DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

MASTER OF ARTS-POLITICAL SCIENCES

SEMESTER -III

WOMEN AND POLITICS

OPEN ELECTIVE 304

BLOCK-1

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH BENGAL

Postal Address:

The Registrar,

University of North Bengal,

Raja Rammohunpur,

P.O.-N.B.U., Dist-Darjeeling,

West Bengal, Pin-734013,

India.

Phone: (O) +91 0353-2776331/2699008

Fax: (0353) 2776313, 2699001

Email: regnbu@sancharnet.in ; regnbu@nbu.ac.in

Wesbsite: www.nbu.ac.in

First Published in 2019

FOREWORD

The Self Learning Material (SLM) is written with the aim of providing simple and organized study content to all the learners. The SLMs are prepared on the framework of being mutually cohesive, internally consistent and structured as per the university's syllabi. It is a humble attempt to give glimpses of the various approaches and dimensions to the topic of study and to kindle the learner's interest to the subject

We have tried to put together information from various sources into this book that has been written in an engaging style with interesting and relevant examples. It introduces you to the insights of subject concepts and theories and presents them in a way that is easy to understand and comprehend.

We always believe in continuous improvement and would periodically update the content in the very interest of the learners. It may be added that despite enormous efforts and coordination, there is every possibility for some omission or inadequacy in few areas or topics, which would definitely be rectified in future.

We hope you enjoy learning from this book and the experience truly enrich your learning and help you to advance in your career and future endeavours.

WOMEN AND POLITICS

BLOCK- 1

BLOCK- 2

BLOCK 1 : WOMEN AND POLITICS

Introduction to the Block

Unit 1 deals with the women's potical approach and we have also analyzed the meaning of the 'political' and you are now familiar with the debates on the medieval political thought and the modern understanding of the political

Unit 2 deals with Liberal feminism conceives of freedom as personal autonomy—living a life of one's own choosing—and political autonomy—being co-author of the conditions under which one lives.

Unit 3 deals with A good place to situate the start of theoretical debates about women, class and work is in the intersection with Marxism and feminism. Such debates were shaped not only by academic inquiries

Unit 4 deals Radical feminist beliefs are based on the idea that the main cause of women's oppression originates from social roles and institutional structures being constructed from male supremacy and patriarchy.

Unit 5 deals with The phrase "socialist feminism" was increasingly used during the 1970s to describe a mixed theoretical and practical approach to achieving women's equality. Socialist feminist theory analyzed the connection between the oppression of women and other oppressions in society, such as racism and economic injustice.

Unit 6 deals with the status of women in India has been subject to many changes over the span of recorded Indian history. Their position in early society was of very high position in India's ancient period, especially in the Indo-Aryan speaking regions, and their subordination continued to be reified well into India's early modern period.

Unit 7 deals with the historical movement in India in Pre-independence era by women in India and also we can learn the inter linkages and correlations of the movement with history and society

UNIT 1: FEMINIST PERSPECTIVES OF POLITICAL

STRUCTURE

1.0 OBJECTIVES

After completing this Unit you will be able to:

- Explain the concept of modernity and the political;
- Examine the debates within liberal feminism and the idea of the political;
- Discuss the feminist alienation of 'personal is political'; and
- Analyze the contemporary voices from the margin.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

In the previous Unit you have read about the historical evolution of the notion of the political in western context. We have also analyzed the meaning of the 'political' and you are now familiar with the debates on the medieval political thought and the modern understanding of the political. As you know now that the category of 'the political' is

contested. This Unit maps the ways in which the idea of the political has been being transformed through history. It examines the historical trajectory of the notion of the political and pushes it further into the feminist recovery of the idea of the political. It addresses the following questions. How does capitalist modernity impact the lives of women? How does it structure the notions of private and political in the context of women? What is the position of liberal feminists on the idea of the political? Does it privileges a few and excludes the others? How do women experience patriarchy in the private and public sphere? How have the later radical feminist ideas been influenced by the feminist ideas of the nineteenth century? What are the limitations that are discussed on the feminist conception 'the personal is political'? It also discusses the contemporary feminist recasting of the idea of the political. Finally, it examines how the concept of the public and private would play on in the contexts such as black and Dalit women. The following section explores the historical context of modernity and transitions in the debates on the notion of the political.

Feminist political philosophy is an area of philosophy that is in part focused on understanding and critiquing the way political philosophy is usually construed—often without any attention to feminist concerns—and on articulating how political theory might be reconstructed in a way that advances feminist concerns. Feminist political philosophy is a branch of both feminist philosophy and political philosophy. As a branch of feminist philosophy, it serves as a form of critique or a hermeneutics of suspicion (Ricœur 1970). That is, it serves as a way of opening up or looking at the political world as it is usually understood and uncovering ways in which women and their current and historical concerns are poorly depicted, represented, and addressed. As a branch of political philosophy, feminist political philosophy serves as a field for developing new ideals, practices, and justifications for how political institutions and practices should be organized and reconstructed.

While feminist philosophy has been instrumental in critiquing and reconstructing many branches of philosophy, from aesthetics to

philosophy of science, feminist political philosophy may be the paradigmatic branch of feminist philosophy because it best exemplifies the point of feminist theory, which is, to borrow a phrase from Marx, not only to understand the world but to change it (Marx and Engels 1998). And, though other fields have effects that may change the world, feminist political philosophy focuses most directly on understanding ways in which collective life can be improved. This project involves understanding the ways in which power emerges and is used or misused in public life (see the entry on feminist perspectives on power). As with other kinds of feminist theory, common themes have emerged for discussion and critique, but there has been little in the way of consensus among feminist theorists on what is the best way to understand them. This introductory article lays out the various schools of thought and areas of concern that have occupied this vibrant field of philosophy for the past forty years. It understands feminist philosophy broadly to include work conducted by feminist theorists doing this philosophical work from other disciplines, especially political science but also anthropology, comparative literature, law, and other programs in the humanities and social sciences.

Historical Context and Developments

Current feminist political philosophy is indebted to the work of earlier generations of feminist scholarship and activism, including the first wave of feminism in the English-speaking world, which took place from the 1840s to the 1920s and focused on improving the political, educational, and economic system primarily for middle-class women. Its greatest achievements were to develop a language of equal rights for women and to garner women the right to vote. It is also indebted to the second wave of feminism, which, beginning in the 1960s, drew on the language of the civil rights movements (e.g., the language of liberation) and on a new feminist consciousness that emerged through women's solidarity movements and new forms of reflection that uncovered sexist attitudes and impediments throughout the whole of society. By 1970, feminism had expanded from activism to scholarship with the publication of

Shulamith Firestone's The Dialectic of Sex (Firestone 1971); Kate Millett's Sexual Politics (Millett 1970); and Robin Morgan's Sisterhood is Powerful (Morgan 1970).

One of the first theoretical advances of second wave feminism was to separate out biological conceptions of women's identity from socially-constructed ones in order to disprove the notion that biology was destiny and hence that women's main role was as mothers and caregivers. Drawing on the social sciences and psychoanalytic theory, anthropologist Gayle Rubin developed an account of a "sex/gender system" (Rubin 1975; Dietz 2003, 401; and the entry on feminist perspectives on sex and gender). The sex/gender distinction pointed to "a set of arrangements by which the biological raw material of human sex and procreation is shaped by human, social intervention" (Rubin 1975, 165). While biological sex was fixed, in Rubin's view, gender was a social construction that served to divide the sexes and privilege men. Because gender was mutable, the sex/gender distinction gave feminists a powerful tool to look for ways to address women's oppression.

With this socially-constructed notion of gender, early second-wave theorists sought out an understanding of woman as a universal subject and agent of feminist politics. A major set of fault lines in feminist thought since the 1990s is over the questions of the subject of "woman." According to Mary Dietz's 2003 article laying out the field, there are two large groups here. One champions the category of woman (in the singular and universal), arguing that the specificity of women's identity, their sexual difference from men, should be appreciated and revalued. (The other, discussed below, takes up women's diversity.) This "difference feminism" includes two distinct groups: (i) those who look at how gendered sexual difference is socially constituted and (ii) those who look at how sexual difference is constructed symbolically and psychoanalytically. The first, social difference feminism, includes theories that revalue mothering and caring and has been developed largely in the Anglo-American context. (See for example Tronto 1993 and Held 1995.) The second, symbolic difference feminism, is that of what are often referred to as the French Feminists, including Irigaray,

Cixous, and Kristeva. They belong in this group to the extent that they value and distinguish women's specific sexual difference from men's. Irigaray's focus on sexual difference is emblematic of this. Social-difference and symbolic-difference feminisms have very little to do with each other but, Dietz argues, they share the notion that a feminist politics requires a category woman that has a determinate meaning (Dietz 2003, 403; Nicholson 1994, 100).

Just as Marxist theory sought out a universal subject in the person of the worker, feminists theorists sought it out in a shared and common condition that afflicted women across cultures. But this notion of a universal womanhood was interrupted by other thinkers, such as bell hooks, saying that it excluded non-white and non-middle-class women's experience and concerns. Hooks' 1981 book titled Ain't I a Woman? exposed mainstream feminism as a movement of a small group of middle- and upper-class white women whose experience was very particular, hardly universal. The work of hooks and later Cherrie Moraga, Gloria Anzaldúa, Maria Lugones, Elizabeth Spelman, and others foregrounded the need to account for women's multiple and complex identities and experiences. By the 1990s the debates about whether there was a coherent concept of woman that could underlie feminist politics was further challenged by non-Western women challenging the Western women's movement as caught up in Eurocentric ideals that led to the colonization and domination of "Third World" people. What is now known as postcolonial theory further heightened the debate between feminists who wanted to identify a universal feminist subject of woman (e.g. Okin, Nussbaum, and Ackerly) and those who call for recognizing multiplicity, diversity, and intersectionality (e.g., Spivak, Narayan, Mahmood, and Jaggar).

The effects of this diversity movement would be felt more in the 1990s and beyond. In the meantime, in the 1970s and 1980s feminist theory began to develop in the various areas of the social sciences and humanities, and in philosophy it began to arise in what were already the different traditions and areas of research. As a branch of political

philosophy, feminist political philosophy has often mirrored the various divisions at work in political philosophy more broadly. Prior to the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War, political philosophy was usually divided into categories such as liberal, conservative, socialist, and Marxist. Except for conservatism, for each category there were often feminists working and critiquing alongside it. Hence, as Alison Jaggar's classic text, Feminist Politics and Human Nature, spelled out, each ideological approach drew feminist scholars who would both take their cue from and borrow the language of a particular ideology (Jaggar 1983). Jaggar's text grouped feminist political philosophy into four camps: liberal feminism, socialist feminism, Marxist feminism, and radical feminism. The first three groups followed the lines of Cold War global political divisions: American liberalism, European socialism, and a revolutionary communism (though few in the west would embrace Soviet-style communism). Radical feminism was the most indigenous of the feminist philosophies, developing its own political vocabulary with its roots in the deep criticisms of patriarchy that feminist consciousness had produced in its first and second waves. Otherwise, feminist political philosophy largely followed the lines of traditional political philosophy. But this has never been an uncritical following. As a field bent on changing the world, even liberal feminist theorists tended to criticize liberalism as much or more than they embraced it, and to embrace socialism and other more radical points of view more than to reject them. Still, on the whole, these theorists generally operated within the language and framework of their chosen approach to political philosophy.

Political philosophy began to change enormously in the late 1980s, just before the end of the Cold War, with a new invocation of an old Hegelian category: civil society, an arena of political life intermediate between the state and the household. This was the arena of associations, churches, labor unions, book clubs, choral societies and manifold other nongovernmental yet still public organizations. In the 1980s political theorists began to turn their focus from the state to this intermediate realm, which suddenly took center stage in Eastern Europe in

organizations that challenged the power of the state and ultimately led to the downfall of communist regimes.

After the end of the Cold War, political philosophy along with political life radically realigned. New attention focused on civil society and the public sphere, especially with the timely translation of Jürgen Habermas's early work, the Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere (Habermas 1989). Volumes soon appeared on civil society and the public sphere, focusing on the ways in which people organized themselves and developed public power rather than on the ways that the state garnered and exerted its power. In fact, there arose a sense that the public sphere ultimately might exert more power than the state, at least in the fundamental way in which public will is formed and serves to legitimate—or not—state power. In the latter respect, John Rawls's work was influential by developing a theory of justice that tied the legitimacy of institutions to the normative judgments that a reflective and deliberative people might make (Rawls 1971). By the early 1990s, Marxists seemed to have disappeared or at least become very circumspect (though the downfall of communist regimes needn't have had any effect on Marxist analysis proper, which never subscribed to Leninist or Maoist thought). Socialists also retreated or transformed themselves into "radical democrats" (Mouffe 1992, 1993, 2000).

Now the old schema of liberal, radical, socialist, and Marxist feminisms were much less relevant. There were fewer debates about what kind of state organization and economic structure would be better for women and more debates about the value of the private sphere of the household and the nongovernmental space of associations. Along with political philosophy more broadly, more feminist political philosophers began to turn to the meaning and interpretation of civil society, the public sphere, and democracy itself.

Feminist theorists have also done substantial work in rescuing from obscurity feminist political philosophers who were excluded from the

canon and rethinking the canon itself. See the entry on Feminist History of Philosophy.

2. Contemporary Approaches and Debates

Now in the second decade of the twenty-first century, feminist theorists are doing an extraordinary variety of work on matters political and democratic, including global ethics, human rights, disabilities studies, bioethics, climate change, and international development. Some of the tensions that came to the fore in previous decades are played out in any of these areas.

For example, in global ethics there is a debate over whether there are universal values of justice and freedom that should be intentionally cultivated for women in the developing world or whether cultural diversity should be prized. Feminist theorists have sought to answer this question in a number of different and compelling ways. (For some examples see Ackerly 2000, Ackerly & Okin 1999, Benhabib 2002 and 2008, Butler 2000, Gould 2004, and Zerilli 2009.)

Likewise new philosophical work on disabilities, as the entry on feminist perspectives on disability explains, is informed by a great deal of feminist theory, from standpoint philosophy to feminist phenomenology, as well as political philosophical questions of identity, difference, and diversity. (See also Carlson & Kittay, 2010.)

Ultimately, the number of approaches that can be taken on any of these issues is as high as the number of philosophers there are working on them. Nonetheless there are some general family resemblances to be found in certain groupings, not altogether unlike Jaggar's 1983 classification. The remainder of this entry will identify how the previous schema has changed and what new constellations have emerged.

1.2 MODERNITY AND THE POLITICAL

As you know, with the sweeping changes that Europe began to experience around the 14th century, a new way of being and thinking began. Feudalism was on its way out, and new ways of organizing the economy emerged. Trade, in the wake of navigational advances, became the fulcrum around which society, economy and indeed the polity came to be organized. The state became less fragmented; more centralized, and needed a standing well-organized army to guarantee law and order on trade routes to meet the demands of the new class of mercantile capitalists. Centralized states developed which organized and generated revenue. Old feudal ties began to weaken, and new ways of organizing social, familial and religious life gradually emerged. New questions about the individual and the state and society came to be asked; indeed the idea of the individual itself was new. Women were also obviously affected by these changes, and feminism maybe broadly defined as a specific response to the challenges and opportunities that 'modernity' brought in its wake albeit unequally for women. By the second half of the 17th century, the distinction between the public and the private (See Unit 4, Block 1, MWG-002) came to be etched rather sharply in England. The nature of agriculture changed and a growing army of wage laborers very different from the earlier family based system of production became the order of the day. Thus, for the first time a distinction between the public world of employment and the private world of the home emerges. In the earlier Unit, we have already traced the evolution of this bifurcation from Aristotle to liberal philosophy. With capitalism and modernity, a complete separation of productive economic activity from the homestead and the household becomes the norm. Thus, begins the separation of women from the economic activities related to the newly emerging capitalist market. Women who were up until now partners in work, found them squeezed out of work, economic activities that were carried out from homesteads now increasingly shifted to new locales outside the home. Aristocratic women who partnered their husbands in the management of their estates were increasingly restricted to the running of the household. A host of economic and demographic factors created a situation where women began to look at marriage as the only viable solution to their economic

insecurities. For the first time, the distinction between the public and the private became sharp. The beginnings of capitalist modernity create a new kind of social and economic organization relegating women to the private sphere with adverse impact on women. Thus,asking questions about women's assigned roles in the private sphere and the constant demand to be integrated into the public sphere, or the rejection of this division or for that matter the call for imbuing the political/public with values that are traditionally associated with the private or non-political sphere are all tendencies that we see in various strands of feminism. Some strands accept the division and ask for women to be allowed their rightful place in the public sphere. Others have rejected this division completely and argued that values like tolerance, nurturance, love, co-operation, sacrifice and so on need to be injected into the political/public arena. Thus, a great deal of intellectual and political energy within feminism is devoted to either the rejection of or the challenging of the public-private divide. This is in some sense characteristic of the feminist articulation.

1.3 LIBERAL FEMINISM AND THE IDEA OF THE POLITICAL

Modern feminism is often traced back to 17th century liberalism that promised universal applications of the idea of equality, freedom and dignity based on the assumption of shared rationality. Early feminism tried to solve the apparent contradiction between the universal assumptions of modernity, liberal philosophy, and the capitalist market, on the one hand, and the unequal role, opportunities and access that women had on the other hand to these supposedly universal spaces — the state and the market. The classical liberal feminist, response has been to say that it was merely an oversight and that the 'political' would soon be stretched to accommodate women. The contention was that the newly minted 'political' which was the abode of justice, freedom and equality would soon notice women's absence and open up. Women were not to be found in this sphere because of women's as yet underdeveloped rationality. With equal education and opportunities, this would be

rectified and women would eventually occupy their rightful place in the public/political sphere. Mary Wollstonecraft, John Stuart Mill and many others demonstrated a touching faith in the universal character of the political sphere and believed that this exclusion of women from the 'political' was at best temporary and would soon be a thing of the past. Contemporary feminist are not persuaded to think of this exclusion of women from the 'universal' political space as an unfortunate oversight or inconsistency, but rather as something that is probably written into the very nature of the so-called universal/political sphere. Coming two years after the French Revolution, Mary Wollstonecraft's book A Vindication of the Rights of Women (1792) waswritten at a time when industrialization had gathered steam but not enough to provide women with respectable employment. The only options existing for women were lowpaying jobs in appalling conditions. Middle class women continued to be economically dependent on marriage and husbands, which by then had become very stifling given the complete separation of the private and the public. Mary Wollstonecraft's basic argument was an extension of the liberal principles to women. She wished to claim for women, universal reason, autonomy, freedom and equality. She sought to demonstrate that 'feminine vanity' was a social construct and not a natural attribute, and that, given education and exposure women could become rational, free-thinking individuals. She insisted that women too must be in a position to freely choose their actions. The conviction about equal ability to reason was extended by Wollstonecraft to a demand for equal rights. This clear political programme for equal rights articulated by Mary Wollstonecraft thus took the nascent feminist consciousness in a clearly political direction. A road map for change was presented, and in a sense, this could be seen as the earliest feminist call, for it had within it a concrete demand for political change. From here to the demand for suffrage was not a very long distance, at least in terms of ideas. Wollstonecraft presented ideas that were converted into concrete political strategies by later feminists.

Mary Wollstonecraft rejected the public-private divide on which the liberal worldview was based, but this did not take her very far because

despite arguing against a devaluation of the private sphere, the fact was that domestic work remained unpaid and was not recognized as work. Later feminists have identified this as the reason for the perpetuation of women's economic dependence on the institution of marriage. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the anti-slavery discourse was gathering ground in USA. This became an ideal context for women to examine their lives along the matrix of freedom and dignity. America was experiencing a churning and it was not long before issues of gender came to be talked of in the same breath as race. Many white women did take an active part in the anti-slavery campaign only to find them completely ignored in the anti-slavery convention held in 1840 in London. This embittered women like Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815-1902) who had been active members of the anti-slavery movement in the USA. The momentous Seneca Falls Convention of 1848 (you may revisit Unit 1 and 2 , Block 1, MWG-001) was an attempt to deal with this rejection. This is considered a landmark event in the history of feminism because this is the first ever women's rights convention which Stanton described as "the inauguration of a rebellion such as the world had never seen"(Davis, 2008,p.50).The Convention continued to be plagued by the same dilemmas that were faced nearly a century ago by Mary Wollstonecraft — the recognition of women as a distinctive group was accompanied by a strong denial of any significance of this distinctness! Of course the women who came together at the Convention seemed not to be aware of the fact that appeals to reason and principles of justice would not persuade men to voluntarily part with their privileged position in society. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, one of the luminaries of the Seneca Fall Convention that you have already read about identified the issue of power and domination not just in public life but also in the most intimate relationships as the fundamental problem. She described society as being organized by 'man power'under which womanhood was always faced with the threat of rape —on the highways as much as at the home. She is suggesting that women experience the weight of male power not just in the public/political sphere but also in the private sphere. This link that she and many others of her ilk make is vital for the strengthening of feminist understanding. It is no wonder that therefore she campaigned for

changing the conditions of family and marriage. In fact, she attacked the institution of marriage and likened it to unpaid prostitution and domestic labour. Stanton clearly made a connection between domination and oppression within the family (private) and outside (public/political). She organized many small women-only groups where marriage and the consequent loss of autonomy, especially sexual autonomy, were often discussed.Personal problems were discussed in these groups, signaling clearly a belief that these indeed were not isolated, individual personal problems but were a result of a systemic arrangement of power in society and hence political or public in nature. Stanton in fact makes the crucial feminist link between loss of autonomy in the private sphere with marginalization and lack of power in the political/public sphere. Others like Lucy Stone (1818-1893)for instance, bemoaned the futility of the right to vote or to own property when not accompanied by the right over one's body. Thus, a re-definition anticipating the later radical feminist slogan of the personal being political is already emerging in the nineteenth century. There was a realization that the private/non-political is as much an arena of power as the political, hence the notion of the political begins to be stretched. This implied that power within the private sphere could also be challenged and re-articulated, that women could gain freedom not simply by being allowed to enter public life but by a transformation of the situations in their homes. These early feminists placed hitherto unnoticed issue on the centre stage of feminist consciousness. Elizabeth Cady Stanton for instance discussed the loss of identity and slave-like status of married women and insisted that they retain at least part of their own names. She even experimented with fashion, suggesting that women dress for comfort; to this end she introduced the bloomer costume. This of course invited such ridicule and hostility that she had to soon stopped wearing it in public. The point for us to note however is the connection that feminists are making between seemingly disparate issues — that of a woman changing her name upon marriage or clothes that women wear with the issue of women's rights and freedoms. It is this realization that power constructs both the private and the public, and hence both spheres are political that makes feminism radical. Many of the issues that our feminist foremothers raised are still

with us, and we continue to battle and understand these. You would find the following passage from Nivedita Menon's writing on the whole business of women changing their names upon marriage very interesting and pertinent.

"Another feature of this new form of family that has become increasingly ubiquitous is the phenomenon of the changing of the woman's surname upon marriage. Surnames themselves are relatively new in India, and emerged under British rule, previous practices of naming being gradually reshaped to fit the new state's requirements of legibility. This phenomenon is found in all British colonies, by the way (Scott 1998). Along with the emergence of the surname, one sees the emergence of Mrs X, X being the surname of the husband, and sometimes his first name if he has not adopted the surname format as many have not yet, in South India for example. The idea that women not change their surname upon marriage, is thus, not so much a 'western feminist' idea, but rather for us in India, could be seen as a return to one's traditions! Every Indian family today only has to go back a generation to remember how different naming practices used to be, and consider the implications of that for women's identity. The surnames that emerged under colonialism are simply caste names of course, and thus we see also the move to drop surnames as a deliberate political act, by Dalits as well as by non-Dalits." (Menon, 2012, pp.32-33)

Feminists have argued that the ideal citizen of a liberal democracy and the qualities and attributes associated with this ideal citizen unmistakably derive from a complex set of attitudes and characteristics that are associated with the masculinity in patriarchal societies. Thus, extending these attributes to women actually does not hold any promise to women. On the contrary, it would appear that despite the extension women are somehow not capable or are unwilling to share the universal experience and space of the state and the market. This is so, because while the public/political sphere might be stretched open for women to participate in, but no simultaneous changes are undertaken in the private sphere. This results in a situation where women seemingly have an equal chance

of participating in the modern state and the market, but are actually unable to do so. These further results in the perpetuation of the stereotype of women being unwilling, incapable and even disinterested in the political/public matters and activities. Whereas, the fact is that the political has been so constructed that it is most accessible to the life that many men under patriarchy live, and this has come to be seen as the natural order of things. It is a life where all care-giving and nurturance activities are assumed to be naturally the domain of the woman, thus freeing up enormous amounts of time and generating a great deal of leisure for men to actively engage in the political sphere. Most men would have either a wife, mother or sister to take care of their creature comforts, life would be very different if women too could for instance have 'wives'. It is in this spirit that Carole Pateman for instance has famously asked democracy to be put into practice in the kitchen, in the nursery and in the bedroom (Pateman, 1991, p.222) Liberal democracy, the favored mode in most western societies has been faulted by feminists for its invocation of a specific kind of private/public divide which persuades us to believe that the private sphere is completely independent and irrelevant to the public sphere. It ignores the way in which sexual inequalities in the household or labour force could adversely impact women's chances of acting as political equals. In fact this separation seemed to suggest that the arrangements in the private sphere were purely a consequence of individual choice and personal arrangement. Susan Moller Okinargues that liberalism's fundamental abstract deals with an individual who is actually the male head of household . On the other hand, CarolePateman has argued that men are thought of as 'citizen warriors' whereas women as thought of as 'citizen mothers'. The notions of equality, justice and liberty are based on the so-to-say normal individual who it turns out is actually the white, heterosexual, university educated able bodied male. The universal of the liberal conceptions of democracy is in reality far too specifically constructed, it tends to universalize what is essentially a specific experience and then thrusts this as the normal and desirable model for all others to emulate. Liberalism is based on well-policed boundaries of the public and the private. The norms of behavior and conduct are decidedly male. For instance, if

someone were to stray into a political party meeting with a child on her hip or display emotions it would be seen as out of place. Children, the elderly and the invalid are to be cared for by someone — somehow. Wives, mothers, sisters or daughters would be expected to do this, but what happens when a wife or a mother is herself trying to be part of the so called universal structures that are inherently biased in favour of the male way of being and thinking.

Thus, the question we are posing is, can gender neutrality which lends liberalism its supposed universal character be the solution or is it part of the problem? Iris Marion Young has argued that this supposed "view from nowhere of no one in particular" (Young, 1990 p.104) serves to strengthen the interests of a particular group, inevitably the privileged group. Hence it is very important to acknowledge difference and allow for the different voices to be heard and then logically of course to be represented.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Explain the concept of modernity.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   …….

2. What is liberal feminism?

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   …….

1.4 THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL

Let us know more about this concept. While some feminists have eagerly sought integration into the public/political mainstream, others have decried this attempt. They have argued that women are different from men and indeed are even superior. Discriminatory policies are not the reason for women's marginalization. Even when non-discriminatory policies are in place, the fact is that women's absence from the political/public sphere remains the more or less the same.

The nature of capitalist organization or of the modern nation-state also do not offer a complete explanation for women's exclusion from the political, this group of feminists would argue that it is the existence of male power in the form of patriarchy that is responsible for the marginalization of women from the political sphere. This radical feminist point of view has argued that men's power is not confined to the public world alone, but characterizes all relationships between sexes- from the most intimate to the most public. From this vantage point, the family is as culpable as the capitalist market in the creation and perpetuation of a political/non-political divide with unequal, damaging and dangerous consequences for women. Thus, the family, community, religion, or the market, government and the state all come to be seen as agents of patriarchy. In this context, the slogan 'the personal is political' acquires deep significance and meaning. By the close of the 1960s,the entire western world especially the United States of America was in turmoil. Fundamental questions regarding the nature of society, economy, family and sexuality began to be asked. Disenchantment with hitherto existing progressive and radical movements had begun to set in, women realized that these groups were no different from the earlier ones when it came to the question of equality between women and men. 'Girls continued to clean up, while the men discussed strategy'. Women who had entered the 'political' world realized only too soon that the organization and assumptions on which the private sphere was based spilled over and influenced the public/political sphere. From this perspective it began to become clear that polite requests and petitions for equal opportunities or changes within the existing legal structures were futile. New women's

groups infused with this consciousness emerged that were committed to the idea that 'the personal is political'. Seen from here, it was clear that no aspect of life lacked a political dimension and political struggle could therefore take many new forms.

1.5 THE PERSONAL IS POLITICAL: QUESTING PRIVACY

The idea that the personal is political is not without its critics. It has been objected to for its strong totalitarian implications, since it suggests that there is no aspect of life that can be free from political scrutiny and that feminists have to account for every minute and intimate details of their lives. It has been criticized and sometimes ridiculed for taking political correctness to absurd limits, say in fashion or fairy tales. You would however realize that neither fashion nor fairy tales are actually innocent of an underlying patriarchal agenda and theme. Some of you might have read the rather amusing politically correct fairy tales. While it might be somewhat of a caricature, it does draw our attention to the patriarchal undertones of these much loved tales.A more serious criticism is that by insisting that the personal is political, there is an effective de-politicization. It seems to suggest that feminist can never change the world, till every single detail of their own personal lives has been cleaned up of patriarchy. This attitude, the critics fear would lead to a withdrawal from large scale, collective struggles to self-obsessed, individual scrutiny's. While some radical feminists might have interpreted it and withdrawn from collective struggles, but this is clearly not what Kate Millet had in mind when she formulated this position? Radical feminists have since clarified that the demand is not for politicization of private life, for the fact is that private life is already political. In fact, the existing notions of privacy help conceal the political dimensions of private life. Violence within the household is often overlooked as a private matter, whereas from the radical feminist perspective it is obviously a political matter.

1.6 CONTEMPORARY VOICES

Contemporary feminists have moved away from making pleas for equal participation in the political/public sphere or separatism. Contemporary feminists do acknowledge the political significance of coercive sex. You would hear contemporary feminists asking for a change in the conditions of employment and the nature of work, rather than simply ask for women to be able to join the public/workforce. There is a realization that the public has been till now structured in a way that makes women's entry and continued presence difficult and challenging at the best of times, and impossible at the worst. You must have heard women often being asked how they propose to manage marriage and career, have you ever heard this question being asked of a man? In fact, it would be considered funny and maybe even offensive. This is so because, man's role in the public/political sphere is predicated on a particular immutable role assigned to women. A logical corollary of this is to seek a greater role for men within the private/ household sphere. These shifts in feminist thinking have meant a serious departure from conventional western political philosophy's bifurcation of human life into private and public, especially liberal philosophy. Liberal philosophy and politics makes the promise of universal citizenship based on the supposedly universal principle of public/private dichotomy. The fact however that is this dichotomy is culturally and socially specific and heavily gendered. Women are associated with the private sphere and men with the public/political. This distinction devalues the qualities associated with private life and women. The public world is constructed as dispassionate, impersonal and disembodied, rising above the messy specificities of emotion, caring, subjectivity and physical needs. It is this distinction which occludes the political nature of oppression within the family and sexuality in the private sphere thereby adversely affecting the ability of women to compete with men in the public sphere. The key task for feminists is to reveal the political and essentially contested and gendered nature of the current categories through which the world is understood and lived in. This is important so that issues of deep significance can no longer be excluded on the pretext of being a private matter.

1.7 MARGINALIZED VOICES

Black feminists have drawn our attention to how different the critique of the public/private looks from their window as opposed to the white feminist window. Black women in America have always been in the public sphere, working as slaves, farm hands, wet nurses and were subjected to coercive sex by the slave owners. The strict dichotomy that the white women experienced, between the world of work and the home, is totally alien to most black women. Black women and their bodies had no privacy for they were to be at the disposal of the slave owner/employer. In contemporary America, Black women are amongst the most marginalized and thus dependent on the state for assistance. This makes their lives open to state scrutiny and monitoring of the most intimate aspects of their life. These experiences unique to black women in America question the basis of the private/public distinctions that feminism critiques. Black women are clearly battling a situation wherein they seem to have no private haven to retreat to, oppression and exploitation, coercion and indignity is a continuum that they experience at home and at work. The experience of Dalit women in India is somewhat similar, for while the upper caste women have been subjected to tight boundaries of the home and the outside, Dalit women have a life that has to be lived pretty much in the public. This does not make their lives and experiences therefore more liberating and empowering. The exact nature of occupation of the private/public sphere by women in all cases is determined by a combination of political, economic, and social factors. This gives us an idea of the nature of power in a particular society. So while the upper caste woman is oppressed because she cannot step out in public or be a part of the workforce, the Dalit woman is oppressed because she has to forcibly be in the public sphere and be part of the workforce.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss the debate on modernity and the political.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

2. Debate the feminist claim ‘The personal is political’ with suitable example.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

3. Explain the contemporary voices and marginalized voices of feminist discourse?

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

1.8 LET US SUM UP

After reading this Unit, you would hopefully be in a better position to understand the changing perspectives within feminism regarding the vexed issue of what is political. The fact is that this question cannot be answered without the almost joined at the hip discussion of the feminist understanding of the public and the private. These discussions are not mere intellectual exercise but have a deep connection with the kind of movements and politics that feminist groups would espouse. If politics is seen as all pervasive then even the act of resisting small patriarchal practices within the confines of one’s home would constitute a political act, whereas if politics is seen as only that which unfolds outside the boundaries of the household then only voting or forming governments etc. would qualify to be politics.

1.9 KEY WORDS

Capitalism : It refers to socio and economic methods in commodities exchange that determines societal relations. It also accounts for exploitation based on wage labour and private ownership of means of production. It endorses free, competitive market and private property. It defends the position that prosperity can be achieved through the search of self-centred interests. It believes in profit maximization.

Citizen : A member of a particular state. Rights and responsibilities that determine linkages between state and democracy constitute citizenship. Citizens possess membership of the state.

Modernity : It characterizes the features of the modern society. It is measured on the basis of social, political, cultural and economic levels of certain societies. Universalism and activism are considered as some of the values of modernity.

Polity : It signifies society that functions on the basis of political authority.

1.10 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

4. Explain the concept of modernity.
5. What is liberal feminism?
6. Discuss the debate on modernity and the political.
7. Debate the feminist claim ‘The personal is political’ with suitable example.
8. Explain the contemporary voices and marginalized voices of feminist discourse?

1.11 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, Nicholas, Stephen Hill and Bryan.S.Turner(2000).The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology, New Delhi: Penguin.

Notes

- Ackelsberg Martha A. and Mary Lydon Shanley (1996).'Privacy, Publicity and Power: A Feminist Rethinking of the Public-Private Distinction' in Revisioning the Political. (Edt). by Nancy J. Hirschmann and Christine Di Stefano. Westview Books. UK.
- Adams, Michelle M. Moody (1998). "'Self/other'" in Blackwell Companion to Feminist Philosophy.(Edt). by Alison M. Jaggar and Iris Marion Young, . Blackwell Publishers. USA, UK.
- Bryson, Valerie(1992) Feminist Political Theory. Palgrave. UK.
- Collins, PatriciaHill (2000). Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. New York: Routledge.
- Davis, Sue (2008). The Political Thought of Elizabeth Cady Stanton: Women's Rights and the American Political Traditions , NYU Press.
- Farrelly, Colin (2004) Contemporary Political Theory: A Reader. Sage. UK. hooks, bell (2000). Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center, Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Heywood, Andrew (1997). Politics, London: Macmillan.
- Kerr, Andrea Moore(1992). Lucy Stone: Speaking Out for Equality. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers , University Press.
- Menon , Nivedita(2012).Seeing Like a Feminist, Penguin/Zubaan.
- Millet Kate (1969). Sexual Politics , Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Okin, Susan Moller (2004). Gender, Justice and Gender: An Unfinished Debate, Volume, 72, Issue 5.
- Pateman, Carole (1990).The Disorder of Women: Democracy, Feminism, and Political Theory, Stanford University Press.
- Roessler, Beate (1996) 'New Ways of Thinking about Privacy' in The Oxford
- Handbook of Political Theory, (Edt) by John S. Dryzek, Bonnie Honig, and Anne Phillips, Oxford University Press. UK.
- Robertson, David (1993) Dictionary of Politics ,London: Penguin

- Rege, Sharmila (2006). Writing Caste/ Writing Gender: Narrating Dalit
- Women's Testimonios New Delhi: Zubaan.
- Wollstonecraft,Mary (1792).A Vindication of the Rights of Woman. http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/wollstonecraft-mary/ Retrieved on 22ndJanuary, 2013.
- Young Iris Marion (1990). Justice and the Politics of Difference, Princeton University Press.

1.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. Modernity, a topic in the humanities and social sciences, is both a historical period (the modern era), as well as the ensemble of particular socio-cultural norms, attitudes and practices that arose in the wake of the Renaissance—in the "Age of Reason" of 17th-century thought and the 18th-century "Enlightenment". Some commentators consider the era of modernity to have ended by 1930, with World War II in 1945, or the 1980s or 1990s; the following era is called postmodernity. The term "contemporary history" is also used to refer to the post-1945 timeframe, without assigning it to either the modern or postmodern era. (Thus "modern" may be used as a name of a particular era in the past, as opposed to meaning "the current era".)

