

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

The Possibilities and Perils of Social Justice Feminism: What We Can Learn From the Single-Sex Public Education Debates

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6v8346fx>

Author

Williams, JA

Publication Date

2023-12-11

Peer reviewed

**THE POSSIBILITIES AND PERILS OF SOCIAL JUSTICE
FEMINISM: WHAT WE CAN LEARN FROM THE SINGLE-
SEX PUBLIC EDUCATION DEBATES**

Juliet A. Williams[†]

In “*Social Justice Feminism*,” Kristen Kalsem and Verna Williams invite readers to re-imagine feminist activism for the twenty-first century.¹ Describing a pervasive sense of exhaustion among women’s movement activists, Kalsem and Williams outline the contours of a “newly articulated” feminist ideal capable of revitalizing activism.² Arising from “a concern about recognizing and addressing multiple oppressions,” social justice feminism begins with a recognition of differences in social location to build “coalitions across the intersections of race, class, sexuality, ethnicity, among other forms of identity.”³ In a development parallel to the widespread embrace of intersectionality as a guiding analytic among feminist scholars, social justice feminism seeks to connect the struggle against gender injustice to a “broadly based movement for egalitarianism.”⁴

In this feminist project of renewal, the term “social justice” is invoked by way of foregrounding the commitment to a social vision shared across a wide range of progressive causes. As Kalsem and Williams observe, the term “‘social justice’ enjoys great purchase” in contexts as varied as human rights, hip hop, and

[†] Associate Professor of Gender Studies, University of California-Los Angeles. I would like to thank Verna Williams, whose pioneering analysis of single-sex public schooling initiatives in the United States has been invaluable in advancing my own understanding of the subject. I would also like to thank the participants in the Social Justice Feminism conference, hosted by the University of Cincinnati Law School in 2012, for their insightful comments and encouragement.

¹ Kristen Kalsem & Verna Williams, *Social Justice Feminism*, 18 UCLA WOMEN’S L.J. 131 (2010).

² *Id.* at 138.

³ *Id.* at 158.

⁴ *Id.* at 138, *citing*, NATIONAL COMMISSION ON THE OBSERVANCE OF INTERNATIONAL WOMEN’S YEAR, THE SPIRIT OF HOUSTON: THE FIRST NATIONAL WOMEN’S CONFERENCE 205-06 (Mim Kelber ed., 1978)

education.⁵ Kalsem and Williams provide an impressively rich catalog of issues and causes framed as questions of “social justice” in contemporary discourse; based on this inventory, one might assume that rhetorical rights to the term “social justice” belong exclusively to those who identify with a progressive agenda. But this is not at all the case—as I have come to learn while researching the issue of single-sex public education in the United States.

Over the past twenty-five years, hundreds of experimental single-sex programs have been initiated in public schools across the country. These programs have sparked heated debate over the nature of gender difference and the legal meaning of gender discrimination. Many leading feminist and civil rights groups have registered strong opposition to local single-sex initiatives, declaring segregation of any kind to have no place in public schools and warning of the risks of sex-stereotyping. In response to these charges, single-sex education advocates have reappropriated the term social justice, insisting that their primary objective is to extend access to an elite educational approach to all students, not just those whose families can afford to pay for it.

Utilizing Kalsem and Williams’ “keywords” approach, this Article examines the appropriation of the term “social justice” by those who regard feminists not as allies, but as antagonists.⁶ The case of single-sex public education reveals the meaning of the term “social justice” to be subject to vigorous contestation and strategic re-signification in the contemporary political field. In the single-sex public education debates, the objections of feminists have been derided, denounced, and dismissed by those who portray feminism as an elitist project with a long history of insensitivity to the needs and interests of people of color. In this way, the ongoing debate over single-sex public education stands as a cautionary tale. Moving forward, feminists must do more than *proclaim* a commitment to social justice; feminists must *reclaim* the term from those who deploy social justice rhetoric as a strategy to silence and discredit opposition to sexist policies. The strategic deployment of antiracist critique by those seeking to silence and delegitimize

⁵ Kalsem & Williams, *supra* note 1, at 147-148.

⁶ *Id.* at 139-140.

feminist voices must be contested by all who hold social justice as a horizon of possibility guiding social engagement and political activism in the present.

