CHAPTER I

CREATION OF GENDER DICHOTOMY : IN THE WEST AND INDIA

Gender relations both in the West and in India have historically taken the form of gender dichotomies. Though in both cases the creation of gender dichotomies has been related to the emergence of the middle-class in the 18th and 19th centuries, the process in India has been a far more complex one due to the colonial experience as well as factors of caste and community. This chapter then is an attempt to deal with the question of both the material basis of these dichotomies and the process of their ideological construction in the context of the 18th, 19th and 20th century Europe and India to see how these have affected women and the resultant feminist discourse in general and feminist literary theory, or women’s writing in particular in the 20th century.

As pointed out by various historians in Europe, this process had essentially started with the rise of capitalism in the 18th century; the creation of the middle-class and the separation in the spheres of the household and work-place, resulting in the sharpening in the sexual division of labour and a corresponding cultural and ideological creation of gender divisions. This chapter mentions briefly how this takes place in a capitalist social
formation in general and how it was helped along by specific ideological and cultural processes in German speaking Europe in particular; religion, education, the German philosophers and conduct books are analysed as examples.

In the Indian context, it was the colonial experience and the nationalists response to it which determined the construction of gender dichotomies and helped create a new identity for women in the late 19th century. Here Orientalists and later Indian reformers had a vital part to play in the shaping of this new role for women by their selective appropriation of Hinduism and the conscious stress they laid on a certain type of education for women which would help them in being good wives and mothers. Clear also, as pointed out by Sangari and Vaid how "lives of women exist at the interface of caste and class inequality, especially since description and management of gender and female sexuality is involved in maintenance and reproduction of social inequality".¹

In both instances, Europe as well as India, what emerges is that "not only are patriarchal systems class differentiated and open to constant and consistent reformulation, but defining gender seems to be crucial to formation of classes and dominant ideologies".²

Before looking at the socio-cultural processes however, which have historically helped to define gender, it would be useful to understand the terms "sex" and "gender"
and the distinction between them, since it is precisely the confusion between these two terms which has been of help to patriarchal ideology in justifying women's oppression and exclusion on the basis of biology.

Whereas the traditional view with its emphasis on sex differences believed that "maleness" and "femaleness" are biologically given properties of individuals with clear implications for social behaviour of one sort or another, studies by Ann Oakley amongst others, show the wide variation that exists in the way different cultures and societies define gender. Thus, "sex" as a term acquires biological connotations and "gender" social or cultural ones with the terms "male" and "female" corresponding to "sex" and "masculine" and "feminine" to "gender". ³

Despite the fact that medical research does "suggest that biological self-differentiation extends beyond gonad and hormone to interior structures of brain and thus to the controlling centers of behaviour", the consensus of opinion on questions of role of biology in determining development of gender identify in normal individuals seems to be that it is a minimal one, since "biological predisposition to male or female gender identity can be decisively and ineradically overridden by cultural learning". ⁴ As reiterated by Ann Oakely it is actually quite clearly the social process of social construction of gender, which starts immediately after birth and carries on
through childhood to adolescence which creates the gender difference. Since "children's gender roles and identities can be so clearly correlated with variations in social stereotypes and parental models, the implication is that they are very largely a product of culture". So Ann Oakely concludes, that evidence of how gender identities are acquired, and facts relating to sex and gender "suggest strongly that gender has no biological origin." So Ann Oakely concludes, that evidence of how gender identities are acquired, and facts relating to sex and gender "suggest strongly that gender has no biological origin."

Michele Barret in "Women's Oppression Today", makes a similar distinction between "sexual difference" and "gender difference" and reiterates that "gender difference is not... based on biology", but it is "sexual difference precisely which is biological difference". According to her, since biologistic accounts of gender division lead to celebration of "natural" differences which are supposed to underlie women's pacificism, nurturance and maternalism, they are inadequate and unsatisfactory and only help reinforce social definitions of biological difference which have developed historically, "to accept that the entire gamut of masculinity and feminity is necessarily grounded in biological difference".

Barrett argues that on the question of sexuality too, biologistic accounts prove to be inadequate since they tend not to distinguish between the various elements of sexuality: gender identity, sexual practice and procreation so that "procreative heterosexuality" is seen as the
"naturally" given basis of all sexual behaviour. It is this appealing to biologistic imperatives, she feels which helps justify not only the inevitability of procreation and its necessary structuring of sexual practice, but also male pleasure and promiscuity. Extending her argument to the question of procreation she stresses on the need to distinguish between women's role in procreation and their supposed responsibility for childcare, since though "there is no biological reason why women particularly or exclusively concerned with child rearing, this logical extension of physiological division of labour takes place in many cultures and periods of history."

Thus she concludes that in capitalist social formation for example the pattern of gender relations is overwhelmingly a social rather than a natural one, but a social construction that caricatures biological difference in a grotesque way, then appeals to this misrepresented natural world for its own justification. It would be therefore necessary to insist the biological difference does not and cannot explain social arrangement of gender.