   Depending on the field, "modernity" may refer to different time periods or qualities. In historiography, the 17th and 18th centuries are usually described as early modern, while the long 19th century corresponds to "modern history" proper. While it includes a wide range of interrelated historical processes and cultural phenomena (from fashion to modern warfare), it can also refer to the subjective or existential experience of the conditions they

produce, and their ongoing impact on human culture, institutions, and politics (Berman 2010, 15–36). See Section 1.2

2. Liberal feminism is an individualistic form of feminist theory, which focuses on women's ability to maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Liberal feminists argue that society holds the false belief that women are, by nature, less intellectually and physically capable than men; thus it tends to discriminate against women in the academy, the forum, and the marketplace. Liberal feminists believe that "female subordination is rooted in a set of customary and legal constraints that blocks women's entrance to and success in the so-called public world". They strive for sexual equality via political and legal reform. Liberal feminism is contrasted with radical feminism

Check Your Progress 2

1. This assessment is situated within the context of the debate about the relevance of traditional leadership institutions or alternatively culture in the twin processes of democratisation and decentralisation. While one side of the debate dismisses them as sheer obstacles, the other side argues that they are a resource that can be tapped into in order to effectively domesticate the reforms, since traditional leaders embody values and virtues of political accountability, transparency and probity. The underlying argument of this article is that while research findings demonstrate that traditional leaders have indeed the potential to play a midwife role in the efforts to domesticate and customize the reforms to the exigencies of local conditions, their ill material circumstances render them overwhelmingly easy targets for politicians bent on satisfying their own strategic political considerations.
2. The nature of capitalist organization or of the modern nation-state also do not offer a complete explanation for women’s exclusion from the political, this group of feminists would argue that it is

the existence of male power in the form of patriarchy that is responsible for the marginalization of women from the political sphere. This radical feminist point of view has argued that men's power is not confined to the public world alone, but characterizes all relationships between sexes- from the most intimate to the most public. From this vantage point, the family is as culpable as the capitalist market in the creation and perpetuation of a political/non-political divide with unequal, damaging and dangerous consequences for women. Thus, the family, community, religion, or the market, government and the state all come to be seen as agents of patriarchy. See Section 1.4

3. See Section 1.6 and 1.7

UNIT 2: LIBERAL FEMINISM

STRUCTURE

2.0 OBJECTIVES

After finishing this unit, we can able to know:

- Liberal Feminism
- Personal Autonomy
- Political Autonomy
- Justification
- Historical Sources
- Classical-Liberal or Libertarian Feminism
- Equity Feminism

- Cultural Libertarian Feminism

2.1 INTRODUCTION

Liberal feminism conceives of freedom as personal autonomy—living a life of one's own choosing—and political autonomy—being co-author of the conditions under which one lives. Liberal feminists hold that the exercise of personal autonomy depends on certain enabling conditions that are insufficiently present in women's lives, or that social arrangements often fail to respect women's personal autonomy and other elements of women's flourishing. They hold also that women's needs and interests are insufficiently reflected in the basic conditions under which they live, and that those conditions lack legitimacy because women are inadequately represented in the processes of democratic self-determination. Liberal feminists hold that autonomy deficits like these are due to the "gender system" (Okin 1989, 89), or the patriarchal nature of inherited traditions and institutions, and that the women's movement should work to identify and remedy them. As the protection and promotion of citizens' autonomy is the appropriate role of the state on the liberal view, liberal feminists hold that the state can and should be the women's movement's ally in promoting women's autonomy. There is disagreement among liberal feminists, however, about the role of personal autonomy in the good life, the appropriate role of the state, and how liberal feminism is to be justified.

2.2 LIBERAL FEMINISM

2.2.1 Personal Autonomy

1. Procedural Accounts of Personal Autonomy

Liberal feminists hold that women should enjoy personal autonomy. That is, they hold that women should live lives of their own choosing. Some offer "procedural" accounts of personal autonomy (MacKenzie and

Stoljar discuss these, 1999, 13–19). These accounts suggest that to say women should enjoy personal autonomy means they are entitled to a broad range of autonomy-enabling conditions. On this view, the women's movement should work to identify and promote these conditions. Identifying these enabling conditions requires careful attention to the particular ways in which autonomy deficits are produced in diverse women's lives. Procedural accounts avoid judging directly the substance of women's choices or the arrangements that ensue. The following list of enabling conditions is representative.

Being free of violence and the threat of violence: Violence and the threat of violence violate women's dignity; they make women do what others want or reduce women's sphere of activity to avoiding harm. In some cases violence fractures the self and takes from women their sense of self-respect (Brison 1997). The feminist literature on violence against women documents the particular role that violence and the threat of violence play in unfairly disempowering and limiting women (Cudd 2006, 85–118).

Being free of the limits set by patriarchal paternalistic and moralistic laws: Patriarchal paternalistic laws restrict women's options on the grounds that such limits are in women's interest. Think for example of laws that limit women's employment options on the grounds that taking certain jobs is not in women's interest (Smith 2004). Patriarchal moralistic laws restrict women's options on the grounds that certain options should not be available to women because morality forbids women's choosing them. Think for example of laws that prohibit or restrict prostitution or abortion, or laws that favor certain kinds of sexual expression or family forms (Cornell 1998; Brake 2004). Together, patriarchal paternalistic and moralistic laws steer women into socially preferred ways of life. These are unfair restrictions on women's choices, on the liberal feminist view, because women's choices should be guided by their own sense of their self-interest and by their own values. (But see Chambers (2008, 203–231) for liberal feminist uses of paternalism.)

Having access to options: On the liberal feminist view, women are entitled to access to options (Alstott 2004, 52). Women's access to options is frequently and unfairly restricted due to economic deprivation, in particular due to the "feminization of poverty" (Pearce 1978; see also Cudd 2006, 119–154). Other sources of unfairly reduced options for women are stereotyping and sex discrimination in education and employment (Smith 2004; Rhode 1997). Such stereotyping and discrimination affects some racial, ethnic and cultural groups in particularly pernicious ways. Liberal feminists also point to the way cultural homogeneity unfairly limits women's options (Cudd 2006, 234), for example when culture assigns identities and social roles according to sex (Okin 1989, 170ff; Alstott 2004; Meyers 2004; Cornell 1998, x; Chambers 2008).

Some emphasize the importance of internal, psychological enabling conditions as well, for example the ability to assess one's own preferences and imagine life otherwise (Meyers 2002, 168; Cudd 2006, 234–235; MacKenzie 1999). Without the ability to assess the preferences on the basis of which one makes choices, and the ability to imagine life otherwise, one can't meaningfully be said to have options other than affirming the status quo (see also Chambers 2008, 263–4). These internal enabling conditions are related to the external ones. Violence and the threat of violence, stereotyping and discrimination, material deprivation, and cultural homogeneity all can have the effect of closing down reflection and imagination.

On this view, the women's movement should work to identify and promote autonomy-enabling conditions. Identifying these conditions requires careful attention to the particular ways in which autonomy deficits are produced in women's lives. On the liberal feminist view, the state has an important role to play in promoting these conditions. But there is much that cannot be done by the state (Cudd 2006, 223). For example, while the state can refrain from blocking such endeavors, women themselves must develop new "alternative emancipatory imagery" (Meyers 2002, 168), and fashion new ways of being a woman

and new kinds of relationships through experiments in living (Cudd 2006, 234; Cornell 1998).

Some critics argue that freedom is of limited value because, even when enabling conditions like these are in place, women may choose limiting and disadvantaging social arrangements. Some point to the phenomenon of deformed preferences: when attractive options are limited or arrangements unfair, people may develop preferences for those limits or for less than their fair share (Nussbaum 1999a, 33, 50; Cudd 2006, 152). This phenomenon makes changing preferences through increased freedom problematic, and leads some feminists to reject theories that prioritize free choice (Yuracko 2003). Advocates of procedural accounts of autonomy concede that the enabling conditions do not rule out that a woman could choose, for example, to undergo clitorectomy (Meyers 2004, 213) or become a pornographic model (Cudd 2004, 58). As Ann Cudd explains, possibilities like these must be accepted because liberal feminism values freedom and thus cannot advocate direct "preference education" (Cudd 2004, 57). Liberal feminism must offer only a "… gradualist approach. Individuals and groups will make various experiments in living that we cannot now precisely imagine. They will sometimes go on a mistaken path" (57). But they must be freed up to find their own way. As Diana Meyers explains, the moral imagination of feminist theorists and activists is limited (as is everyone's); they cannot know with certainty what substantive choices are compatible with personal autonomy (Meyers 2004, 213). Moreover, one should expect autonomous lives to take diverse forms in diverse cultural contexts. On this view, "a morally defensible and politically viable conception of autonomy for an era of global feminism" must be agnostic about the content of women's choices as long as they do not close off autonomy (205).

2. Fairness in Personal Relationships

Some liberal feminists hold that the social arrangements of personal life should not only be freely chosen, but should be characterized by fairness

or justice. Jean Hampton draws on the contractualist tradition in moral and political philosophy to describe one way in which heterosexual intimate relationships often fail to be fair or just (Hampton 1993). (For extended discussion of Hampton's feminism, see Abbey 2011, 120–151. For more on feminist uses of contractualism.

On Hampton's view, a personal relationship is fair only if both parties to it could "reasonably accept the distribution of costs and benefits (that is, the costs and benefits that are not themselves side effects of any affective or duty-based tie between us) if it were the subject of an informed, unforced agreement in which we think of ourselves as motivated solely by self-interest" (Hampton 1993, 240). Of course, many women choose to enter or remain in relationships in part because of affective benefits; for example women often get satisfaction from satisfying others or fulfilling a duty. Why set aside these affective benefits, as Hampton recommends, when evaluating the fairness of a relationship? Hampton does not set them aside out of a conviction that a woman's affective nature is not part of her essential self. Nor does she set them aside out of a conviction that this aspect of a woman's nature is not valuable. (For criticism of Hampton, see Sample 2002.) Her test sets them aside because affective benefits of relationships are not received from the other; they are benefits that flow from one's own nature (Radzik 2005, 51). Thus while they may, and probably should, figure in a woman's overall decision about whether to enter or remain in a particular relationship, Hampton believes they should not figure in the evaluation of a relationship's fairness. As Linda Radzik explains in her defense of Hampton, a relationship is fair or just if the benefits that flow from each to the other are on par, that is, if each gives as much as she gets (51). When one party gets from the other significantly more than he gives, he is denying the other her legitimate entitlement to reciprocation.

This test formalizes an important insight of the women's movement: personal relationships, in particular traditional heterosexual relationships, are often unfair to women, indeed often exploit women's tendency to care about others. Injustice of this sort is not uncommon. Thus Hampton's test

invites criticism of a wide swath of human social life (Sample 2002, 271). But Hampton does not call on women to cease valuing others' satisfaction or the fulfillment of duty (Hampton 1993, 227). Instead, she calls on the women's movement to cultivate in women and men a sensitivity and an aversion to this kind of injustice, and to develop remedies.

Procedural accounts of personal autonomy do not require that relationships be just in the way Hampton recommends. According to procedural accounts, it is possible that a choice to enter or remain in a personal relationship in which one gives more than she gets from the other can be autonomous. Therefore, according to procedural accounts, liberal feminists should focus on ensuring that women are not pressured into or unable to exit them.

To be sure, Hampton's account of justice in personal relationships can be a resource to women and men reflecting on their own preferences. It invites reflection on how one's own preferences affect the distribution of benefits and burdens within a relationship. Also, moral criticism of relationships that exploit women's preferences reminds us that relationships can be otherwise (because ought implies can). This reminder enhances personal autonomy by broadening the imagination. Thus procedural accounts of personal autonomy can include Hampton's test, not as definitive of the acceptability of social arrangements, but as a contribution to the kind of reflection about the good life on which the personal autonomy of individuals depends.

3. Personal Autonomy and Human Flourishing

Martha Nussbaum proposes an account of the good life that has “at its heart, a profoundly liberal idea … the idea of the citizen as a free and dignified human being, a maker of choices” (Nussbaum 1999a, 46). Echoing procedural accounts of personal autonomy (section 1.1.1), Nussbaum explains: “If one cares about people's powers to choose a conception of the good, then one must care about the rest of the form of

life that supports those powers" (45). But for Nussbaum personal autonomy is merely one of the "major human functionings" (43) which define "a good human life" (42). These functionings include, among other things, bodily health and integrity, affiliation, and political participation (41–42). To be sure, personal autonomy, or in Nussbaum's words "practical reason," is a good that "suffuses all the other functions" (44). But personal autonomy is not prioritized. A good life is one in which one is able to enjoy all of the major human functionings, that is, to flourish.

Nussbaum's approach takes on the problem of deformed preferences directly. To be sure, some may choose lives that do not include the actual exercise of some of the functionings—an ascetic may choose to compromise bodily health. But, Nussbaum explains, one must be able to function in each of these ways. Social arrangements are to be criticized if they render their participants unable to function in the valued ways regardless of their preferences (50). The women's movement should sensitize women and men to the injustice of denying women the ability to function in these valued ways, identify arrangements that are unjust to women by paying careful attention to diverse women's lives, and recommend remedies. Nussbaum holds that her account is compatible with global moral pluralism and thus may function as a foundation for a global feminism (Nussbaum 1999a, 40).

Nussbaum's "capabilities approach" may be compared with procedural accounts of autonomy. Procedural accounts suggest that the women's movement should work to protect and promote women's ability to live lives of their own choosing by identifying particular autonomy deficits in women's lives and promoting the conditions that enable autonomy. These approaches avoid directly judging the substance of the choices women make or the arrangements that result. They leave it to individuals and groups to fashion new, diverse, non-oppressive ways of life. The list of enabling conditions for personal autonomy is not unlike Nussbaum's list of human functionings. But advocates of procedural approaches may worry that the goal of the women's movement, according to the

capabilities approach, is to bring to women a particular way of life, namely one in which women can function in these ways, instead of freeing women up to find their own way (Cudd 2004, 50). As Drucilla Cornell, an advocate of a procedural approach explains, "social equality [should be] redefined so as to serve freedom" (Cornell 1998, xii) because "there is nothing more fundamental for a human being" (17; see also Cudd 2004, 51–52). Procedural accounts of autonomy can include Nussbaum's approach, not as definitive of the kinds of lives women should live, but as an important contribution to the kind of reflection on the good life on which personal autonomy depends. (There is a large literature on Nussbaum's liberal feminism; for liberal feminist discussion, see for example Abbey 2011 152–205; and Robeyns 2007.)

4. Personal Autonomy and the State

There is substantial agreement among liberal feminists that the gender system, or the patriarchal nature of inherited traditions and institutions, plays an important role in perpetuating morally objectionable deficits in personal autonomy in women's lives, and that the state can and should take action to remedy them. There is also substantial agreement among liberal feminists concerning what the state should do. There is disagreement about some hard cases, however, that pit liberal values against one another.

Liberal feminists hold that the state must effectively protect women from violence, regardless of where that violence takes place (Cudd 2006, 85–118, 209; Rhode 1997, 1193–95). They also hold that sexist paternalistic and moralistic laws are an unjust use of state power. Such laws place control over women's lives in the hands of others and steer women into preferred ways of life. Laws restricting access to abortion are of particular import in this context because they take an extremely momentous choice away from women, and together with the cultural assignment of caregiving duties to women, steer women into the social role of mother. Women must have a legal right to abortion and meaningful access to abortion services. In addition, liberal feminists hold

that the state must not grant preferential treatment to particular family forms (Brake 2004, 293; Lloyd 1995, 1328; McClain 2006, 60). Some argue that this means giving gay and lesbian partnerships the same recognition currently available to heterosexuals (McClain 2006, 6; Hartley and Watson 2011). Others argue for removing marriage's privileged legal status altogether or treating it legally more like other associations (Case 2006; Metz 2010).

Liberals tend to reject laws prohibiting prostitution. They advocate instead the legal regulation of the sex trade prioritizing women's safety and women's control over their own working conditions (Cornell 1998, 57; Nussbaum 2002, 90). They support the right to collective bargaining to secure decent wages and working conditions (Cornell 1998, 57; Cudd 2006, 211), as well as a guaranteed minimum income (Cudd 2006, 154). They also support laws against sex discrimination in education, employment, and public accommodations. According to liberal feminists, the refusal to hire or promote a woman or do business with her because she is a woman is a morally objectionable limit on her options. So are workplaces that are hostile to women. Liberal feminists argue that laws prohibiting sexual harassment, and requiring affirmative action and comparable worth policies are often called for to remedy past and ongoing sex discrimination (Williams 2000, 253).

Liberal feminists hold also that a significant source of women's reduced options is the structure of the workplace, which assumes that workers are free of caregiving responsibilities (Okin 1989, 176; Williams 2000). Women, and increasingly men, do not fit this model. The effect of not fitting the model is dramatic. As Anne L. Alstott explains: “Caretakers at every income level have fewer options than noncaretakers at the same income level” (Alstott 2004, 97). She continues: “I am worried that child-rearing too dramatically contracts the options among which mothers can choose” (23). Alstott and others argue that the state must ensure that the socially essential work of providing care to dependents does not unreasonably interfere with the personal autonomy of caregivers. Policies proposed to ensure sufficient personal autonomy for

caregivers include parental leave, state subsidized, high quality day care, and flexible work schedules (Cudd 2006, 228; Okin 1989, 175). Some recommend financial support for caregivers (Alstott 2004, 75ff), others suggest guaranteeing a non-wage-earning spouse one half of her wage-earning spouse's paycheck (Okin 1989, 181).

But workplaces fail to accommodate the socially essential caregiving work of their employees in various ways. Thus Joan Williams has argued for legal recognition of the right to not be discriminated against in employment on the basis of one's caregiving responsibilities. Williams recommends, if necessary, legal action alleging failure to recognize this right as an incentive to employers to accommodate caregivers (Williams 2000, 274).

There is disagreement among liberal feminists about some hard cases that pit liberal values against one another. Liberal feminists tend to reject legal limits on pornography (Cornell 1998, 57–58). But some hold that arguments for restricting violent pornography are not unreasonable (Laden 2003, 148–149; Watson 2007, 469; for what such a not unreasonable argument might look like, see Eaton 2007), and that the best arguments for freedom of expression fail to show that it should not be limited (Brison 1998). Indeed some argue that violent pornography can undermine the autonomy of viewers (Scoccia 1996) and the status of women as equal citizens (Spaulding 1988–89).

Other hard cases concern the role of the state in family life. Family life has dramatic effects on the personal autonomy of its adult members. Assuming the role of caregiver, for example, dramatically contracts women's options. On a liberal feminist view, the state has an interest in ensuring that family life does not undermine women's personal autonomy. Some hold that the state should promote justice in the family—for example, the sharing of paid and unpaid labor by its adult members (Okin 1989, 171). Others hold that the state may not be guided by a substantive ideal of family life (Alstott 2004, 114; see also Nussbaum 2000, 279–280; and Wolf-Devine 2004).

Girls' participation in families is, especially in the early years, nonvoluntary. The family affects the development of girls' sense of self-worth, as well as their preferences, and the capacities, like the capacity for reflection and imagination, on which their ability to live lives of their own choosing depends (Okin 1989, 97). Liberal feminists hold that the state must protect and promote the development of autonomy capacities in children, especially girls. For example they hold that child-marriage should be legally prohibited (McClain 2006, 79); girls should have access to abortion without parental consent or notification (Rhode 1994, 1204); girls must receive a formal education free of sexist stereotyping, including instruction in the legal equality of women (McClain 2006, 81; Lloyd 1995, 1332), including autonomy-promoting sex education (McClain 2006, 57–58), and ensuring that girls are prepared to be economically independent (Lloyd 1995, 1332). Beyond this some hold that girls' interest in developing autonomy capacities requires that families be internally just, that is, that there be an equal division of paid and unpaid labor between adults, so that families are not characterized by "dependence and domination" (Okin 1989, 99–100; see also Follesdal 2005). Others are not convinced that there is a necessary connection between this kind of justice in families and the development of girls' autonomy capacities (Lloyd 1995, 1335–1343), and hold that the state may not be guided by a substantive ideal of family life (Alstott 2004, 114; see also Nussbaum 2000a, 279–280; and Wolf-Devine 2004). (See section 1.2.1 for more discussion of this issue).

2.2.2 Political Autonomy

Some liberal feminists emphasize the importance of political autonomy, that is, being co-author of the conditions under which one lives. Some use contractualist political theory to argue that the state should ensure that the basic structure of society satisfies principles of justice that women, as well as men, could endorse. Others argue that the democratic legitimacy of the basic conditions under which citizens live depends on

the inclusion of women in the processes of public deliberation and electoral politics.

1. Distributive Justice

Some liberal feminists, inspired by John Rawls' contractualist liberal theory of justice (Rawls 1971; 1993), argue that the state should ensure that the basic structure of society distributes the benefits and burdens of social cooperation fairly, that is, in a manner that women as well as men could endorse (Alstott 2004; Baehr 2004; Bojer 2002; Lloyd 1998; McClain 2006; Okin 1989; Thompson 1993; for an overview of feminist responses to Rawls, see Abbey 2013). They argue that the basic structure currently distributes benefits and burdens unfairly, in part due to the gender system, or the patriarchal nature of inherited traditions and institutions.

As Rawls puts it, the basic structure of society is: "The way in which the major social institutions distribute fundamental rights and duties and determine the division of advantages from social cooperation. By major institutions I understand the political constitution and the principal economic and social arrangements…Competitive markets and the monogamous family [are] examples of major social institutions… The basic structure is the primary subject of justice because its effects are so profound and present from the start. The intuitive notion here is that this structure contains various social positions and that men born into different positions have different expectations of life determined, in part, by the political system as well as by economic and social circumstances. In this way the institutions of society favor certain starting places over others" (Rawls 1971, 6–7).

Rawls argues that the fairness of the basic structure of society may be assessed by asking what principles representatives of citizens (parties) would choose to determine the distribution of primary goods in society if they were behind a "veil of ignorance" (Rawls 1971, 12). The veil of ignorance blocks from the parties knowledge of their place in society: for

example their socio-economic status, religion, and sex. (Rawls does not include sex in A Theory of Justice (Rawls 1971), but adds it in "Fairness to Goodness" (Rawls 1975, 537).) Susan Okin proposes we "take seriously both the notion that those behind the veil of ignorance do not know what sex they are and the requirement that the family and the gender system, as basic social institutions, are to be subject to scrutiny" (Okin 1989, 101).

Rawls argues that parties behind the veil of ignorance would choose two principles: a liberty principle providing for the "most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all;" and a principle of equality requiring equality of opportunity, and permitting inequalities only if they are to the benefit of the least well off (Rawls 1971, 302–303).

Okin argues that the "gender system" violates both the liberty and equality of opportunity principles because by effectively assigning roles to citizens according to sex it circumvents citizens' "free choice of occupation" (Okin 1989, 103). On Okin's view, this means that in a just society "gender could no longer form a legitimate part of the social structure, whether inside or outside the family" (103). None of the institutions of the basic structure, including the family, could assign roles according to sex. It is common to argue that the state, educational institutions, and workplaces should not assign roles according to sex. But Okin argues that this applies to the family as well. Gender blindness must play the same role in the family that it plays in these institutions. In Okin's words, there must be "congruence" between the principles that govern these institutions and those that govern family life. That is, families must be just.

Okin offers a second argument to support the claim that families must be just. Rawls explains that a society based on his two principles of justice can be stable because within it citizens develop a sense of justice (Rawls 1971, 453ff). For our purposes consider that citizens must develop the conviction that citizens generally are due the rights of equal citizenship.

Okin argues that when children are raised within unjust families, families which lack "equality and reciprocity," and are characterized by "dependence and domination," they are not likely to develop the requisite sense of justice (Okin 1989, 99–100; see also McClain 2006, 73–84). Instead, girls and boys and may grow to believe that women are not entitled to equal citizenship. Therefore, if the society governed by Rawls' two principles of justice is to be stable, families must be just.

Other feminists apply contractualist political philosophy inspired by Rawls to the problem of justice for women but draw slightly different conclusions from Okin. S.A. Lloyd (1998), Anne L. Alstott (2004) and Linda C. McClain (2006) each argue that a basically Rawlsian contractualist argument supports the claim that the current disadvantages women suffer as a result of their shouldering a disproportionate share of the burdens of social reproduction must be remedied by state action. All three endorse many of Okin's policy proposals (Lloyd 1995, 1332; 1998, 218; Alstott 2004). But they reject Okin's claim that the state should promote a particular substantive ideal of family life (Lloyd 1995, 1340–1341; Lloyd 1998, 218; McClain 2006, 78). Alstott writes: "The egalitarian family is, even in principle, a troubling ideal. Strictly equal sharing seems unduly constraining, not merely because families today deviate from the idea, but because free people might want to organize their lives differently" (Alstott 2004, 113). Other liberal feminists have voiced similar concerns. Ann Cudd worries that state action intended to promote gender fairness and foster women's autonomy could impose a homogenizing conception of the good life, and stifle the very reinventions of self and experiments in living that women's liberation requires (Cudd 2006, 209, 223; see also Wolf-Devine 2004). Elizabeth Anderson writes: "The plurality of conceptions of the good that are likely to survive in a world in which the state has done all it can be reasonably and justly expected to do will include a host of unreasonable conceptions of the good, some of which may well be patriarchal. In the face of such injustices, liberals counsel feminists to redirect their claims from the state to those promulgating such unreasonable conceptions of the good, and to redirect their activism from a focus on state action to other

domains, including civil society, churches, and the family. I think this counsel is wise, which is why I am a liberal feminist" (Anderson 2009, 131; see also 141–144).

2. Public Deliberation and Electoral Politics

Some liberal feminists, who emphasize the importance of political autonomy—that women be co-authors of the conditions under which they live—focus in particular on participation in the processes of democratic self-determination. These processes include both political deliberation in the many arenas of public political discourse, and electoral politics. Liberal feminists hold that the conditions under which women live lack legitimacy because women are inadequately represented in these processes. They hold that this political autonomy deficit is, in large part, due to the "gender system" (Okin 1989, 89), or the patriarchal nature of inherited traditions and institutions, and that the women's movement should work to identify and remedy it.

Attempts to increase women's participation in public deliberation and electoral politics confront a vicious circle of women's exclusion. The gender system leads to women's being underrepresented in influential forums of public deliberation, including in elected law-making bodies. For example women have less free time to engage in public deliberation because of the double-burden they carry of paid and unpaid labor; sex stereotyping leads many to think that women (especially women from particular ethnic and cultural groups) are less capable of leadership than men; the behavior called for in agonistic public deliberation and electoral politics is understood to be masculine; issues of particular interest to women are seen as personal and not political issues; women lack power in the many institutions (like churches, universities, and think tanks) that influence political debate, etc. But when women are underrepresented in these forums and law-making bodies, it is unlikely that the justice of the gender system will become the subject of public conversation or its dismantling a target of legislative action.

Some liberal feminists explore ways to escape this vicious circle. Because women are excluded from important forums of public deliberation and electoral politics in complex ways, remedies must address a variety of problems. Justice in the distribution of benefits and burdens in society would go some way towards enabling women to access forums of public debate on equal terms with men (Okin 1989, 104). But cultural change is necessary as well if stereotypes about women's abilities are not to interfere with their participation, if women's needs and interests are to be understood as legitimate claims on democratic power, and if men's dominance in institutions of influence is to be overcome. Seyla Benhabib argues that the women's movement, along with other new social movements like the gay and lesbian liberation movement, has begun this work (Benhabib 1992). While much of this change is cultural and must come about through civic action, the state has a role to play. Linda McClain argues that all children must receive civic education—to equip them for democratic citizenship—including instruction in women's equality (McClain 2006, 81). She also argues that the state may use its persuasive power to put traditionally excluded issues, like violence against women or the dilemma of balancing work and family, on the agenda for public deliberation (78).

Others take on the vicious circle of women's exclusion by recommending legal mechanisms for the inclusion of women in electoral politics (see Rhode 1994, 1205–1208; Peters 2006; Phillips 1991). Some suggest that legal mechanisms for including those who have been systematically excluded may be justified as remedies for the unjust disproportionate political power enjoyed by others (Phillips 2004, 6–10). Suggested mechanisms include targets or quotas for women (and other underrepresented groups) on party slates, or proportional representation in elected bodies. Karen Green, for example, argues for "guaranteed equal representation of both sexes in parliament" (Green 2006). There is diversity of opinion, however, among liberal feminists about the justice and efficacy of such mechanisms (Peters 2006; see also Rhode 1994, 1205).

2.2.3 Justification

We can distinguish between comprehensive liberal feminisms and political liberal feminisms (or feminist political liberalisms). The distinction between political and comprehensive doctrines in political theory is due to Rawls (1993) but has been taken up by some liberal feminists in recent years. (For explicit discussion of the distinction in liberal feminism, see for example Abbey 2007; 2011, 72–82, 226–247; Baehr 2008; 2013; Chambers 2008, 159–201; Enslin 2003; Hartley and Watson 2010; Lloyd 1998; Neufeld 2009; Neufeld and Schoelandt 2013; Nussbaum 1999b, 108; 2000b, 76 fn38; Okin 1994; 1999, 129–130; and Watson 2007).

Comprehensive liberal feminisms are grounded in moral doctrines. Liberal feminisms typically give accounts of how state power should be used to feminist ends; so a comprehensive liberal feminism typically includes the claim that state power should be used to some particular feminist ends because some moral doctrine requires it. A comprehensive liberal feminism typically gives an account of how part of associational life—beyond what is traditionally understood as 'the political'—should be arranged, for example that the family should foster women's and girls' personal autonomy, or that domestic associations should distribute benefits and burdens fairly. Some comprehensive liberal feminisms focus primarily on associational life and only peripherally on the role of the state. Comprehensive liberal feminist accounts of how associational life generally should be arranged may, but need not, include the claim that the state ought to enforce such arrangements. There is nothing about grounding in a moral doctrine that forces a comprehensive liberal feminism to include the claim that the state should enforce liberal feminist values outside of what is traditionally understood as 'the political.' To be sure, comprehensive liberal feminisms typically do this. The reason is that comprehensive liberal feminisms typically reject the traditional public/private distinction, and hold that the political justice liberalism promises for women can be realized only when associational life—the family, for example—does not undermine girls' and women's

personal autonomy, or distribute benefits and burdens unfairly. (But note that to reject the traditional public/private distinction is not to reject any and all such distinctions.)

Political liberal feminisms (or feminist political liberalisms) are accounts of how state power should be used to feminist ends that are grounded in public political values. Public political values are not the particular values of any one moral doctrine; they are values that are shared by the many reasonable comprehensive moral doctrines citizens hold (Rawls 1993, 227–230). Advocates of political liberal feminism hold that state power is used justly when supported by values that are endorsable by all reasonable citizens. Like comprehensive liberal feminists, political liberal feminists typically reject the traditional public/private distinction. Thus they typically hold that public values can justify using state power to compensate for, or even to dismantle, patriarchal (and other disadvantaging) hierarchies that are pervasive in associational life. (Again, to reject the traditional public/private distinction is not to reject any and all such distinctions.)

2.2.4 Historical Sources

Liberal feminism is part of, and thus finds its roots in, the larger tradition of liberal political philosophy; thus we see much liberal feminist work inspired by Immanuel Kant, John Stuart Mill, and John Rawls (and other figures in this tradition). But liberal feminism shares with feminist political philosophy generally a concern with understanding the "gender system" (Okin 1989, 89), that is, the patriarchal nature of inherited traditions and institutions, so that it might recommend a remedy. To get a good picture of that system, liberal feminists draw broadly from the rich tradition of feminist theorizing. For example, some liberal feminists draw on radical feminist insights into the nature of violence against women (Nussbaum 1999a) and into the nature of gender identity (Chambers 2008m 43–80); some draw on psychoanalytic feminist theory (Meyers 2002; Cornell 2003); some on socialist feminist work on women's

exploitation in the home (Anderson 2004; Gheaus 2008); and some on feminist theories of care (Alstott 2004; Bhandary 2010).

2.2.5 Criticism

Some argue that liberal feminisms run the risk of being insufficiently liberal. Measures intended to promote gender fairness and the autonomy of women could end up unreasonably hindering autonomy (Cudd 2006, 223). Some argue that Susan Okin's claim that the state should be guided by an egalitarian ideal of family life is an example of such a measure. Other measures recommended by liberal feminists that some hold may be illiberal include quotas on party slates or in elected bodies (Peters 2006) and bans on violent pornography.

Classical liberals or libertarians are critical of liberal feminisms because, on their view, liberalism cannot support the claim that the right of some against coercive interference may be violated in order to promote the autonomy capacities of others, such as we find in affirmative action programs, or in the substantial taxation that would be necessary to fund the social programs liberal feminists endorse (Epstein 2002; Tomasi 2009).

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss about Liberal Feminism.

   ……

   ……

   ……

2. Discuss the Criticism.

   ……

   ……

2.3 CLASSICAL-LIBERAL OR LIBERTARIAN FEMINISM

Classical-liberal feminism or libertarian feminism (these terms will be used interchangeably here—see fn. 1) conceives of freedom as freedom from coercive interference. It holds that women, as well as men, have a right to such freedom due to their status as self-owners. It holds that coercive state power is justified only to the extent necessary to protect the right to freedom from coercive interference. Equity feminists are classical-liberal or libertarian feminists who hold that, in societies like the United States, the only morally significant source of oppression of women is the state. They hold that feminism's political role is to bring an end to laws that limit women's liberty in particular, but also to laws that grant special privileges to women. Some equity feminists see a nonpolitical role for feminism, helping women to benefit from their freedom by developing beneficial character traits or strategies for success, or navigating among their increasing options. Other equity feminists are socially conservative and argue that, while the state should not enforce them, traditional values function as bulwarks against state power and produce independent and self-restraining citizens. Cultural libertarian feminists are classical-liberal or libertarian feminists who hold that the culture of societies like the United States is patriarchal and a significant source of oppression of women. They hold that the patriarchal culture and the state are complementary systems of oppression. Cultural libertarian feminists hold that much of the oppression women suffer today is noncoercive, however, and thus should not be met with state remedies but with a nonviolent movement for feminist social change.

2.3.1 Equity Feminism

Equity feminism is a form of classical-liberal or libertarian feminism that holds that feminism's political role is simply to ensure that everyone's, including women's, right against coercive interference is respected (Sommers 1994, 22). Wendy McElroy, an equity feminist writes: “I've

always maintained that the only reason I call myself a feminist is because of [the] gov[ernment]. By which I mean, if the government (or an anarchist defense assoc[iation]) acknowledged the full equal rights of women without paternalistic protection or oppression, I would stop writing about women's issues" (McElroy 1998c).

Feminism's political role involves assuring that women's right against coercive interference by private individuals is recognized and protected by the state (for example women's right against groping on the street or rape within marriage (McElroy 1991a)), and that women's right against coercive interference by the state itself is respected. The latter means feminists should object to laws that restrict women's liberty in particular (for example laws that limit women's employment options (Taylor 1992, 228)), and laws that protect women in particular (for example laws granting preferential treatment to women (Paul 1989)). Equity feminists suggest that this has been largely accomplished in countries like the United States. Joan Kennedy Taylor explains: feminism's "goal of equal political liberty for women has been pretty much reached in the United States" (Taylor 2001; see also Sommers 1994, 274).

If women are to be described as currently oppressed in societies like the United States, on the equity feminist view, one must show that the state fails to protect women, as a group, from sustained and systematic rights violations. Some feminists have argued that violence against women is pervasive in societies like the United States so that, even though the law recognizes women's right against it, that right is insufficiently protected, and thus women endure sustained and systematic denial of their right to bodily integrity (Dworkin 1991). Equity feminists endeavor to refute this claim by showing that the prevalence of violence against women has been exaggerated. For example Rita Simon contests the claim that as many as 154 out of 1,000 women have been raped. On her accounting, the number is closer to 19 per 1,000; and "rape is less common than other violent crimes"(Simon 2002, 235). In addition, she claims, "the criminal justice system does not ignore or make light of crimes against females"(Simon 2002, 236). Katie Roiphe argues that date rape is not a

significant threat to women (Roiphe 1994). Concurring with Roiphe, Cathy Young writes: "women have sex after initial reluctance for a number of reasons … fear of being beaten up by their dates is rarely reported as one of them" (Young 1992).

Women have also been said to be oppressed because their right to be treated the same as men by employers, educational institutions, and associations has been violated in a sustained and systematic way. That is, some argue, women have been regularly denied the right to equal access to opportunities because they are women. Equity feminists generally hold that no rights are violated when employers, educational institutions, public accommodations or associations discriminate against women. Nonetheless, equity feminists argue that discrimination against women is not a serious problem. Diana Furchtgott-Roth and Christine Stolba argue that "complaints about systematic economic discrimination against women simply do not square with the evidence" (Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999, xi; see also 2001). They argue that "women's wages and education levels are closing the gap with those of men" (xii). In addition, Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth claim that women have "surpassed men in education". Christina Hoff Sommers concurs, arguing that, rather than failing to provide girls with an education equal to that of boys, our current educational system disproportionately benefits girls (Sommers 2000, 20–23, 178).

Equity feminists argue that the differences in outcomes between women and men can be explained, not by violence against women and sex discrimination, but by differences in the preferences of women and men (Epstein 2002, 33; Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999, xii). "In many cases where women remain behind men, personal choices explain outcomes more readily than does overt discrimination" (Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999, xii). To be sure, classical-liberal or libertarian feminists hold that women and men are sufficiently the same that they have the "same political interests," in particular the interest in being treated as a self-owner (McElroy 2002, 14–15). But, for some equity feminists, biological differences between the sexes largely explain the sex segregation in the

workplace and in family roles still common in countries like the United States (Epstein 2002; Lehrman 1997, 5, 31).

Other equity feminists think biological sex differences alone do not explain this phenomenon (Young 2004). Women's preferences may reflect the effects of socialization or incentives: for example women may be socialized to prefer stereotypically female roles, or the rewards associated with such roles for women may provide motivation for women to take them up. But equity feminists hold that, because women are not legally required, or actually forced in some other way, to choose traditional roles, their choices are not coerced, and thus state remedies are inappropriate. On the equity feminist view, a law prohibiting women to become surgeons is coercive because it constitutes a threat of loss of liberty or property. But if one is socialized to prefer stay-at-home motherhood, or one discovers that one prefers to stay home with children given the other real options, one may still choose to become a surgeon without risking loss of liberty or property. As Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth put it (using the word"prevents" in a very strong sense): "Nothingprevents women from choosing the surgical specialty"(Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999, 60; my emphasis).

2.3.2 Cultural Libertarian Feminism

Cultural libertarianism is a form of classical liberalism or libertarianism that is "concerned about constraints on individual freedom from government as well as from traditionalist familial, religious, and community institutions-the same civil institutions that conservatives see as necessary for ordered liberty to thrive"(Young 2007). Cultural libertarian feminism holds that these institutions reflect the patriarchal nature of society and are oppressive of women. Thus cultural libertarian feminism recognizes sources of women's oppression other than the state (Presley 2000; Johnson and Long 2005—see Other Internet Resources). As Charles Johnson and Roderick Long put it, patriarchal culture and the state are "interlocking systems of oppression" (Johnson and Long 2005—see Other Internet Resources), both of which should be opposed

by feminists. They explain: “There is nothing inconsistent or un-libertarian in holding that women's choices under patriarchal social structures can be sufficiently ‘voluntary,’ in the libertarian sense, to be entitled to immunity from coercive legislative interference, while at the same time being sufficiently ‘involuntary,’ in a broader sense, to be recognized as morally problematic and as a legitimate target of social activism” (Johnson and Long 2005—see Other Internet Resources).

Calling this view “anarchist feminism,” Sharon Presley writes: “What the anarchist feminists are calling for is a radical restructuring of society, both in its public and private institutions” (Presley 2000). Such feminists hold that much of the oppression women currently suffer is noncoercive, however. Laws against prostitution are coercive—the state can put a violator in jail or force her to pay a fine. But on the cultural libertarian feminist view, much of the pressure to conform to gender roles is not coercive. Noncoercive oppression can be resisted, although it is often not easy to do so. Cultural libertarian feminists hold that noncoercive oppression should not be remedied by the state (see also Tomasi 2009). As Presley and Kinsky explain, on the cultural libertarian view, to try to remedy the noncoercive oppression of women with coercive state action “just changes the sort of oppression, not the fact” (Presley and Kinsky 1991, 78). This oppression should be opposed by a nonviolent movement for feminist social change.