In 1996, the U.S. Supreme Court declared the male-only admissions policy at the state-run Virginia Military Institute (VMI) unconstitutional.⁷ Far from disappearing, however, single-sex public education has made a surprising comeback in the years since the *VMI* decision. Over the past decade, the number of single-sex K-12 public schools in the U.S. has skyrocketed, growing from fewer than 10 in 2002 to nearly 100 today, with hundreds more co-ed schools now offering single-sex classes for academic instruction.⁸ The single-sex public education revival has its roots in the early 1990s, when sex segregation gained attention as a potential antidote to a widely proclaimed epidemic of violence, psychological disturbance, and academic underachievement reported to be afflicting a generation of boys and young men. Emphasizing the acute challenges facing at-risk youth—particularly economically disadvantaged boys of color living in the nation’s faltering urban centers—sex segregation was introduced in a small number of public schools in the early 1990s in programs specifically designed for Black boys living in inner cities. However, under threat of legal challenge, these initiatives quickly were abandoned. By the mid-1990s, advocacy for single-sex public education had shifted course, with new constituencies emerging to promote all-girls’ learning environments, particularly for female students from disadvantaged backgrounds. The cause gained an important ally in wealthy philanthropist Ann Rubenstein Tisch, who helped launch the Young Women’s Leadership School of East Harlem in 1996.⁹ The success of the Harlem Girls’ School provided critical momentum in support of single-sex public education, and in 2001, a provision was added to the No Child Left Behind Act making federal funding available to public schools

⁷ *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515 (1996).

⁸ *Single Sex Schools/Schools with Single Sex Classrooms/What’s the Difference?*, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR SINGLE-SEX PUBLIC EDUCATION, <http://www.singlesexschools.org/schools-schools.htm> (last visited June 28, 2014).

⁹ *Our Founder*, YOUNG WOMEN’S LEADERSHIP NETWORK, <http://www.ywln.org/our-team> (last visited June 28, 2014).

seeking to launch single-sex programs.¹⁰ Even with this show of Congressional support, the legality of sex-segregation in K-12 public schools was dubious at best. Hoping to capitalize on growing support for single-sex initiatives, advocates began campaigning to alter landmark civil rights laws prohibiting sex discrimination in public schools.¹¹ As a result of these efforts, in 2006, the U.S. Department of Education amended its Title IX guidelines, easing restrictions on programs that segregate on the basis of sex.¹²

Economically disadvantaged students of color have been disproportionately represented among those participating in these experimental educational programs.¹³ The demand for swift action to address the public education crisis facing economically disadvantaged students of color created a critical opening for experimental reform initiatives, including single-sex programs. Seizing this opportunity, advocates have highlighted the benefits of single-sex education for at-risk students in particular. Drawing on the reputation of single-sex education as the preference of elite, privileged parents, advocates promote single-sex programs as an opportunity for poor kids to partake of educational approaches historically reserved for those with the greatest financial resources. Reflecting on her decision to launch the Harlem Girls' School, Ann Rubenstein Tisch explained: "Logic said to me, 'It's been a way of educating affluent girls for hundreds of years. If it works there, why wouldn't it work in the inner city?'"¹⁴ Adopting a similar line in 2004 amidst demands to soften regulations governing sex discrimination in public schools, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchinson declared: "It's time our nation's public school children have the same options as their private school contemporaries."¹⁵

¹⁰ Verna Williams, *Reform or Retrenchment?: Single-Sex Education and the Construction of Race and Gender*, 2004 WIS. L. REV. 15, 27-28.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.* at 29-30.

¹³ *Id.* at 26.

¹⁴ Karen Uhlenhuth, *Single Sex, Singular Education?*, THE KANSAS CITY STAR, Dec. 17, 2002.