Looking at the historical development of the family one can clearly ascertain this, the family being the central site of women's oppression within contemporary capitalist societies; the reason being both the material structure of the household which makes women financially dependent on men and in the ideology of the "family" which
confines women to primary concern with domesticity and motherhood. Barrett reiterates how it is precisely by characterising very different family forms as "the family" and conceding the existence of an institution that, in whatever historical context it is found is essentially and naturally there,\textsuperscript{12} that has underwritten much of women's oppression. Studies of various types of societies have also shown clearly that "'the family' does not exist other than as an ideological construct since structure of household, definition and meaning of kinship and the ideology of 'the family' itself have all varied enormously in different types of society."\textsuperscript{13}

A historical study of the various forms shows the many variations, "the present concept of the family being a conflation of two elements which were separate earlier on Kinship and coresidence\textsuperscript{14} with the household based on ties of kinship being a recent phenomenon. Barrett draws attention to differences between household structures of different social classes ad well, as per the four models suggested by Mark Poster: peasant or aristocratic forms, working class family of early industrial revolution and the bourgeois family of the mid-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{15}

The interrelatedness of class and gender is thus clearly evident in the context of Europe where it was the "developing bourgeoisie, which clearly affected the ideological construction of the meaning of significance of
household arrangements for the notion of the family", securing at "the ideological level" the "hegemonic definition of family life" as naturally based on close kinship as properly organised though a male breadwinner with financially dependent wife and children and as haven of privacy beyond public realm of commerce and industry. It is within this ideology of family that the construction of gender identity and definition of masculinity and femininity pre-eminently takes place, "an ideological process by which supposedly 'natural' relations between parents and children, men and women, are struggled for, the 'family' providing nexus for various themes: romantic love, feminine nurturance, maternalism, self sacrifice, masculine protection and financial support" which characterize conceptions of gender and sexuality.

Families are thus interlinked to and respond to ideology of "the family", besides being busy in reproducing it although gender identity is not exclusively constructed within the family, this being a process which takes place continually through child's life and is recreated or even changes considerably through the process of ideological representation. Barrett thus points out the two processes simultaneously involved in the construction of gender: firstly, within families and secondly, the social construction of gender within an ideology of familialism, gender identity and its meaning being reproduced.
pervasively in processes of gender socialization that takes place in families themselves. Thus the crucial role of families in constructing masculinity and feminity and providing pressures which encourage a disposition towards heterosexual conformity becomes quite clear, the family household constituting "both the ideological ground on which gender difference and women's oppression are constructed, and the material relations in which men and women are differentially engaged in wage-labour and class structure", dependence on men being reproduced ideologically and also in material relations, with mutually strengthening relations between them.

The theoretical and historical analysis of the question of "family" leads one to conclude with Barrett, that though "common household production", which was "slowly eradicated in the long and uneven development of capitalism" could have been more egalitarian between men and women than in the capitalist social formation, there was division based on gender, those social divisions based on biological differences proceeded capitalism, "providing men with specific advantages on which to build". Even though technological developments like contraception have made "biological differentiation a much less plausible basis" for overwhelming social gender division, historically the "developments during the transition to capitalism saw an increase and entrenchment of divisions which earlier were less deeply integrated into relations of production, thus
making it clear that "social construction of gender division massively outweighs any basis in biological differences". 20

The close connection between class and gender becomes even more evident when one makes a more detailed study of the material and ideological structures which have influenced the development of the family in the long process of capitalist development and the contradictory effects of this process on women. Thus Dorothy Smith in "Women, Class and Family" shows how "the family or forms of family work and living, are integral to the active process of constructing and reconstructing class relations, particularly as the dominant class responds to changes in the forms of property relations and changes in the organisation of the capitalist enterprise and capitalist social relations". 21 She shows how family relations and gender roles have affected and been affected through the various stages of capitalism.

In the earlier stages for example, in the absence of specialised capital holding institutions, trusts etc. continuities of property and consolidation of "capital transgenerationally depended upon an organisation of family relations which subsuned wife as civil person under person of her husband and gave father significant control over relation formed in marriage by his sons and daughters. Marriages among the bourgeoisic brought into being relations among properties appropriated by individuals." 22 The civil
person was the man who had the right to appropriate his wife's property, earnings and labour as well as of his own minor children in interests of capitalist enterprise on which the family depended, family becoming corporate economic unit identified with an individual man.

In the later stages however, with the change in economic institutions, property relations determining form of bourgeois and middle-class family, internal structure of appropriation and relation of domestic labour to these have also been modified, especially with property shifting to corporate form of ownership and the chief person economically is no longer individual person but corporate person, so that "a radical separation between the company or corporation and bourgeois or middle class emerges" bringing about major changes "in roles and activities of women, and the contexts in which women's domestic labour in the home is done". Smith points out how this change from the earlier forms of externalised economic relations, which depended upon "networks of kinsfolk in varying degrees, and where separation of family and business was blurred" so that "the domestic work of women was not isolated form relational politics of business" to the corporate form which "completes separation of family and household from economy and where economic relations become increasingly differentiated and specialised at an extra-local, national or international level," has contributed towards isolating women in
households as the economic process was sealed off with specific competences and qualification becoming more important than family ties which resulted in the absolute privatisation of the middle class domestic world.