Cultural libertarian feminists target the patriarchal culture by, for example, developing in individuals (especially women) the ability to be independent. This involves enabling individuals to resist authority and think for themselves (Presley 2001). Cultural libertarian feminists also recommend the development of more deeply consensual relationships and institutions (Heckert 2004—see Other Internet Resources), relationships and institutions in which there is an equality of authority (Long 2001—see Other Internet Resources). While some equity feminists (see section 1.2) would applaud this work, they would call it “personal,” reserving the term “political” for the work of securing for women their right against coercive interference. Equity feminist Wendy

McElroy writes: “I understand that there is a cultural form of feminism and many women would still fight for improved prestige or status, and I wouldn't criticis[e] them for doing so. It just wouldn't grip me. Guess I'm a political animal after all”(McElroy 1998c). But cultural libertarian feminists consider this work to be an integral part of a larger political struggle for women's freedom.

2.3.3 Sources

Classical-liberal or libertarian feminists understand themselves as heirs to the first generation of feminist political philosophers, for example Mary Wollstonecraft, Harriet Taylor Mill, and John Stuart Mill (Taylor 1992, 25–39); the first generation of feminist political reformers in the United States, for example the abolitionist feminists Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Sarah Grimke (McElroy 2002, 6–7); and the tradition of 19th century anarchist feminism, including figures such as Voltairine de Cleyre (McElroy 2002, 8; Presley 2000; Presley and Sartwell 2005). Equity feminists stress the extent to which these early thinkers and activists identify women's liberation with equal respect for women's right against coercive interference (Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 2001, 1–2). Cultural libertarian feminists emphasize the extent to which these thinkers and activists challenged both coercive state power and the patriarchal culture (Presley 2000; Johnson and Long 2005—see Other Internet Resources).

Classical-liberal or libertarian feminists hold that “the very arguments that rightly led to the legal reforms affecting the status of women during the 19th century militate against the demands for reform from the late 20th century women's movement” (Epstein 2002, 30). That is, they hold that the defense of equal rights and independence for women promulgated by these early feminists is incompatible with the tendency of the contemporary women's movement to call on the state to improve the lives of women.

2.3.4 Anti-Discrimination Law and Preferential Treatment

Classical-liberal or libertarian feminism requires same treatment of women and men under just law. This means that sex discrimination by the state, for example when the state functions as an employer, is impermissible (Block 1991, 102; Epstein 2002, 34; Warnick 2003, 1608). But classical-liberal or libertarian feminists oppose laws that prohibit discrimination against women by nonstate actors, for example in employment, education, public accommodations, or associations (McElroy 1991a, 22–23; Epstein 1992). They hold that the interaction of citizens should be subject to state control only to the extent necessary to protect citizens' right against coercive interference. Businesses violate citizens' right against coercive interference if they steal from their customers or employees; associations violate it if they extort their members; colleges violate it if they kidnap students. But businesses do not violate this right if they refuse to do business with women, pay women less for the same work, or create a working environment that is hostile to them because of their sex. Private educational institutions do not violate this right if they refuse to educate girls or women, offer them an inferior education, or create a learning environment that is hostile to them because of their sex. Business and professional associations do not violate this right if they refuse to admit women as members or make them feel unwelcome because of their sex.

Classical-liberal or libertarian feminism, as described here, clearly implies rejection of legal prohibition of private discrimination in employment, education, public accommodations, and associations. But in the literature one finds a range of views. Some categorically reject any legal protection against private discrimination (Taylor 1992, 62). Others accept basic protections such as those afforded in U.S. law by the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972; but reject more robust protections, such as non-remedial affirmative action or comparable worth (Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 2001, 179; see also 107–108).

Classical-liberal or libertarian feminism holds that private businesses, educational institutions, and associations are free to give or withhold preferential treatment to women. But the state may not treat women preferentially because the state must treat citizens the same regardless of sex. Nor may the state require that private businesses, educational institutions, or associations treat women preferentially. This is because, on the equity feminist view, failure to treat women preferentially is not a violation of anyone's right against coercive interference. Examples of preferential treatment under the law, which classical-liberal or libertarian feminists oppose, include affirmative action in employment and education (Lehrman 1997, 25), comparable worth (Paul 1989), and advantages for women in the legal treatment of custody and domestic violence (Simon 2002).

While equity feminists resist state remedies for private discrimination against women, they also hold that such discrimination is not currently a serious problem in countries like the United States (see section 1.2.1). In addition, they argue, "even where discrimination may exist, we find little, if any, evidence that expanded government intervention would serve any useful purpose"(Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 1999, xii), and speculate that freer markets would make whatever discrimination currently takes place even more rare (McElroy 2002a, 187).

2.3.5 Justification

Why should individuals be treated as self-owners? Much of the classical-liberal or libertarian feminist literature, especially the equity feminist literature, is written for public policy and popular audiences. Thus more attention is paid to implications and policy applications than to philosophical justification. Several justifications are mentioned in the literature. Kirp, Yudoff, and Franks, for example, refer to Kant's categorical imperative and claim that treating individuals as self-owners is what is meant by treating individuals as ends in themselves ((Kirp et al. 1986, 13–14). Wendy McElroy grounds her thought in the natural law

tradition (McElroy 1998b). Some imply a perfectionist justification according to which the perfection of the human being requires being treated as a self-owner (Presley 2001).

By far the most common argument in the classical-liberal or libertarian feminist literature is consequentialist. The argument says that the political arrangements recommended by classical-liberalism or libertarianism, as compared with the alternatives, will provide women with more of what is good for them: for example safety, income and wealth, choices, and options. Liberalizing guns laws will make women safer (Stevens, et al. 2002); legalizing prostitution and porn will improve the lives of women in those trades (Almodovar 2002; Strossen 2000) and open opportunities for others; freer markets will root out discrimination against women and stimulate the proliferation of amenities essential to working women, like daycare centers (Epstein 2002, 33; Paul 2002, 208–209; Stolba and Furchtgott-Roth 2001, 124, 180; Conway 1998). Indeed, some argue that liberalizing the market will release such an "explosion of prosperity" that women will not need help from a welfare state (Long 1997—see Other Internet Resources).

2.3.6 Criticism

Some critics take aim at the consequentialist argument offered in support of classical-liberal or libertarian feminism. The consequentialist argument says that the political arrangements recommended by classical-liberalism or libertarianism, as compared with the alternatives, will provide women with more of what is good for them. Following Ashlie Warnick, we can distinguish the claim that particular liberty-restricting policies are bad for women (and that some liberty-enhancing policies are good for women) from the claim that all liberty-restricting policies harm women, or that a minimal state (or no state) would be better for women overall (Warnick 2003). It is surely possible to cite liberty-restricting policies that are bad for women—laws limiting women's employment options—and thus to cite liberty-enhancing policies that are good for women—not having such laws. But it is also possible to cite liberty-restricting policies that are good for women—for example the legal

prohibition against sex discrimination in employment, education, and public accommodations (which classical-liberal or libertarian feminists recommend dismantling (see section 2.5)). Of course, if sex discrimination is rare, as some classical-liberal or libertarian feminists contend (see section 2.2.1), laws prohibiting it will not produce much benefit. But, as liberal feminists Deborah Rhode and Ann Cudd argue sex discrimination is all too common (Rhode 1997, 156; Cudd 2006, 140–142). Think also of the classical-liberal or libertarian feminist recommendation that women and men be treated exactly the same by the state (see sections 2.1 and 2.5). While different treatment can stigmatize and entrench stereotypes, same treatment can disadvantage women if they are not similarly situated to men—which, arguably, is the case (Minow 1990). So the larger case—that all liberty-restricting policies harm women, or that a minimal state (or no state) would be better for women overall—has not been made convincingly (Warnick 2003). Another concern about the larger case is that much of the support offered is speculative, for example Roderick Long's assertion that "the explosion of prosperity that a libertarian society would see would go a long way toward providing women with an economic safety net more effective than any government welfare program" (Long 1997—see Other Internet Resources).

In addition to the consequentialist argument, classical-liberal or libertarian feminists offer an argument from principle. According to this argument, regardless of the consequences, women and men should be treated as self-owners with rights to property justly acquired and to freedom from coercive interference because this is what they deserve as ends in themselves, or because this is what moral insight teaches, or because this is what their perfection requires (see section 2.6). In short, the claim is that the dignity of women and men depends on their being treated as self-owners.

Critics urge us to consider that all human beings are utterly dependent on the care of others for many years at the start of life; many come to need the care of others due to temporary or permanent disability later in life;

and many require care as they become infirm at the end of life. Those who provide care for those who cannot care for themselves will also find themselves dependent on others for material support. These are enduring features of any human community. Thus all individuals have a high priority interest in receiving care when it is needed (Kittay 1999; Nussbaum 2000). As liberal feminist Susan Okin argues, a theory that ignores this interest must assume that there is a "realm of private life in which the reproductive and nurturant needs of human beings are taken care of" (Okin 1989, 75). This assumption hides the fact that it is women who typically satisfy this interest, and do so often without pay and at great sacrifice to themselves. This renders classical-liberalism or libertarianism, including its feminist versions, blind to the nature of obligations to, and entitlements of, children and others who require care. In addition, because caring labor is hidden from view, it becomes impossible to evaluate the justice of the arrangements under which the interest in receiving care is commonly satisfied. This suggests that freedom from coercive interference fails to capture what human dignity requires. At the very least, that dignity requires the right to care when one is unable to care for oneself and the right to a share of resources if one is charged with providing care for those who require it.

In a related criticism, Okin argues that classical-liberal or libertarian views are self-refuting. If individuals have a right to control their bodies and own the fruits of their labor, then women—who presumably make children from resources that have been given to them freely or were bought by them—own their children (Nozick 1974; Okin 1989, 80, 81; see also Jeske 1996; and Andersson 2007). But if women own their children, and everyone begins as a child, then no one owns herself (Okin 1989, 85).

Jennifer Roback Morse, herself a classical-liberal or libertarian feminist, concedes: "I think it is well to admit… that our inattention to family life and community responsibility has left libertarians open to the charge that we do not care very much about these matters" (Morse 2001, 28).

Liberal criticism of the argument from principle begins by noting that the liberties championed by classical-liberals and libertarians are valuable because of what they make it possible for individuals to be and do. But it is not liberties alone which facilitate our being and doing what we value. We require also, at least, adequate material resources, genuine opportunities, and standing as an equal in society (Rawls 1971; Rawls 1993). What is needed is a basic structure of society, including property rules, that secures these. Thus freedom from coercive interference fails to capture what human dignity requires.

Critics have also taken aim at the treatment of oppression in classical-liberal or libertarian feminism. Recall that equity feminism holds that women are oppressed when the state fails to protect them, as a group, from sustained and systematic rights violations. Recall also that for equity feminists the only rights that create coercible duties are the rights to justly acquired property and freedom from coercive interference. Equity feminists argue that, in western countries like the United States, women are not oppressed because the state protects these rights of women. It should be conceded that much violence against women which was, in the past, tolerated or condoned is now unambiguously prohibited. But, critics contend, violence against women remains all too common in western countries, and thus it is premature to suggest that women are not oppressed, that is, are not effectively protected against sustained and systematic rights violations (Rhode 1997, 120; see also Cudd 2006, 93ff).

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss about the Equity Feminism.

……

……

……

2. What is Cultural Libertarian Feminism?

……

……

……

2.4 LET US SUM UP

As we have seen, while cultural libertarian feminists are culturally liberal, some classical-liberal feminists are culturally conservative. They content that classical-liberalism or libertarianism must call for voluntary adherence to traditional morality because that morality is necessary for the reproduction of citizens capable of independence and self-restraint. Critics respond that the traditional morality championed by cultural conservatives disadvantages women and girls in myriad ways. Think here, for example, of how the traditional nuclear family places on women a disproportionate and disadvantaging share of the burdens of reproduction (Okin 1989). Socially conservative equity feminists are untroubled by this disadvantage as long as it is voluntarily chosen. Some nonliberal feminists argue that the fact that a political philosophy grounded in the value of voluntary choice is compatible with traditions and institutions that disadvantage women shows that feminism should not be so grounded (Jaggar 1983, 194; Yuracko 2003, 25–26). Liberal feminists embrace the value of voluntary choice for feminism, but argue that women often cannot exercise it, because sexist socialization and a homogeneous culture render them incapable of critically assessing their preferences and imagining life otherwise (Meyers 2004; Cornell 1998; Cudd 2006). Indeed, if critical thinking is necessary for freedom but corrosive of tradition, cultural conservatives must be wary of freedom. Thus there is a tension within culturally conservative equity feminism between the emphasis on voluntariness and the value of tradition. (For related criticism, see Loudermilk 2004, 149–172).

To summarize, critics suggest that classical-liberal or libertarian feminism is not adequately supported by a consequentialist case; fails to recognize our obligations to those who cannot care for themselves; hides from view the way in which the work of care is distributed in society; denies that state power should be used to ensure equality of opportunity for women and women's equal standing in society; and (cultural libertarianism excepted) is uncritical of traditional social arrangements that limit and disadvantage women. For reasons such as these, some have argued that classical-liberal or libertarian feminism counts as neither feminist nor liberal (Minnich 1998; see also Freeman 1998).

2.5 KEY WORDS

Liberalism: Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on liberty, consent of the governed, and equality before the law.

Equality: the state of being equal, especially in status, rights, or opportunities.

Justice: just behaviour or treatment.

2.6 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss about Liberal Feminism.
2. Discuss the Criticism.
3. Discuss about the Equity Feminism.
4. What is Cultural Libertarian Feminism?

2.7 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Abbey, Ruth (2013). 'Biography of a Bibliography: Three Decades of Feminist Response to Rawls.' In Abbey (2013).
- —— (2011). The Return of Feminist Liberalism. Montreal & Kingston: Mcgill-Queens University Press.
- —— (2007). 'Back Toward a Comprehensive Liberalism? Justice as Fairness, Gender and Families.' Political Theory 35: 5–28.
- Abbey, Ruth (ed.) (2013). Feminist Interpretations of Rawls. College Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Notes

- Alstott, Linda (2004). No Exit: What Parents Owe Their Children and What Society Owes Parents. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Anderson, Elizabeth (2009). 'Toward a Non-Ideal, Relational Methodology for Political Philosophy: Comments on Schwarzman's Challenging Liberalism.' Hypatia 24: 130–145.
- Antony, Louise and Charlotte Witt (eds.) (1993). A Mind of One's Own. Oxford: Westview.
- Baehr, Amy R. (2013). 'Liberal Feminism: Comprehensive and Political.' In Abbey (2013).
- —— (2008). 'Perfectionism, Feminism, and Public Reason.' Law and Philosophy 27: 193–222.
- —— (2004). 'Feminist Politics and Feminist Pluralism: Can We Do Feminist Political Theory without Theories of Gender?' Journal of Political Philosophy 12: 411–436.
- —— (1996). 'Towards a New Feminist Liberalism: Okin, Rawls, and Habermas.' Hypatia 11: 49–66. Reprinted in The Philosophy of Rawls: A Collection of Essays, vol. 3 Henry S. Richardson and Paul J. Weithman, eds. (New York: Garland Publishing, 1999): 295–312.
- Baehr, Amy R. (ed.) (2004). Varieties of Feminist Liberalism. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Barclay, Linda (2013). 'Liberal Daddy Quotas: Why Men Should Take Care of the Children, and How Liberals Can Get Them to Do It.' Hypatia 28:163–178.
- Benhabib, Seyla (1992). Situating the Self. New York: Routledge.
- Bhandary, Asha (2010). 'Dependency in Justice: Can Rawlsian Liberalism Accommodate Kittay's Dependency Critique? ' Hypatia 25: 140–156.
- Bojer, Hilde (2002). 'Women and the Rawlsian Social Contract.' Social Justice Research 15: 393–407.
- Brake, Elizabeth (2004). 'Rawls and Feminism: What Should Feminists Make of Liberal Neutrality?' Journal of Moral Philosophy 1: 293–309.

2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Section 2.2
2. Some argue that liberal feminisms run the risk of being insufficiently liberal. Measures intended to promote gender fairness and the autonomy of women could end up unreasonably hindering autonomy (Cudd 2006, 223). Some argue that Susan Okin's claim that the state should be guided by an egalitarian ideal of family life is an example of such a measure. Other measures recommended by liberal feminists that some hold may be illiberal include quotas on party slates or in elected bodies (Peters 2006) and bans on violent pornography. See Section 2.2.5

Check Your Progress 2

1. Women have also been said to be oppressed because their right to be treated the same as men by employers, educational institutions, and associations has been violated in a sustained and systematic way. That is, some argue, women have been regularly denied the right to equal access to opportunities because they are women. Equity feminists generally hold that no rights are violated when employers, educational institutions, public accommodations or associations discriminate against women. Nonetheless, equity feminists argue that discrimination against women is not a serious problem. See sub section 2.3.1

2. See Sub section 2.3.2

UNIT 3: MARXIST FEMINISM

STRUCTURE

3.0 OBJECTIVES

After this unit, we can able to know:

- Marxism, Work, and Human Nature
- Marxist-Feminist Analyses
- First Wave Feminist Analyses of Women and Work
- Second Wave Feminist Analyses of Housework
- The Public/Private Split and Its Implications
- Psychological Theories of Women and Work
- Ethical Theories of Women's Caring Work
- Modernist vs. Postmodernist Feminist Theory

- Race, Class, and Intersectional Feminist Analyses
- Anarchist Perspectives on Work and its Other
- Punitive Perspectives on Work and Non-Work

3.1 INTRODUCTION

A good place to situate the start of theoretical debates about women, class and work is in the intersection with Marxism and feminism. Such debates were shaped not only by academic inquiries but as questions about the relation between women's oppression and liberation and the class politics of the left, trade union and feminist movements in the late 19th and 20th centuries, particularly in the U.S., Britain and Europe. It will also be necessary to consider various philosophical approaches to the concept of work, the way that women's work and household activities are subsumed or not under this category, how the specific features of this work may or may not connect to different "ways of knowing" and different approaches to ethics, and the debate between essentialist and social constructionist approaches to differences between the sexes as a base for the sexual division of labor in most known human societies.

The relation of women as a social group to the analysis of economic class has spurred political debates within both Marxist and feminist circles as to whether women's movements challenging male domination can assume a common set of women's interests across race, ethnicity, and class. If there are no such interests, on what can a viable women's movement be based, and how can it evade promoting primarily the interests of white middle class and wealthy women? To the extent to which women do organize themselves as a political group cutting across traditional class lines, under what conditions are they a conservative influence as opposed to a progressive force for social change? If poor and working class women's issues are different than middle and upper class women's issues, how can middle class women's movements be trusted to address them? In addition to these questions, there is a set of issues related to cross-cultural comparative studies of women, work and

relative power in different societies, as well as analyses of how women's work is connected to processes of globalization.

Considerable research in the past 30 years has been devoted to women and work in the context of shifting divisions of labor globally (Ehrenreich and Hochschild 2004). Some of this feminist work proceeds from the development perspectives promoted by the UN and other policy making institutions (Chen et al. 2005), while other research takes a more critical view (Beneria 2003; Pyle and Ward 2007). Many studies address changes in the gender division of labor within specific national economies (Freeman 1999; George 2005; Rofel; Sangster 1995) while others consider the impact of transnational migration on women's class position (Pratt 2004; Romero 1992; Stephen 2007; Keogh 2015) and women's opportunities for cross-class solidarity and grassroots-based organizing (Mohanty 2003). More recent feminist research has addressed the restructuring of work and its impact on women and gender culture as an effect of neo-liberal economic adjustments (Adkins 2002; Enloe 2004; Federici 2008; McRobbie 2002; Skeggs 2003).

3.2 MARXISM, WORK, AND HUMAN NATURE

Marxism as a philosophy of human nature stresses the centrality of work in the creation of human nature itself and human self-understanding (see the entry on Marxism). Both the changing historical relations between human work and nature, and the relations of humans to each other in the production and distribution of goods to meet material needs construct human nature differently in different historical periods: nomadic humans are different than agrarian or industrial humans. Marxism as a philosophy of history and social change highlights the social relations of work in different economic modes of production in its analysis of social inequalities and exploitation, including relations of domination such as racism and sexism. (Marx 1844, 1950, 1906–9; Marx and Engels 1848, 1850; Engels 1942). Within capitalism, the system they most analyzed, the logic of profit drives the bourgeois class into developing the productive forces of land, labor and capital by expanding markets,

turning land into a commodity and forcing the working classes from feudal and independent agrarian production into wage labor. Marx and Engels argue that turning all labor into a commodity to be bought and sold not only alienates workers by taking the power of production away from them, it also collectivizes workers into factories and mass assembly lines. This provides the opportunity for workers to unite against the capitalists and to demand the collectivization of property, i.e., socialism, or communism.

According to Engels's famous analysis of women's situation in the history of different economic modes production in The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1942), women are originally equal to, if not more powerful than, men in communal forms of production with matrilineal family organizations. Women lose power when private property comes into existence as a mode of production. Men's control of private property, and the ability thereby to generate a surplus, changes the family form to a patriarchal one where women, and often slaves, become the property of the father and husband.

The rise of capitalism, in separating the family household from commodity production, further solidifies this control of men over women in the family when the latter become economic dependents of the former in the male breadwinner-female housewife nuclear family form. Importantly, capitalism also creates the possibility of women's liberation from family-based patriarchy by creating possibilities for women to work in wage labor and become economically independent of husbands and fathers. Engels stresses, however, that because of the problem of unpaid housework, a private task allocated to women in the sexual division of labor of capitalism, full women's liberation can only be achieved with the development of socialism and the socialization of housework and childrearing in social services provided by the state. For this reason, most contemporary Marxists have argued that women's liberation requires feminists to join the working class struggle against capitalism (Cliff 1984).

3.3 MARXIST-FEMINIST ANALYSES

Many Marxist-feminists thinkers, prominent among them sociologists and anthropologists, have done cross-cultural and historical studies of earlier forms of kinship and economy and the role of the sexual or gender division of labor in supporting or undermining women's social power (cf. Reed 1973, Leacock 1972, Rosaldo and Lamphere 1974). They have also attempted to assess the world economic development of capitalism as a contradictory force for the liberation of women (Federici 2004; Mies 1986; Saffioti 1978) and to argue that universal women's liberation requires attention to the worse off: poor women workers in poor post-colonial countries (Sen & Grown 1987). Other feminist anthropologists have argued that other variables in addition to women's role in production are key to understanding women's social status and power (Sanday 1981; Leghorn and Parker 1981). Yet other feminist economic historians have done historical studies of the ways that race, class and ethnicity have situated women differently in relation to production, for example in the history of the United States (Davis 1983; Amott and Matthaei 1991). Finally some Marxist-feminists have argued that women's work in biological and social reproduction is a necessary element of all modes of production and one often ignored by Marxist economists (Benston 1969; Hennessy 2003; Vogel 1995).

3.4 FIRST WAVE FEMINIST ANALYSES OF WOMEN AND WORK

Those feminist analyses which have highlighted the role of women's work in the social construction of gender and the perpetuation of male dominance have been termed liberal, radical, Marxist, and socialist feminism by such influential categorizers as Jaggar and Rothenberg [Struhl] (1978), Tong (2000), Barrett (1980), Jaggar (1983) and Walby (1990)[2]. However, the pigeonhole categories of liberal, radical, Marxist, or socialist categories apply poorly to both to first wave

women's movement feminist predecessors and contemporary deconstructionist, post-structuralist and post-colonialist perspectives.

A number of first wave feminists write about work and class as key issues for women's liberation, such as socialist-feminist Charlotte Perkins Gilman, heavily influenced by Darwinism and 19th century utopian modernism (Gilman 1898, 1910, 1979), anarchist Emma Goldman (1969), and existentialist, radical feminist and Marxist of sorts Simone de Beauvoir (1952). This is because the debates that arose around the place of the women's movement in class politics were different in the early and mid-twentieth century than they were in the 1960s when many feminist theorists were trying to define themselves independently of the left anti-Vietnam war and civil rights movements of the time.

The debate about the economic and social function of housework and its relation to women's oppression is an old one that has been a feature of both the first and second wave women's movements in the US, Britain and Europe. In both eras, the underlying issue is how to handle the public/private split of capitalist societies in which women's reproductive functions have either limited their work to the home or created a "second shift" problem of unpaid housework and childcare as well as waged work. In the first wave, located as it was in the Victorian period where the dominant ideology for middle and upper class women was purity, piety and domesticity (also called the "cult of true womanhood"), the debate centered on whether to keep housework in the private sphere yet make it more scientific and efficient (Beecher 1841; Richards 1915), or whether to "socialize" it by bringing it into the public sphere, as socialist Charlotte Perkins Gilman advocated (1898).

In the US, the "public housekeeping" aspect of the Progressive movement of the 1890s through early 1900s advocated that women bring the positive values associated with motherhood into the public sphere — by obtaining the vote, cleaning out corruption in politics, creating settlement houses to educate and support immigrants, and forming the

women's peace movement, etc. (cf. Jane Addams 1914). Disagreements about whether to downplay or valorize the distinctive function and skills in motherhood as work for which women are naturally superior, or to see motherhood as restricting women's chances for economic independence and equality with men in the public sphere, were also evident in debates between Ellen Keys (1909, 1914) and Gilman. Keys represented the difference side, that women are superior humans because of mothering; while Gilman and Goldman took the equality side of the debate, that is, that, women are restricted, and made socially unequal to men, by unpaid housework and mothering

3.5 SECOND WAVE FEMINIST ANALYSES OF HOUSEWORK

In the second wave movement, theorists can be grouped by their theory of how housework oppresses women. Typically, liberal feminists critique housework because it is unpaid. This makes women dependent on men and devalued, since their work is outside the meaningful sphere of public economic production (Friedan 1963). Marxist feminist theorists see this as part of the problem, but some go further to maintain that housework is part of a household feudal mode of production of goods for use that persists under capitalism and gives men feudal powers over women's work (Benston 1969, Fox 1980). Other Marxist feminists argue that women's housework is part of the social reproduction of capitalism (Federici 1975, 2004; Malos 1975; Vogel 1995). That the necessary work of reproducing the working class is unpaid allows more profits to capitalists. It is the sexual division of labor in productive and reproductive work that makes woman unequal to men and allows capitalists to exploit women's unpaid labor. Some even make this analysis the basis for a demand for wages for housework (Dalla Costa 1974; Federici 1975). More recently, Federici has done an analysis of the transition to capitalism in Europe. She argues that it was the emerging capitalist class need to control working class reproduction, to eliminate working class women's control over biological reproduction, and to assure their unpaid reproductive work in the home by restricting

abortions, that fueled the campaign against witches during this period (Federici 2004).

One of the philosophical problems raised by the housework debate is how to draw the line between work and play or leisure activity when the activity is not paid: is a mother playing with her baby working or engaged in play? If the former, then her hours in such activity may be compared with those of her husband or partner to see if there is an exploitation relation present, for example, if his total hours of productive and reproductive work for the family are less than hers (cf. Delphy 1984). But to the extent that childrearing counts as leisure activity, as play, as activity held to be intrinsically valuable (Ferguson 2004), no exploitation is involved. Perhaps childrearing and other caring activity is both work and play, but only that portion which is necessary for the psychological growth of the child and the worker(s) counts as work. If so, who determines when that line is crossed? Since non-market activity does not have a clear criterion to distinguish work from non-work, nor necessary from non-necessary social labor, an arbitrary element seems to creep in that makes standards of fairness difficult to apply to gendered household bargains between men and women dividing up waged and non-waged work. (Barrett 1980).

One solution to this problem is simply to take all household activity that could also be done by waged labor (nannies, domestic servants, gardeners, chauffeurs, etc.) as work and to figure its comparable worth by the waged labor necessary to replace it (Folbre 1982, 1983). Another is to reject altogether the attempts to base women's oppression on social relations of work, on the grounds that such theories are overly generalizing and ignore the discrete meanings that kinship activities have for women in different contexts (Nicholson 1991; Fraser and Nicholson 1991; Marchand 1995). Or, one can argue that although the line between work and leisure changes historically, those doing the activity should have the decisive say as to whether their activity counts as work, i.e., labor necessary to promote human welfare. The existence of second wave women's movements critiques of the "second shift" of unpaid

household activity indicates that a growing number of women see most of it as work, not play (cf. Hochchild 1989). Finally, one can argue that since the human care involved in taking care of children and elders creates a public good, it should clearly be characterized as work, and those who are caretakers, primarily women, should be fairly compensated for it by society or the state (Ferguson and Folbre 2000: Folbre 2000, Ferguson 2004).

3.6 THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE SPLIT AND ITS IMPLICATIONS

Liberal, Marxist and radical feminists have all characterized women as doubly alienated in capitalism because of the public/private split that relegates their work as mothers and houseworkers to the home, and psychologically denies them full personhood, citizenship and human rights (Foreman 1974, Okin 1989, Pateman 1988, Goldman 1969). Noting that women workers on average only have about 70% of the average salary of men in the contemporary U.S., feminists have claimed this is because women's work, tied stereotypically to housework and hence thought unskilled is undervalued, whether it is cleaning or rote service work, or nurturing work thought to be connected to natural maternal motivations and aptitudes. Hence some feminists have organized in campaigns for "comparable worth" to raise women's wages to the same as men's wages involving comparable skills (Brenner 2000; cf. also articles in Hansen and Philipson eds. 1990).

Many radical feminists maintain that women's work is part of a separate patriarchal mode of reproduction that underlies all economic systems of production and in which men exploit women's reproductive labor (Delphy 1984; O'Brien 1981; Leghorn and Parker 1981; Rich 1980; Mies 1986). Smith (1974), O'Brien (1981), Hartsock (1983 a,b), Haraway (1985) and Harding (1986) pioneered in combining this radical feminist assumption with a perspectival Marxist theory of knowledge to argue that one's relation to the work of production and reproduction gave each gender and each social class a different way of knowing the social totality. Women's work, they argued, ties them to nature and human

needs in a different way than men's work does, which creates the possibility of a less alienated and more comprehensive understanding of the workings of the social totality. Patricia Hill Collins argues further that the racial division of labor, institutional racism and different family structures put African American women in yet a different epistemic relation to society than white and other women (1990, 2000). Writing in a post-modernist re-articulation of this feminist standpoint theory, Donna Haraway argues that the breakdown of the nature/culture distinction because of scientific technology and its alteration of the human body makes us into "cyborgs". Hence our perspectives are so intersectional that they cannot be unified simply by a common relation to work. What is required for a feminist politics is not a situated identity politics, whether of gender and/or race and/or class, but an affinity politics based on alliances and coalitions that combine epistemic perspectives (Haraway 1985).

Like these radical feminists, some socialist-feminists have tried to develop a "dual systems" theory (cf. Young 1981). This involves theorizing a separate system of work relations that organizes and directs human sexuality, nurturance, affection and biological reproduction. Rather than seeing this as an unchanging universal base for patriarchy, however, they have argued that this system, thought of as the "sex/gender system" (Rubin 1975; Hartmann 1978, 1981a,b), or as "sex/affective production" (Ferguson 1989, 1991; Ferguson and Folbre 1981) has different historical modes, just as Marx argued that economies do. Rubin argues that sex/gender systems have been based in different kinship arrangements, most of which have supported the exchange of women by men in marriage, and hence have supported male domination and compulsory heterosexuality. She is hopeful that since capitalism shifted the organization of the economy from kinship to commodity production, the power of fathers and husbands over daughters and wives, and the ability to enforce heterosexuality, will continue to decline, and women's increasing ability to be economically independent will lead to women's liberation and equality with men.

With a different historical twist, Hartmann argues that a historical bargain was cemented between capitalist and working class male patriarchs to shore up patriarchal privileges that were being weakened by the entrance of women into wage labor in the 19th century by the creation of the "family wage" to allow men sufficient wages to support a non-wage-earning wife and children at home (1981a). While Ferguson and Folbre (1981) agree that there is no inevitable fit between capitalism and patriarchy, they argue that there are conflicts, and that the family wage bargain has broken down at present. Indeed, both Ferguson and Smart (1984) argue that welfare state capitalism and the persistent sexual division of wage labor in which work coded as women's is paid less than men's with less job security are ways that a "public patriarchy" has replaced different systems of family patriarchy that were operating in early and pre-capitalist societies. Walby (1990) has a similar analysis, but to her the connection between forms of capitalism and forms of patriarchy is more functional and less accidental than it appears to Ferguson and Smart.

Walby argues that there are two different basic forms of patriarchy which emerge in response to the tensions between capitalist economies and patriarchal household economies: private and public patriarchy. Private patriarchy as a form is marked by excluding women from economic and political power while public patriarchy works by segregating women. There is a semi-automatic re-adjustment of the dual systems when the older private father patriarchy based on the patriarchal family is broken down due to the pressures of early industrial capitalism. The family wage and women's second class citizenship that marked that initial re-adjustment are then functionally replaced by a public form of patriarchy, the patriarchal welfare state, where women enter the wage labor force permanently but in segregated less well paid jobs. But Ferguson (1989,1991), Smart (1984) and Folbre (1994) suggest that although the patriarchal control of fathers and husbands over wife and children as economic assets has been diminished in advanced capitalism, there is always a dialectical and contradictory tension between patriarchy and capitalism in which both advances and retreats for women's equality as

citizens and in work relations are constantly occurring in the new form of public patriarchy. Thus, the new "marriage" of patriarchal capitalism operates to relegate women to unpaid or lesser paid caring labor, whether in the household or in wage labor, thus keeping women by and large unequal to men. This is especially notable in the rise of poor single-mother-headed families. However, as it forces more and more women into wage labor, women are given opportunities for some independence from men and the possibility to challenge male dominance and sex segregation in all spheres of social life. Examples are the rise of the first and second wave women's movements and consequent gains in civil rights for women.

The work of feminist sociologist Dorothy Smith (1989) has been a notable intervention into the public-private split by bringing into view the institutions and power regimes that regulate the everyday world, their gender subtext, and basis in a gendered division of labor. Legal feminist critics expand on the biopolitics of the patriarchal welfare state, which psychiatrizes as it threatens mothers with the loss of child custody. This represents a new eugenics twist on the enduring mistrust of working-class mothers and casting those who are imprisoned as undeserving parent (Guggenheim 2007; Law 2012). African American mothers bear the brunt of punitive and racist family and criminal law (Thompson 2010; Solinger et al. 2010).

3.7 PSYCHOLOGICAL THEORIES OF WOMEN AND WORK

The socialist-feminist idea that there are two interlocking systems that structure gender and the economy, and thus are jointly responsible for male domination, has been developed in a psychological direction by the psychoanalytic school of feminist theorists. Particularly relevant to the question of women and work are the theories of Mitchell (1972, 1974), Kuhn and Wolpe (1978), Chodorow (1978, 1979, 1982) and Ruddick (1989). Mothering, or, taking care of babies and small children, as a type of work done overwhelmingly by women, socializes women and men to have different identities, personalities and skills. In her first work (1972),

Mitchell argues that women's different relations to productive work, reproduction, socialization of children and sexuality in patriarchy give her lesser economic and psychological power in relation to men. In a Freudian vein, Mitchell later argues (1974) that women learn that they are not full symbolic subjects because compulsory heterosexuality and the incest taboo bar them from meeting either the desire of their mother or any other woman. Chodorow, also reading Freud from a feminist perspective, suggests that women's predominance in mothering work is the basis for the learned gender distinction between women and men. The sexual division of infant care gives boys, who must learn their masculine identity by separating from their mother and the feminine, a motive for deprecating, as well as dominating, women. Ruddick from a more Aristotelian perspective suggests that it is the skills and virtues required in the practice of mothering work which not only socially construct feminine gender differently from men's, but could ground an alternative vision for peace and resolving human conflicts, if a peace movement were led by women.

Ferguson argues that the "sex/affective" work of mothering and wifely nurturing is exploitative of women: women give more nurturance and satisfaction (including sexual satisfaction) to men and children than they receive, and do much more of the work of providing these important human goods (cf. also Bartky 1990). The gendered division of labor has both economic and psychological consequences, since women's caring labor creates women less capable of or motivated to separate from others, and hence less likely to protest such gender exploitation (Ferguson 1989, 1991). Folbre argues by contrast that it is only because women's bargaining power is less than men's because of the power relations involved in the gender division of labor and property that women acquiesce to such inequalities (Folbre 1982). Ferguson argues that gendered exploitation in a system of meeting human needs suggests that women can be seen as a "sex class" (or gender class) which cuts across economic class lines (1979, 1989, 1991). This line of thought is also developed by Christine Delphy (1984), Monique Wittig (1980) and Luce Irigaray (1975).

On the other side of the debate, Brenner (2000) argues that women are not uniformly exploited by men across economic class lines: indeed, for working class women their unpaid work as housewives serves the working class as a whole, because the whole class benefits when its daily and future reproduction needs are met by women's nurturing and childcare work. They argue further that middle and upper class women's economic privileges will inevitably lead them to betray working class women in any cross-class alliance that is not explicitly anti-capitalist. Hochschild (2000) and hooks (2000) point out that career women tend to pay working class women to do the second shift work in the home so they can avoid that extra work, and they have an interest in keeping such wages, e.g., for house cleaning and nannies, as low as possible to keep the surplus for themselves. Kollias (1981) argues further that working class women are in a stronger political position to work effectively for women's liberation than middle class women, while McKenny (1981) argues that professional women have to overcome myths of professionalism that keep them feeling superior to working class women and hence unable to learn from or work with them for social change.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss the Marxism, Work, and Human Nature.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……....

2. Compare Marxist-Feminist Analyses.

   ……
   ……

……

……

……...

3. Describe First Wave Feminist Analyses of Women and Work.

……

……

……

……

……...

3.8 ETHICAL THEORIES OF WOMEN'S CARING WORK

Several authors have explored the ethical implications of the sexual division of labor in which it is primarily women who do caring labor. Nancy Fraser (1997) and Susan Moller Okin (1989) formulate ethical arguments to maintain that a just model of society would have to re-structure work relations so that the unpaid and underpaid caring labor now done primarily by women would be given a status equivalent to (other) wage labor by various means. In her council socialist vision, Ferguson (1989, 1991) argues that an ideal society would require both women and men to do the hitherto private unpaid work of caring or "sex/affective labor." For example, such work would be shared by men, either in the family and/or provided by the state where appropriate (as for elders and children's childcare), and compensated fairly by family allowances (for those, women or men, doing the major share of housework), and by higher pay for caring wage work (such as daycare workers, nurses, and teachers).

Carol Gilligan (1982) claims that women and girls tend to use a different form of ethical reasoning — she terms this the "ethics of care" — than men and boys who use an ethics of justice. Some have argued that this different ethical approach is due to women's caring sensibilities that have been developed by the sexual division of labor (Ruddick 1989). Interestingly, the debate between feminist theorists of justice, e.g., Fraser

and Okin, and ethics of care feminists such as Gilligan and Ruddick, is less about substance than a meta-ethical disbute as to whether ethics should concern principles or judgments in particular cases. All of these theorists seem to have ideal visions of society which dovetail: all would support the elimination of the sexual division of labor so that both men and women could become equally sensitized to particular others through caring work.