¹⁵ Ben Feller, *Government Plans to Relax Title IX Restrictions*, WASHINGTON POST, Mar. 3, 2004, available at <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn>

Building on this rationale for promoting single-sex initiatives in K-12 public schools, a commitment to social justice has emerged as a key talking point among prominent proponents of single-sex education. In 2002, Dr. Leonard Sax founded the National Association for the Advancement of Single Sex Public Education. The name of the organization itself—clearly echoing that of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP)—itself suggests a self-conscious effort to align the campaign for single-sex public education with a broader project of racial justice.¹⁶ Since 1992, Sax has become the movement’s most visible media spokesman, and he frequently invokes the phrase “social justice” when arguing that all parents—not just those who can afford private school tuitions—should have the opportunity to choose a single-sex environment for their children.¹⁷ In numerous public appearances and media reports, Sax has repeated his message that the debate over single-sex public education “boils down to social justice to make it a choice.”¹⁸

In claiming the mantle of social justice, advocates for single-sex education rhetorically align themselves with progressive social movements. But the vision of social justice propounded by prominent advocates like Sax holds that the best way to redress social inequality is to create “choices” and “opportunities.” It is *social justice, neoliberal style*—and it is an understanding that stands in stark contrast to the use of the term by those whose primary goal is not simply to expand choices, but to reduce inequality.

It is not just the term “social justice” that is being subject to strategic re-signification in debates over gender and education;

/articles/A26323-2004Mar3.html.

¹⁶ NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR SINGLE-SEX PUBLIC EDUCATION, *supra* note 8. The phrase “for the Advancement of” subsequently was dropped.

¹⁷ LEONARD SAX, *WHY GENDER MATTERS: WHAT PARENTS AND TEACHERS NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE EMERGING SCIENCE OF SEX DIFFERENCES* (2005).

¹⁸ Katherine Leal Unmuth, *Lancaster High School Tries Single Sex Classes for Some Students*, THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS, Apr. 17, 2011, available at <http://www.dallasnews.com/news/education/headlines/20110417-lancaster-high-school-tries-single-sex-classes-for-some-students.ece>; see also SAX, *supra* note 17; Jim Farrell, *Class Divide: Single-Sex Schoolrooms Take Off*, HARTFORD COURANT NEWS, June 12, 2007; Michael Alison Chandler, *Study Faults Case for Single-Sex Education*, WASHINGTON POST, Sept. 23, 2011, at A02.

other progressive buzzwords are also being appropriated by those pushing an anti-feminist agenda. For example, in a recent op-ed piece, *New York Times* columnist David Brooks sounds the “boy crisis” alarm, warning that U.S. schoolboys are being turned off to learning by a “culturally homogenous” educational culture systematically biased in favor of girls.¹⁹ Brooks insists that boys need an alternative to a school culture dominated by teachers who promote cooperation, sharing, and environmentalism; he recommends the hiring of more teachers who “celebrate competition,” “honor military virtues,” and structure class like a “boot camp.”²⁰ Provocatively, Brooks pitches his case to re-center traditional masculinities as an argument for greater “cultural diversity” in a highly feminized educational culture.²¹

Not surprisingly, the effort to frame the single-sex education as a social justice issue has failed to persuade many feminists and other civil rights advocates. Insisting that “separate is never equal,” feminist opposition has drawn heavily on the analogy to race segregation as critics have warned that separating students on the basis of sex will only serve to reinforce damaging gender stereotypes.²² The evidence suggests that these concerns are justifiable. A recent report prepared by the ACLU for the Department of Education Office of Civil Rights finds evidence of rampant sex-stereotyping in single-sex public education programs across the country.²³ For example, one Virginia school explains its embrace of single-sex classrooms on the grounds that:

Boys prefer reading material that is non-fiction, or if fiction, adventure oriented. In math, boys can get interested in ‘pure’ math and geometry, without linking it to the real world applications. The female brain does not prefer such action ... girls prefer

¹⁹ David Brooks, *Honor Code*, N.Y. TIMES, July 6, 2012, at A23.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

²² *REPORT: Preliminary Findings of ACLU Teach Kids, Not Stereotypes Campaign*, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION (Aug. 20, 2012), <https://www.aclu.org/womens-rights/report-preliminary-findings-aclu-teach-kids-not-stereotypes-campaign>.

