keynes (England): Open University Press, 1990.

Smith, D. "Telling the truth after postmodernism". *Writing the Social: Critique, Theory and Investigations*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1999. 96-130.

Snider, A. "Cartesian Bodies". *Modern Philosophy*. 98.2. 299.

Spiegel, Henry. W. *The Growth of Economic Thought*. 3rd Ed. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.

Strassman, D. "Not a free market: The rhetoric of disciplinary authority in economics". Eds. Ferber, M. A and Nelson, J. A. *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993. 54-68.

Winter, Ian. ed. *Social Capital and Public Policy in Australia*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies, 2000.