3.9 MODERNIST VS. POSTMODERNIST FEMINIST THEORY

Useful anthologies of the first stage of second wave socialist feminist writings which include discussions of women, class and work from psychological as well as sociological and economic perspectives are Eisenstein (1979), Hansen and Philipson (1990), Hennessy and Ingraham (1997), and Holmstrom (2002). Jaggar (1983) wrote perhaps the first philosophy text explaining the categories of liberal, radical, Marxist and socialist-feminist thought and defending a socialist-feminist theory of male domination based on the notion of women's alienated labor. Others such as Jaggar and Rothenberg (1978), Tuana and Tong (1995) and Herrmann and Stewart (1993) include classic socialist feminist analyses in their collections, inviting comparisons of the authors to others grouped under the categories of liberal, radical, psychoanalytic, Marxist, postmodern, postcolonial and multicultural feminisms.

Various post-modern critiques of these earlier feminist schools of thought such as post-colonialism as well as deconstruction and post-structuralism challenge the over-generalizations and economic reductionism of many of those constructing feminist theories that fall under the early categories of liberal, radical, Marxist or socialist feminism (cf. Grewal and Kaplan 1992; Kaplan et al. 1999; Nicholson 1991; Fraser and Nicholson 1991; hooks 1984, 2000; Anzaldúa and Moraga 1981; Sandoval 2000). Others argue that part of the problem is the master narratives of liberalism or Marxism, the first of which sees all domination relations due to traditional hierarchies and undermined by capitalism, thus ignoring the independent effectivity of racism (Josephs

1981); and the second of which ties all domination relations to the structure of contemporary capitalism and ignores the non-capitalist economics contexts in which many women work, even within so-called capitalist economies, such as housework and voluntary community work (Gibson-Graham 1996).

In spite of the "pomo" critiques, there are some powerful thinkers within this tendency who have not completely rejected a more general starting point of analysis based on women, class and work. For example, Spivak (1988), Mohanty (1997), Carby (1997), and Hennessy (1993, 2000) are creating and re-articulating forms of Marxist and socialist-feminism less susceptible to charges of over-generalization and reductionism, and more compatible with close contextual analysis of the power relations of gender and class as they relate to work. They can be grouped loosely with a tendency called materialist feminism that incorporates some of the methods of deconstruction and post-structuralism (Hennessy 1993; Landry and MacLean 1993).

3.10 RACE, CLASS, AND INTERSECTIONAL FEMINIST ANALYSES

Many in the contemporary feminist theory debate are interested in developing concrete "intersectional" or "integrative feminist" analyses of particular issues which try to give equal weight to gender, race, class and sexuality in a global context without defining themselves by the categories, such as liberal, radical or materialist, of the earlier feminist debate categories (cf. work by Davis 1983; Brewer 1995; Crenshaw 1997; Stanlie and James 1997; Anzaldúa 1999; hooks 1984, 2000). Nonetheless strong emphasis on issues of race and ethnicity can be found in their work on women, class and work. For example, Brewer shows that white and African-American working class women are divided by race in the workforce, and that even changes in the occupational structure historically tend to maintain this racial division of labor. Hooks argues that women of color and some radical feminists were more sensitive to

class and race issues than those, primarily white, feminists whom she labels “reformist feminists” (hooks 2000).

Presupposed in the general theoretical debates concerning the relations between gender, social and economic class, and work are usually definitions of each of these categories that some thinkers would argue are problematic. For example, Tokarczyk and Fay have an excellent anthology on working class women in the academy (1993) in which various contributors discuss the ambiguous positions in which they find themselves by coming from poor family backgrounds and becoming academics. One problem is whether they are still members of the working class in so doing, and if not, whether they are betraying their families of origin by a rise to middle class status. Another is, whether they have the same status in the academy, as workers, thinkers and women, as those men or women whose families of origin were middle class or above. Rita Mae Brown wrote an early article on this, arguing that education and academic status did not automatically change a working class woman’s identity, which is based not just on one’s relation to production, but one’s behavior, basic assumptions about life, and experiences in childhood (Brown 1974). Joanna Kadi (1999) describes herself as cultural worker who tackles elitism in the white academy, including in women’s studies courses. Tokarczyk and Fay acknowledge that the definition of “class” is vague in the U.S. Rather than provide a standard philosophical definition in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions for membership in the working class, they provide a cluster of characteristics and examples of jobs, such as physically demanding, repetitive and dangerous jobs, jobs that lack autonomy and are generally paid badly. Examples of working class jobs they give are cleaning women, waitresses, lumberjacks, janitors and police officers. They then define their term “working class women academics” to include women whose parents had jobs such as these and are in the first generation in their family to attend college (Tokarczyk and Fay, 5). They challenge those that would argue that family origin can be overcome by the present position one has in the social division of labor: simply performing a

professional job and earning a salary does not eradicate the class identity formed in one's "family class" (cf. Ferguson 1979).

More recent work in socio-legal studies also has begun to question the limits of intersectional analysis (Grabham et al. 2009). It acknowledges the importance of intersectionality, a term coined by law professor Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989) to shed light on epistemic injustice done to Black women in anti-discrimination law. Yet, despite its merit for overcoming the dual system's theoretical impasse, Joanna Conaghan also critiques the essentializing tendencies of intersectional analysis which succeeds mainly dealing with race and gender oppression at an individual level, but it has little to offer to remedy structural injustice. Furthermore, because such method is identity-focused it will not get at the dimension of class which has been traditionally thought in relational not locational terms (2008, 29–30).

To theorize the problematic relation of women to social class, Ferguson (1979, 1989, 1991) argues that there are at least three different variables — an individual's work, family of origin, and present household economic unit — which relate an individual to a specific socio-economic class. For example, a woman may work on two levels: as a day care worker (working class), but also as a member of a household where she does the housework and mothering/child care, while her husband is a wealthy contractor (petit bourgeois, small capitalist class). If in addition her family of origin is professional middle class (because, say, her parents were college educated academics), the woman may be seen and see herself as either working class or middle class, depending on whether she and others emphasize her present relations of wage work (her individual economic class, which in this case is working class), her household income (middle class) or her family of origin (middle class).

Sylvia Walby deals with this ambiguity of economic class as applying to women as unpaid houseworkers by claiming against Delphy (1984) that the relevant economic sex classes are those who are housewives vs. those who are husbands benefiting from such work, not those of all women and

men, whether or not they do or receive housework services (Walby 1990). Ferguson, however, sides with Delphy in putting all women into "sex class", since all women, since trained into the gender roles of patriarchal wife and motherhood, are potentially those whose unpaid housework can be so exploited. But seeing herself as a member of a fourth class category, "sex class," and hence, in a patriarchal capitalist system, seeing herself exploited as a woman worker in her wage work and unpaid second shift housework, is thus not a given but an achieved social identity. Such an identity is usually formed through political organizing and coalitions with other women at her place of employment, in her home and her community. In this sense the concept of sex class is exactly analogous to the concept of a feminist epistemological standpoint: not a given identity or perspective, but one that is achievable under the right conditions.

Realizing the importance of this disjuncture between economic class and sex class for women, Maxine Molyneux (1984) argues in an often cited article that there are no "women's interests" in the abstract that can unify women in political struggle. Instead, she theorizes that women have both "practical gender interests" and "strategic gender interests." Practical gender interests are those that women develop because of the sexual division of labor, which makes them responsible for the nurturant work of sustaining the physical and psychological well-being of children, partners and relatives through caring labor. Such practical gender interests, because they tie a woman's conception of her own interests as a woman to those of her family, support women's popular movements for food, water, child and health care, even defense against state violence, which ally them with the economic class interests of their family. Strategic gender interests, on the contrary, may ally women across otherwise divided economic class interests, since they are those, like rights against physical male violence and reproductive rights, which women have as a sex class to eliminate male domination.

Molyneux used her distinctions between practical and strategic gender interests to distinguish between the popular women's movement in Nicaragua based on demands for economic justice for workers and

farmers against the owning classes, demands such as education, health and maternity care, clean water, food and housing, and the feminist movement which emphasized the fight for legal abortion, fathers' obligation to pay child support to single mothers, and rights against rape and domestic violence. She and others have used this distinction between practical and strategic gender interests to characterize the tension between popular women's movements and feminist movements in Latin America (Molyneux 2001; Alvarez 1998; Foweraker 1998).

A similar distinction between different types of women's interests was developed further as a critique of interest group paradigms of politics by Anna Jónasdóttir (1988, 1994). Jónasdóttir argues that women have a common formal interest in votes for women, women's political caucuses, gender parity demands, and other mechanisms which allow women a way to develop a collective political voice, even though their content interests, that is, their specific needs and priorities, may vary by race and economic class, among others. Her distinctions, and those of Molyneux, have been changed slightly — practical vs. strategic gender needs, rather than interests — to compare and contrast different paradigms of economic development by World Bank feminist theorist Carolyn Moser (1993). Most recently the Jónasdóttir distinctions have been used by Mohanty (1997) to defend and maintain, in spite of postmodernists' emphasis on intersectional differences, that commonalities in women's gendered work can create a cross-class base for demanding a collective political voice for women: a transnational feminism which creates a demand for women's political representation, developing the platform of women's human rights as women and as workers. Nonetheless, the tension between women's economic class-based interests or needs and their visionary/strategic gender interests or needs is still always present, and must therefore always be negotiated concretely by popular movements for social justice involving women's issues.

Another approach to the problematic nature of socio-economic class as it relates to women are empirical studies which show how class distinctions are still important for women in their daily lives as a way to compare and

contrast themselves with other women and men, even if they do not use the concepts of "working class," "professional class" or "capitalist class". Many have pointed out that the concept of class itself is mystified in the U.S. context, but that nonetheless class distinctions still operate because of different structural economic constraints, which act on some differently from others. The Ehrenreichs (1979), in a classic article, argue that this mystification is due to the emergence of a professional-managerial class that has some interests in common with the capitalist class and some with the working class. Whatever its causes, there are empirical studies which show that class distinctions still operate between women, albeit in an indirect way. Barbara Ehrenreich (2001), by adopting the material life conditions of a poor woman, did an empirical study of the lives of women working for minimum wages and found their issues to be quite different from and ignored by middle and upper-class women. Diane Reay (2004) does an empirical study of women from manual labor family backgrounds and their relation to the schooling of their children, and discovers that they use a discourse that acknowledges class differences of educational access and career possibilities, even though it does not specifically define these by class per se. Similarly, Julie Bettie (2000) does an impressive discourse analysis of the way that Latina high school students create their own class distinctions through concepts such as "chicas," "cholas" and "trash" to refer to themselves and their peers. These categories pick out girls as having middle class, working class or poor aspirations by performance indicators such as dress, speech, territorial hang-outs and school achievement, while never mentioning "class" by name. Women's experiences of growing up working class are presented in the anthology edited by Tea (2003).

3.11 ANARCHIST PERSPECTIVES ON WORK AND ITS OTHER

So far, it has been assumed that work is an intrinsic good.

What if waged or unwaged work itself were to be considered problematic or oppressive? Autonomous Marxists contest that liberal or socialist feminist perspectives have unnecessarily mystified work and have

operated with a moralism. Autonomists are associated with the Operaismo, post-Operaismo and Autonomia movements, the Midnight Notes Collective, Zerowork, Lotta Feminista, and the Wages for Housework movement (Weeks 2011, 241). Whether one ought to be paid for housework or reproductive labor or seek equal employment opportunities, feminists have not sufficiently opposed the sanctification of work. Championing the refusal of work means to abandon a narrow focus on the critique of the extraction of surplus value or of the process of deskilling. Furthermore, it is imperative to interrogate how work dominates our lives (Weeks 2011, 13). Kathi Weeks charges that a productivist bias is common to feminist and Marxist analysis. The credo of autonomists then is liberation from work, in contradistinction to Marxist humanists such as Erich Fromm's advocacy for liberation of work.

The Wages for Housework campaign demanded purposefully the impossible. These feminists did not only ask for compensation for unpaid domestic labor, but also postulated the end of such work (Federici 1995). Post-work also means post-domestic care, something that gets lost in some of the ethic of care analysis, which inadvertently fosters a romantic attachment to endowing meaning to such work. Furthermore, post-work also appeals to carving out space for "queer time" and queer resistant agency (Halberstam 2005, Lehr 1999), an appeal to unscripted life. A wholesale critique of housework is not easily understood; even Arlie Hochschild's (1997) own analysis of her ethnographic studies of diverse family practices comes to the conclusion that authentic housework should be sanctified and set apart from mere alienating factory production (Weeks 2011, 157–59).

A post-work ethic entails a playful commitment to leisure and unstructured activities such as day-dreaming. Joseph Trullinger (2016) extends Kathi Weeks' analysis by drawing on Marcuse's concept of great refusal and playful labor defying commodity fetishism and productivism. By ignoring the liberatory power of play, Weeks insufficiently engages the meaning of work and the asceticism of the work ethic (Trullinger

2016, 469). Still, the danger of play morphing into (unpaid) labor is real, as evinced by social media corporate giant FaceBook exploiting play-labor for capitalist gains (Fuchs 2016) and a veritable corporate feminism may ask us to "lean in" (Sandberg 2013) rather than "lean out".

3.12 PUNITIVE PERSPECTIVES ON WORK AND NON-WORK

While it is reasonable to champion daydreams and play as intrinsic goods, idle time itself is often not felt as a good or luxury, but instead a psychic imposition. This is why one speaks of "doing time," when one is sentenced to a prison term or worse, to death row (Moses 2007). Imprisonment is anathema to indigenous, socio-centric peoples in the Global South, and imprisonment is closely connected to the disciplinary apparatus of western colonization of the Americas and Africa (Nagel 2007). The birth of the western modern prison focused on self-discipline, known as the "separate system" of Philadelphia, PA, leading to enforced isolation and separate celling. Day-dreaming in a solitary cell becomes positively dangerous and suicides and mental illness increase exponentially (Casella et al. 2016). Idle time is thus countered by another prison regime, the Auburn, NY, factory system, also known as the "silent system," where prisoners worked in a factory, but they were forbidden to talk with each other. Under the notorious Southern US convict lease system, representing the shift "from the prison of slavery to the slavery of prisons" (Davis 1998), Black female and male prisoners are toiling in chain gangs, a visceral reminder of the trauma of chattel slavery.

Another haunting reminder of chattel slavery is the neoliberal welfare state's intrusion in the family, charging parents with poor work ethic and neglect of their children. In the US, poor children of color, especially Black, Latino, and American Indians living on reservations, are at higher risk of being taken away from their kin and carers and turned over to the foster care system (Goldberg 2015). The world over, parents who are socially displaced such as Romanian immigrants in Norway, are under greater scrutiny by state actors, e.g., child protective services. In the US, social workers' own white middle class (protestant) work ideology is

enforced paradoxically on grieving mothers: these stigmatized women are summoned to complete parenting skills courses, cooking courses, etc., and are thus effectively forced out of a paid job, made dependent on the good will of the social worker and family court judge, who may grant access to child-supervised visits. Thus, parents charged with child abuse and/or neglect are thus unable to pursue education or a job, often creating an intergenerational cycle of the violence of poverty. In ideological terms, this is coded as welfare dependency and racialized as a controlling image, thus stereotyping young Black mothers (Fraser and Gordon 1994; Hill Collins 1990, 2000). In response, the National Welfare Rights Organization was created to destigmatize welfare by postulating it as a human right (Toney 2000) and by also demanding a basic income, as alternative to punitive welfare (Weeks 2011, 138). The proposal for basic income has gained traction in recent years, cumulating in a Swiss referendum, even though it was defeated in 2016. Migrant workers, worker-mothers who serve as domestic workers are also at risk (of deportation and/or imprisonment) for facing frivolous neglect charges or simply for lacking proper visa status. Gendered moral economies operate across national, racial and geographic borders in enforcing a domestic and domesticating patriarchal ideology and determining who is a good victim and deserves to be rescued (Keogh 2015; Nagel 2011; Gutiérrez Rodríguez 2010; Grewal and Kaplan 1992; Kaplan et al. 1999).

Stigmatized work such as erotic labor or sex work has divided feminists into two camps: those who support sex workers' rights to organize and seek labor law protection and those who call themselves abolitionists but actually advocate a prohibitionist approach of "trafficking in women" that serves to rescue girls and women from such degrading, dangerous punishment (Nagel 2015). Some sex worker rights approaches focus on eschewing the moralizing rallying cry of choice versus coercion and seek to destigmatize such labor and offer a postcolonial critique of prohibitionist ideology (Kempadoo and Doezema 1995). Others also focus on the lived experiences and agencies of such workers and contextualize their lives within structural constraints of the feminization of poverty (Dewey 2010; Zheng 2009). Paradoxically, by focusing

narrowly on income-generating activities, Dewey (2010) contents that such advocates actually reinscribe stigmatization. And some sex workers' rights organizations such as COYOTE ("Call Off Your Old Tired Ethics") also inadvertently endorse a traditional work-ethic ideology by appealing to a moralizing discourse of respectability (Weeks 2011, pp. 67–68).

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Write about Psychological Theories of Women and Work.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

2. Discuss Ethical Theories of Women's Caring Work.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

3. Compare Modernist vs. Postmodernist Feminist Theory.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

4. Discuss Race, Class, and Intersectional Feminist Analyses.

……

……

……

……

……

3.13 CONCLUDING REMARKS

Theoretical and empirical debates about the relation of women to class and work, and the implications of these relations for theories of male domination and women's oppression as well as for other systems of social domination, continue to be important sources of theories and investigations of gender identities, roles and powers in the field of women and gender studies, as well as in history, sociology, anthropology and economics. They also have important implications for epistemology, metaphysics and political theory in the discipline of philosophy, and consequently other disciplines in humanities and the social sciences.

3.14 LET US SUM UP

Marxist feminism is a philosophical variant of feminism. Marxist Feminism is focused on the ways in which women could be oppressed through systems of capitalism and the individual ownership of private property. According to Marxist feminists, women's liberation can only be achieved through a radical restructuring of capitalist economies, in which, they contend, much of women's labor is uncompensated.

Marx categorised employment in two ways, productive, and nonproductive. Loosely defined, productive labor includes the production of materials, crafting of materials into products, and the roles which support labor. Alternatively, unproductive labor, includes circulation of finished commodities, monetary exchange, and activities towards increasing monetary value, i.e. marketing. In capitalism, for instance, the work of maintaining a family has little material value, as it

produces no marketable products. In Marxism, the maintenance of a family is productive, as it has a service value, and is used in the same sense as a commodity. Marxist feminist authors popular in 1970s USA, such as Margaret Benston and Peggy Morton, relied heavily on analysis of productive and unproductive labour to attempt to shift a perception of the time, that consumption was the purpose of a family, presenting arguments for a state paid wage to homemakers, and a cultural perception of the family as a productive entity.

With the emergence of intersectionality as a widely popular theory of current feminism, Marxist feminists include an analysis of other sources of oppression beyond class that increase exploitation in a capitalist system. However, they also remain critical of intersectionality theory for relying on bourgeois identity politics. Intersectionality operates within Marxist feminism as a lens to view the interaction of different aspects of identity as a result of structural and systematic oppression. The organization Radical Women provides a clear example of successful incorporation of the goals of Marxist feminism without overlooking identities that are more susceptible to exploitation. They contend that elimination of the capitalist profit-driven economy will remove the motivation for sexism, racism, homophobia, and other forms of oppression.

3.15 KEY WORDS

Marxism: Marxism is a method of socioeconomic analysis that views class relations and social conflict using a materialist interpretation of historical development and takes a dialectical view of social transformation. It originates from the works of 19th-century German philosophers Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

3.16 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Discuss the Marxism, Work, and Human Nature.
2. Compare Marxist-Feminist Analyses.
3. Describe First Wave Feminist Analyses of Women and Work.

4. Write about Psychological Theories of Women and Work.
5. Discuss Ethical Theories of Women's Caring Work.
6. Compare Modernist vs. Postmodernist Feminist Theory.
7. Discuss Race, Class, and Intersectional Feminist Analyses.

3.17 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Addams, Jane, 1914, "Women and Public Housekeeping", in Women and Public Life, in James P. Lichtenberger (ed.), Annuals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, v.56.
- Alvarez, Sonia, 1998, "Latin American Feminisms 'Go Global': Trends of the 1990s and Challenges for the New Milennium", in S. Alvarez, E. Dagnin and A. Escobar (eds.), Cultures of Politics/Politics of Cultures: Revisioning Latin American Social Movements, Boulder Co: Westview, pp. 93–115.
- Amott, Teresa and Julie Matthaei, 1991, Race, Gender and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States, Boston: South End Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria, 1999, Borderlands/La Frontera, San Francisco: Aunt Lute Press.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria and Cherrie Moraga (eds.), 1981, This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color, Watertown MA: Persephone Press.
- Barrett, Michele, 1980, Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis, London: Verso.
- Bartky, Sandra, 1990, Femininity and Domination: Studies in the Phenomenology of Oppression, New York: Routledge.
- Beauvoir, Simone De, 1978, The Second Sex, tr. & ed. by. HM Parsley, New York: Knopf.
- Beecher, Catherine, [1841] 1970, A Treatise on Domestic Economy, New York: Source Book Press.
- Beneria, Lourdes, 2003, Gender, Development, and Globalization: Economics As If All People Mattered, London: Routledge.

- Benston, Margaret, 1969, "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation", Monthly Review, 21 (4), September.
- Bettie, Julie, 2000, "Women without Class: Chicas, Cholas, Trash and the Presence/Absence of Class Identity", Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 6 (1): 1–35.
- Brenner, Johanna, 2000, Women and the Politics of Class, New York: Monthly Review.
- Brewer, Rose, 1993,"Theorizing Race, Class and Gender", in Stanlie James and Abena Busia, pp. 13–30.
- Brown, Rita Mae, 1974, "The Last Straw", in Bunch and Myron 1974, pp. 13–23.
- Bunch, Charlotte and Nancy Myron (eds.), 1974, Class and Feminism, Baltimore: Diana Press.
- Capella, Jean, James Ridgeway, and Sarah Shourd, Hell is a Very Small Place: Voices from Solitary Confinement. New York: The New Press.
- Carby, Hazel, 1997, "White Woman Listen!!" in Hennessy and Ingraham 1997, pp. 110–128.
- Chen, Martha, et al., 2005, Progress of the World's Women: Women, Work, and Poverty, New York: UNIFEM.
- Chodorow, Nancy, 1978, The Reproduction of Mothering, Berkeley: University of California.
- ——, 1979, "Mothering, Male Dominance, and Capitalism", in Zillah Eisenstein (ed.), Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism, New York: Monthly Review Press, pp. 83–106.
- ——, 1989, "Toward a Relational Individualism", in Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory, London: Polity Press, pp. 154–162.
- Cliff, Tony, 1984, Class Struggle and Women's Liberation, London: Blackwell.
- Conaghan, Joanna, 2009, "Intersectionality and the Feminist Project in Law," in Graham et al. (eds.), 21–48.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé, 1989, "Demarginalizing the Intersection between Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Anti-

Discrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Anti-Racist Politics", University of Chicago Legal Forum: 139–67.

- ——, 1992, "Whose Story is it Anyway? Feminist and Anti-racist Appropriations of Anita Hill", in Toni Morrison (ed.), Race-ing Justice, Engendering Power, New York: Pantheon, pp. 402–41.
- Dalla Costa, Maria, 1974, The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community, Bristol, England: Falling Wall Press.
- Davis, Angela Y., 1983, Women, Race, and Class, New York: Vintage Press.
- ——, 1998, "From the Prison of Slavery to the Slavery of Prisons: Frederick Douglass and the Convict Lease System", in Joy James (ed.), The Angela Y. Davis Reader. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Delphy, Christine, 1984, Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

3.18 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Section 3.2
2. See Section 3.3
3. See Section 3.4

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 3.7
2. See Section 3.8
3. See Section 3.9
4. See Section 3.10

UNIT 4: RADICAL FEMINISM

STRUCTURE

4.0 OBJECTIVES

After this unit, we can able to know:

- To know about the Theory and ideology of Radical feminism;
- To discuss about the Movement related with Radical feminism;
- To highlight the Radical lesbian feminism;
- To discuss the Views on transgender topics
- To do Criticism of Radical feminism.

4.1 INTRODUCTION

Definition of Radical Feminism

Radical feminist beliefs are based on the idea that the main cause of women's oppression originates from social roles and institutional structures being constructed from male supremacy and patriarchy. The

main difference between radical feminism and other branches is that they didn't concentrate on equalizing the distribution of power. Instead, they focused their efforts on completely eliminating patriarchy by transforming the entire structure of society. More specifically, they wanted to get rid of traditional gender roles.

Radical Feminist Theory

Radical feminism was a branch that formed during the second wave of feminism in the 1960s. At this point in time, women had won the right to vote and were working more outside of the home. In addition, the United States had gone through the sexual revolution which had lowered the pressure for people to be strictly monogamous and had given them more room for sexual expression.

In other words, life for women had greatly improved over the previous half century. However, women still experienced oppression on a regular basis. Would you have felt satisfied knowing that you could now work outside the home but would not be viewed as equal? Or knowing that you were going to be paid much less than a man that did the exact same job as you?

The sexual revolution had also brought some freedom to sexual expression. However, there was still a lack of reproductive rights. For example, how would you have felt if you didn't have the right to access birth control? Radical feminists believed that these were deliberate power plays by men and that the institutions and systems that supported this oppression were just the tools they used to maintain control.

Unlike other forms of feminism that viewed power as something positive as long as it was evenly distributed, radical feminists believed that power was mostly something experienced in a dualistic system of domination and subordination, with one party always experiencing oppression. This system was an outrage to radical feminists, and as a result, they tended to be militant with their efforts, calling for direct action against patriarchy

and male supremacy. They organized sit-ins and demonstrations at various events that they felt supported these systems and institutions of oppression.

One of the most memorable demonstrations was the Miss America protest of 1968 which was staged by the New York Radical Women. This event was what gave birth to the mythical image of the 'bra-burning feminist'. Bras were not burned at this demonstration, but they were tossed into a trash can with other items including high heels, eyelash curlers, cosmetics, wigs, and magazines such as Cosmopolitan and Playboy. This was done in protest against what was seen as the ridiculous standards of beauty to which women were held.

Radical Feminist theory analyses the structures of power which oppress the female sex. Its central tenet is that women as a biological class are globally oppressed by men as a biological class. We believe that male power is constructed and maintained through institutional and cultural practices that aim to bolster male superiority through the reinforcement of female inferiority. One such manifestation of the patriarchy is gender, which we believe to be a socially constructed hierarchy which functions to repress female autonomy and has no basis in biology. Radical Feminists also critique all religions and their institutions, and other practices that promote violence against women such as prostitution, pornography and FGM. The subjugation of women is a social process that has no basis in biology or any other pretext, and thus can and should be challenged and dismantled.

Radical Feminists see that our oppression as females is closely linked to and bound up in our roles as the bearers of new life and male hatred of our female reproductive power. Radical Feminists take an unequivocal stance on the right to female reproductive justice.

Radical Feminism increasingly recognises that females from different oppressed groups experience a combination of oppressions. Class, race

and disability have systematic structural impacts on different women's lives in different toxic combinations.

Radical Feminists believe in an autonomous women's movement as the path to women's liberation. We believe in the importance of female only spaces where theory and action is developed from the lived reality of females who have been socialised into womanhood.

4.2 THEORY AND IDEOLOGY

Alongside the obvious questions of freedom of information and criminal justice, the Julian Assange affair has also made visible a multitude of contemporary anxieties concerning sex and gender. This was brought into sharp relief by claims that Assange's prospects of a fair trial might be compromised by the possibility that Sweden's chief prosecutor Marianne Ny is a "malicious radical feminist" with a "bias against men".

But what exactly is radical feminism? If popular attitudes to feminism are anything to go by, it's clearly something pretty terrifying.

Research suggests that, in the popular imagination, the feminist – and the radical feminist in particular – is seen as full of irrational vitriol towards all men, probably a lesbian and certainly not likely to be found browsing in Claire's Accessories. As an academic working on issues concerning gender and politics, I've had the good fortune of meeting lots of inspiring feminist women – and men – but despite searching I've yet to locate a feminist matching that particular description. Perhaps I haven't looked hard enough. A more likely possibility is that the popular insistence that radical feminists – and often by implication feminists in general – are all man-haters reflects wider misunderstandings about the history of feminism and its impact on contemporary gender relations.

So what is radical feminism? Historically, radical feminism was a specific strand of the feminist movement that emerged in Europe and North America in the late 1960s. Distinctive to this strand was its emphasis on the role of male violence against women in the creation and

maintenance of gender inequality (as argued by the likes of Susan Brownmiller, Andrea Dworkin and Catherine MacKinnon). And while a minority of radical feminists – most infamously Valerie Solanas – were hostile to men, radical feminism was much more instrumental in generating widespread support for campaigns around issues such as rape, domestic violence and sexual harassment.

However, in Britain at least, radical feminism has never been particularly dominant, partly because – in the eyes of many socialist and postcolonial feminists – it has been insufficiently attentive to the intersections between gender inequality and other categories, such as race and class. So Rod Liddle's peddling of the tiresome rightwing idea that radical feminism has destroyed the family, along with Dominic Raab's assault on "feminist bigotry" and the Vatican's efforts to address "distortions" caused by radical feminism, rest on at least two implausible assumptions. First, they reduce feminism to a horrifying caricature that never really existed and second, they make the frankly bizarre suggestion that radical feminism is the dominant ideology of our times. It would seem that not only do these radical feminists commit the outrage of not wearing makeup, but they use the time this frees up to consolidate their world domination. Or an alternative explanation might be that these are the paranoid anxieties of fearful anti-feminists.

Their fear is not totally misplaced, for radical feminism has undoubtedly had some success. Fortunately for Dominic Raab, world domination is not one of them. Three decades ago, the notion that rape and domestic violence are pressing political issues rather than trivialities, or that men should play an active role in childcare, would have been seen by many as radical and dangerous. Today, thanks to the influence of the insights of diverse strands of feminism (including, but not limited to, radical feminism), these ideas have seeped into the mainstream. Despite this, genuine gender equality can seem distant, but many groups and individuals continue to push in the right direction.

Although the rights and wrongs of the Assange affair are at this stage far from clear, whenever accusations of "man-hating feminism" enter into a debate, our suspicions should be immediately aroused. For more often than not, the temptation to close down debate by tossing around accusations of man-hating radical feminism is caused not by a fear of debate, but by the deeper fear that feminism might actually have something important to say.

4.3 MOVEMENT

Roots

The ideology of radical feminism in the United States developed as a component of the women's liberation movement. It grew largely due to the influence of the civil rights movement, that had gained momentum in the 1960s, and many of the women who took up the cause of radical feminism had previous experience with radical protest in the struggle against racism. Chronologically, it can be seen within the context of second wave feminism that started in the early 1960s. The primary players and the pioneers of this second wave of feminism included Shulamith Firestone, Kathie Sarachild, Ti-Grace Atkinson, Carol Hanisch, and Judith Brown. Many local women's groups in the late sixties, such as the UCLA Women's Liberation Front (WLF), offered diplomatic statements of radical feminism's ideologies. UCLA's WLF co-founder Devra Weber recalls, "the radical feminists were opposed to patriarchy, but not necessarily capitalism. In our group at least, they opposed so-called male dominated national liberation struggles".

These women helped secure the bridge that translated radical protest for racial equality over to the struggle for women's rights; by witnessing the discrimination and oppression to which the black population was subjected, they were able to gain strength and motivation to do the same for their fellow women. They took up the cause and advocated for a variety of women's issues, including abortion, the Equal Rights Amendment, access to credit, and equal pay. Most women of color (who were predominantly working-class) did not participate in the formation

of the radical feminist movement because it did not address many issues that were relevant to those from a working-class background. But for those who felt compelled to stand up for the cause, radical action was needed, so they took to the streets and formed consciousness raising groups to rally support for the cause and recruit people willing to fight for it. Later, second-wave radical feminism saw greater numbers of black feminists and other women of color participating.

In the 1960s, radical feminism emerged simultaneously within liberal feminist and working-class feminist discussions, first in the United States, then in the United Kingdom and Australia. Those involved had gradually come to believe that it was not only the middle-class nuclear family that oppressed women, but that it was also social movements and organizations that claimed to stand for human liberation, notably the counterculture, the New Left, and Marxist political parties, all of which were male-dominated and male-oriented. In the United States, radical feminism developed as a response to some of the perceived failings of both New Left organizations such as the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) and feminist organizations such as NOW.[citation needed] Initially concentrated in big cities like New York, Chicago, Boston, Washington, DC, and on the West Coast,[a] radical feminist groups spread across the country rapidly from 1968 to 1972.

At the same time parallel trends of thinking developed outside the USA: The Women's Yearbook from Munich gives a good sense of early 1970s feminism in West Germany: "Their Yearbook essay on behalf of the autonomous feminist movement argued for patriarchy as the oldest, most fundamental relationship of exploitation. Hence the necessity of feminists' separating from men's organizations on the Left, since they would just use women's efforts to support their own goals, in which women's liberation did not count. The editors of Frauenjahrbuch 76 also explicitly distanced themselves from the language of liberalism, arguing that "equal rights define women's oppression as women's disadvantage." They explicitly labeled the equal rights version of feminism as wanting to be like men, vehemently rejecting claims that "women should enter all

the male-dominated areas of society. More women in politics! More women in the sciences, etc. . . . Women should be able to do everything that men do." Their position—and that of the autonomous feminists represented in this 1976 yearbook—instead was that: "This principle that 'we want that too' or 'we can do it too' measures emancipation against men and again defines what we want in relationship to men. Its content is conformity to men. . . . Because in this society male characteristics fundamentally have more prestige, recognition and above all more power, we easily fall into the trap of rejecting and devaluing all that is female and admiring and emulating all that is considered male. . . . The battle against the female role must not become the battle for the male tole. . . . The feminist demand, which transcends the claim for equal rights, is the claim for self-determination."

Radical feminists introduced the use of consciousness raising (CR) groups. These groups brought together intellectuals, workers, and middle class women in developed Western countries to discuss their experiences. During these discussions, women noted a shared and repressive system regardless of their political affiliation or social class. Based on these discussions, the women drew the conclusion that ending of patriarchy was the most necessary step towards a truly free society. These consciousness-raising sessions allowed early radical feminists to develop a political ideology based on common experiences women faced with male supremacy. Consciousness raising was extensively used in chapter sub-units of the National Organization for Women (NOW) during the 1970s. The feminism that emerged from these discussions stood first and foremost for the liberation of women, as women, from the oppression of men in their own lives, as well as men in power. Radical feminism claimed that a totalizing ideology and social formation—patriarchy (government or rule by fathers)—dominated women in the interests of men.

Groups

Logo of the Redstockings

Within groups such as New York Radical Women (1967–1969; no relation to the present-day socialist feminist organization Radical Women), which Ellen Willis characterized as "the first women's liberation group in New York City", a radical feminist ideology began to emerge that declared that "the personal is political" and "sisterhood is powerful", formulations that arose from these consciousness-raising sessions. This call to women's activism was coined by Kathie Sarachild in the 1960s. New York Radical Women fell apart in early 1969 in what came to be known as the "politico-feminist split" with the "politicos" seeing capitalism as the source of women's oppression, while the "feminists" saw male supremacy as "a set of material, institutionalized relations, not just bad attitudes". The feminist side of the split, which soon began referring to itself as "radical feminists", soon constituted the basis of a new organization, Redstockings. At the same time, Ti-Grace Atkinson led "a radical split-off from NOW", which became known as The Feminists. A third major stance would be articulated by the New York Radical Feminists, founded later in 1969 by Shulamith Firestone (who broke from the Redstockings) and Anne Koedt.

During this period, the movement produced "a prodigious output of leaflets, pamphlets, journals, magazine articles, newspaper and radio and TV interviews". Many important feminist works, such as Koedt's essay The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm (1970) and Kate Millet's book Sexual Politics (1970), emerged during this time and in this milieu.

Ideology emerges and diverges

At the beginning of this period, "heterosexuality was more or less an unchallenged assumption". Among radical feminists, the view became widely held that, thus far, the sexual freedoms gained in the sexual revolution of the 1960s, in particular, the decreasing emphasis on monogamy, had been largely gained by men at women's expense. This assumption of heterosexuality would soon be challenged by the rise of political lesbianism, closely associated with Atkinson and The Feminists.

Redstockings and The Feminists were both radical feminist organizations, but held rather distinct views. Most members of Redstockings held to a materialist and anti-psychologistic view. They viewed men's oppression of women as ongoing and deliberate, holding individual men responsible for this oppression, viewing institutions and systems (including the family) as mere vehicles of conscious male intent, and rejecting psychologistic explanations of female submissiveness as blaming women for collaboration in their own oppression. They held to a view—which Willis would later describe as "neo-Maoist"—that it would be possible to unite all or virtually all women, as a class, to confront this oppression by personally confronting men.

Ellen Willis

The Feminists held a more idealistic, psychologistic, and utopian philosophy, with a greater emphasis on "sex roles", seeing sexism as rooted in "complementary patterns of male and female behavior". They placed more emphasis on institutions, seeing marriage, family, prostitution, and heterosexuality as all existing to perpetuate the "sex-role system". They saw all of these as institutions to be destroyed. Within the group, there were further disagreements, such as Koedt's viewing the institution of "normal" sexual intercourse as being focused mainly on male sexual or erotic pleasure, while Atkinson viewed it mainly in terms of reproduction. In contrast to the Redstockings, The Feminists generally considered genitally focused sexuality to be inherently male. Ellen Willis, the Redstockings co-founder, would later write that insofar as the Redstockings considered abandoning heterosexual activity, they saw it as a "bitter price" they "might have to pay for [their] militance", whereas The Feminists embraced separatist feminism as a strategy.

The New York Radical Feminists (NYRF) took a more psychologistic (and even biologically determinist) line. They argued that men dominated women not so much for material benefits as for the ego

satisfaction intrinsic in domination. Similarly, they rejected the Redstockings view that women submitted only out of necessity or The Feminists' implicit view that they submitted out of cowardice, but instead argued that social conditioning simply led most women to accept a submissive role as "right and natural".