²³ *Id.*

reading fiction material that does not necessarily contain much action. In math, girls generally prefer a real world application that shows them why it is meaningful. They are generally not interested in ‘pure’ math for its own sake.²⁴

At another school, a newsletter to parents proudly announces that in the all-girls classes, “young ladies have ... a daily cup of cocoa as they read the *Portland Press Herald* and discuss local, national and global events.” Meanwhile, the boys are given “an exercise area within the class and all the young men have the opportunity to exercise.”²⁵

The ACLU’s findings are confirmed in numerous media reports covering local single-sex programs in public schools. In many single-sex programs, girls and boys are taught differently based on pedagogic theories derived from pseudoscientific claims about innate sex differences.²⁶ Meanwhile, prominent single-sex education advocates are being paid to lead professional development courses where teachers are informed that boys are naturally active and aggressive, and that they learn best under stress. Girls, on the other hand, should be coddled in the classroom; teachers are advised to smile and to avoid administering timed tests or engaging in other anxiety-provoking activities.²⁷

Why should boys be given the opportunity to move around in class and encouraged to exercise and play sports, while girls are made to sit still throughout the entire academic day? What will be the professional consequences of training boys to perform under pressure, while depriving girls of the opportunity to develop this critical life skill? Who benefits when teachers believe boys most enjoy instruction that emphasizes facts and objective information about the world, whereas girls prefer fiction and talking about their feelings? One wonders: Is the real point of these programs to

²⁴ *Id.* at 4.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ Diane Halpern et al., *The Pseudoscience of Single-Sex Schooling*, 333 *SCIENCE* 1706 (2011).

²⁷ SAX, *supra* note 17 at 86-92.

promote social justice by affording greater educational opportunities to disadvantaged kids—or do these programs leverage concern with educational inequity in the interest of promoting a highly traditional gender ideology?

In opposing single-sex public schooling initiatives, feminist critics contest a vision of social justice that treats the issue of sexism as a marginal concern. But when feminist legal organizations have objected to single-sex initiatives, they have been vigorously denounced as out-of-touch elitists whose meddling in local affairs threatens to derail community efforts to improve educational opportunities for the most disadvantaged kids. In other words, feminist opposition to sexism in single-sex programs has been portrayed as an effort to subvert social justice, not to promote it. The idea that feminists “just don’t get it” when it comes to social justice is reinforced by media reports on the issue, which frequently represent the debate as a struggle between advocates for disadvantaged kids on the one hand, and feminists on the other.²⁸ By framing the debate this way, the media implicitly reinforces the view that to be feminist and to care about racial and economic disadvantage are two very different matters.

This view of feminism is one that proponents of single-sex education have frequently voiced in an effort to invalidate, dismiss, and silence those who have raised concerns about sex discrimination in single-sex programs. A particularly vivid example comes from the early 1990s, when controversy over a Detroit initiative thrust the issue of single-sex public education into the national spotlight. In February 1991, the Detroit Board of Education approved plans for three male academies conceived to address the “special needs” of Black boys.²⁹ At the time, school board Vice-President Frank Hayden warned that “unless innovative measures are taken within the educational community, the survival of young African-American males in Detroit will be threatened.”³⁰ The plan for the academies was approved by the Detroit school board, but not without dissent. As Board member

²⁸ David Goodman, *Detroit Approves All-Male Academy*, THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, Feb. 28, 1991.

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.*

Gloria Cobbin explained, “[i]f we want to offer single-sex schools for those students who function better in that type of environment, then we should offer it to each sex and to all the races—not just single out Black males as ‘problem children.’”³¹ This controversy was represented in media reports as a conflict between community advocates for Black youths and national legal organizations such as the American Civil Liberties Union and the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund.³²

To be sure, dissenters within the community had their own reasons for not broadcasting their opposition—as Shawn Garrett, a Detroit mother of a 4-year old daughter, quickly learned. On August 5, 1991, just three weeks before the Detroit academies were to open, the ACLU and NOW Legal Defense Fund filed a lawsuit in Federal District court, on behalf of Garrett and other Detroit parents.³³ Charging sex discrimination, these organizations urged the admission of girls to the planned male academies. As Howard Simon of the ACLU of Michigan put it, “[t]here is clearly a crisis, but the crisis is all urban school children. These schools may open up a whole new world for these boys. That world should be open to girls, too.”³⁴ Explaining why she chose to file a discrimination claim, Garrett stated simply, “I want my daughter to have the best, too.”³⁵ But Garrett’s decision to join the case proved personally costly. As the date of oral argument drew near, she was subjected to harassing phone calls and hostile treatment.³⁶ Just thirty minutes before oral argument in the case was set to begin, Garrett withdrew from the action.³⁷

