1. **Are there orthodoxies associated with feminism that have become problematic and what are they?**
   - How can neofeminism justify being woman focused? If everything is context-specific, how do you not recognize the subordination of men? What about men’s conditions? How do you articulate the focus on women once you have complexified it?
     - Legal feminist theory and practice is partly interchangeable with the study of gender. You are studying gender but understand it as a system that tends to subordinate persons who are labeled as female. Can still understand how gender works in multiple contexts.

2. **In your own scholarship do you reject any of these orthodoxies? If so, how?**

   Dichotomy between agent vs. object. Rejecting or trying to carve out space where women can be both victims and agents at once. Kathryn Abrams. This is a theoretical model I’d love to see people run with? The constrained agency question is a good one. Theoretical work that allows for individuality. Between agency and victimhood – there is something you can theorize around. Leverage the insights.

3. **Is there some convergence of voices around new feminist principles?**
   **What are they?**
   - What are the issues? What are the main issue in women’s lives. False consciousness? What are the problems that women have?
     - Family law – multiple axes of parenting but not the “right” to be a parent.

4. **What should be the focus of feminist scholarship?**
   - How do you instrumentalize some of these ideas.
   - TANF support – not structured around women? Client community to the table.
- Ideas for language for advocacy.
- First wave approach. Here’s a list of things that are wrong with women. Equal citizens – same rights as you
- Work/life balance
- Parenting and money
- Material needs
- Violence against women – how to resolve it
- Healthcare
- Christine Littleton – lived reality
- Reproductive justice broadly construed
- Relationship to the state. Distributive model of the state? Something else?
- Anti-racism
- Environmental justice globally
- Poverty. Disproportionately women and children
- Economic security across the board. Gap between rich and poor. Economically dislocation, marginalization
- Intimate relationships – restructuring
- Trafficking
- Collaborative arrangements.
- Bustier and miniskirt?????? – sex, third wave, pleasure, sexy dressing,
- Social isolation and alienation
- War
- GLBT
- Feminist judges and jurisprudence
- Hegemonic masculine images. Gender performativity. How masculinity and femininity
- Gender segregation
- Better representation for women in political system. More numbers of progressives.
5. What are the benefits or drawbacks of giving this new set of feminist scholarship a blanket name? What should that name be?

- Unorthodox feminism
- Jargon doesn’t help – we don’t want to talk about the theory of the problem. They want to talk about single black mothers. Too much theorizing that isn’t helpful
- Heterodox feminism
- Don’t attack all of the second wave
- If everything is context specific, what’s at the core, is there an animating principle? Do we need a grand narrative? If we have to recognize all unique experiences, then what is left?
- Is neofeminism just shifting power around. Not attacking idea that power is the issue.
- Generational and labeling ideas are difficult. What is it about law that resists the complexity? Is neofeminism a critique of the law’s treatment of feminism rather than a critique of second wave feminism?
- Multiple levels of people who are exposed to these issues.
- We have to find the right law. But what about politics. Maybe we don’t conceive of the politics because we are lawyers.
  - Moving beyond the law and figuring out what the vehicles of change should be.
- Second-wave defenders
  - Second wave feminists understand that women are multidimensional, but you have to keep it simple. Strategic choice to choose good or bad. Multiple contexts are antithetical to social change.
  - Can appeal to courts and legislatures through rights. When you add in the complexity you lose, but all you gain is a complex law review article. On the ground concrete change. When you add intersectional claims you are likely to lose. Decision makers need clear cut categories.
o Reductionist approach to the description of dominance feminism. There is a tremendous richness of the feminist movement. Danger in trying to describe something so complex in broad terms. Not all people who are anti-DV want a criminal law agenda. Danger in never getting beyond. Too much short handing.