Forms of action

Radical feminism was not and is not only a movement of ideology and theory. Radical feminists also take direct action. In 1968, they protested against the Miss America pageant in order to bring "sexist beauty ideas and social expectations" to the forefront of women's social issues. Even though there weren't any bras burned on that day, this protest is famous for the phrase "bra-burner". "Feminists threw their bras—along with "woman-garbage" such as girdles, false eyelashes, steno pads, wigs, women's magazines, and dishcloths—into a "Freedom Trash Can", but they did not set it on fire". In 1970, more than one hundred feminists staged an 11-hour sit-in at the Ladies' Home Journal. These women demanded that the editor "be removed and replaced by a woman editor". The Ladies Home journal, "with their emphasis on food, family, fashion, and femininity, played an important role in maintaining the status quo and thus were instruments of women's oppression". One member explains the motivation of the protest noting that they "were there to destroy a publication which feeds off of women's anger and frustration, a magazine which destroys women. In addition, they "used a variety of tactics-demonstrations and speakouts" about topics such as rape. Through "tireless[ly] organizing among friends and coworkers, on street corners, in supermarkets and ladies' rooms" these radical feminists were able gain an amazing amount of exposure". The movement gained momentum, while a "prodigious output of leaflets, pamphlets, journals, magazine articles, newspaper and radio and TV interviews" were produced. In France and West Germany radical feminists developed further direct actions:

Self-incrimination

On 6 June 1971 the title of the Stern (magazine) showed 28 German actresses and jounalists confessing “We Had an Abortion!” wir haben abgetrieben! unleashing a campaign against the abortion ban. The journalist Alice Schwarzer had organized this following the French example Manifeste_des_343.

Later in 1974, Alice Schwarzer persuaded 329 doctors to admit in Der Spiegel publicly to having performed abortions and she found a woman willing to terminate her pregnancy on camera with vacuum aspiration, thereby promoting this method and show it on the German television news magazine Panorama.

This was a new tactic: The ostentatious, publicly documented violation of a law that millions of women had broken thus far, only in secret and under undignified circumstances. Broadcasting freedom came under fire as never before.

— Cristina Perincioli

Circumventing the abortion ban

The women’s centers did abortion counseling, compiled a list of Dutch abortion clinics, visited them and organized bus trips every two weeks. Police accused the organizers of illegal conspiracy. "The center used these arrests to publicize its strategy of civil disobedience and raised such a public outcry that the prosecutions were dropped. The bus trips continued without police interference. This victory was politically significant in two respects... while the state did not change the law, it did back off from enforcing it, deferring to women's collective power. The feminist claim to speak for women was thus affirmed by both women and the state."

Leaving the church in groups

Groups of radical feminists left the Catholic and Protestant church in protest of its abortion policy thus refusing to finance the churches with their taxes. In Germany those baptized in one of the officially recognized

churches have to document that they have formally left the church in order not to be responsible for paying church tax.

Protest in the courtroom and at the German Press Council

Lesbian groups and women's centers joined forces throughout Germany against a witch-hunt by the press against two women who had arranged the murder an abusive husband. 146 female journalists and 41 male colleagues successfully petitioned the German Press Council to censure the "Springer company publications … for their sensationalist coverage of this trial."

Genital self-exams

Helped women to gain knowledge about how their own bodies functioned so they would no longer be at the mercy of the medical profession. An outgrowth of this movement was the founding of the Feminist Women's Health Center [de] (FFGZ) in Berlin in 1974.

Social organization and aims

Radical feminists have generally formed small activist or community associations around either consciousness raising or concrete aims. Many radical feminists in Australia participated in a series of squats to establish various women's centers, and this form of action was common in the late 1970s and early 1980s. By the mid-1980s many of the original consciousness raising groups had dissolved, and radical feminism was more and more associated with loosely organized university collectives. Radical feminism can still be seen, particularly within student activism and among working class women. In Australia, many feminist social organizations accepted government funding during the 1980s, and the election of a conservative government in 1996 crippled these organizations. The movement also arose in Israel among Jews. While radical feminists aim to dismantle patriarchal society, their immediate aims are generally concrete. Common demands include:

Expanding reproductive rights: "Defined by feminists in the 1970s as a basic human right, it includes the right to abortion and birth control, but implies much more. To be realised, reproductive freedom must include not only woman's right to choose childbirth, abortion, sterilisation or birth control, but also her right to make those choices freely, without pressure from individual men, doctors, governmental or religious authorities. It is a key issue for women, since without it the other freedoms we appear to have, such as the right to education, jobs and equal pay, may prove illusory. Provisions of childcare, medical treatment, and society's attitude towards children are also involved."
Changing the organizational sexual culture, e.g., breaking down traditional gender roles and reevaluating societal concepts of femininity and masculinity (a common demand in US universities during the 1980s). In this, they often form tactical alliances with other currents of feminism.

Views on the sex industry

Radical feminists have written about a wide range of issues regarding the sex industry—which they tend to oppose—including but not limited to: harm to women during the production of pornography, the social harm from consumption of pornography, the coercion and poverty that leads women to become prostitutes, the long-term effects of prostitution, the raced and classed nature of prostitution, and male dominance over women in prostitution and pornography.

Prostitution

Radical feminists argue that most women who become prostitutes are forced into it by a pimp, human trafficking, poverty, drug addiction, or trauma such as child sexual abuse. Women from the lowest socioeconomic classes—impoverished women, women with a low level of education, women from the most disadvantaged racial and ethnic minorities—are over-represented in prostitution all over the world. Catharine MacKinnon asked: "If prostitution is a free choice, why are the

women with the fewest choices the ones most often found doing it?" A large percentage of prostitutes polled in one study of 475 people involved in prostitution reported that they were in a difficult period of their lives, and most wanted to leave the occupation.

MacKinnon argues that "In prostitution, women have sex with men they would never otherwise have sex with. The money thus acts as a form of force, not as a measure of consent. It acts like physical force does in rape." They believe that no person can be said to truly consent to their own oppression and no-one should have the right to consent to the oppression of others. In the words of Kathleen Barry, consent is not a "good divining rod as to the existence of oppression, and consent to violation is a fact of oppression". Andrea Dworkin wrote in 1992:

Prostitution in and of itself is an abuse of a woman's body. Those of us who say this are accused of being simple-minded. But prostitution is very simple. ... In prostitution, no woman stays whole. It is impossible to use a human body in the way women's bodies are used in prostitution and to have a whole human being at the end of it, or in the middle of it, or close to the beginning of it. It's impossible. And no woman gets whole again later, after.

She argued that "prostitution and equality for women cannot exist simultaneously" and to eradicate prostitution "we must seek ways to use words and law to end the abusive selling and buying of girls' and women's bodies for men's sexual pleasure".

Radical feminist thinking has analyzed prostitution as a cornerstone of patriarchal domination and sexual subjugation of women that impacts negatively not only on the women and girls in prostitution but on all women as a group, because prostitution continually affirms and reinforces patriarchal definitions of women as having a primary function to serve men sexually. They say it is crucial that society does not replace one patriarchal view on female sexuality—e.g., that women should not have sex outside marriage/a relationship and that casual sex is shameful

for a woman, etc.—with another similarly oppressive and patriarchal view—acceptance of prostitution, a sexual practice based on a highly patriarchal construct of sexuality: that the sexual pleasure of a woman is irrelevant, that her only role during sex is to submit to the man's sexual demands and to do what he tells her, that sex should be controlled by the man, and that the woman's response and satisfaction are irrelevant. Radical feminists argue that sexual liberation for women cannot be achieved so long as we normalize unequal sexual practices where a man dominates a woman. "Feminist consciousness raising remains the foundation for collective struggle and the eventual liberation of women".

Radical feminists strongly object to the patriarchal ideology that has been one of the justifications for the existence of prostitution, namely that prostitution is a "necessary evil", because men cannot control themselves; therefore it is "necessary" that a small number of women be "sacrificed" to be used and abused by men, to protect "chaste" women from rape and harassment. These feminists see prostitution as a form of slavery, and say that, far from decreasing rape rates, prostitution leads to a sharp increase in sexual violence against women, by sending the message that it is acceptable for a man to treat a woman as a sexual instrument over which he has total control. Melissa Farley argues that Nevada's high rape rate is connected to legal prostitution. Nevada is the only US state that allows legal brothels, and it is ranked 4th out of the 50 U.S. states for sexual assault crimes.

Indigenous women are particularly targeted for prostitution. In Canada, New Zealand, Mexico, and Taiwan, studies have shown that indigenous women are at the bottom of the race and class hierarchy of prostitution, often subjected to the worst conditions, most violent demands and sold at the lowest price. It is common for indigenous women to be over-represented in prostitution when compared with their total population. This is as a result of the combined forces of colonialism, physical displacement from ancestral lands, destruction of indigenous social and cultural order, misogyny, globalization/neoliberalism, race

discrimination and extremely high levels of violence perpetrated against them.

Pornography

Radical feminists, notably Catharine MacKinnon, charge that the production of pornography entails physical, psychological, and/or economic coercion of the women who perform and model in it. This is said to be true even when the women are presented as enjoying themselves. It is also argued that much of what is shown in pornography is abusive by its very nature. Gail Dines holds that pornography, exemplified by gonzo pornography, is becoming increasingly violent and that women who perform in pornography are brutalized in the process of its production.

Radical feminists point to the testimony of well-known participants in pornography, such as Traci Lords and Linda Boreman, and argue that most female performers are coerced into pornography, either by somebody else, or by an unfortunate set of circumstances. The feminist anti-pornography movement was galvanized by the publication of Ordeal, in which Linda Boreman (who under the name of "Linda Lovelace" had starred in Deep Throat) stated that she had been beaten, raped, and pimped by her husband Chuck Traynor, and that Traynor had forced her at gunpoint to make scenes in Deep Throat, as well as forcing her, by use of both physical violence against Boreman as well as emotional abuse and outright threats of violence, to make other pornographic films. Dworkin, MacKinnon, and Women Against Pornography issued public statements of support for Boreman, and worked with her in public appearances and speeches.

Radical feminists hold the view that pornography contributes to sexism, arguing that in pornographic performances the actresses are reduced to mere receptacles—objects—for sexual use and abuse by men. They argue that the narrative is usually formed around men's pleasure as the only goal of sexual activity, and that the women are shown in a

subordinate role. Some opponents believe pornographic films tend to show women as being extremely passive, or that the acts which are performed on the women are typically abusive and solely for the pleasure of their sex partner. On-face ejaculation and anal sex are increasingly popular among men, following trends in porn. MacKinnon and Dworkin defined pornography as "the graphic sexually explicit subordination of women through pictures or words".

Radical feminists say that consumption of pornography is a cause of rape and other forms of violence against women. Robin Morgan summarizes this idea with her oft-quoted statement, "Pornography is the theory, and rape is the practice." They charge that pornography eroticizes the domination, humiliation, and coercion of women, and reinforces sexual and cultural attitudes that are complicit in rape and sexual harassment. In her book Only Words (1993), MacKinnon argues that pornography "deprives women of the right to express verbal refusal of an intercourse".

MacKinnon argued that pornography leads to an increase in sexual violence against women through fostering rape myths. Such rape myths include the belief that women really want to be raped and that they mean yes when they say no. It is disputed that "rape myths perpetuate sexual violence indirectly by creating distorted beliefs and attitudes about sexual assault and shift elements of blame onto the victims". Additionally, according to MacKinnon, pornography desensitizes viewers to violence against women, and this leads to a progressive need to see more violence in order to become sexually aroused, an effect she claims is well documented.

German radical feminist Alice Schwarzer is one proponent of the view that pornography offers a distorted sense of men and women's bodies, as well as the actual sexual act, often showing performers with synthetic implants or exaggerated expressions of pleasure, engaging in fetishes that are presented as popular and normal.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. How do you know about the Theory and ideology of Radical feminism?

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

2. Discuss about the Movement related with Radical feminism.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

4.4 RADICAL LESBIAN FEMINISM

Radical lesbians are distinguished from other radical feminists through their ideological roots in political lesbianism. Radical lesbians see lesbianism as an act of resistance against the political institution of heterosexuality, which they view as violent and oppressive towards women. Julie Bindel has written that her lesbianism is "intrinsically bound up" with her feminism.

During the Women's Liberation Movement of the 1970s, straight women within the movement were challenged on the basis of their heterosexual identities perpetuating the very patriarchal systems that they were working to undo. A large fraction of the movement sought to reform sexist institutions while "leaving intact the staple nuclear unit of oppression: heterosexual sex". Others saw the logic of lesbianism as a

strong political act to end male dominance and as central to the women's movement.

Radical lesbians criticized the women's liberation movement for its failure to criticize the "psychological oppression" of heteronormativity, which they believe to be "the sexual foundation of the social institutions". They argued that heterosexual love relationships perpetuate patriarchal power relations through "personal domination" and therefore directly contradicted the values and goals of the movement. As one radical lesbian wrote, "no matter what the feminist does, the physical act [of heterosexuality] throws both women and man back into role playing... all of her politics are instantly shattered". They argued that the women's liberation movement would not be successful without challenging heteronormativity.

Radical lesbians believe lesbianism actively threatens patriarchal systems of power. They defined lesbians not only by their sexual preference, but by their liberation and independence from men. Lesbian activists Sydney Abbot and Barbara Love argued that "the lesbian has freed herself from male domination" through disconnecting from them not only sexually, but also "financially and emotionally". They argue that lesbianism fosters the utmost independence from gendered systems of power, and from the "psychological oppression" of heteronormativity.

Rejecting norms of gender, sex and sexuality is central to radical lesbian feminism. Lesbianism as a political act represents an ability to create identity from all aspects of the human condition, both masculine and feminine, while rejecting societal identities that are imposed onto bodies by a culture. Radical lesbians believed that "lesbian identity was a 'woman-identified' identity'", meaning it should be defined by and with reference to women, rather than in relation to men.

In their manifesto "The Woman-Identified Woman", the lesbian radical feminist group Radicalesbians underline the necessity of creating a "new consciousness" that rejects normative definitions of womanhood and

femininity, which center on the powerlessness. This redefinition of womanhood and femininity means freeing lesbian identities from harmful and divisive stereotypes. As Abbot and Love argued in "Is Women's Liberation a Lesbian Plot?" (1971):

As long at the word 'dyke' can be used to frighten women into a less militant stand, keep women separate from their sisters, and keep them from giving primacy to anything other than men and family—then to that extent they are dominated by male culture.

Radical lesbians reiterate this thought, writing, "in this sexist society, for a woman to be independent means she can't be a woman, she must be a dyke". The rhetoric of a woman-identified-woman has been criticized for its exclusion of heterosexual women. According to some critics, "[lesbian feminism's use of] woman-identifying rhetorics should be considered rhetorical failures". Other critics argue that the intensity of radical lesbian feminist politics, on top of the preexisting stigma around lesbianism, gave a bad face to the feminist movement and provided fertile ground for tropes like the man-hater or bra burner.

4.5 VIEWS ON TRANSGENDER TOPICS

Since the 1970s, there has been a debate among radical feminists about transgender identities. In 1978, the Lesbian Organization of Toronto voted to become womyn-born womyn only and wrote:

A woman's voice was almost never heard as a woman's voice—it was always filtered through men's voices. So here a guy comes along saying, "I'm going to be a girl now and speak for girls." And we thought, "No you're not." A person cannot just join the oppressed by fiat.

Some radical feminists, such as Andrea Dworkin, Catharine MacKinnon, John Stoltenberg and Monique Wittig, have supported recognition of trans women as women, which they describe as trans-inclusive feminism, while others, such as Mary Daly, Janice Raymond, Robin Morgan, Germaine Greer, Sheila Jeffreys, Julie Bindel, and Robert Jensen, have

argued that the transgender movement perpetuates patriarchal gender norms and is incompatible with radical-feminist ideology.

Those who exclude Trans women from womanhood or women's spaces refer to themselves as gender critical and are referred to by others as trans-exclusionary. Radical feminists in particular who exclude trans women are often referred to as "trans-exclusionary radical feminists" or "TERFs",an acronym to which they object, say is inaccurate (citing, for example, their inclusion of trans men as women), and argue is a slur or even hate speech. These feminists argue that because trans women are assigned male at birth, they are accorded corresponding privileges in society, and even if they choose to present as women, the fact that they have a choice in this sets them apart from people assigned female. Gender-critical or trans-exclusionary radical feminists in particular say that the difference in behavior between men and women is the result of socialization. Lierre Keith describes femininity as "a set of behaviors that are, in essence, ritualized submission", and hence, gender is not an identity but a caste position, and gender-identity politics are an obstacle to gender abolition. They hold the same position with respect to race and class. Julie Bindel argued in 2008 that Iran carries out the highest number of sex-change operations in the world, because "surgery is an attempt to keep gender stereotypes intact", and that "it is precisely this idea that certain distinct behaviours are appropriate for males and females that underlies feminist criticism of the phenomenon of 'transgenderism'." According to the BBC in 2014, there are no reliable figures regarding gender-reassignment operations in Iran.

In The Transsexual Empire: The Making of the She-Male (1979), the lesbian radical feminist Janice Raymond argued that "transsexuals ... reduce the female form to artefact, appropriating this body for themselves". In The Whole Woman (1999), Germaine Greer wrote that largely male governments "recognise as women men who believe that they are women ... because [those governments] see women not as another sex but as a non-sex"; she continued that if uterus-and-ovaries transplants were a mandatory part of sex-change operations, the latter

"would disappear overnight". Sheila Jeffreys argued in 1997 that "the vast majority of transsexuals still subscribe to the traditional stereotype of women" and that by transitioning they are "constructing a conservative fantasy of what women should be ... an essence of womanhood which is deeply insulting and restrictive." In Gender Hurts (2014), she referred to sex reassignment surgery as "self-mutilation", and she used pronouns that refer to biological sex; she argued that feminists need to know "the biological sex of those who claim to be women and promote prejudicial versions of what constitutes womanhood", and that "use by men of feminine pronouns conceals the masculine privilege bestowed upon them by virtue of having been placed in and brought up in the male sex caste".

By contrast, trans-inclusive radical feminists claim that a biology-based or sex-essentialist ideology itself upholds patriarchal constructions of womanhood. Andrea Dworkin argued as early as 1974 that transgender people and gender identity research have the potential to radically undermine patriarchal sex essentialism: "Work with transsexuals, and studies of formation of gender identity in children provide basic information which challenges the notion that there are two distinct biological sexes. That information threatens to transform the traditional biology of sex difference into the radical biology of sex similarity". In 2015, radical feminist Catherine MacKinnon said that "male dominant society has defined women as a discrete biological group forever. If this was going to produce liberation, we'd be free ... To me, women is a political group. I never had much occasion to say that, or work with it, until the last few years when there has been a lot of discussion about whether trans women are women ... I always thought I don't care how someone becomes a woman or a man; it does not matter to me. It is just part of their specificity, their uniqueness, like everyone else's. Anybody who identifies as a woman, wants to be a woman, is going around being a woman, as far as I'm concerned, is a woman."

4.6 CRITICISM

Early in the radical feminism movement, some radical feminists theorized that "other kinds of hierarchy grew out of and were modeled on male supremacy-were in effect specialized forms of male supremacy". Therefore, the fight against male domination took priority because "the liberation of women would mean the liberation of all". This view is contested, particularly by intersectional feminism and black feminism. Critics argue that this ideology accepts the notion that identities are singular and disparate, rather than multiple and intersecting. For example, understanding women's oppression as disparate assumes that "men, in creating and maintaining these systems, are acting purely as men, in accordance with peculiarly male characteristics or specifically male supremacist objectives".

Ellen Willis' 1984 essay "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism" says that within the New Left, radical feminists were accused of being "bourgeois", "antileft", or even "apolitical", whereas they saw themselves as "radicalizing the left by expanding the definition of radical". Early radical feminists were mostly white and middle-class, resulting in "a very fragile kind of solidarity". This limited the validity of generalizations based on radical feminists' experiences of gender relations, and prevented white and middle-class women from recognizing that they benefited from race and class privilege. Many early radical feminists broke ties with "male-dominated left groups", or would work with them only in ad hoc coalitions. Willis, although very much a part of early radical feminism and continuing to hold that it played a necessary role in placing feminism on the political agenda, criticized its inability "to integrate a feminist perspective with an overall radical politics", while viewing this limitation as inevitable in the context of the time.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Highlight the Radical lesbian feminism.

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

2. Discuss the Views on transgender topics.

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

3. How do you do Criticism of Radical feminism?

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

   ……

4.7 LET US SUM UP

Radical feminists assert that society is a patriarchy in which the class of men is the oppressors of the class of women. They propose that the oppression of women is the most fundamental form of oppression, one that has existed since the inception of humanity. As radical feminist Ti-Grace Atkinson wrote in her foundational piece "Radical Feminism" (1969):

The first dichotomous division of this mass [mankind] is said to have been on the grounds of sex: male and female ... it was because half the human race bears the burden of the reproductive process and because man, the ‘rational’ animal, had the wit to take advantage of that, that the child bearers, or the 'beasts of burden,' were corralled into a political class: equivocating the biologically contingent burden into a political (or

necessary) penalty, thereby modifying these individuals' definition from the human to the functional, or animal.

Radical feminists argue that, because of patriarchy, women have come to be viewed as the "other" to the male norm, and as such have been systematically oppressed and marginalized. They further assert that men as a class benefit from the oppression of women. Patriarchal theory is not generally defined as a belief that all men always benefit from the oppression of all women. Rather, it maintains that the primary element of patriarchy is a relationship of dominance, where one party is dominant and exploits the other for the benefit of the former. Radical feminists believe that men (as a class) use social systems and other methods of control to keep women (and non-dominant men) suppressed. Radical feminists seek to abolish patriarchy by challenging existing social norms and institutions, and believe that eliminating patriarchy will liberate everyone from an unjust society. Ti-Grace Atkinson maintained that the need for power fuels the male class to continue oppressing the female class, arguing that "the need men have for the role of oppressor is the source and foundation of all human oppression".

The influence of radical-feminist politics on the women's liberation movement was considerable. Redstockings co-founder Ellen Willis wrote in 1984 that radical feminists "got sexual politics recognized as a public issue", created second-wave feminism's vocabulary, helped to legalize abortion in the USA, "were the first to demand total equality in the so-called private sphere" ("housework and child care ... emotional and sexual needs"), and "created the atmosphere of urgency" that almost led to the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. The influence of radical feminism can be seen in the adoption of these issues by the National Organization for Women (NOW), a feminist group that had previously been focused almost entirely on economic issues.

4.8 KEY WORDS

Radical: In more everyday language, a **radical** is someone who has very extreme views, so you could say that their views are different from the

root up. Similarly, a **radical** flaw or change is a fundamental one whereas a **radical** design or idea is very new and innovative.

Feminism: Feminism is a range of social movements, political movements, and ideologies that share a common goal: to define, establish, and achieve the political, economic, personal, and social equality of the sexes.

Amendments: An **amendment** is a formal or official change made to a law, contract, constitution, or other legal document. It is based on the verb to amend, which means to change for better. **Amendments** can add, remove, or update parts of these agreements.

4.9 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. How do you know about the Theory and ideology of Radical feminism?
2. Discuss about the Movement related with Radical feminism.
3. Highlight the Radical lesbian feminism.
4. Discuss the Views on transgender topics.
5. How do you do Criticism of Radical feminism?

4.10 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, Ti-Grace (2000) [1969]. "Radical Feminism". In Crow, Barbara A. (ed.). Radical Feminism: A Documentary Reader. New York: New York University Press. pp. 82–89.
2. Dines, Gail (Jun 29, 2011). "Gail Dines on radical feminism". Melbourne: Wheeler Centre, Sydney Writers' Festival – via YouTube.
3. Echols, Alice (1989). Daring To Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America 1967-1975. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
4. Evans, Sara M. (Summer 2002). "Re-Viewing the Second Wave". Feminist Studies. 28 (2): 258–267. doi:10.2307/3178740. JSTOR 3178740.

5. Firestone, Shulamith (1970). The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution. New York: William Morrow and Company.
6. Jeffries, Sheila (2014). Gender Hurts: A Feminist Analysis of the Politics of Transgenderism. Routledge. ISBN 978-0415539395.
7. Linden-Ward, Blanche; Green, Carol Hurd (1993). American Women in the 1960s: Changing the Future. New York: Twayne. ISBN 978-0-8057-9905-7.
8. MacKinnon, Catharine A. (1989). Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
9. Shelley, Martha (2000) [1970]. "Lesbianism and the Women'='s Liberation Movement". In Crow, Barbara A. (ed.). Radical Feminism: A Documentary Reader. New York: New York University Press. pp. 305–309.
10. Willis, Ellen (Spring–Summer 1984). "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism". Social Text. The 60's without Apology (9/10): 91–118. doi:10.2307/466537. JSTOR 466537.

4.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 4.2
2. See Section 4.3

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 4.4
2. See Section 4.5
3. See Section 4.5

UNIT 5: SOCIALIST FEMINISM AND DIFFERENCE FEMINISM

STRUCTURE

5.0 OBJECTIVES

After this unit, we can able to know:

- To know Socialist Feminism
- To discuss Anarcha-feminism
- To understand Marxist feminism
- To know Later theoretical works
- To know Praxis
- To discuss Intersectionality
- To describe Motherhood and the private sphere
- To know Difference Feminism

- To discuss History of Difference Feminism
- To know Essentialism and difference feminism
- To do the Criticisms of Difference Feminism

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The phrase "socialist feminism" was increasingly used during the 1970s to describe a mixed theoretical and practical approach to achieving women's equality. Socialist feminist theory analyzed the connection between the oppression of women and other oppressions in society, such as racism and economic injustice.

The Socialist Basis

Socialists had fought for decades to create a more equal society that did not exploit the poor and the powerless in the same ways that capitalism did. Like Marxism, socialist feminism recognized the oppressive structure of a capitalist society. Like radical feminism, socialist feminism recognized the fundamental oppression of women, particularly in a patriarchal society. However, socialist feminists did not recognize gender and only gender as the exclusive basis of all oppression. Rather, they held and continue to hold that class and gender are symbiotic, at least to some degree, and one cannot be addressed without taking the other into consideration.

Socialist feminists wanted to integrate the recognition of sex discrimination within their work to achieve justice and equality for women, for working classes, for the poor and all humanity.

A Little History

The term "socialist feminism" might make it sound as though the two concepts—socialism and feminism—are cemented together and intertwined, but this has not always been the case. Socialist Party leader Eugene V. Debs and Susan B. Anthony were at odds back in 1905, each of them supporting a different end of the spectrum. Decades later, Gloria

Steinem suggested that women, and particularly younger women, were eager to throw their support behind socialist Bernie Sanders rather than Hillary Clinton, a concept that became evident in the 2016 national election when Sanders won 53 percent of the female vote in the New Hampshire primary in contrast to Clinton's 46 percent.

Difference feminism, also known as Black feminism is a perspective that sees how women are oppressed by the patriarchy but also by both capitalism and racism. They argue that minority-ethnic, working-class women are the most discriminated against people in society.

5.2 SOCIALIST FEMINISM

Socialist feminism rose in the 1960s and 1970s as an offshoot of the feminist movement and New Left that focuses upon the interconnectivity of the patriarchy and capitalism. Socialist feminists argue that liberation can only be achieved by working to end both the economic and cultural sources of women's oppression. Socialist feminism is a two-pronged theory that broadens Marxist feminism's argument for the role of capitalism in the oppression of women and radical feminism's theory of the role of gender and the patriarchy. Socialist feminists reject radical feminism's main claim that patriarchy is the only or primary source of oppression of women. Rather, socialist feminists assert that women are unable to be free due to their financial dependence on males. Women are subjects to the male rulers in capitalism due to an uneven balance in wealth. They see economic dependence as the driving force of women's subjugation to men. Further, socialist feminists see women's liberation as a necessary part of larger quest for social, economic and political justice. Socialist feminists attempted to integrate the fight for women's liberation with the struggle against other oppressive systems based on race, class or economic status.

Socialist feminism draws upon many concepts found in Marxism, such as a historical materialist point of view, which means that they relate their ideas to the material and historical conditions of people's lives. Thus, socialist feminists consider how the sexism and gendered division

of labor of each historical era is determined by the economic system of the time. Those conditions are largely expressed through capitalist and patriarchal relations. Socialist feminists reject the Marxist notion that class and class struggle are the only defining aspects of history and economic development. Karl Marx asserted that when class oppression was overcome, gender oppression would vanish as well. According to socialist feminists, this view of gender oppression as a sub-class of class oppression is naive and much of the work of socialist feminists has gone towards specifying how gender and class work together to create distinct forms of oppression and privilege for women and men of each class. For example, they observe that women's class status is generally derivative of her husband's class or occupational status, e.g. a secretary that marries her boss assumes his class status.

In 1972, "Socialist Feminism: A Strategy for the Women's Movement", which is believed to be the first publication to use the term socialist feminism, was published by the Hyde Park Chapter of the Chicago Women's Liberation Union (Heather Booth, Day Creamer, Susan Davis, Deb Dobbin, Robin Kaufman and Tobey Klass). Other socialist feminists, notably two long-lived American organizations Radical Women and the Freedom Socialist Party, point to the classic Marxist writings of Frederick Engels (The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State) and August Bebel (Woman and Socialism) as a powerful explanation of the link between gender oppression and class exploitation. In the decades following the Cold War, feminist writer and scholar Sarah Evans says that the socialist feminist movement has lost traction in the West due to a common narrative that associates socialism with totalitarianism and dogma.

How Is Socialist Feminism Different?

Socialist feminism has often been compared to cultural feminism, but they are quite different although there are some similarities. Cultural feminism focuses almost exclusively on the unique traits and accomplishments of the female gender in opposition to those of men.

Separatism is a key theme, but socialist feminism opposes this. The goal of socialist feminism is to work with men to achieve a level playing field for both genders. Socialist feminists have referred to cultural feminism as "pretentious."

Socialist feminism is also distinctly different from liberal feminism, although the concept of liberalism has changed over the early decades of the 21st century. Although liberal feminists seek equality of the sexes, socialist feminists do not believe that is entirely possible within the constraints of current society.

The focus of radical feminists is more on the root causes of inequalities that exist. They tend to take the position that sexual discrimination is the sole source of the oppression of women. However, radical feminism may be more closely related than some other forms of feminism are to socialist feminism.

Of course, all these types of feminism share similar and often identical concerns, but their remedies and solutions vary.

5.3 ANARCHA-FEMINISM

Anarcha-feminism, also called anarchist feminism and anarcho-feminism, combines anarchism with feminism. It generally views patriarchy as a manifestation of involuntary coercive hierarchy that should be replaced by decentralized free association. Anarcha-feminists believe that the struggle against patriarchy is an essential part of class struggle, and the anarchist struggle against the state. In essence, the philosophy sees anarchist struggle as a necessary component of feminist struggle and vice versa. L. Susan Brown claims that "as anarchism is a political philosophy that opposes all relationships of power, it is inherently feminist". Bakunin opposed patriarchy and the way the law "subjects [women] to the absolute domination of the man". He argued that "[e]qual rights must belong to men and women" so that women can "become independent and be free to forge their own way of life".

Bakunin foresaw the end of "the authoritarian juridical family" and "the full sexual freedom of women."

Anarcha-feminism began with late 19th and early 20th century authors and theorists such as anarchist feminists Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre and Lucy Parsons. In the Spanish Civil War, an anarcha-feminist group, Mujeres Libres (Free Women) linked to the Federación Anarquista Ibérica, organized to defend both anarchist and feminist ideas, while the prominent Spanish anarchist and feminist leader Federica Montseny held that the "emancipation of women would lead to a quicker realization of the social revolution" and that "the revolution against sexism would have to come from intellectual and militant 'future-women.' According to this Nietzschean concept of Federica Montseny's, women could realize through art and literature the need to revise their own roles."

In Argentina, Virginia Bolten is responsible for the publication of a newspaper called La Voz de la Mujer (The Woman's Voice), which was published nine times in Rosario between 8 January 1896 and 1 January 1897, and was revived, briefly, in 1901. A similar paper with the same name was reportedly published later in Montevideo, which suggests that Bolten may also have founded and edited it after her deportation. "La Voz de la Mujer described itself as "dedicated to the advancement of Communist Anarchism". Its central theme was that of the multiple nature of women's oppression. An editorial asserted, "We believe that in present-day society nothing and nobody has a more wretched situation than unfortunate women." Women, they said, were doubly oppressed—by bourgeois society and by men. Its feminism can be seen from its attack on marriage and upon male power over women. Its contributors, like anarchist feminists elsewhere, developed a concept of oppression that focused on gender oppression. Marriage was a bourgeois institution which restricted women's freedom, including their sexual freedom. Marriages entered into without love, fidelity maintained through fear rather than desire, oppression of women by men they hated—all were seen as symptomatic of the coercion implied by the marriage contract. It

was this alienation of the individual's will that the anarchist feminists deplored and sought to remedy, initially through free love and then, and more thoroughly, through social revolution."

Lucía Sánchez Saornil, leader of Mujeres Libres, in 1933

Mujeres Libres was an anarchist women's organization in Spain that aimed to empower working class women. It was founded in 1936 by Lucía Sánchez Saornil, Mercedes Comaposada and Amparo Poch y Gascón and had approximately 30,000 members. The organization was based on the idea of a "double struggle" for women's liberation and social revolution and argued that the two objectives were equally important and should be pursued in parallel. In order to gain mutual support, they created networks of women anarchists. Flying day-care centres were set up in efforts to involve more women in union activities. Lucía Sánchez Saornil, was a Spanish poet, militant anarchist and feminist. She is best known as one of the founders of Mujeres Libres and served in the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo (CNT) and Solidaridad Internacional Antifascista (SIA). By 1919, she had been published in a variety of journals, including Los Quijotes, Tableros, Plural, Manantial and La Gaceta Literaria. Working under a male pen name, she was able to explore lesbian themes at a time when homosexuality was criminalized and subject to censorship and punishment. Writing in anarchist publications such as Earth and Freedom, the White Magazine and Workers' Solidarity, Lucía outlined her perspective as a feminist.

In the past decades, two films have been produced about anarcha-feminism. Libertarias is a historical drama made in 1996 about the Spanish anarcha-feminist organization Mujeres Libres. In 2010, the Argentinian film Ni dios, ni patrón, ni marido was released which is centered on the story of anarcha-feminist Virginia Bolten and her publishing of La Voz de la Mujer.

Mikhail Bakunin opposed patriarchy and the way the law "[subjected women] to the absolute domination of the man". He argued that "[e]qual

rights must belong to men and women" so that women could "become independent and be free to forge their own way of life". Bakunin foresaw the end of "the authoritarian juridical family" and "the full sexual freedom of women". On the other hand, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon viewed the family as the most basic unit of society and of his morality and believed that women had the responsibility of fulfilling a traditional role within the family.

Since the 1860s, anarchism's radical critique of capitalism and the state has been combined with a critique of patriarchy. Anarcha-feminists thus start from the precept that modern society is dominated by men. Authoritarian traits and values—domination, exploitation, aggression and competition—are integral to hierarchical civilizations and are seen as "masculine". In contrast, non-authoritarian traits and values—cooperation, sharing, compassion and sensitivity—are regarded as "feminine" and devalued. Anarcha-feminists have thus espoused creation of a non-authoritarian, anarchist society. They refer to the creation of a society based on cooperation, sharing and mutual aid as the "feminization of society".

Anarcha-feminism began with late 19th and early 20th century authors and theorists such as anarchist feminists Emma Goldman, Voltairine de Cleyre and Lucy Parsons. In the Spanish Civil War, an anarcha-feminist group, Mujeres Libres ("Free Women"), linked to the Federación Anarquista Ibérica, organized to defend both anarchist and feminist ideas. Stirnerist Nietzschean feminist Federica Montseny held that the "emancipation of women would lead to a quicker realization of the social revolution" and that "the revolution against sexism would have to come from intellectual and militant 'future-women'". According to this Nietzschean concept of Federica Montseny's, women could "realize through art and literature the need to revise their own roles". In China, the anarcha-feminist He Zhen argued that without women's liberation society could not be liberated.

5.4 MARXIST FEMINISM

Marxist feminism is a sub-type of feminist theory which focuses on the social institutions of private property and capitalism to explain and criticize gender inequality and oppression. According to Marxist feminists, private property gives rise to economic inequality, dependence, political and domestic struggle between the sexes, and is the root of women's oppression in the current social context.

Marxist feminism's foundation is laid by Friedrich Engels in his analysis of gender oppression in The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State (1884). He argues that a woman's subordination is not a result of her biological disposition but of social relations, and that men's efforts to achieve their demands for control of women's labor and sexual faculties have gradually solidified and become institutionalized in the nuclear family. Through a Marxist historical perspective, Engels analyzes the widespread social phenomena associated with female sexual morality, such as fixation on virginity and sexual purity, incrimination and violent punishment of women who commit adultery, and demands that women be submissive to their husbands. Ultimately, Engels traces these phenomena to the recent development of exclusive control of private property by the patriarchs of the rising slaveowner class in the ancient mode of production, and the attendant desire to ensure that their inheritance is passed only to their own offspring: chastity and fidelity are rewarded, says Engels, because they guarantee exclusive access to the sexual and reproductive faculty of women possessed by men from the property-owning class.

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, both Clara Zetkin and Eleanor Marx were against the demonization of men and supported a proletariat revolution that would overcome as many male–female inequalities as possible. As their movement already had the most radical demands in women's equality, most Marxist leaders, including Clara Zetkin and Alexandra Kollontai, counterposed Marxism against bourgeois feminism, rather than trying to combine them.

Orthodox Marxists argue that most Marxist forerunners claimed by feminists or Marxist feminists including Clara Zetkin and Alexandra Kollontai were against capitalist forms of feminism. They agreed with the main Marxist movement that feminism was a bourgeois ideology counterposed to Marxism and against the working class. Instead of feminism, the Marxists supported the more radical political program of liberating women through socialist revolution, with a special emphasis on work among women and in materially changing their conditions after the revolution. Orthodox Marxists view the later attempt to combine Marxism and feminism as a liberal creation of academics and reformist leftists who want to make alliances with bourgeois feminists. For instance, Alexandra Kollontai wrote in 1909:

For what reason, then, should the woman worker seek a union with the bourgeois feminists? Who, in actual fact, would stand to gain in the event of such an alliance? Certainly not the woman worker.

A pioneering Marxist and feminist, Mary Inman of the Communist Party USA challenged the party's orthodox position by arguing that the home is a center of production and housewives carry out productive labor. Her writings include In Woman's Defense (1940) and Woman-Power (1942). Inman's work was at first warmly received by several top Communist women leaders, including Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Ella Reeve Bloor, but the CPUSA leadership began an official attack on Inman's work for purported ideological deviation in 1941. A series of articles written against Inman's ideas appeared in the party's literary monthly, The New Masses, and the polemic was extended with the publication of a pamphlet by A. Landy, Marxism and the Woman Question.

Radical Women, a major Marxist-feminist organization, bases its theory on Marx' and Engels' analysis that the enslavement of women was the first building block of an economic system based on private property. They contend that elimination of the capitalist profit-driven economy will remove the motivation for sexism, racism, homophobia, and other forms of oppression.

5.5 LATER THEORETICAL WORKS

Zillah R. Eisenstein

Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism was a collection of essays assembled and anthologized by Zillah R. Eisenstein in 1978.