The district judge issued his ruling less than two weeks before the Detroit academies were set to open. Finding the constitutional challenge persuasive, he granted the plaintiff’s

³¹ *Id.*

³² See, e.g., Desda Moss, *New Chief Backs All-Male School*, USA TODAY, Aug. 14, 1991; Isabel Wilkerson, *Detroit’s Boys-Only Schools Facing Bias Lawsuit*, N.Y. TIMES, Aug. 14, 1991, available at <http://www.nytimes.com/1991/08/14/education/detroit-s-boys-only-schools-facing-bias-lawsuit.html>

³³ Wilkerson, *supra* note 32.

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ Williams, *supra* note 10, at 18.

³⁷ *Id.* at 17, fn.10.

motion for a preliminary injunction and ordered school officials to admit girls.³⁸ Immediately, feminists were denounced for derailing a popular community initiative. An episode of the popular nighttime news show *Nightline*, airing just after the *Garrett* decision, provides a glimpse of the rhetorical strategies mobilized to transform a decision that upheld the rights of Black girls into a defeat for the Black community.³⁹ Arguing in favor of the academies were Clifford Wallace, the school principal who wrote the plan for the all-male academies, joined by Kwame Kenyatta, from the Malcolm X Community Center in Detroit.⁴⁰ On the other side was Helen Neuborne, head of the NOW Legal Defense and Education Fund.⁴¹ At her first chance to speak, Neuborne emphasized that NOW's primary concern in bringing the suit was to address the exclusion of girls from a promising new public schooling initiative. With an educational crisis in urban Detroit of such immense magnitude, Neuborne insisted, "what you can't do is throw the girls educationally out of the lifeboat."⁴² At that point Kenyatta interrupted, declaring Neuborne's concern for the community's girls to be a mere "smoke screen."⁴³ From Kenyatta's perspective, "[w]hat the issue is really around is an academy that is set up to address the issue of African males here in this country."⁴⁴ Later, Kenyatta expanded: "[W]e think that NOW and the ACLU are outsiders and it's really a question of self-determination. Detroit is 90 percent Black, and as a Black community we have a right to decide what the educational system will be in our community."⁴⁵ Pushing back, Neuborne demanded: "But what about the Black girls? They're the girls that are being left out."⁴⁶ At that point, Watson interjected to explain that girls in the community—including his own daughters—will benefit from

³⁸ *Id.* at 18.

³⁹ *Nightline: Detroit Black "Male Academies" Ruled Unfair* (ABC News television broadcast Aug. 15, 1991).

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ *Id.*

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *Id.*

the all-male academies, too, by gaining “some positive African-American males to choose from when they get ready to get married.”⁴⁷

Watson’s suggestion that the appropriate way to address the public education crisis in the Black community is to provide boys with enhanced educational opportunities and girls with better husbands surely demands a feminist response. But Neuborne’s effort to rebut the sexism in this remark was summarily dismissed by her interlocutors as reflecting racist anxiety about community empowerment initiatives. In this way, we see the charge of bias within the women’s movement being levied not in the interest of pushing for a more inclusive feminism, but rather to invalidate the feminist position itself.

The *Garrett* holding was announced in 1991, the same year Kimberlé Crenshaw published her celebrated law review article, “*Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color*.”⁴⁸ Crenshaw is often acknowledged for coining the term “intersectionality” in her writings during this period.⁴⁹ But as critic Robyn Wiegman has recently observed, this citational gesture is undermined by those who invoke Crenshaw’s name by way of proclaiming the inclusion of Black women in the feminist canon while failing to seriously engage Crenshaw’s work.⁵⁰ By attempting to situate Crenshaw’s foundational essays in their specific historical context, my aim here is to move beyond hollow invocation to highlight the specific aspects of intersectional political dynamics Crenshaw identifies.

In “*Mapping the Margins*,” Crenshaw presents intersectionality as a corrective to identity politics that produce marginalization from within by ignoring intragroup differences.⁵¹ As Crenshaw explains, “[t]he failure of feminism to interrogate race means that the resistance strategies of feminism will often replicate and reinforce the subordination of people of color, and the failure of antiracism to interrogate patriarchy means that

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ Kimberlé Crenshaw, *Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color*, 43 STAN. L. REV. 1241 (1991).