Sociologist and academic Rhonda F. Levine cites Eisenstein's work as a "superb discussion of the socialist-feminist position" in her anthology Enriching the Sociological Imagination: How Radical Sociology Changed the Discipline. Levine goes on to describe the book as "one of the earliest statements of how a Marxist class analysis can combine with a feminist analysis of patriarchy to produce a theory of how gender and class intersect as systems of inequality".

Eisenstein defines the term 'capitalist patriarchy' as "descriptive of the 'mutually reinforcing dialectical relationship between capitalist class structure and hierarchical sexual structuring."

She believes: "The recognition of women as a sexual class lays the subversive quality of feminism for liberalism because liberalism is premised upon women's exclusion from public life on this very class basis. The demand for real equality of women with men, if taken to its logical conclusion, would dislodge the patriarchal structure necessary to a liberal society."

Donna Haraway and "A Cyborg Manifesto"

In 1985, Donna Haraway published the essay "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century" in Socialist Review. Although most of Haraway's earlier work was focused on emphasizing the masculine bias in scientific culture, she has also contributed greatly to feminist narratives of the twentieth century. For Haraway, the Manifesto came at a critical juncture at which feminists, in order to have any real-world significance, had to acknowledge their situatedness within what she terms the "informatics of

domination". Feminists must, she proclaims, unite behind "an ironic dream of a common language for women in the integrated circuit". Women were no longer on the outside along a hierarchy of privileged binaries but rather deeply imbued, exploited by and complicit within networked hegemony, and had to form their politics as such.

According to Haraway's manifesto, "there is nothing about being female that naturally binds women together into a unified category. There is not even such a state as 'being' female, itself a highly complex category constructed in contested sexual scientific discourses and other social practices" (p. 155). A cyborg does not require a stable, essentialist identity, argues Haraway, and feminists should consider creating coalitions based on "affinity" instead of identity. To ground her argument, Haraway analyzes the phrase "women of color", suggesting it as one possible example of affinity politics. Using a term coined by theorist Chela Sandoval, Haraway writes that "oppositional consciousness" is comparable with a cyborg politics, because rather than identity it stresses how affinity comes as a result of "otherness, difference, and specificity" (p. 156).

Autonomist feminism

Leopoldina Fortunati is the author of The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital (L'arcano della riproduzione: Casalinghe, prostitute, operai e capitale), a feminist critique of Marx. Fortunati is the author of several books, including The Arcane of Reproduction (Autonomedia, 1995) and I mostri nell'immaginario (Angeli, 1995), and is the editor of Gli Italiani al telefono (Angeli, 1995) and Telecomunicando in Europa (1998), and with J. Katz and R. Riccini Mediating the Human Body. Technology, Communication and Fashion (2003). Her influences include Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Antonio Negri, and Karl Marx.

Silvia Federici is an Italian scholar, teacher, and activist from the radical autonomist feminist Marxist tradition.[36] Federici's best known work,

Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation, expands on the work of Leopoldina Fortunati. In it, she argues against Karl Marx's claim that primitive accumulation is a necessary precursor for capitalism. Instead, she posits that primitive accumulation is a fundamental characteristic of capitalism itself—that capitalism, in order to perpetuate itself, requires a constant infusion of expropriated capital.

Federici connects this expropriation to women's unpaid labour, both connected to reproduction and otherwise, which she frames as a historical precondition to the rise of a capitalist economy predicated upon wage labor. Related to this, she outlines the historical struggle for the commons and the struggle for communalism. Instead of seeing capitalism as a liberatory defeat of feudalism, Federici interprets the ascent of capitalism as a reactionary move to subvert the rising tide of communalism and to retain the basic social contract.

She situates the institutionalization of rape and prostitution, as well as the heretic and witch-hunt trials, burnings, and torture at the center of a methodical subjugation of women and appropriation of their labor. This is tied into colonial expropriation and provides a framework for understanding the work of the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and other proxy institutions as engaging in a renewed cycle of primitive accumulation, by which everything held in common—from water, to seeds, to our genetic code—becomes privatized in what amounts to a new round of enclosures.

Material feminism

Material feminism highlights capitalism and patriarchy as central in understanding women's oppression. The theory centers on social change rather than seeking transformation within the capitalist system. Jennifer Wicke, defines materialist feminism as "a feminism that insists on examining the material conditions under which social arrangements, including those of gender hierarchy, develop [...]. [M]aterialist feminism avoids seeing this gender hierarchy as the effect of a singular [...]

patriarchy and instead gauges the web of social and psychic relations that make up a material, historical moment". She states that "materialist feminism argues that material conditions of all sorts play a vital role in the social production of gender and assays the different ways in which women collaborate and participate in these productions". Material feminism also considers how women and men of various races and ethnicities are kept in their lower economic status due to an imbalance of power that privileges those who already have privilege, thereby protecting the status quo.

The term material feminism was first used in 1975 by Christine Delphy. The current concept has its roots in socialist and Marxist feminism; Rosemary Hennessy and Chrys Ingraham, editors of Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives, describe material feminism as the "conjuncture of several discourses—historical materialism, Marxist and radical feminism, as well as postmodernist and psychoanalytic theories of meaning and subjectivity". The term materialist feminism emerged in the late 1970s and is associated with key thinkers, such as Rosemary Hennessy, Stevi Jackson and Christine Delphy. Rosemary Hennessy traces the history of Materialist Feminism in the work of British and French feminists who preferred the term materialist feminism to Marxist feminism. In their view, Marxism had to be altered to be able to explain the sexual division of labor. Marxism was inadequate to the task because of its class bias and focus on production. Feminism was also problematic due to its essentialist and idealist concept of woman. Material feminism then emerged as a positive substitute to both Marxism and feminism. Material feminism partly originated from the work of French feminists, particularly Christine Delphy. She argued that materialism is the only theory of history that views oppression as a basic reality of women's lives. Christine Delphy states that this is why women and all oppressed groups need materialism to investigate their situation. For Christine Delphy, "to start from oppression defines a materialist approach, oppression is a materialist concept". She states that the domestic mode of production was the site of patriarchal exploitation and the material basis of the oppression of women. Christine Delphy

further argued that marriage is a labor contract that gives men the right to exploit women. The Grand Domestic Revolution by Dolores Hayden is a reference. Hayden describes Material feminism at that time as reconceptualizing the relationship between the private household space and public space by presenting collective options to take the "burden" off women in regard to housework, cooking, and other traditional female domestic jobs.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. How do you know Socialist Feminism?

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   …….

2. Discuss about the Anarcha-feminism.

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   …….

3. What do you understand Marxist feminism?

   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   …….

4. How do you know later theoretical works?

……

……

……

……

……

5.6 PRAXIS

Socialist feminists believe that women's liberation must be sought in conjunction with the social and economic justice of all people. They see the fight to end male supremacy as key to social justice, but not the only issue, rather one of many forms of oppression that are mutually reinforcing.

Women's liberation in real socialism

In the forty years of socialism in East Germany, the German Democratic Republic (GDR), many feminist demands were implemented:

While women in the West still fought for a liberal abortion law, abortion was allowed up to the 12th week since 1972 and contraception was available to anyone.

While women in the West still had no access to the better paid male dominated professions, women in the GDR were encouraged to do so and promoted to further studies.

Children were taken care of by kindergarten and pre-kindergarten, a service women in West Germany are still waiting for and the main obstacle to equal employment opportunities.

Nevertheless, feminists of West Berlin remained skeptical as they lived door to door with this real socialism. Cäcilia Rentmeister, who had personal contacts to friends and relatives in East Berlin analyzed in 1974 women's situation in the GDR in an article.

Chicago Women's Liberation Union

The Chicago Women's Liberation Union, known colloquially as CWLU, was formed in 1969 after a founding conference in Palatine, Illinois. Naomi Weisstein, Vivian Rothstein, Heather Booth, and Ruth Surgal were among the founders of it. The main goal of the organization was to end gender inequality and sexism, which the CWLU defined as "the systematic keeping down of women for the benefit of people in power". The purpose statement of the organization expressed that "Changing women's position in society isn't going to be easy. It's going to require changes in expectations, jobs, child care, and education. It's going to change the distribution of power over the rest of us to all people sharing power and sharing in the decisions that affect our lives." The CWLU spent almost a decade organizing to challenge both sexism and class oppression. The group is best known for the 1972 pamphlet "Socialist Feminism: A Strategy for the Women's Movement". Nationally circulated, the publication is believed to be the first to use the term socialist feminism.

The CWLU was organized as an umbrella organization to unite a wide range of work groups and discussion groups. A representative from each work group went to monthly meetings of the Steering Committee to reach consensus on organizational policy and strategy. They addressed a myriad of issues including women's health, reproductive rights, education, economic rights, visual arts and music, sports, lesbian liberation, and much more.

Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell

Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell (W.I.T.C.H.) was the name of many related but independent feminist groups formed in the United States during 1968 and 1969 and who were important in the development of socialist feminism. The name W.I.T.C.H. was also sometimes expanded as "Women Inspired to Tell their Collective

History", "Women Interested in Toppling Consumer Holidays", and many other variations.

There was no centralized organization; each W.I.T.C.H. group was formed independently by women inspired by the ideas and example of previous actions. Their activism mainly took the form of "zaps", a form of guerrilla theater mixing street theatre and protest, where they used attention-catching and humorous public actions to highlight political and economic complaints against companies and government agencies, frequently involving the use of witch costumes and the chanting of hexes. Witches often appeared as stock characters in feminist Left theatre, representing the misogynist crone stereotype.

On Halloween 1968, women from W.I.T.C.H. staged a "hex" of Wall Street at a branch of Chase Manhattan Bank, wearing rags and fright makeup; Robin Morgan stated that the Dow Jones Industrial Average declined sharply the next day. The DJIA did not decline sharply, and experienced a rise over the next several days and weeks. In December 1968 W.I.T.C.H targeted both the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Chicago Eight, saying that they conspired to treat only men as "leaders" of the antiwar movement. In 1969, W.I.T.C.H. held a protest at a "Bridal Fair" at Madison Square Garden. Members wore black veils. They handed out pamphlets titled "Confront the Whoremakers", chanted "Here come the slaves/Off to their graves", and had a mock "unwedding" ceremony. The protests also involved turning loose several white mice at the event, which Fair attendees began scooping up off the ground. The event resulted in negative media coverage for W.I.T.C.H., and some dissention among members over goals and tactics. In February 1970, the Washington coven (W.I.T.C.H. chapters were called "covens") held a protest during a Senate hearing on population control. They interrupted Texas Senator Ralph Yarborough's testimony by chanting and throwing pills at panel members and people in the audience galleries. Spin-off "covens" were founded in Chicago, Illinois and Washington, D.C., and W.I.T.C.H. zaps continued until roughly the beginning of 1970. The "zap" protests used by W.I.T.C.H.

may have helped inspire the zap action protest tactics adopted shortly afterwards by LGBT activists, and still in use.

Big Flame

Big Flame was "a revolutionary socialist feminist organisation with a working-class orientation" in the United Kingdom. Founded in Liverpool in 1970, the group initially grew rapidly, with branches appearing in some other cities. Its publications emphasised that "a revolutionary party is necessary but Big Flame is not that party, nor is it the embryo of that party". The group was influenced by the Italian Lotta Continua group.

The group published a magazine, Big Flame; and a journal, Revolutionary Socialism. Members were active at the Ford plants at Halewood and Dagenham.[citation needed] and devoted a great deal of time to self-analysis and considering their relationship with the larger Trotskyist groups. In time, they came to describe their politics as libertarian Marxist. In 1978, they joined the Socialist Unity electoral coalition, led by the Trotskyist International Marxist Group. In 1980, the anarchists of the Libertarian Communist Group joined Big Flame. The Revolutionary Marxist Current also joined at about this time. However, as more members of the group defected to the Labour Party, the journal ceased to appear in 1982, and the group was wound up in about 1984. Ex-members of the group were involved in the launch of the mass-market tabloid newspaper the News on Sunday in 1987, which folded the same year. The name of the group was taken from a television play, The Big Flame (1969), written by Jim Allen and directed by Ken Loach for the BBC's Wednesday Play season. It dealt with a fictional strike and work-in at the Liverpool Docks.

5.7 INTERSECTIONALITY

Feminist historian Linda Gordon asserts that socialist feminism is inherently intersectional, at least to a certain degree, because it takes into account both gender and class. Gordon says that because the foundation of socialist feminism rests on multiple axes, socialist feminism has a

history of intersectionality that can be traced back to a period decades before Dr. Kimberlé Crenshaw first articulated the concept of intersectionality in 1989. According to Gordon, socialist feminism of the 1980s expanded upon the concept of intersectionality by examining the overlapping structures that instantiate oppression. Feminist scholar and women's studies professor Elizabeth Lapovsky Kennedy says that this broader analysis of societal structures began with socialist feminism and served as a catalyst for feminist scholarship. Kennedy says that many of the first women's studies programs were established by socialist feminist theorists.

Despite the supposed presence of intersectionality in socialist feminism, many feminists, particularly women of color, critique the movement for perceived deficiencies in regards to racial equity. In Kennedy's account of socialist feminism's impact on women's studies, she says that a lack of Black voices in feminist academia contributed to whitewashing of women's studies programs and courses. Kum-Kum Bhavani, a professor at University of California Santa Barbara, and Margaret Coulson, a socialist feminist scholar, assert that racism in the socialist feminist movement stems from the failure of many white feminists to recognize the institutional nature of racism. According to Bhavani and Coulson, race, class, and gender are inextricably linked, and the exclusion of any one of these factors from one's worldview would result in an incomplete understanding of the systems of privilege and oppression they say constitute our society. Kathryn Harriss, a feminist scholar from the United Kingdom, describes what she sees as the shortcomings of the socialist feminist movement of the 1980s in the United Kingdom. Harriss describes marginalized women's grievances with the Women's Liberation Movement, a large socialist feminist group. She says many lesbian women criticized the movement for its domination by heterosexual feminists who perpetuated heterosexism in the movement. Similarly, Black women asserted that they were deprived a voice due to the overwhelming majority of white women in the WLM advocating widely held views regarding violence against women, the family, and

reproductive rights that failed to account for the distinct struggles faced by women of color.

5.8 MOTHERHOOD AND THE PRIVATE SPHERE

Socialist feminists highlight how motherhood and the gendered division of labor many assert grows "naturally" from women's role as mothers is the source of women's exclusion from the public sphere and creates women's economic dependence on men. They assert that there is nothing natural about the gendered division of labor and show that the expectation that women perform all or most reproductive labor, i.e. labor associated with birthing and raising children but also the cleaning, cooking, and other tasks necessary to support human life, deny women the capacity to participate fully in economic activity outside the home. In order to free themselves from the conditions of work as a mother and housekeeper, socialist feminists such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman saw the professionalization of housework as key. This would be done by hiring professional nannies and housekeepers to take the load of domestic work away from the woman in the house.[59] Perkins Gilman also recommended the redesign of homes in ways that would maximize their potential for creativity and leisure for women as well as men, i.e. emphasizing the need for rooms like studios and studies and eliminating kitchens and dining rooms. These changes would necessitate the communalization of meal preparation and consumption outside the home and free women from their burden of providing meals on a house-by-house scale.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. What is Praxis?

……

……

……

……

……

2. Discuss about Intersectionality.

……

……

……

……

……

3. Describe Motherhood and the private sphere.

……

……

……

……

……

5.9 DIFFERENCE FEMINISM

Difference feminism holds that there are differences between men and women but that no value judgment can be placed upon them and both genders have equal moral status as persons.

The term "difference feminism" developed during the "equality-versus-difference debate" in American feminism in the 1980s and 1990s, but subsequently fell out of favor and use. In the 1990s feminists addressed the binary logic of "difference" versus "equality" and moved on from it, notably with postmodern and/or deconstructionist approaches that either dismantled or did not depend on that dichotomy.

Difference feminism did not require a commitment to essentialism. Most strains of difference feminism did not argue that there was a biological, inherent, ahistorical, or otherwise "essential" link between womanhood and traditionally feminine values, habits of mind (often called "ways of

knowing"), or personality traits. These feminists simply sought to recognize that, in the present, women and men are significantly different and to explore the devalued "feminine" characteristics. This variety of difference feminism is also called gender feminism.

Some strains of difference feminism, for example Mary Daly's, argue not just that women and men were different, and had different values or different ways of knowing, but that women and their values were superior to men's. This viewpoint does not require essentialism, although there is ongoing debate about whether Daly's feminism is essentialist

Difference feminism, also referred to as essentialist feminism, assumes there are biological differences between men and women. If you read Carol Gilligan's In a Different Voice, for example, note how she discusses how men and women speak differently, as well as think differently.

A supporter of difference feminism would posit that the differences between men and women create inequality between them. As a result, it doesn't make sense to treat the genders as equals.

According to this perspective, one difference with scientific evidence is that women are instinctively more nurturing than men. It varies from the separate but equal perspective that men and women have innate differences but are to receive equal treatment. An equality feminist would argue that men and women should get the same treatment in all areas of life: work, home, and socially.

Sub-types of Difference Feminism

There are two types. The first kind is social difference feminism. A feminist in this category analyzes how social constructs create differences between women and men. Meanwhile, the second group, called symbolic difference feminism, focus on the symbolic and psychological influences on those same differences.

5.10 HISTORY OF DIFFERENCE FEMINISM

These is debate as to when this feminist approach originated. Some people say it began in the 1980s, while others claim it was before that and dates back to the 1970's. Regardless of which decade holds its true origins, the perspective is much newer than the equality approach (liberal feminism) that dates back to England's Mary Wollstonecraft's urging for equal rights for women in 1792. Personally, I think difference feminism gained its most attention when Carol Gilligan published In A Different Voice in 1982.

Difference feminism grew significantly in the 1980's and 1990's, which is why it may sound familiar to you. As well, you may have heard it mentioned as being part of "second-wave feminism."

It gained attention as people questioned what characteristics were traditionally viewed as being "feminine," such as caring and empathy. Also under question was the phrase "a woman's intuition."

Difference feminism was developed by feminists in the 1980s, in part as a reaction to popular liberal feminism (also known as "equality feminism"), which emphasized the similarities between women and men in order to argue for equal treatment for women. Difference feminism, although it still aimed at equality between men and women, emphasized the differences between men and women and argued that identicality or sameness are not necessary in order for men and women, and masculine and feminine values, to be treated equally. Liberal feminism aimed to make society and law gender-neutral, since it saw recognition of gender difference as a barrier to rights and participation within liberal democracy, while difference feminism held that gender-neutrality harmed women "whether by impelling them to imitate men, by depriving society of their distinctive contributions, or by letting them participate in society only on terms that favor men".

Difference feminism drew on earlier nineteenth-century strains of thought, for example the work of German writer Elise Oelsner, which held that not only should women be allowed into formerly male-only spheres and institutions (e.g. public life, science) but that those institutions should also be expected to change in a way that recognizes the value of traditionally devalued feminine ethics (like care [see ethics of care]). On the latter point, many feminists have re-read the phrase "difference feminism" in a way that asks "what difference does feminism make?" (e.g. to the practice of science) rather than "what differences are there between men and women"?

5.11 ESSENTIALISM AND DIFFERENCE FEMINISM

Some have argued that the thought of certain prominent second-wave feminists, like psychologist Carol Gilligan and radical feminist theologian Mary Daly, is "essentialist". In philosophy essentialism is the belief that "(at least some) objects have (at least some) essential properties". In the case of sexual politics essentialism is taken to mean that "women" and "men" have fixed essences or essential properties (e.g. behavioral or personality traits) that cannot be changed. However, essentialist interpretations of Daly and Gilligan have been questioned by some feminist scholars, who argue that charges of "essentialism" are often used more as terms of abuse than as theoretical critiques based on evidence, and do not accurately reflect Gilligan or Daly's views.

5.12 CRITICISMS OF DIFFERENCE FEMINISM

What are criticisms of the approach? A big one is that difference feminism doesn’t acknowledge that women and men are unique within their sex and gender.

No two women are exactly the same, just as no two men are the same. As critics of this approach explain, assuming men all have the same viewpoints and that women all have the same viewpoints is not realistic. They argue that different classes and cultures influence different viewpoints for men and women.As an Amazon associate I earn from qualifying purchases, at no additional cost to you.

As for Gilligan's book In A Different Voice, some people embrace the text while others reject it. For critics, the main fault in Gilligan's views is that she asserts women have their own morality that they feel, which is different than men.

Furthermore, women articulate that morality differently than men. At this point you might be thinking this sound a lot like patriarchal thinking.

Are women too dainty to be equal with men? Stereotypes much? Critics would say yes.

Check Your Progress 3

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. What do you know Difference Feminism?

   ……
   ……
   ……

2. Discuss History of Difference Feminism.

   ……
   ……
   ……

3. What do you know Essentialism and difference feminism?

……

……

……

4. Discuss Criticisms of Difference Feminism.

……

……

……

5.13 LET US SUM UP

As for supporters of Carol Gilligan's work, they view her as wise in understanding gender differences as a key component of how we experience day-to-day life in the culture that surrounds us. Interesting to note is that Gilligan was featured on the cover of The New York Times in the 1990's with a glowing article in the pages inside the magazine.

I hope this is a useful overview of what is difference feminism. There are many other types of feminism, including liberal, radical (including anarcho-feminism) and socialist feminism.

5.14 KEY WORDS

Difference Feminism: Difference feminism, also known as *Black feminism* is a perspective that sees how women are oppressed by the patriarchy but also by both capitalism and racism. They argue that minority-ethnic, working-class women are the most discriminated against people in society.

Socialist: Socialism is a range of economic and social systems characterised by social ownership of the means of production and workers' self-management, as well as the political theories and movements associated with them. Social ownership can be public, collective or cooperative ownership, or citizen ownership of equity.

5.15 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

5. How do you know Socialist Feminism?

6. Discuss about the Anarcha-feminism.
7. What do you understand Marxist feminism?
8. How do you know later theoretical works?
9. What is Praxis?
10. Discuss about Intersectionality.
11. Describe Motherhood and the private sphere.
12. What do you know Difference Feminism?
13. Discuss History of Difference Feminism.
14. What do you know Essentialism and difference feminism?
15. Discuss Criticisms of Difference Feminism.

5.16 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Lapovsky Kennedy, Elizabeth (2008). "Socialist Feminism: What Difference Did It Make to the History of Women's Studies?". Feminist Studies. 34 (3).[permanent dead link]
- What is Socialist Feminism?, retrieved on May 28th 2007.
- Buchanan, Ian. "Socialist Feminism." A Dictionary of Critical Theory. Oxford Reference Online. Oxford University Press. Web. 20 October 2011.
- "Socialist Feminism vs. Other Types of Feminism". ThoughtCo. Retrieved 16 March 2017.
- Harriss, Kathryn (1989-01-01). "New Alliances: Socialist-Feminism in the Eighties". Feminist Review (31): 34–54. doi:10.2307/1395089. JSTOR 1395089.
- Margeret "Peg" Strobel; Sue Davenport (1999). "The Chicago Women's Liberation Union: An Introduction". The CWLU Herstory Website. University of Illinois. Archived from the original on 4 November 2011. Retrieved 25 November 2011.
- Kennedy, Elizabeth Lapovsky (2008). "Socialist Feminism: What Difference Did It Make to the History of Women's Studies?". Feminist Studies. 34 (3): 497–525. JSTOR 20459218.
- Brown, L. Susan (1995). "Beyond Feminism: Anarchism and Human Freedom". Reinventing Anarchy, Again. San Francisco: AK Press. pp. 149–154. ISBN 978-1-873176-88-7. p. 208.

- An Anarchist FAQ. What is Anarcha-Feminism? Archived October 2, 2009, at the Wayback Machine
- "Carol Gilligan". Psychology's Feminist Voices.
- Scott, Joan (1988). "Deconstructing Equality-Versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Post-structuralist Theory for Feminism". Feminist Studies. 14 (1): 32. doi:10.2307/3177997.
- Bock, Gisela; James, Susan (1992). Beyond Equality and Difference. Routledge. ISBN 9780415079891.
- Voet, Rian (1998). Feminism and Citizenship. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. ISBN 9781446228043.
- Schiebinger, Londa. Has Feminism Changed Science?. p. 8.
- Grande Jensen, Pamela. Finding a New Feminism: Rethinking the Woman Question for Liberal Democracy. p. 2 footnote 4.
- Tandon, Neeru. Feminism: A Paradigm Shift. p. 68.
- Fowler, Robert Booth (1999). Enduring Liberalism: American Political Thought Since the 1960s. University Press of Kansas. p. 133. ISBN 978-0-70-060974-1.
- Ford, Lynne E. (2008). Encyclopedia of Women and American Politics. New York: Facts on File. p. 187. ISBN 978-0-81-605491-6.
- Hoagland, Sarah Lucia; Frye, Marilyn. "Feminist Interpretations of Mary Daly".
- Sandilands, Catriona (1999). The Good-Natured Feminist Ecofeminism and the Quest for Democracy. pp. chapter 5: "Cyborgs and Queers".
- Voet, Rian (1998). Feminism and Citizenship. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Grande Jensen, Pamela. Finding a New Feminism: Rethinking the Woman Question for Liberal Democracy. p. 3.
- "Accidental vs Essential Properties". Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. Retrieved 21 March 2017.
- Heyes, Cressida J. (1997). "Anti-Essentialism in Practice: Carol Gilligan and Feminist Philosophy". Hypatia. 13 (3): 142–163. doi:10.1111/j.1527-2001.1997.tb00009.x.

- Braidotti, Rosi (1992). "Essentialism" in Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A Critical Dictionary.
- Suhonen, Marja (2000). "Toward Biophilic Be-ing: Mary Daly's Feminist Metaethics and the Question of Essentialism" in Feminist Interpretations of Mary Daly. Penn State University Press. p. 112.

5.17 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Section 5.2
2. See Section 5.3
3. See Section 5.4
4. See Section 5.5

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 5.6
2. See Section 5.7
3. See Section 5.8

Check Your Progress 3

1. See Section 5.9
2. See Section 5.10
3. See Section 5.11
4. See Section 5.12

UNIT 6: INDIAN WOMEN— FAMILY, CASTE, CLASS, CULTURE, RELIGION, SOCIAL SYSTEM

STRUCTURE

6.0 OBJECTIVES

The status of women in India has been subject to many changes over the span of recorded Indian history. Their position in early society was of very high position in India's ancient period, especially in the Indo-Aryan speaking regions, and their subordination continued to be reified well into India's early modern period. Practises such as female infanticide, dowry, child marriage and the taboo on widow remarriage, have had a long duration in India, and have proved difficult to root out, especially in caste Hindu society in northern India.

As of 2018, some women have served in various senior official positions in the Indian government, including that of the President of India, the Prime Minister of India, and the Speaker of the Lok Sabha. However, many women in India continue to face significant difficulties. The rates

of malnutrition are exceptionally high among adolescent girls and pregnant and lactating women in India, with repercussions for children's health. Violence against women, especially sexual violence, has been on the rise in India.

After this unit we can able to understand:

- To know the Indian Women’s Status
- To discuss about the Family, Caste, Class, Culture, Religion and Social System.

6.1 INTRODUCTION

"You can tell the condition of a Nation by looking at the status of its Women." Jawaharlal Nehru, Leader of India's Independence movement, and India's first Prime Minister.

So, how is women's status in India? Today's India offers a lot of opportunities to women, with women having a voice in everyday life, the business world as well as in political life. Nevertheless India is still a male dominated society, where women are often seen as subordinate and inferior to men. This gender bias is the cause that SAARTHAK is fighting for; therefore, in the following we will focus on the wrongs rather than on the rights. This doesn't mean that there aren't a lot of positives to report on, and we will cover some of those in the "Indian women on the rise" section. However, even though India is moving away from the male dominated culture, discrimination is still highly visible in rural as well as in urban areas, throughout all strata of society. While women are guaranteed equality under the constitution, legal protection has a limited effect, where patriarchal traditions prevail.

India's Patriarchal Traditions

1. Dowry Tradition

Much of the discrimination against women arises from India's dowry tradition, where the bride's family gives the groom's family money and/or gifts. Dowries were made illegal in India in 1961, however the law is almost impossible to enforce, and the practice persists for most marriages. Unfortunately, the iniquitous dowry system has even spread to communities who traditionally have not practiced it, because dowry is sometimes used as a means to climb the social ladder, to achieve economic security, and to accumulate material wealth. The model used to calculate the dowry takes the bridegroom's education and future earning potential into account while the bride's education and earning potential are only relevant to her societal role of being a better wife and mother. The bridegroom's demand for a dowry can easily exceed the annual salary of a typical Indian family, and consequently be economically disastrous especially in families with more than one or two daughters.

2. Women as a Liability

The Indian constitution grants women equal rights to men, but strong patriarchal traditions persist in many different societal parts, with women's lives shaped by customs that are centuries old. Hence, in these strata daughters are often regarded as a liability, and conditioned to believe that they are inferior and subordinate to men, whereas sons might be idolized and celebrated.

But why is that?

There are a couple of reasons, why men might be regarded an asset for a family:
Considered capable of earning money
Carry on the family line
Able to provide for their aging parents
Bring a wife (and with this a capable domestic helper) into the family
Play an important role in death rituals in Hindu religion, which ensure, that the soul is released from the body and can go to heaven.

On the other hand, there are a couple of reasons why women might be regarded more of a liability for a family:

Not considered capable of earning money

Seen as economically and emotionally dependent on men

While they help with domestic duties during childhood and adolescence, they go to live with their husband's family after marriage, which means less help in the household of their originating family, and most importantly loss of money due to the dowry tradition.

This might explain why the birth of a daughter may not always be perceived as equally blissful as the birth of a son, and why "May you be blessed with a hundred sons" is a common Hindu wedding blessing.

Discrimination against Women

It should be noted that in a vast country like India - spanning 3.29 million sq. km, where cultural backgrounds, religions and traditions vary widely - the extend of discrimination against women also varies from one societal stratum to another and from state to state - some areas in India being historically more inclined to gender bias than others. There are even communities in India, such as the Nairs of Kerala, certain Maratha clans, and Bengali families, which exhibit matriarchal tendencies, with the head of the family being the oldest woman rather than the oldest man. However, many Indian women face discrimination throughout all stages of their life, beginning at (or even before) birth, continuing as an infant, child, adolescent and adult. The stages can be divided in following sections:

Before Birth / As an Infant

As a Child

After Marriage

As a Widow

Discrimination against Women: Before Birth / As an Infant

India is one of the few countries where males outnumber females; the sex ratio at birth (SRB) – which shows the number of boys born to every 100

girls - is usually consistent in human populations, where about 105 males are born to every 100 females.

There are significant imbalances in the male/female population in India where the SRB is 113; there are also huge local differences from Northern / Western regions such as Punjab or Delhi, where the sex ratio is as high as 125, to Southern / Eastern India e.g. Kerala and Andhra Pradesh, where sex ratios are around 105. Though "prenatal sex discrimination" was legally banned in 1996, the law is nearly impossible to enforce and is not even familiar to all Indian families. Hence, the preference for a male child persists, quite often out of mere practical, financial concerns, because the parents might not be able to afford the marriage dowry for (another) daughter. This leads to some of the most gruesome and desperate acts when it comes to gender discrimination:

Selective abortions

Murdering of female babies

Abandonment of female babies

Prenatal tests to determine the sex of the fetus were criminalized by Indian law in 1994, but the above mentioned imbalances in the sex ratio at birth, clearly point to gender selective abortions. While abortion is officially illegal in India there are some exceptions to this rule such as the failure of contraceptive device used by a couple; if the woman was raped; or if the child would suffer from severe disabilities. In total 11 million abortions take place annually and around 20,000 women die every year due to abortion related complications.

Discrimination against Women: As a Child

Nutrition & Health

As a child, girls are often treated differently from male children in terms of nutrition and health care; where limited food or financial resources are available, the insufficient means are prone to be allocated unevenly in favour of the male offspring.

This imbalance results in insufficient care afforded to girls and women, and is the first major reason for the high levels of child malnutrition. This nutritional deprivation has two harmful consequences for women:

1. They never reach their full growth potential
2. Anaemia

Both consequences are risk factors in pregnancy, complicating childbearing and resulting in maternal and infant deaths, as well as low birth weight infants.

Education

India's constitution guarantees free primary school education for both girls and boys up to age 14. This has been repeatedly reconfirmed, but primary education in India is not universal, and often times not seen as really necessary for girls. Their parents might consider it more important, that they learn domestic chores, as they will need to perform them for their future husbands and in-laws. Another disincentive for sending daughters to school is a concern for the protection of their virginity. When schools are located at a distance, when teachers are male, and when girls are expected to study along with boys, parents are often unwilling to expose their daughters to the potential assault on their virginity, that would ultimately result in an insult to the girl's family's honor.

This results in one of the lowest female literacy rates in the world.

Literacy Rate for Women: 54%

Literacy Rate for Men: 76%

As a comparison, female literacy per 2009: Pakistan: 60%, Peru: 89%, Indonesia: 93%.

Mothers' illiteracy and lack of schooling directly disadvantage their young children. Low schooling translates into poor quality of care for children, consequently in higher infant and child mortality and malnutrition, because mothers with little education are less likely to

adopt appropriate health-promoting behaviors, such as having young children immunized.

Social sector programmes e.g. “Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan” (Education for Everyone) are promoting girls' education to equalize educational opportunities and eliminate gender disparities, but these initiatives will take time to unfold their whole effect.

Child Marriages

The Prohibition of Child Marriage Act 2006 bans marriage below age 18 for girls and age 21 for boys, but some 80 % of Indians live in villages where family, caste and community pressures are more effective than any legislature. According to UNICEF's "State of the World's Children 2009" report, 47% of India's women aged 20–24 were married before the legal age of 18, with 56% in rural areas. The report also showed that 40% of the world's child marriages occur in India.

Why does it happen?

Financial Benefit

As outlined above, due to the dowry tradition women are prone to be a (financial) burden for their families, thus seen as a liability.

If the match is made at an early age, the dowry is usually much lower, as the dowry is calculated on the future husband's societal status and education, which – obviously – would be much lower at an early age.

Common Hindu phrase: “The younger the groom, the cheaper the Dowry”

In addition marrying off girls at an early age, ensures, that they marry as virgins, thus protecting the girl's and their family's honour.

Historical Origins

Child marriages started during the invasions of Northern India around 1,000 years ago, when unmarried girls were raped by invaders.

To protect their women from abuse, family members began marrying their daughters at young ages.

Religious origin

Copying the myth that the goddess Parvati had decided to marry god Shiva when she was only eight, girls were married off as young as eight or nine years old.

The consequences

Girls between 15 and 19 are twice as likely to die of pregnancy-related reasons as girls between 20 and 24. Girls married off as children sometimes stay in their parents' house until puberty, but it is just as common, that they move in with their husband and in-laws right after marriage. In that case, many child wives are inclined to experience domestic violence, marital rape, deprivation of food, and lack of access to information, healthcare, and education. Thus, the vicious cycle of illiteracy and abuse is likely to be continued and passed on to their own daughters.

Discrimination against Women: After Marriage

There is mainly a bias towards men and their superiority in marital relationships: while women ought to be respected, protected and kept happy by their husbands – their happiness being vital for the prosperity, peace and happiness of the whole family – they should also be kept under constant vigilance, since they cannot be completely trusted or left to themselves. Whereas as a child a girl is supposed to remain in the custody and care of her parents, after marriage she becomes the property and responsibility of her husband, who is supposed to take care of her and keep her in his custody.

Under the existing cultural and social ethos of India a married girl / woman is no longer considered to be part of the family of her birth, instead she has become part of the family of the groom. Hence, after marriage the woman leaves her parental home and lives with her husband's family, where she is required to assume all household labour and domestic responsibilities.

In certain parts of Indian society, women are conditioned from birth to be subservient not only to their future husbands, but also to the females in

their husband's family especially, their mother-in-law. Accordingly, the surrounding society mandates a woman's obedience to her husband and her in-laws. Any disobedience would bring disgrace to both, the wife herself and her originating family, and might lead to the woman being ostracized and neglected by her very own family and in her own home.

Discrimination against Women: After Marriage

There is no cultural or religious tradition behind one of the most ghastly incidents of female oppression, but the prevalence of the dowry tradition has supposedly lead to “Bride Burning” (or other form of murdering) of the newly-wed wife by the husband and his family, who would claim, that she died in a domestic accident, so that the widowed husband would be free to marry again and collect another dowry.

Indian law demands a formal criminal investigation when a newly married woman dies within the home within 7 years of marriage. According to Indian National Crime Record Bureau, there were 8,239 dowry death cases, 1,285 cases of attempted dowry deaths, and another 4,890 cases with pending investigations in 2009. The punishment for dowry deaths is a term of 7 years, which may extend to life imprisonment. Indian law clearly distinguishes the offence of dowry deaths from the offence of murder, for which a death sentence might be declared.

Discrimination against Women: As a Widow

Indian government has enacted numerous laws to protect widow's rights, including prohibitions against traditional practices for which India has been discredited, such as the burning of widows (Sati). Whereas in India's contemporary culture, especially in the modern urban middle-class, these societal norms have given way to a more righteous conduct, the enforcement of the law continues to be challenging, where there are regional, religious or caste variants of family law, which tend to escape government jurisdiction. Hence, a widow is still seen as a liability in some part of the Indian society, which might result in her being

abandoned by her in-laws. As her originating family is often unable or unwilling to take her back as well, she might be left on her own, without any education, skills, or financial assistance. Instead, she is subjected to many restrictions, and might be required to shave her head permanently, or to wear white clothes for the rest of her life; thus, stigmatized, she is not allowed to enter in any celebration e.g. weddings, because her presence is considered to be inauspicious. Moreover, a widow might face trouble securing her property rights after her husbands death, nor be allowed to remarry, disregarding at what age she became a widow. As the described discrimination against widows is likely to occur in the same societal surroundings as the above mentioned child marriages, this might lead to child or teenage widows, who are bound to be isolated and ostracized for the rest of their lives.

Discrimination against Women: For Inheritance

While in the educated, urban middle class women's rights continue to improve, there remains a strong bias against gender equality in those societal parts of India, where patriarchal traditions prevail. Consequently, in these strata any inheritance of a deceased husband or father would be passed down to the oldest son, while his wife or daughters would not receive any financial benefit. There are laws in place to ensure legal protection for women's right to inheritance, but the enforcement of the law is challenging, when the woman is refused her right by the family, and when she is not confident or educated enough to claim her right.

Having looked at the status of women in India, we come back to the previously quoted statement from Jawaharlal Nehru "You can tell the condition of a Nation by looking at the status of its Women." The concluding questions are: which nation can claim to be a free and prosperous society, where half of its population is being oppressed? And which striving nation can afford to oppress half of its population? Obviously, the answer to that question is: none! Sustainable and long-term development is not possible without the participation and empowerment of women, only if they participate in the economic and

societal development, the full potential of a society of India's society will be unfolded.

6.2 INDIAN WOMEN'S STATUS

Women are the pioneers of nation. Indian culture attaches great importance to women, comprising half of world's population. According to a report of secretary general of United Nations, women constitute 50% of human resources, the greatest human resource next only to man having great potentiality.

Women are the key to sustainable development and quality of life in the family. The varieties of role the women assume in the family are those of wife, leader, administrator, manager of family income and last but not the least important the mother.

1. As a wife:

Woman is man's helpmate, partner and comrade. She sacrifices her personal pleasure and ambitions, sets standard of morality, relieves stress and strain, tension of husband, and maintains peace and order in the household. Thereby she creates necessary environment for her male partner to think more about the economic upliftment of family. She is the source of inspiration to man for high endeavour and worth achievements in life.

She stands by him in all the crises as well as she shares with him all successes and attainments. She is the person to whom he turns for love, sympathy, understanding, comfort and recognition. She is the symbol of purity, faithfulness and submission and devotion to her husband.

2. As an Administrator and Leader of the Household:

A well-ordered disciplined household is essential to normal family life. The woman in the family assumes this function. She is the chief executive of an enterprise. She assigns duties among family members

according to their interest and abilities and provides resources in-term of equipment and materials to accomplish the job.

She plays a key role in the preparation and serving of meals, selection and care of clothing, laundering, furnishing and maintenance of the house. As an administrator, she organizes various social functions in the family for social development. She also acts as a director of recreation. She plans various recreational activities to meet the needs of young and old members of the family.

3. As a Manager of Family Income:

Woman acts as the humble manager of the family income. It is her responsibility to secure maximum return from every pye spent. She always prefers to prepare a surplus budget instead of a deficit budget. She is very calculating loss and gain while spending money. She distributes judiciously the income on different heads such as necessities, comforts and luxuries. The woman in the family also contributes to the family income through her own earning within or outside the home. She has positive contribution to the family income by the work. She herself performs in the home and uses waste products for productive purposes.

4. As a Mother:

The whole burden of child bearing and greater part of child rearing task are carried out by the woman in the family. She is primarily responsible for the child's habit of self-control, orderliness, industriousness, theft or honesty. Her contacts with the child during the most formative period of his development sets up his behaviour pattern. She is thus responsible for the maintenance of utmost discipline in the family.

She is the first teacher of the child. She transmits social heritage to the child. It is from mother that the child learns the laws of the race, the manner of men, moral code and ideals. The mother, because of her intimate and sustained contact with the child, she is able to discover and

nurture child's special traits aptitudes and attitudes which subsequently play a key role in the shaping of his personality.

As a mother she is the family health officer. She is very much concerned about the physical wellbeing of every member of the family, the helpless infant, the sickly child, the adolescent youth, and senescent parent. She organizes the home and its activities in such a way so that each member of the family has proper food, adequate sleep and sufficient recreation. She made the home a place of quite comfortable and appropriate setting for the children through her talent. Besides, she cultivates taste in interior design and arrangement, so that the home becomes an inviting, restful and cheerful place.

The mother is the central personality of the home and the family circle. All the members turn to her for sympathy, understanding and recognition. Woman devotes her time, labour and thought for the welfare of the members of the family. For the unity of interacting personalities, man provides the temple woman provides the ceremonies and the atmosphere.

The woman performs the role of wife, partner, organizer, administrator, director, re-creator, disburser, economist, mother, disciplinarian, teacher, health officer, artist and queen in the family at the same time. Apart from it, woman plays a key role in the socio-economic development of the society.

Modern education and modern economic life use to compel woman more and more to leave the narrow sphere of the family circle and work side by side for the enrichment of society. She can be member of any women's organisation and can launch various programmes like literacy programme such as adult education, education for disadvantaged girls etc.

The purpose of introducing such literacy programme is to raise the society as education enables women to respond to opportunities, to challenge their traditional roles and to change their life circumstances.

Education is the most important instrument for human resource development.

Women are the key to sustainable development and quality of life. So they should be members of community centre or club to disseminate knowledge about handicraft, cottage industries, food preservation and low cost nutritious diet to people belonging low socio economic status for their economic upliftment. They should act as leaders of the society to raise voice against women violence, exploitation in household as well as in work place, dowry prohibition superstition and other social atrocities.

They should be member of religious institution to deliver spiritual speech to adolescent boys and girls in order to eliminate juvenile delinquency problem from the society. In addition they have pivotal role in pre and post marital counselling for adolescent girl regarding sexual transmitted disease. AIDS and other infectious diseases. They are supposed to create awareness about Human rights, women and child rights, credit facility of bank, different immunization programmes to low socio economic status people of the society.

Moreover it is the women who have sustained the growth of society and moulded the future of nations. In the emerging complex social scenario, women have a vital role to play in different sectors. They can no longer be considered as mere harbingers of peace but are emerging as the source of power and symbol of progress.

6.3 FAMILY

The family is an important institution that plays a central role in the lives of most Indians. As a collectivistic society, Indians often emphasise loyalty and interdependence. The interests of the family usually take priority over those of the individual, and decisions affecting one's personal life – such as marriage and career paths – are generally made in consultation with one's family. People tend to act in the best interest of

their family's reputation, as the act of an individual may impact the perception of the entire family by their community.

Although most family members are within geographical proximity or part of the same occupational groups, the growth of urbanisation and migration has seen younger generations challenging these perceptions of family. Today, many people have extensive family networks that are spread across many different regions and hold different occupations. The links an Indian person maintains with their extended family overseas are often much closer than those of most people in English-speaking Western societies. Indians living abroad also maintain close connections to their family remaining in India through regular phone calls, sending remittances or visiting if circumstances allow.

Household Structure

The concept of family extends beyond the typical nuclear unit to encompass the wider family circle. These large multigenerational families can also be essential to providing economic security to an individual. They often provide a source of work in a family agricultural business or lead to opportunities in cities where kinship ties and third-party introductions are crucial for employment.

People may be encouraged to have relationships with their aunts and uncles that are just as strong as parental relationships. In many parts of India, it is common to find three or four generations living together. The father (or eldest son, if the father is not present) is usually the patriarch while his wife may supervise any daughters or daughters-in-law that have moved into the household. Extended families tend to defer to the elderly and observe a clear hierarchy among family members. In more urban areas, people will usually live in smaller nuclear families yet maintain strong ties to their extended family.

Gender Roles

The inequality between the status of men and women is quite pronounced in India. There are varying customs surrounding a practice known as '*pardah*' that calls for the seclusion of women in certain situations. It is practised mostly in northern India and among conservative Hindu or Muslim families. In accordance with pardah, females are generally expected to leave the domestic realm only when veiled and accompanied by a man. Nuances in the custom vary between ethnicities, religions and social backgrounds. For example, married Hindu women in particular parts of northern India may wear a '*ghoonghat*' (a specific kind of veil or headscarf) in the presence of older male relatives on their husband's side.

The degree to which gender inequalities persist is undergoing continuous change. For example, a brother and sister in India are now likely to receive equal schooling and treatment in the educational system. Although still bound by many constraining societal expectations, educated women in society are becoming more empowered through employment opportunities and political representation. There are also affirmative action programs for women to help address structural inequalities.

Marriage and Dating

Arranged marriages are common throughout India, though expectations and practices of marital arrangements vary depending on the region and religion. Marriages are typically arranged through a matchmaker, the couple's parents or some other trusted third party. Unlike in the past where individuals would not be informed about their future partner, it is now more common for the family to consult the couple for consent before the wedding.

Arranged marriages are nearly always influenced by caste considerations. Therefore, endogamous marriages remain a common practice (limited to members of the same caste or, in some cases, religion). This is in part because arranging marriages is a family activity that is carried out

through pre-existing networks of a broader community. Although people will marry within the same caste, families avoid marriage within the same subcaste. The institutions of arranged marriage and caste endogamy enable parents to influence the futures of their children as well as sustain the local and social structure. Intercaste marriages are almost never arranged. Such marriages are known as 'love marriages' and are becoming more common. Regardless of how one finds a spouse, the family is nearly always consulted in the marriage process.

Usually, weddings are conducted in the villages of the families, regardless of whether the family resides in their village or in a major city. Indeed, it is common for families to keep their village home for the purpose of weddings or other major family events. Weddings may span over a number of days and specific practices vary depending on the region and the religion of the families.

6.4 CASTE

During the British Raj, many reformers such as Ram Mohan Roy, Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar and Jyotirao Phule fought for the betterment of women. Peary Charan Sarkar, a former student of Hindu College, Calcutta and a member of "Young Bengal", set up the first free school for girls in India in 1847 in Barasat, a suburb of Calcutta (later the school was named Kalikrishna Girls' High School). hile this might suggest that there was no positive British contribution during the Raj era, that is not entirely the case. Missionaries' wives such as Martha Mault née Mead and her daughter Eliza Caldwell née Mault are rightly remembered for pioneering the education and training of girls in south India. This practice was initially met with local resistance, as it flew in the face of tradition. Raja Rammohan Roy's efforts led to the abolition of Sati under Governor-General William Cavendish-Bentinck in 1829. Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar's crusade for improvement in the situation of widows led to the Widow Remarriage Act of 1856. Many women reformers such as Pandita Ramabai also helped the cause of women.

Kittur Chennamma, queen of the princely state Kittur in Karnataka, led an armed rebellion against the British in response to the Doctrine of lapse. Rani Lakshmi Bai, the Queen of Jhansi, led the Indian Rebellion of 1857 against the British. She is now widely considered as a national hero. Begum Hazrat Mahal, the co-ruler of Awadh, was another ruler who led the revolt of 1857. She refused deals with the British and later retreated to Nepal. The Begums of Bhopal were also considered notable female rulers during this period. They were trained in martial arts. Chandramukhi Basu, Kadambini Ganguly and Anandi Gopal Joshi were some of the earliest Indian women to obtain a degree.

In 1917, the first women's delegation met the Secretary of State to demand women's political rights, supported by the Indian National Congress. The All India Women's Education Conference was held in Pune in 1927, it became a major organisation in the movement for social change. In 1929, the Child Marriage Restraint Act was passed, stipulating fourteen as the minimum age of marriage for a girl. Mahatma Gandhi, himself a victim of child marriage at the age of thirteen, he later urged people to boycott child marriages and called upon young men to marry child widows.

When the police arrived at the crime scene, their underwear was found discarded by the bushes.

The women had both been stripped naked, beaten and slapped, and then brutally gang-raped until they lost consciousness.

“First they slapped me a lot, and then they dragged me. And when I tried to run, I was also pregnant at that time with a baby girl, and then they kicked me in my chest, near my heart,” Rukanksha* told TRT World.

“Even till now it hurts a lot in my heart.”

One day in December 2017, Rukanksha and seven other women had gone into the forest to collect firewood a few kilometres away from their

village in Haryana, India. They were accosted by five men – a sweeper and four landlords – from a caste higher than their Dalit status. Dalits are members of Hinduism's lowest hierarchy. Two of the women, Rukanksha and Sukriti*, tried to save the other six, but were instead captured and raped.

Her baby was born two months later, but the incident has left its scars.

These violations are part of a growing problem in India, where caste and gender-based inequality are rampant. The discrimination of Dalit women is two-fold – because they are born both Dalit and a woman. Rape has long been used as a tool to maintain power and discrimination and this has been clear as violence against Dalit women has been on the rise in recent years. Between 2007 to 2017, crimes against Dalits increased by 66 percent, while rape against Dalit women doubled, National Crime Bureau statistics show. Six Dalit women are raped every day.

"Crimes against Dalits are often not properly registered or investigated, conviction rates are low, and there is a large backlog of cases. Police are also known to collude with perpetrators from dominant castes in covering up crimes by not registering or investigating offences against Dalits," a report by Amnesty International said.

The caste system is a centuries-old phenomenon in the sub-continent and a spate of sexually violent attacks is its ugly manifestation prevalent in most of India.

Over the past few decades, India has gained a reputation for rape. The brutal 2012 gang rape of Jyoti Singh Pandey on a moving bus sparked widespread outcry and a call for change. The ensuing debate and activism advocating for strict laws against rapists translated into a legal amendment in 2013, tightening up the anti-rape laws, even pronouncing punishments to acts such as stalking, which have been shown to lead to physical assault, rape or even murder.

Adding to that, is the caste system – a deep-rooted part of India's culture. Dating back 3,000 years, it can be used to dictate someone's job, the education and opportunities they receive and their dietary requirements. Whatever caste one is born into is the one they will stay in until the day they die; they cannot marry out of it.

"Gendering Caste" examines the role of women in the perpetuation of caste and the need to go beyond the conventional dichotomy of purity and pollution.

THE study of caste in India has attracted much interest over the years for a number of reasons. Its capacity to renew itself in new and myriad forms and identities now preoccupies sociologists, historians and feminists, including members of the political class. New caste identities have emerged in the social, economic and, more importantly, political arena. The traditional forms of caste divisions still exist. But the emergence of numerically strong caste groups belonging mostly to the backward classes is creating a completely new discourse in social, economic and political terms.

In Gendering Caste, the feminist historian and academic Uma Chakravarti, who has had a close association with the women's movement in India, examines the need to look at caste beyond the conventional dichotomy of purity and pollution. The book is part of a series titled "Theorising Feminism" published by Sage and edited by Maithreyi Krishnaraj. It looks specifically at how caste and gender work in extricable ways to reinforce patriarchy and perpetuate inequalities through the institutionalisation of roles designed for women, manifested in modern forms. Among the themes it deals with are the questions of how the Indian caste system views women and how women view the system of social stratification in contemporary India.

In the early 1990s, when it became clear that reservation for backward classes was going to be a reality, the uproar against it by the "forward castes", especially in north India, was a sociological event in itself. The southern States, which had a well-entrenched system of affirmative

action for backward classes and a long history of social reform movements, did not have a problem with reservation. Delhi, with its vast network of undergraduate colleges where young people from the north poured in for higher studies, was the epicentre of the anti-Mandal protests.

Uma Chakravarti begins with a narration of the protests. She had met girl students, presumably from upper-caste backgrounds, among the protesters who held placards that read "We don't want unemployed husbands". This appeared to her as a self-regulatory code that was a consequence of internalising the ideology of mandatory endogamous marriages. That marriages should take place within the caste and even the sub-caste is a fundamental ideological construct of the caste system.

The writer says ancient Brahmanical texts, which validate inequality in the name of tradition, continue to be held as sacred, apparently even by castes at the lower end of the spectrum. It is testimony to the social, economic and political power that the upper castes continue to wield. The policy of reservation, if anything, has been a drop in the ocean, she says.

The role of marriage and its centrality in perpetuating and reinforcing the "assumed immortality of the male line", the "vansa", also needs to be looked at more critically, the writer says. If the productive power of the lower castes was appropriated, she writes, the "reproductive power" of women was controlled by the upper castes. Women were the "gateways", the purveyors and the custodians of the hierarchy. As a living example of the "lived reality" and resilience of caste, Uma Chakravarti repeatedly refers to the words inscribed on the placard held by upper-caste girl students in Delhi University during the agitation against reservation.

Brutal reprisal

Notwithstanding the pledge of equality enshrined in the Constitution, recourse to violence has also been increasing, especially as Dalits and

others attempt to translate the promise of equality into substantive reality.

The Khairlanji incident, where a Maharashtra Dalit family was murdered, and the burning of Dalit homes at Mirchpur in Hisar, Haryana, show how even a little assertion of equality is met with brutal reprisal. Honour killings punishing inter-caste marriages in most cases involve unions between women from the upper castes and men from lower castes or backward classes. The reprisal is often violently directed at women who have supposedly transgressed tradition and thus compromised their role as "gatekeepers" of ritual and lineage.

The writer observes that Brahmanical patriarchy's obsessive concern with controlling female sexuality in order to ensure the reproduction of pure blood, described as the earliest evidence of genetic engineering, has survived across all caste groups, high and low, and that changes in legal forms and liberal ideologies have not been able to break its hold. Tragically, lower castes, especially in northern India, also monitor female sexuality for purposes of exogamy without quite realising that these norms are derived from the very structures that oppress them in other ways.

Fear of reprisal is weaker in places with histories of affirmative action, strong social reform movements and political movements by the Left. The presence, growth and survival of the Left parties in a sense testify to their success in raising class issues and building solidarities beyond caste identities while also raising issues of caste oppression. The perception that one can only understand what caste oppression is if one belongs to an oppressed caste has often proved to be a limitation in organising the poor on class lines. While most caste-based organisations have men at the helm, it might be worthwhile to study how women perceive identity politics.

6.5 CLASS

Scholars have begun to consider the role of gender in class-based orientations, but the conclusions vary substantially across studies. Psychology studies using laboratory or online experiments conclude — controlling for gender — that upper class individuals prioritize their own self-interest and self-reliance whereas lower class individuals prioritize social relationships. The setting and outcome variables in many of these studies are far removed from the gendered environments women face at work and at home. Studies that do consider employment choices report nonsignificant effects for gender. The inconsistency between these results and a wealth of empirical evidence that women and men make markedly different employment choices in practice cries out for further investigation into possible interactions between gender and class. We identified only two studies that investigate the interplay between gender and class on women's self-other orientations, both qualitative interview studies. The first, exploring lower and middle class women's life experiences, finds that middle class women report strong connections ton and trust in family and friends, while the social and economic isolation accompanying poverty reduces lower class women's access to supportive social ties and heightens necessary reliance on the self. The second finds that professional women who grew up in middle and upper class households tend to assign credit for their career success to their relationships with others, while their peers raised in lower class households are more likely to attribute their success to self-reliance. Reflecting realities of their respective employment and domestic realms, middle and upper class women may endorse feminine ideals by focusing on their connections with others, while lower class women may be more likely to step outside the traditionally feminine other-orientation as they maneuver among constraints at work and at home.

6.6 CULTURE

An understanding of culture in its broadest sense is indispensable in comprehending the development processes of a country. The way we define culture depends on the interpreter. The anthropologist's view is that- culture is the man-made part of the human environment. Many scholars believe, on the other hand, that culture is the quality of mind,

life, and civilization. Most scholars however agree that culture arises from observation of what human beings do and what they refrain from doing as a consequence of being brought up in one group as opposed to another. In the broader sense of the term, one would be obliged to agree that culture represents a way of life. In this sense, Indian culture would represent what all classes and communities in India have combined to make an Indian way of life. When we trace the importance of culture on women's development, we have naturally to take recourse to historical processes. If we take pre-Hindu society and examine the culture of the Mohenjodaro and Harappan civilizations through a study of the archaeological remains of this period, it appears that women held a dignified position in society. This can be seen from the way they stand in sculptural poses, like the early Mohenjodaro dancing girl who is a confident and self-contained rather than a timid product of suppression or repression. The town planning concept enunciated by Harappan culture also shows a satisfactory and comfortable domestic architecture, which means that the woman who controlled the hearth was intended to live in comfort along with her family. Till about the seventh to eighth century A.D., India was almost entirely a product of Hindu culture and civilization. It is, therefore natural that Hindu thoughts, rituals and customs determined the position of women in our society. After the Aryan entry into India, the position of women is enunciated in Vedic literature itself. We find that some of the most important early divinities in Vedic culture were women, like *Usha* or dawn. In the *Pauranic* period, man had to realize most of his important goals by paying obeisance to female divinities. The goal of achieving prosperity, for some the most important aim of life, was to be achieved through Lakshmi, the Goddess of Prosperity and the consort .of Vishnu. The divinity responsible for imparting knowledge was Saraswati. Similarly, the destroyer of evil and the nurturer of good was Durga, the consort of Shiva. The role of women as fertility goddesses and the givers of birth to man emerged very early in Indian culture. Similarly, the concept of *purusa* and *prakriti,* which became the male and female elements of creation with women representing creation through their *shakti,* also epitomized a high position for women. Most gods in Indian mythology

had wives who were also worshipped. An important indicator of a woman's position in society is whether the birth of a girl child is welcome in that society. We notice, however, that during the Vedic period, the *Atharva Veda* prescribes charms and rituals to ensure the birth of a son in preference to that of a daughter. There is however, evidence to show that the birth of a daughter was not a cause of concern to the family in the Vedic and Upanishadic ages. On the contrary, we find that the *Brihadaranyaka Upanishad* prescribes a ritual for a householder in the event of his desiring the birth of a scholarly daughter. Indeed, some thinkers indicated in the Sama Veda that the birth of a talented and well-behaved daughter might be more worthwhile than that of a son. In well-to-do circles, an accomplished and beautiful daughter was a subject of pride. In lower sections of society, the custom of bride price prevailed and so it may be presumed that a daughter was not unwelcome.

There is sufficient evidence to indicate that girls were entitled to education, and we know that many women became renowned scholars, like Gargi who challenged Yajnavalkya in debate and Atreyi who was a great scholar of Vedanta and studied under Valmiki and Agastya Rishi. Women like Lopamudra, Visvavara, Sikata Nivavan, and Ghosha were among the authors of the *Rig Veda', brahmavadinis,* who pursued scholarship for the rest of their lives. There were also a number of women poets in the first millennia in various parts of the country. Devi and Vijayanka are the best known. Women were allowed to remain celibates. Indeed, some great women scholars renounced marriage in order to devote themselves to penance and self-realization or even scholarship. Vedic society did however enjoin marriage as a religious and social duty, but it was not obligatory. Women even had the right to choose their partners. There is no mention of dowry being given to women or demanded by the man's family. A few gifts were given at the time of *kanyadan* as charity. Within marriage, women were supposed to be equal partners for the attainment of the goals of *dharma, artha, kama* and *moksha.* The highest position given to her was in the concept of *Ardhanareeswara,* where Shiva is considered half man and half woman. The love of Siva and Parvati represents the highest ideal of

conjugal attachment. Society allowed widow remarriage and levirate. The fact that soon after the birth of Buddhism, women were allowed to join nunneries is again an indication of their status in society. This phenomenon gave greater encouragement to female education. The Jain tradition also speaks of women giving up the worldly life and becoming *sadhavi*. Women had the right to employment and several of them rose to be renowned teachers and physicians, many became dramatists, musicians, and dancers. Participation in the performing arts was considered a very respectable occupation. In the lower classes of society most women worked hard at their livelihood through agriculture, by manufacturing textiles and handicrafts. As far as the economic rights of women are concerned, during the Vedic age, husband and wife were considered to be the joint owners of their household and its property. The husband was required to take a solemn oath at the time of marriage that he would not harm his wife's rights and interests. In practice, women did not have absolute rights over the joint property and were required to transact affairs in relation to it in consultation with and on the advice of their husbands. They were entitled to maintenance.

The position of women after the eighth to ninth century A.D., takes a turn towards greater orthodoxy and control of women as possessions. Whereas, in the Vedas the destruction of an embryo was considered to be very sinful, the custom of female infanticide crept into some sections of the society during the medieval period; but it was confined largely to t6e lower, uncultured, and very poor classes, and there too was considered to be abnormal behaviour and of rare occurrence. Most girls, were deprived of an education unless they happened to be members of the aristocracy or well-to-do business classes, or were born into the entertainment professions, i.e. courtesans and dancing and singing girls. The custom of early marriage first manifested itself among the lower classes members of which charged bride-price and therefore sought to marry off their daughters at a very young age. The popularity of early marriage increased during the medieval period, stemming from the desire to protect girl children being coveted by the foreign invaders. This custom is mentioned by European travellers like Manucci' and Tavernier' who

visited India. Akbar' issued a fiat that no marriage should be performed before puberty. It was, however, normal for girls to be married off at an age of between nine to twelve, i.e., before they attained puberty, right up to the early twentieth century. The question of marriage by choice did not arise. The custom of dowry remained, as hitherto, of the bride's parents voluntarily gifting ornaments and occasionally cash to their daughters at the time of marriage. There was no prior negotiation of the extent of gifts to be given at the time of marriage, nor was it demanded. The right to divorce and widow remarriage seems to have almost disappeared in the second millennia, though, occasionally such cases are known to have occurred, especially among the lower castes. In marriage, the obligation of fidelity was enjoined on both the parties along with love, care, and mutual maintenance. The custom of polygamy, though known earlier, becomes common among the ruling classes. *Purdah* came into existence under Muslim influence. A woman did not inherit her husband's wealth but was supposed to be cared for by her son. The concept of the mother being considered as sacred and worthy of worship continued from the Vedic age and women had a position of respect. There were many *rishis* like Vishnu and Yajnavalkya, who recognized the right of a widow to her husband's property. This was occasionally practiced in the south but rarely in the north. The concept of *stridhan* becomes very conspicuous, and it was supposed to consist not only of the gifts received by woman at the time of her marriage but whatever was given to her by her maternal and other relatives during her married life. Many jurists propounded that the husband's gifts of landed property to the wife also formed part of her *stridhan.* Her right to alienate this property by sale or gifting it to her parents' family was however chaIlenged. If the widow did not have children, it was expected that it should go to the husband's collaterals. The custom of *sati* is first mentioned among the Brahmins before the birth of Christ, but was not really considered to be the wife's religious duty. Some women, overcome with grief, voluntarily committed suicide by throwing themselves on their dead husband's funeral pyre, like Madri, the wife of Pandu, the father of the Pandavas, as mentioned in the *Mahabharata.* The Kshatriyas did not follow this because their uncertain existence would have meant a lot of child

widows. After the eighth century, this custom becomes much commoner. In Kashmir, we even hear of mothers, sisters, servants, and ministers committing *sati* with the rulers in the *Rajatarangini?* Contemporary literature of Bana, Kalidasa, and Bhasa shows that it was popular among royal families. This custom was also commonly practiced in Rajasthan by women of the royal family and many others, as also among the Nayaks in South India. By the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; this custom was also occasionally practiced by the lower castes in north India. However, at no stage of India's history was *sati* a common practice and was certainly nowhere near universal. We have some figures from 1815 to 1828 indicating that it was miniscule." Throughout the medieval period, there were exceptions to the rule as far as the lower status of women was concerned. In many princely families, both Muslim and Hindu women were highly educated and often took part in governing their States during the minority of their children, and this has happened frequently in the Jaipur State. Women took interest in the defence of their husbands' States. We have the example of the celebrated Tara, wife of Prithviraj, an heir-apparent to the throne of Chittor, who lost her life in a battle with a Muslim ruler. Upper class women occasionally exercised their right to choice in the selection of their husbands. In the seventeenth century, there was a famous case of Charumati of Kishangarh in Rajasthan who was betrothed to Aurangzeb by her brother but who refused to marry him and instead sent a message to Maharana Raj Singh of Udaipur to rescue and marry her. We also have evidence of women scholars both in Rajasthan and throughout the rest of the country, like the famous poetess Mira of Chittor, and of Andal in the South. Among the Muslims, we find the highly cultivated Nurjahan, Mumtaz Mahal, Jahanara Begum, and Roshanara Begum taking a great interest in charitable works, in the construction of *sarais* or rest-houses by the roadsides, in feeding the poor, and in constructing mosques, mausoleums, and gardens.

During the medieval period and later, both in the north and south, women of the royal and aristocratic classes had a certain degree of economic independence through their large dowries and the *jagirs* bestowed on them by their husbands. Both Maharaja Man Singh of Jodhpur" and

Maharana Bhim Singh of Udaipur" gifted *jagirs* to their wives. Maharaja Pratap Singh of Jaipur gifted *e jagir* to his daughter Chandra Kunwar in Jaipur.'? The Maharanis of Udaipur, Jodhpur, and Kotah, from their own resources constructed temples, gardens, and *bawris* to provide drinking water. Women from the poorer families worked as agricultural labourers, cultivators, handloom weavers, spinners, and made handicrafts. Many of them took to domestic employment or became singing and dancing girls. By the end of the millennium we find that, in general, women enjoyed a much higher position in the scriptures and in religious rituals than in practice, their position gradually becoming one of complete dependence on and subservience to men. It would be true to say that it was generally a question of class that determined the status of a woman. We do not have any recorded evidence about the status of tribal women. From the early nineteenth century, the wind of change as far as position of women is concerned started blowing in our country. The British rule had a healthy influence on women. It began with the Bengal Renaissance where social reformers such as Vidya Sagar and Raja Ram Mohan Roy, founder of the Brahmo Samaj, advocated education for girls, marriage after adolescence, and the right to widow remarriage. There was a countrywide movement, including Rajasthan where Maharajas like Ram Singh 11 (1833-79) of Jaipur banned dowries being given. We find that towards the end of the nineteenth century, women had started coming out of their homes to seek education, but this was on a very restricted scale. The struggle for independence against British rule in India, had its impact, all the leaders participating in it encouraging social reform, and one of the principal planks of the reformist movement was improvement in the status of women. Women joined the struggle for Independence in large numbers and the Western educated leadership of the Congress Party supported their right to equality. As early as 1936, in the state of Madras, women had got the right to vote. The Women's Right to Property Act was passed in 1929. The Constitution adopted in 1950 also stressed the equality of the sexes in Articles 15,16 and 39 providing protection for and improvement in the status of women.

6.7 RELIGION

The study of women and religion typically examines the role of women within particular religious faiths, and religious doctrines relating to gender, gender roles, and particular women in religious history. Most religions elevate the status of men over women, have stricter sanctions against women, and require them to be submissive. While there has been changes towards equality, religions overall still lag the rest of society in addressing gender issues. There are fundamentalists within every religion who actively resist change. There is often a dualism within a religion that exalts women on the one hand, while demanding more rigorous displays of devotion on the other. This leads some feminists to see religion as the last barrier for female emancipation.

Men have been dominant as recipients, interpreters and transmitters of divine messages, while women have largely remained passive receivers of teachings and ardent practitioners of religious rituals. Attitudes developed around patriarchal interpretations of religious belief have defined and shaped the social and cultural contexts of Indian women resulting in their disempowerment and second-class status.

In India, where politics uses religion as a tool to manipulate the masses, women bear the brunt of the consequences of cultural attitudes and the impact of religion and politics in their particular milieu. Recognizing the influence of religion and culture on Indian women's lives, Streevani (which means "voice of women") took the initiative to organize a national consultation on the theme "Impact of Religion and Culture on Women's Empowerment – An Indian Perspective." About 50 people — women and men religious, theologians, professionals and a diocesan priest — attended the September 23-26 meeting in Hyderabad, India.

Within the overarching framework of patriarchy in the religious and social sphere, the core issues that emerged were: one, violence against women and, two, sexuality and the politics of gender.

Speakers from different religious traditions alluded to the fact that all religions started as movements presenting a way of life. Many have their origin in protest against established exclusionary and oppressive religious structures. However, within the existing patriarchal structures, once religion took root as an institution with rigid dogmas, there developed a fissure between the episteme and practice. The challenge is to recover the sparks of the original flame to effect change.

"Women have internalized patriarchal Christianity. They are comfortable with just a little space that is given to them," said Presentation Sr. and theologian Shalini Mulackal. The language, symbols and culturally conditioned interpretation of religious scriptures have evolved a practice that alienates women and even influences exploitation and violence towards them.

Lubna Sarwath, a social activist and scholar in Islamic economics, declared that Islam has moved away from God and the teachings of the Quran. Usha Rani Vongur, a Marxist feminist, said, "Religion controls our thoughts. It distorts reality and obstructs us from questioning." Manusmriti, the divine code of conduct for Hindus, depicts women in a very poor light and is full of derogatory statements about them. It advocates total control of women by the men in their lives. It also divided Indian society into castes, granting privilege to the higher castes and penalties to the lower ones.

"Religion is not a given, it is a negotiated reality," Kalpana Kannabiran, a Hindu woman and director of the Council for Social Development in Hyderabad, said in her keynote address.

Violence against women

In India, violence to women, the marginalized sections of society, and minorities is a disturbing issue. Violence is prevalent in the family and expands to a woman's circle of known persons, even those she is taught to revere and confide in, like religious leaders, and in public spaces.

Cyrilla Chakkalakal, a Franciscan Sister of St. Mary of the Holy Angels, narrated experiences of pain in the lives of nuns arising from patriarchal attitudes. Referring to the murder of two sisters from her congregation in 1990, she narrated how the character assassination of the sisters in the media turned public attention to the sexuality of the sisters and detracted from the who or why of the murders. The leaders of the Catholic community failed to take a stand. Their apathy and silence was painful. Were they being held back by other powers? The suffering that the congregation went through has only abated with time.

Religious structures have a negative impact on victims of sexual abuse, too. Women internalize scriptural interpretation that describes woman as sinner, manipulator and temptress. This contributes to their silence on abuse. Seeing the priest in the place of God compounds the confusion and guilt. As a result, the psychosocial and spiritual impact of abuse committed by the clergy is immense on women victims.

The bodies of women from the Dalit or outcast community are seen as "available," the women portrayed as characterless, so they are exploited for sex. Atrocities to Dalit women are very visible and committed with utter impunity. The internalization of their social status renders them voiceless. The mindset of caste underpins culture in all religious groups, including Christians. However, Dalits have become aware of their status and value in recent times. They comprise 17 percent of the Indian population, so politicians endeavor to reach out to them with various political gimmicks often resulting in splitting the community. Shyamla, a Dalit woman, proposed the articulation of feminism from a Dalit perspective.

Violence to women in the family cuts across all religious and caste groups in India and has its roots in cultural attitudes of male superiority. Narrations of stories of violence to women in the family can only be described as horrendous. One is left wondering how women continue to survive and take care of their children and home. The stories are similar — beating, smothering, choking (even during pregnancy), sexual

violence, emotional violence, violence done to the girl children. But with the existence of a strong women's movement that helped bring changes in the law, women have access to legal help to file cases against domestic violence.

Sexuality and the politics of gender

Kochurani Abraham, a feminist theologian, pointed out that, in all mainstream religions and cultures, the politics of representation is at work mainly by casting humans in a gendered mold. The definition of masculinity places men at an advantage while women, defined as weak, sensitive and dependent, are highly disadvantaged. Ironically Pope Francis too is stuck in the complementary gendered mindset, even though he talks about expanding the roles of women. His otherwise progressive encyclicals refer to gendered roles for women, neglecting qualities like intellectual agency, theological expertise, organizational abilities and leadership skills, Abraham observed.

There is a need to break gender binaries as power is hegemonic and prescribes violence to control, dominate and enforce a system of rule. The gendering of body and sexuality does great violence to women and LGBTIQ persons. The male is considered the norm, and scriptures are used to define women as defective, sinful, needing to be controlled, even by using violence. LGBTIQ persons and their subjectivities are by and large excluded by authorized canons of religions. The issue of LGBTIQ persons is still nascent in India. The person scheduled to talk to us about this topic did not show up but they are included in the program for change.

Church teaching, while professing the equality of women, promotes the notion of complementarily assigning fixed roles to women and men, with women usually in passive and subservient positions, as Fr. Shaji George Kochuthara of the Carmelites of Mary Immaculate pointed out. With regard to sexuality, he said, procreation is the center of the marriage relationship, the leader in theological ethics. Love, equality, respect and

mutuality that contribute toward strengthening the marriage relationship are ignored. This, he said, has led to the active/passive paradigm that legitimates violence, such as marital rape, but also emotional, psychological and financial violence that covertly controls women's sexuality. Church leadership remains silent on the issues of domestic violence and dowry but stresses a morality that condemns abortion and contraceptives and glorifies fidelity in marriage and motherhood no matter the circumstances, Kochuthara concluded.

In India, gender justice is manipulated for political gain. The government has created a controversy over a Uniform Civil Code to divide people on religion and gender. In the name of gender justice, it is fueling Muslim women to stand up against polygamy and the triple talaq as it is practiced in India (where the man says "talaq" three times to divorce his wife). But women's rights lawyer Flavia Agnes, who has taken up several cases of Muslim women's divorce in court, finds that Muslim law can indeed give justice to women, especially to obtain alimony for them, while women in other traditions continue to struggle for those rights. Second wives in the Muslim tradition have full rights, while in other traditions they have no rights. Polygamy is more prevalent in other religious traditions than in Islam. She emphasizes, "We need equality of rights and not equality of the law."

For Catholic women governed by the Code of Canon Law, the major discrimination based on gender is their exclusion from ordination and all the offices contained therein. The maleness of Christ rather than his humanity is emphasized, putting women on a plane lower than men. Even within the category of the non-ordained, women and men do not enjoy equal rights. Only men, including married men, can be ordained deacons and be installed as lectors. As Montfort Br. Varghese Thecknath offered, "The ontologically different character attained by men at ordination becomes a source of power that is sacramental and hierarchal and creates unequal people. This becomes an impediment to the realization of human rights in the church."

Without altering mindsets, very little can change. Hence at this September meeting, an action plan was drawn up for collaborating with male theologians to construct a campaign to boost awareness and create gender sensitivity programs; to form a solidarity group to strengthen the outreach to women victims of sex abuse in the church; and to fortify the Indian Christian Women's Movement. While a more concrete strategy was worked out for the second and third phases of the action plan, the first part needs to become reality. The participants departed with a lot of enthusiasm to go back to their respective ministries and work towards a church that reflects Jesus' call to be a community that believes and lives the "Kin-dom" values of love, justice, equality, peace, reconciliation and communion.

6.8 SOCIAL SYSTEM

Because gender reflects the division of labor in public and private spheres, and the division of labor in both spheres differs by class, the dynamic interplay between gender and class has de facto influence on women's employment beliefs and practices. Two possible refinements to the social psychology of class rise from considering gendered environments in homes and workplaces. First, women's gender-based orientation toward others and preference for affiliation over power may mitigate documented class-based differences in self-other orientation. Second alternative points to the potential for self-other orientation to reverse in women's own understandings of and approach to employment. Middle and upper class women working in male-dominated workplaces, living in households where female employment may be optional, and parenting in communities where intensive parenting is valued, may uphold gendered ideals of women as communal and other-oriented. In contrast, lower class women working in female-dominated occupations, living in households with limited financial resources, and parenting in communities where financial independence is valued, face heightened emphasis on the necessity of looking after one's own self-interests. The self-other orientations of low-income women may thus defy expectations based on gender as well as those based on class. To better understand how both women and men construct meanings regarding the self and

other in employment contexts, psychology research needs to go beyond categorizations based solely on class and build toward a gendered-class framework. Fully investigating the intersection of gender and class, starting with simple demonstrations of similarities or differences in a two (male/ female) by two (higher class/lower class) design, will be revealing. We urge scholars studying class-based differences in beliefs and behaviors to incorporate gendered experiences in homes and workplaces into their research, deepening our understanding of the complex interplay between sources of power and status in society.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss the status of women in Indian society?
   ……
   ……
   ……
2. How can class and caste create discrimination for women in Indian society?
   ……
   ……
   ……
   =

3. How does the religion create gender discrimination?
   ……
   ……
   ……

6.9 LET US SUM UP

In Indian society, women are traditionally discriminated against and excluded from political and family related decisions. Despite the large

amount of work women must do on a daily basis to support their families, their opinions are rarely acknowledged and their rights are limited.

From the time they are born, young Indian girls are the victims of discrimination. According to a 2005 report from the Indian Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, the infant mortality rate among girls is 61% higher than that for boys. This gender inequality is also present in education; only 2/3 of girls between the ages of 6 and 17 are sent to school, compared to 3/4 of boys of the same age. Also, in the countryside, only 46% of women are literate, which is almost one-half the literary rate for men.