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ ROBYN WIEGMAN, OBJECT LESSONS 246-50 (2012).

⁵¹ Crenshaw, *supra* note 48.

antiracism will frequently reproduce the subordination of women.”⁵² While Crenshaw suggests a certain parallel between antiracism and feminism in that both have a history of marginalizing women of color from within, she characterizes the nature of the dilemma women of color face in each of these two contexts quite differently. In the case of the marginalization of women of color within antiracist communities, Crenshaw evinces the painful double bind Black women confront in recognizing that speaking out against sexism risks undermining a precarious movement for racial justice. When addressing the operation of racism within the feminist community, however, the politically vulnerable status of feminism is not highlighted. The single-sex public education debates stand as a reminder that feminism continues to face serious challenges to its credibility in public debate. While Crenshaw rightly draws attention to the harms produced White women presuming to speak “for and as *women*,” what we see in the single-sex public education debates is something different: a campaign to challenge White women who claim not to speak *for* or *as women*, but rather *in solidarity with* women of color.⁵³

For social justice feminists, Crenshaw’s writings on intersectionality hold important lessons. Intersectionality analysis holds feminism accountable to its own implication in and perpetuation of white supremacist logics and practices. At the same time, intersectionality analysis provides the tools for addressing the proliferation of political strategies that divide potential allies and coalition partners. As an account of the politics of complex identity, intersectionality analysis reveals both the silencing of women of color within the feminist movement and the way feminist perspectives are neutralized in public discourse by the insistence that feminism is an inherently elitist project. To put the matter otherwise, feminists need to address not only to the effects of racism within the movement, but also the exploitation of efforts to overcome that racism. Towards this end, intersectionality

⁵² *Id.* at 1252.

⁵³ Kimberlé Crenshaw, *Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics*, 1989 U. CHI. LEGAL. F. 139, 154 (1989).

as a critical analytic can be mobilized not only to mark the fact of silencing and marginalization, but also to demand a more rigorous account of the political processes by which this marginalization is affected.

The single-sex public education debates provide a glimpse of intersectional politics at work. The phrase social justice has been seized as the rallying cry of those defending single-sex programs *against* feminist challenge. In so doing, single-sex education advocates have sought to draw an equivalence between opposition to sexist classroom practices and opposition to expanded educational opportunities for poor kids of color. By foregrounding the desperate need for education reform in underserved communities, concerns about the sexist implications of these programs are more easily overlooked. To be sure, feminist opponents of single-sex education have enabled this dynamic in so far as they have failed to foreground the perspectives of those living through the public education crisis every day. As Galen Sherwin argues, feminist critics of single-sex initiatives have failed to win more popular support because they have “focused so strictly on theory that they have missed the reality of oppression on the ground below.”⁵⁴ Sherwin concludes that feminists themselves deserve a healthy share of the blame for the failure to garner more allies in communities of color.

[C]ritics’ approach to the issue of single-sex schools, the broader history of racism within the feminist movement, and the need for increased educational opportunity in low-income communities go a long way toward explaining supporters’ reluctance to relinquish their claim to antistatist analysis or to look too closely at the cause of academic improvement in single-sex environments.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Galen Sherwin, *Single-Sex Schools and the Antisegregation Principle*, 30 N.Y.U. REV. L. & SOC. CHANGE 35, 76 (2005).

⁵⁵ *Id.* at 78.

Sherwin's analysis is compelling, but it is perhaps incomplete. Reflecting on the single-sex public education debates, it seems equally clear that in a political field in which one can speak either as an antiracist or as a feminist—but not as both—those speaking from the standpoint of social justice feminism will not be heard.

The preceding discussion underscores the need to directly engage a contemporary discursive field in which the term social justice is a highly contested one. The call for social justice feminism is a call for feminism to move beyond narrow constructions of gender equality to address interlocking patterns of subordination. To succeed, social justice feminists must find ways to vigorously challenge bias within the movement, while equally vigorously contesting opportunistic charges of bias levied as a strategy to silence feminist voices. Just as feminists must take the broader project of social justice seriously, we must similarly demand that those who proclaim a commitment to social justice take feminism seriously.