Instead of going to school, girls often find themselves forced to work in order to help their families, often from a very young age. Even more worrisome, 25% of women marry before the age of 15 and very often, they marry against their will. This has profound consequences, notably on women's health and their precarious situation often prevents them from receiving proper health care. For many Indian women, poor treatment, violence and exploitation take place on daily basis.

However, in the last decades, the situation of women in India has greatly improved. An increasing number of Indian women are entering local and national politics and since 2007, the country has been under the rule of a woman, Pratibha Patil. She is the first woman to hold this position since the creation of the Indian Republic in 1950.

Indian society does indeed recognize many women's rights, including the rights to political involvement, family allowance and set up a business. Nevertheless, in rural areas, poverty and a lack of information represent real barriers to women's independence and empowerment. Programs aimed at advancing human rights, literacy and microfinance are therefore necessary in order to restore Indian women to the place they deserve and open doors to a better future.

6.10 KEY WORDS

Caste: Caste is a form of social stratification characterized by endogamy, hereditary transmission of a style of life which often includes an occupation, ritual status in a hierarchy, and customary social interaction and exclusion based on cultural notions of purity and pollution.

Dalit: Dalit, meaning "broken/scattered" in Sanskrit and Hindi, is a term mostly used for the ethnic groups in India and Nepal that have been kept repressed. Dalits were excluded from the four-fold varna system of Hinduism and were seen as forming a fifth varna, also known by the name of Panchama.

6.11 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

4. Discuss the status of women in Indian society?
5. How can class and caste create discrimination for women in Indian society?
6. How does the religion create gender discrimination?

6.12 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- A View on Buddhism. (2015). Brief History of Buddhism in India. Retrieved from http://www.viewonbuddhism.org/india.html.
- Advameg. (n.d.). India. Retrieved from http://www.everyculture.com/Ge-It/India.html.
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2017). Census 2016, Country of Birth of Person by Sex (SA2+) [Data set]. http://stat.data.abs.gov.au/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=ABS_C16_T06_SA.
- Bukstein, J., George, K., & Jenson, R. (2001). Nonverbal Issues. Retrieved from http://academic.depauw.edu/mkfinney_web/teaching/Com227/culturalPortfolios/india/NONVERBALFINAL.htm.

- Central Intelligence Agency. (2017). The World Factbook: India. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/in.html.
- Corbett, K. (2014). India: Behaviour, communication and culture. Culturescope, 104, 24-27.
- Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (2017). India country brief. Retrieved from https://dfat.gov.au/geo/india/Pages/india-country-brief.aspx
- Department of Home Affairs. (2019). India-born: Community Information Summary. Retrieved from https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/mca/files/2016-cis-india.PDF
- Difference Between. (2016). Difference between Indian Culture and Western Culture. Retrieved from http://www.differencebetween.info/difference-between-indian-culture-and-western-culture.
- Dikshit, K.R., Schwartzberg, J. E., Spear, T. G. P., Srivastava, A. L., Thapar, R., & Wolpert, S. A. (2016). India. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/place/India.
- Dotson, M. (n.d.). India Culture Guide - Body Language. Retrieved from https://sites.google.com/a/global.t-bird.edu/india-culture-guide/doing-business-in-india/body-language.
- Dresser, N. (1996). Multicultural Manners. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Geert Hofstede. (2016). India. Retrieved from https://geert-hofstede.com/india.html.

6.13 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Section 6.2
2. See Section 6.4 and 6.5
3. See Section 6.7

UNIT 7: WOMEN'S MOVEMENTS—PRE-INDEPENDENT, POST-INDEPENDENT

STRUCTURE

7.0 OBJECTIVES

After completing this Unit, you will be able to:

- Engage with the historical movement in India in Pre-independence era;
- Learn the inter linkages and correlations of the movement with history and society; and
- Evaluate the strengths and challenges before the movement after independence.

7.1 INTRODUCTION

Though women were actively engaged in the struggle for independence, some of the women leaders took a stand that women's organisations should be away from party politics in 1930. They were concerned more with the social issues rather than the political issues. They decided so as British government's help was necessary for the women's organisations to bring about social changes in women's position through legislation and education.

However, there were some women leaders who took a different stand and aligned themselves with the national movement. They were of the view that women will progress only with political emancipation. They looked upon women's freedom to be dependent on freedom for the country. 1920s and 1930s saw active participation of women in freedom struggle. Women were more active in the Swadeshi movement and picketing of shops selling foreign goods.

The perspective with which women's issues were looked upon underwent a gradual change. The focus shifted from social and educational to political perspectives with the forging of closer link between the Congress and women's groups.

We also understand the role of women's identity politics and women's political mobilization and community based organizations. In this Unit, our attempt is to study the vibrant women's movements with many achievements to its credit. An attempt will be made to understand these linkages of South Asian women's movement and its impact on Indian women's movement, to arrive at an understanding of the present state of the women's movement through the way in which it has evolved through placing demands on the state as well as marinating a critical distance from the state.

7.2 WOMEN AND PRE- INDEPENDENT MOVEMENT

Women's Movements in India: Pre-Independence Women's Movements!

The women's movement in India began as a social reform movement in the nineteenth century. The Western ideas of liberty, equality, and fraternity were being imbibed by the educated elite through the study of English. Western liberalism was to extend to the women's question and translate into awareness on the status of women.

In India, the tradition of women's struggles and movements against patriarchal institutions of gender injustice, have been weak when compared to the women's movements in the Western and European societies. In fact, women's fight against the oppression of patriarchy has been rather slow in emerging.

Most of the women's writings of the eighteenth century reveal disenchantment with the prevalence of patriarchy and gender injustices rather than any kind of active resistance or revolt against them. Women did try to go against the male-dominated world (for example, by joining the Bhakti Movement).

The nineteenth century women found themselves totally suppressed and subjugated by the male patriarchal ideologies and attitudes of those times, though there was a feminist identity consciousness and awareness of their plight. However, this awareness did not get translated into an open and organized struggle for selfhood and survival.

Though there were feelings of deprivation and anger against the injustices women were facing, these remained mostly latent, and at the most, sometimes mildly open. In today's world, feminist movements have gained expression due to similar factors.

The women's movement in India can be seen as forming three "waves". The first wave can be seen during the national movement, when there was mass mobilization of women for participation in the nationalist movement.

Thereafter, for over a decade, there was a lull in political activities by women. The late 1960s saw resurgence in women's political activity and can be called the second wave. In the late 1970s, the third wave of the women's movement emerged, which focused on women's empowerment.

Pre-independence Women's Movements in India (The First Wave of Women's Movement):

Readings of texts, religious, political, cultural, social—oral stories, mythology, folklore, fables, songs, jokes, proverbs, and sayings reveal that women's subordination has existed in different forms since time immemorial. Of course, there have been acts of resistance at different times throughout the Indian history, though these have been sporadic.

There are numerous stories of how women questioned and went against the establishment, personified in the deeds of Razia Sultana, Rani Lakshmibai of Jhansi, Ahilyabai Holkar, Muktabai, and so on. Women throughout history made efforts to break free from the bonds of oppression they had to face by virtue of their birth.

Many women belonging to the various castes joined the Bhakti Movement. The saints stood up for equal rights of men and women. It resulted in some amount of social freedom for women. Women joined in Kathas and Kirtans organized by various saints of the Bhakti Movement. This helped in freeing women from the drudgery and restrictions of domestic life.

The Bhakti Movement was an egalitarian movement that cut across gender and caste discriminations. Some women such as Mira Bai, Akkamahadevi, and Janaki became leading poetesses. The saints of the Bhakti Movement produced considerable literature in the vernacular language, or the language of the people.

Indian culture became acces-sible to women also: Saints also encouraged the worship of the feminine counterparts of male Gods (Narayan-Lakshmi, Krishna-Radha, Vishnu-Lakshmi), which indirectly helped to elevate the status of women.

Major Organizations

Spread of education in the 19th and early 20th centuries made many women to be actively engage themselves in the social and political life of India. The struggle for women's rights and equality was viewed as an integral part of the struggle for independence. Many women who participated in the freedom struggle were also active on the issues concerning the rights of women. Ten women participated in the 1889 Bombay Session of the Indian National Congress. In 1931, Indian National Congress proclaimed that equality between men and women as one of the objectives in the Fundamental Resolution.

Though, women's movements entered a new phase with the arrival of Gandhi, women were associated with the freedom struggle before the arrival of Gandhi. They actively took part in the Swadeshi movement in Bengal (1905-1911) and laso in the Home Rule Movement. But the participation of large number of women began after the arrival of Gandhi. Non-Cooperation movement provided a special role to women. Women peasants were also actively involved in the rural satyagrahas of Bardoli and Borsad. They also participated in the Civil Disobedience Movement and in the Quit India Movement.

Attitude of Mahatma Gandhi

Mahatma Gandhi called for large scale participation of women in India's freedom struggle. This changed the perception of other nationalist leaders. Gandhi said that participation of women in freedom struggle was an integral part of their dharma. Gandhi believed that women were ideally suited for Satyagraha as they are filled with qualities appropriate for non-violent struggle and social uplift programmes of the Indian National Congress. According to Gandhi, women possess qualities of

self-sacrifice and tolerance and an ability to endure sufferings which are sine-qua-non for non-violent struggle. Hence, Gandhian ideology had significant impact on women's movement. He proclaimed that "I am uncompromising in the matter of women's rights". He also said: "Woman is the companion of man gifted with equal mental capabilities."

Attitude of Jawaharlal Nehru

Nehru had liberal views on women's questions as he was influenced by the Western suffragettes. According to Nehru, without achieving economic freedom other aspects of women's equality cannot be realised. He wanted women to be trained in all human activities and was opposed to the view that women's education alone can bring desired changes in the issues concerning women. He also believed that if struggle of women got isolated from the general political, economic and social struggles then the women's movement would remain confined to the upper classes.

Forms of participation of women in freedom struggle

Women contributed to the freedom struggle in a number of ways. They picketed shops selling foreign goods, participated in political protests, organised Prabhat Pheri (singing of patriotic songs) and provided food and shelter for underground political activists and performed the role of messengers carrying messages to political prisoners. In 1930, women participated in large numbers in Gandhiji's Dandi march. Thousands of women got jailed for participating in various events during freedom struggle.

There were some militant groups that were active in Bengal, Punjab, Maharashtra as well as in foreign countries. Some prominent Indian women who worked with revolutionaries include Bhikaji Cama, Perm D S Captian, Sraladevi Choudhurani in Bengal, Sushila Devi and Durga Devi in Punjab, Roopavati Jain in Delhi Kalpana Dutt and Kamal Dasguptain Calcutta, Lakshmi Sahgal, in-charge of the Rani Jhansi Women's regiment which was a part of the Indian National Army founded by Subhas Chandra Bose.

Issues Raised: Women's suffrage

Demand for women's suffrage was raised for the first time in 1917. A memorandum signed by 23 women was presented to Montague and Chelmsford demanding votes on the same terms as men. Other demands like education, training in skills, local self government, and social welfare were also presented. A women's deputation including Sarojini Naidu and Margaret Cousins put forwarded the demand for female franchise to the Viceroy. The Indian National Congress supported the idea of female franchise and the constitutional reforms in 1919 permitted the provincial legislatures to decide on the issue. The Indian National Congress at its Calcutta session in 1917 presided over by Annie Besant supported the demand for female franchise.

In 1918, the Southborough Franchise Committee toured the whole British India to gather information. But initially it was reluctant to grant the right to vote to women as it was of the view that Indian women were not ready for it. But WIA and other leaders like Annie Besant and Sarojini Naidu were aggressively pursuing the issue and even presented evidence before the joint Parliamentary Committee in England. The Joint Parliamentary Committee finally agreed to disallow the sex disqualification but left the issue at the discretion of provincial legislatures to decide how and when to do so.

Subsequently, Travancore-Cochin, a princely state was the first to accord voting rights to women in 1920. Madras became the first province to allow women to exercise their franchise in 1921. But the franchise was extremely limited. Only those women who possessed qualifications of wifehood, property and education were allowed to exercise their franchise.

Women also began to become legislative councillors. In 1926, Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya stood for the Madras Legislative Council

elections contesting from Mangalore but was defeated by a narrow margin. In 1927, Dr. Muthulakshmi Reddy was the first woman to become legislator councillor in Madras. The demand for female franchise was later changed as demand for adult franchise within the national movement.

In 1927 when the Simon Commission was appointed, second phase in the battle for female enfranchisement started. While WIA boycotted the commission, some members of All India Women's Conference (AIWC) met the members of the Commission. AIWC submitted its demands to the Franchise Committee of the Second Round Table Conference. The Franchise Committee of the Second Round Table Conference under the chairmanship Lord Lothian rejected the demand of universal adult franchise. The Committee recommended that 2-5% of seats in provincial legislatures be given to women. But AIWC rejected the idea of reserved seats. The Government of India Act, 1935 removed some of the previous qualifications and increased the number of enfranchised women. All the women above 21 years of age and possessed the qualification of property and education were given the right to vote. Only after independence women got the unrestricted voting rights.

Issues Raised: Reform of Personal laws

The All India Women's conference (AIWC) at the initiative of Margaret Cousins took up the problem of women's education. but AIWC realized that purdah, child marriage, and other social customs were preventing women from getting education. So it waged a vigorous campaign to rise the age of marriage for girls. This resulted in the passage of the Sarada Act in 1929. AIWC alos demanded to reform Hindu laws to prohibit bigamy and to provide women with the rights to divorce and inherit property. But such reforms were finally obtained after a delay with the passage of the Hindu Code Bills in 1950s.

Women in the labour movement

In 1917, Ahmedabad textile workers' strike was led by Anasuya Sarabhai and the Ahmedabad textile mill workers union was established. In the late 1920s there was an increase in the number of women in the worker's movement. Several rominent women unionists and women workers were working for the welfare of the labourers. Maniben Kara emerged as the socialist leader of railway workers. Similarly, Ushabai Dange and Parvati Bhore emerged as the Communist leaders of textile workers.

Role of women in India's freedom struggle

The history of Indian Freedom Struggle would be incomplete without mentioning the contributions of women. The sacrifice made by the women of India will occupy the foremost place. They fought with true spirit and undaunted courage and faced various tortures, exploitations and hardships to earn us freedom.

When most of the men freedom fighters were in prison the women came forward and took charge of the struggle. The list of great women whose names have gone down in history for their dedication and undying devotion to the service of India is a long one.

Woman's participation in India's freedom struggle began as early as in1817 .Bhima Bai Holkar fought bravely against the British colonel Malcolm and defeated him in guerilla warfare. Many women including Rani Channama of Kittur, Rani Begam Hazrat Mahal of Avadh fought against British East India company in the 19th century; 30 years before the "First War of Independence 1857"

The role played by women in the War of Independence (the Great Revolt) of 1857 was creditable and invited the admiration even leaders of the Revolt. Rani of Ramgarh, Rani Jindan Kaur, Rani Tace Bai, Baiza Bai, Chauhan Rani, Tapasvini Maharani daringly led their troops into the battlefield.

Rani Lakshmi Bai of Jhansi whose heroism and superb leadership laid an outstanding example of real patriotism .Indian women who joined the national movement belonged to educated and liberal families, as well as those from the rural areas and from all walk of life, all castes, religions and communities.

Sarojini Naidu, Kasturba Gandhi, Vijayalakmi Pundit and Annie Bezant in the 20th century are the names which are remembered even today for their singular contribution both in battlefield and in political field.

Let us elucidate the role of Indian women who participated in the freedom struggle against British East India Company and British Empire and made great and rich contributions in various ways.

The First War of Independence (1857-58)

The First War of Independence (1857-58) It was the first general agitation against the rule of the British East India Company. The Doctrine of Lapse, issue of cartridges greased with cow and pig fat to Indian soldiers at Meerut 'triggered the fire'. Further, the introduction of British system of education and a number of social reforms had infuriated a very wide section of the Indian people, soon became a widespread agitation and posed a grave challenge to the British rule.

As a result of this agitation the East India Company was brought under the direct rule of the British Crown.Even though the British succeeded in crushing it within a year, it was certainly a popular revolt in which the Indian rulers, the masses and the militia participated so enthusiastically that it came to be regarded as the First War of Indian Independence. Rani Lakshmibai was the great heroine of the First war of India Freedom. She showed the embodiment of patriotism, self-respect and heroism. She was the queen of a small state, but the empress of a limitless empire of glory.

Jalianwalabagh massacre (1919)

General Dyer's Jalianwala Bagh massacre followed the strike wave, when an unarmed crowd of 10,000 Baisakhi celebrators was mercilessly attacked with over 1600 rounds of ammunition. Yet, Gandhi continued to advocate cooperation with the British in December 1919, even as the resistance of ordinary Indians continued. The first six months of 1920 saw an even greater level of mass resistance, with no less than 200 strikes taking place involving 1.5 million workers. It was in response to this rising mass revolutionary tide that the leadership of the Congress was forced to confront its conservatism and give a somewhat more militant face to its program. The "non-violent non-cooperation" movement was thus launched under the stewardship of leaders like Mahatma Gandhi, Lajpat Rai and Motilal Nehru.

Non-cooperation movement launched (1920)

Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi returned to India from South Africa in 1915 and took up the demand for self-rule and non-cooperation movement. Sarla Devi, Muthulaxmi Reddy, Susheela Nair, Rajkumari Amrit Kaur, Sucheta Kripalani and Aruna Asaf Ali are some the women who participated in the non-violent movement. Kasturba Gandhi, the wife of Mahatma Gandhi, and the women of the Nehru family, Kamla Nehru, Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit and Swarup Rani, also participated in the National Movement. Lado Rani Zutshi and her daughters Manmohini, Shyama and Janak led the movement in Lahore.

Civil Disobedience the Dandi Salt March (1930)

Gandhiji inaugurated the Civil Disobedience Movement by conducting the historic Dandi Salt March, where he broke the Salt Laws imposed by the British Government. Followed by an entourage of seventy nine ashram inmates, Gandhi embarked on his march from his Sabarmati Ashram on a 200 mile trek to the remote village Dandi that is located on the shores of the Arabian Sea. On 6th April 1930, Gandhi with the accompaniment of seventy nine satyagrahis, violated the Salt Law by picking up a fistful of salt lying on the sea shore. The Civil Disobedience

Movement was an important milestone in the history of Indian Independence. The aim of this movement was a complete disobedience of the orders of the British Government. During this movement it was decided that India would celebrate 26th January as Independence Day all over the country. On 26th January 1930, meetings were held all over the country and the Congress tri- colour flag was hoisted. The British Government tried to repress the movement and resorted to brutal firing, killing hundreds of people. Thousands were arrested along with Gandhiji and Jawaharlal Nehru. But the movement spread to all the four corners of the country.

The Quit India Movement (1942)

In August 1942, the Quit India movement was launched. "I want freedom immediately, this very night before dawn if it can be had. We shall free India or die in the attempt, we shall not live to see the perpetuation of our slavery", declared the Mahatma, as the British resorted to brutal repression against non-violent satyagrahis. The Quit India resolution, taken against British, directly addressed women "as disciplined soldiers of Indian freedom", required to sustain the flame of war.

Usha Mehta, a committed patriot set up a radio transmitter, called The "Voice of Freedom" to disseminate the "mantra" of freedom-war. News of protest and arrests, deeds of young nationalists, and Gandhi's famous "Do or Die" message for the Quit India movement were circulated amongst the masses. Usha Mehta and her brother persisted with their task of broadcasting until their arrest.

These acts proved that the British could maintain the empire only at enormous cost due to wide spread agitation.

Rani Lakshmibai of Jhansi

Rani Lakshmibai of Jhansi was one of the leaders of the First War of Independence and holds her place in history as a fearless warrior and a passionate patriot. After her husband and young son died, she decided to

take up arms to fight a law according to which Jhansi could be annexed into the British Empire. In school we may have only studied the Rani's valour but, in Jaishree Misra's Rani, we get to see her feminine side. This book doesn't only focus on the battles she fought but also her journey as a woman- from the apprehension she felt as a young bride to the horrors she and her fellow Indians were subjected to at the hands of the British.

02

Begum Hazrat Mahal

Muhammadi Khanum was a courtesan by profession and was ultimately sold into the harem of the King of Oudh (present-day Awadh). After the British refused to accept her son, Brijis Qadr, as the ruler of Oudh she styled herself as Begum Hazrat Mahal and began a revolt against the British. She was often called Rani Lakshmibai's counterpart in the First War of Independence. She not only fought for her kingdom but also against the British's destruction of both temples and mosques. In The City Of Gold And Silver, fairly accurately covers her life story but does border on historical fiction as it reads more like an engrossing novel than a history book. The author also takes the liberty of inventing a love story which has no basis in history to make for a more interesting read.

03

Annie Besant

What makes Annie Besant unique is that she was not an Indian but an Englishwoman who fought for home-rule. From a young age, she stood out from other English ladies by advocating for taboo subjects such as birth control. In her autobiography she talks about her move to India, her passion for India becoming a democracy with home-rule, and setting up the Central Hindu College in Varanasi. She co-created the All India Home Rule League, was arrested for it, and upon her release became the President of the Indian National Congress.

04

Kasturba Gandhi

Without Kasturba Gandhi and her steadfast support, M.K. Gandhi would probably never have been able to achieve what he did. Her nationalism and patriotism were evident even when she lived in South Africa by her championing of the Phoenix Settlement and the cause of Indian workers living in the country. Once in India, she walked side-by-side with her husband in his quest for Independence until the police arrested her and placed her in jail. Although a fictionalised retelling, The Secret Diary Of Kasturba not only tells of her valour and why she should be an important figure in a list of female freedom fighters, but also touches upon uncomfortable subjects, such as, the sexual relationship between her and her husband, her ill-treatment at his hands, and the animosity between him and her son.

05

Sarojini Naidu

Sarojini Naidu has been termed 'The Nightingale of India' as it was through her poems that she inspired many an Indian to fight the British and to stand up for their rights. This remarkable Cambridge-educated woman was an ardent follower of Gandhi, actively propagated the non-cooperation movement, became the president of the Indian National Congress and also the Governor of the United Provinces (present-day Uttar Pradesh). To read some of her beautiful poetry, pick up Sarojini Naidu, edited and curated by professor and author Makarand Paranpaje. It is a collection of her best works along with commentary and context on their importance, so you will also get an understanding of how she inspired the masses through her poetry.

06

Kamaladevi Chattopadhyay

Kamladevi Chattopadhyay's name cannot be excluded from a list of famous female freedom fighters. In 1923, upon hearing of Gandhi's non-cooperation movement, she promptly left her cushy life in London and

returned to India to participate. She went on to found the All India Women's Conference, which promoted legislative reforms, and was one of only two women in the lead team of the Salt Satyagraha. While she has written a memoir, A Passionate Life is a more interesting read as it is a collection of essays by her and gives the reader a glimpse into her thoughts on subjects that mattered to her.

07

Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit

While she may not be as famous as her brother, Jawaharlal Nehru, she holds an esteemed place amongst those who fought for India's freedom. During the freedom struggle, she actively took part in politics to try and influence the treatment of Indians and was imprisoned by the Raj on three separate occasions. In her autobiography, The Scope Of Happiness, not only does she recount these stories but she also talks about her relationship with her brother, her views on her niece- the polarising Indira Gandhi- and gives an insight into the life of Mahatma Gandhi. She also shares humorous anecdotes of eminent figures such as Lord Mountbatten and Prince Charles.

08

Aruna Asaf Ali

Arun Asaf Ali's first tryst with the British was when she actively participated in the Salt Satyagraha and was arrested for her involvement. Upon her release, she took it upon herself to lead the Quit India Movement after the English pre-emptively arrested its major leaders. She soon became a face of the movement and the strength of female freedom fighters when she withstood bullets being fired at her while raising the flag of the Indian National Congress at the Gowalia Tank Maidan. Despite having to go underground to evade an arrest warrant, she continued to edit the Congress' monthly magazine Inquilab. You can

read more about her in her biography or read her fiery speeches in the Words of Freedom: Ideas Of A Nation.

09
Lakshmi Sahgal

Lakshmi Sahgal stands out in this list largely due to her belief in using violence if necessary to get India her freedom. It was a meeting with Subhash Chandra Bose in Singapore that inspired her to become an active member of the Indian National Army and form a women's division called the Rani of Jhansi Regiment. From there on, there was no looking back as she fought the British at every opportunity she got. In Burma, she was placed under house arrest for two years, but still passively resisted the British. She wrote an autobiography which details her inspiring life and features some never-seen-before pictures.

7.3 WOMEN'S QUESTION, STRUGGLE: EMANCIPATION IN ASIA

Apart from events and thought currents in Europe which you have read in MWG-001, Block 1, Unit 1 there were major events in Asia's liberation struggles that left an imprint on the Indian women's struggles for equality, liberty and freedom. In semi-colonial and semi-feudal old China, for a long time, women were kept at the bottom of society. At the same time as China launched its struggle for political unity and national integration, a largescale women's emancipation movement was launched, resulting in the historic liberation of Chinese women which won worldwide attention. The impact of several millennia of oppression and devastation imposed by the feudal patriarchal system on Chinese women was exceptionally grave. In political, economic, cultural, social and family life, women were considered inferior to men. This was profoundly manifested in the following ways:

- Possessing no political rights, women were completely excluded from social and political life.

- Economically dependent, women were robbed of property and inheritance rights and possessed no independent source of income.

- Having no social status, women were forced to obey their fathers before marriage, their husbands after marriage and their sons if they became widowed. Women had no personal dignity or independent status, and were deprived of the right to receive an education and take part in social activities.

They enjoyed no freedom in marriage but had to obey the dictates of their parents and heed the words of matchmakers, and were not allowed to remarry if their spouse died. They were subjected to physical and mental torture, being harassed by systems of polygamy and prostitution; an overwhelming majority of them were forced to bind their feet from childhood. For centuries, 'women with bound feet' was a synonym for the female gender in China. The 1911 Revolution kindled a feminist movement which focused on equal rights for men and women and participation by women in political affairs. These movements promoted the awakening of Chinese women. Nevertheless, they all failed to bring about a fundamental change in their miserable plight as victims of oppression and enslavement. After the Chinese revolution, the Chinese Communist Party declared the achievement of female emancipation and equality between men and women one of its goals. Under the leadership of the Party, women were mobilized and organized to form a broad united front with working women in industry and agriculture as the main body. The Marriage Law of the People's Republic of China, promulgated in 1950, was the first statute enacted by New China.

The experience of many other Asian countries mirrored that of China. There were of course important national differences based on differences in national liberation history. Japanese women lived under feudal oppression much like Chinese women until well into the twentieth century. The macho Samurai culture kept elite women firmly locked into domestic spaces, while poor women on farms and fields worked in

conditions of semi bondage. Women's questioning of the samurai culture of war and violence became public after the Second World War, and it is important to recall that Japanese women led the largest broad based anti-Vietnam demonstrations in Tokyo and Osaka during 1970-71.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Discuss about Women and Pre- Independent Movement.
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
2. Discuss Women's Question, Struggle: Emancipation in Asia.
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……
   ……

7.4 MASS MOVEMENTS: WOMEN AS MAJOR ACTORS

The modern Indian women's movement came into its own in the late twentieth century and can be read together with the history of toiling peoples' struggles of the time. The women's groups associated with class based political parties and mass organizations present a somewhat different picture from that presented by the 'autonomous' stream arguing for an undivided women's movement. This has been discussed in detail in another unit. Although the feminist critique of policy in the mass movements may have been more muted than that in the autonomous

stream, there were much larger numbers of women associated with them. By definition, their articulation presents a critique of state policy.

While the National Federation of Indian Women associated with the undivided communist party continued its work, other formations like the All India Democratic Women's Federation (AIDWA) and the Mahila Dakshata Samitibegan serious work among workers and peasants, and highlighted women's issues as well. The decade of 1970-80s was marked by a general disenchantment with the promises of independence among large sections of the people, and the period is noted for the many mass struggles located on independent platforms as well as struggles led by political formations ranging from Sarvodaya Gandhian to the far left. Many of these movements included significant participation of women and addressed their issues conjointly with any other leading issues guiding the movement. We can study some important movements from this period in order to understand the way in which gender issues enmeshed in other issues were treated during this time.

7.4.1 Chipko Movement and other Ecological Struggles

The Chipko movement originated in the Garhwal Himalayas in the decade of the seventies, and had to do with opposition to tree felling contracted to a sports good manufacturer. The women of the hills protested strongly as they were heavily dependent on the existence of the forest cover for fuel, fodder, and water. They used a unique method of hugging the trees as the tree fellers approached with their logging equipment, and this is why the movement derived this particular name. This movement was successful in stopping this particular contract, and was imitated in the Appiko movement in Karnataka in the decade of the eighties. The Chipko movement was an important milestone in the development of Indian ecofeminist discourse, and posited the theory of women's essential nurturing, caring and life saving qualities. The theory—though not the movement—had its detractors who questioned the legitimacy of this binary essentialist assumption. It has to be noted

that the women involved in the Chipko movement were primarily fighting for livelihood, as the trees felled would leave them without any subsistence. Thus, while the Chipko movement did eventually lead to the Indian government desisting from cutting forests, the basis of the Chipko women was to undermine the contract and to ensure that the forest remained so that their own livelihood was not disrupted—these women would themselves cut trees, albeit not on the scale of a professional lumberman or contractor. Further, the women of Reni village were involved because the men had gone to intercede with the forest officials. The convergence of environmental and feminist assertion could also be read as an imposed critique. It also brings in an added complexity of the ecofeminism discourse of the Chipko movement—were these women fighting patriarchal capitalist structures and was the movement in itself environmental considering its basis? All this notwithstanding, there are underlying complexities of the Chipko debate— particularly the problematic question of whether the women would have initiated the movement if their own sustenance was dependent on felling the tress of the forest—which reflect the concerns and anxieties within ecofeminism. The reading of women as nurturing and peaceful is an essentialist argument; women's involvement in communal violence and caste and class hierarchies problematizes this argument. You will read further on the co-option of the tenets of the women's movement into fundamentalist agendas.

7.4.2 Trade Union and Land Struggles, and Displacement

In the decade of the seventies and eighties trade union struggles of beediworkers at Nipani and mineworkers in Chhattisgarh made important contributions to the mobilization of women. These movements are important because they succeeded in weaving in women's issues into the fabric of the trade union struggle at the same time as they took up the so-called personal issues of women through allied forums. In Chhattisgarh the history of mine mechanization and the negative effect it had on women's employment was taken up as an argument to demand manual or

semi-mechanized mining options that would conserve the jobs of unorganized workers.

In Bihar, the Bodh Gaya movement of the mid-seventies under the leadership of the JP Movement led Chhatra Yuva Sangharsh Vahini spearheaded the demand for the redistribution of the huge landholdings of the Mahants of the Bodh Gaya Math to the landless, at the same time as they demanded that land rights be given to women as well as men. This successful struggle went a long way towards changing the concept of equality in coparcenary rights in Indian jurisprudence. The Narmada movement erupted in the decade of the eighties on the issue of displacement of people and villages concerning the area which would be submerged under the construction of three major dams on the Narmada. The movement had a huge following of women and men across the submergence area in three states. It questioned the development strategy that made it necessary for harnessing water resources in this manner, and became an intensely political issue, with strong opinions being expressed on both sides of the debate.

7.4.3 Women in the Peace Movement

The states of the North East of India were not fully integrated into colonial governance, and the post-independence national integration process was opposed by many in these regions on grounds of subnational identity and cultural differences. The emerging Indian nation state reacted strongly, and over a period of two decades, the north east of India erupted into a conflict zone, with many insurgent groups claiming to represent the true aspirations of the people. The conflict came with its baggage of state brutality, militant attacks on life and property, accompanied by the total destruction of human security for the people of Nagaland, Manipur, Mizoram, Tripura and Assam at different times. In this situation, a section of women emerged as the torchbearers of peace and demanded respect for the fundamental rights of the people. These include traditional women's groups like the Meira Peibis of Manipur, who assumed the mantle of a new role as defenders of ordinary people,

and the Naga Mothers' Association which sent out and maintained its strong message for dialogue, reconciliation and the human security of the ordinary people of the area. These movements are not classified as 'Women's movements in the classical sense of the term as they do not only or exclusively raise women's issues. However, they have involved women in far larger numbers than the so-called pure line women's movements and raise important questions about where the centre of the women's movement in India should really be located. Efforts to consolidate these scattered initiatives into a joint platform and to sharpen the collective theoretical understanding on the issue of women's oppression have been made several times.

The Nari Mukti Sangarsh Sammelan at Patna in 1987 was a major effort in this direction and the later series of movement conferences continued the effort to build perspectives on the women's question and women's struggle. An interesting feature of the end century scenario is the large participation of women in the ranks of armed revolutionary movements of the far left—while normally women are perceived as victims of violence in studies of armed conflict; here women seem to have decided that the only way to overthrow a violent and patriarchal state was by force. This phase is marked by major political mobilization of women, advancement in women's overall political consciousness, and by the development of the discourse on feminist critique of development. The latter includes a developmental, an ecofeminist and a class-based analysis of both state policy and women's marginalization. The most important contribution of the women's movement has been its commitment for peace-initiatives in the disturbed areas torn by communal conflicts, ethnic tensions and mob violence. Media publicity on this issue is extremely important so that such work can be replicated in the places where such groups do not exist. During communal riots in 1992 and 2002 in Gujarat, the women's movement played a pivotal role in providing support to the victims of violence and also took up campaign against xenophobia and jingoism.

7.4.4 State and Movement

An important debate in feminist scholarship concerns the relationship of women with the modern state. Is the state an instrument of women's oppression or can it be used to break down patriarchal authority? There are arguments that the state is a 'contested terrain' on which battles both for and against patriarchy are fought. The paradoxical role of state with regard to women and family results from a structural contradiction between the state's interest in production, on the one hand, and reproduction on the other. Feminist theory has been fairly clear that the state is an active agent of patriarchy and has contributed significantly to the historical subordination of women. Law has indeed been a privileged site of struggle and debate in the contemporary women's movement, with a wide range of expectations and demands being placed by the women's movement on the legal system. However, a full-scale engagement with state based legal reform has sometimes led to a turning away of the eye from the essential patriarchal nature of the state.

7.5 NEGOTIATION, CO-OPTATION AND NEW CHALLENGES IN THE TWENTY FIRST CENTURY

One realization during the decade of the nineties and the turn of the century was the ease with which fundamentalist right wing organizations co-opted the language and style sheet of the women's movement and managed to mobilize large numbers of women in its communal, fundamentalist enterprise, often against the vulnerable sections of other communities. Mouthing the rhetoric of women's empowerment, these organizations combined heavy traditional role casting of 'their' women using this in the violent attacks against the 'others'. These tendencies could be seen in their most riots, when rioting mobs included women of the majority community baying for blood. This shattered the myth of the essential non-violent and peace loving nature of women as well as of their essential commitment to sustainability as claimed by some sections of ecofeminists. The other phenomenon of the end century scenario was the massive funding into women's equity and equal opportunity by the

multilateral, bi-lateral and the non-governmental organization sector. A large section of those politically active in the women's movement have been influenced by these happenings and have thought it important to become a part of the 'capacity building' efforts of these organizations. The government has also conceded to many of the demands of the movement and created spaces in formal structures for women's greater participation, for e.g. through the 73rd and 74th amendments to the Constitution, it has sought to ensure greater participation of local self-governance. These developments have led to many questions about the non-governmental organization of the women's movement as well as co-option of its terminology and concepts. At the end of the day however, the success of the women's movement is not to be measured by its stridency, but by its commitment to ensuring a gender just society, and concrete achievements in this direction. In the twenty first century, the women's movement confronts new challenges of a communalized and fractured polity, and rising fundamentalism of community and caste groups. Honour killings by community courts and the regulatory activities of khap panchayats pose new threats to women's wellbeing and freedom of choice. The sharp decline in the child sex ratio in many parts of the country is indicative of the way in which medical technology has been subverted to service gendercide and of the deep roots of patriarchy in Indian society that will not let its baby girls be born. The new generation of women in the movement will have to devise new strategies, and find new intellectual and political resources to combat these threats. Although we have laws in place against female foeticide, the battle will ultimately have to be fought politically, for gender equity is also a strong political issue.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the model answer given at the end of this unit.

1. Explain the role of women in the peace movement.

   ……

   ……

   ……

2. What do you understand through the inter-linkages of State, Ngoziation and movements?

   ……

   ……

   ……

7.6 LET US SUM UP

In this Unit, you have studied the vibrant women's movements. An attempt will be made to understand these linkages of South Asian women's movement and its impact on Indian women's movement. To arrive at an understanding of the present state of the movement through the way in which it has evolved through placing demands on the state as well as maintain a critical distance from the state.

7.7 KEY WORDS

State: The category of state is not the same as government. Changes in government in democratic system do not witness a change in the structure of the political state. The notion of state is pitted against the notion of civil society that signifies institutions and forms of practices such as school, economy, family and church. It structures human life through politics. State refers to power and authority that structures political order. The State constitutes police, army, civil service, parliament and variants of local authority (Robertson, 1993,pp.444-445).

7.8 QUESTIONS FOR REVIEW

1. Explain the role of women in the peace movement.
2. What do you understand through the inter-linkages of State, Ngoziation and movements?
3. Discuss about Women and Pre- Independent Movement.

4. Discuss Women's Question, Struggle: Emancipation in Asia.

7.9 SUGGESTED READINGS AND REFERENCES

- Blackburn, Simon (2004).Oxford Dictionary of Politics, Delhi: Oxford University Press
- Custers, Peter (1986). Women's role in the Tebhaga movement, Economic and Political Weekly, Vol 21:43.
- Geetha, V. (2007)Patriarchy. Stree.
- Kishwar, Madhu (1986). Gandhi and Women. Manushi Prakashan.
- Rege, Sharmila (2006). Writing Caste, writing Gender: Narrating Dalit
- women's Testemonies. Zubaan.
- Robertson, David (1993).The Penguin Dictionary of Politics, London: Penguin Books
- Sen, lina (1995). A Space within the Struggle, Kali for Women 1995.
- Stree Shakthi Sangathana (1989). We were making history: women in the Telengana movement. Kali for Women.
- Tharu, Susie and K Lalitha (1991). Women writing in India Vol 1. (Edt). Feminist Press.
- Stree Shakthi Sangathana (1989). We were making history: women in the Telengana movement. Kali for Women.
- Sen, lina (1995). A Space within the Struggle, Kali for Women 1995.
- Tharu, Susie and K Lalitha (1991). Women writing in India Vol 1.(Edt). Feminist Press.

7.10 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1. See Sub Section 7.4.3

2. See Sub Section 7.4.4

Check Your Progress 2

1. See Section 7.2
2. See Section 7.3