With family connections no longer remaining important for the individuals advancement in the corporation and the domestic labour of the middle class household becoming increasingly organised as personal service to the individual man, the relation through which men appropriated women's labour changes, so that it becomes highly personalised with the individual man appropriating as his the work done by his wife or other women of his family.

With the development of the nuclear family, the interests of the wife are supposed to be closely connected with husband's career and her role becomes that of supporting him morally and socially as well as by her domestic labour, ensuring his physical well being.

Like Barrett, Smith also reiterates that though taken to be typical, this family organisation is merely a distinct historical and cultural form.

Elaborating however on the contradictory effects these stages in capitalist development have on women, Smith ascertains how they helped remove material barriers only to construct ideological ones, especially through education.

Thus, whereas the earlier form of economic agency
had constituted the biological difference of sex as a component of individual private property, for the bourgeoisie, as property functions get transferred to corporation and as skills acquired though education become increasingly important, the general ability to participate in a more complex world of literate action becomes important.

These developments then, remove the original basis of married women’s exclusion as a component of property relations. Whereas the natural basis of differentiation between the sexes had been fundamental to the economic and political organisation of pre-capitalist social formations, with the rise of capitalism, the basis of differential power and participation in civil society begins to dissipate and barriers become weaker.26

Thus capitalist development, according to her, "rather than instantly precipitating women into the private sphere seems rather to initiate a struggle on one side to reinforce and reorganize the barriers to women’s participation, and on the other to break through barriers already weakened by the advance of capitalism, with women’s education being the site on which this struggle found particular focus - Smith shows how the conception of a specialised education for women preparing them for domesticity points to the new need to plan and organise women’s relation to homes so that "those very ideological
channels through which women's potential access to a wider arena opens, should be those through which they would learn practice of their confinement," ideological organisation being central in organising role and social relations of bourgeois and middle class women.\textsuperscript{28} This involved a process wherein "ideological forms began to shift basis of culture from inherited forms of previous generations, passed from mother to daughters, to an orientation towards the authority of print and hence of ideology generated within ruling apparatus itself by specialists of various types".\textsuperscript{29}

Quite clearly, "over shifting requirements of changing social relations of capitalism, ideologies continue to design and redesign the modes of women's subordination and service to ruling class apparatus, importance of domestic labour of dominant class women and of their subordination to economic and political roles played by men and to work of organising inter class relations, being secured, for example, using ideological as well as other means of class control".

Since it was education which provided access to economic activity one had to "regulate" women's access to education, so that women could be excluded from professional, bureaucratic and political positions, as they would prove problematic. To this effect, "active forms of ideological and state repression responding to incursions by middle class women were developed," the educational system
systematically differentiating boys from girls, girls getting into programmes ensuring their disqualification from kinds of advanced training giving access to the professions, women's post-secondary training focusing largely within Arts and Social Sciences or in subordinate forms of professional training such as nursing, pharmacy etc.\(^{30}\) (2).

This type of education, thus, secured the double function of denying entry to women as "active participants to ruling apparatus" as well as laying down "specific ideological controls thorough which changing relations of rapidly shifting capitalist development could be reformulated and reorganised as they were fed through to family and to women's work in the family".\(^{31}\)

Within the working class too, Smith maintains, patterns of family organisation have increasingly become similar to middle class with respect to wife's dependence on her husband's wage, though history of that relation has been very different. Whereas in the middle class, in the earlier stages, the civil status of wife had been obliterated as she was subsumed in family economic unit identified with him, and later her domestic labour becomes subordinated to his career and employment outside is organised to ensure jurisdiction of male authority and appropriation of women's labour, so that dependency become part of perpetuated pattern of excluding women and married women in particular from functioning as independent economic agents, in the
working class, the history of family form does not start with women’s exclusion from economic activity and "does not involve formation of property holding unit identified with man", women’s exclusive dependency on men’s wages was only gradually established and was "differently structured". For working class women "dependency is directly on man’s wage earning capacity and role and a man’s status and authority in the family is directly linked to his capacity to earn".

And how the family as a form has changed historically from the 18th century onwards in the German speaking world in particular and how these changes were interlinked with the process of the bourgeoisie defining itself as a class, is brought out clearly by Ute Frevert’s study, which shows how even as late as the first half of the 18th century the world "Family" was unknown. Instead there was the "Haus" run by the "Hausvater" and the "Hausmutter" each with its areas of authority. Besides, the children and other relatives, others outside the family also lived with "Hausvater" and "Hausmutter", for example: the farmhands, apprentices, journeymen and clerks. They all lived and worked together, but in a strict hierarchical order, with the "Hausvater" at the top and the "Hausmutter" however having control of the internal economy of the household, with each member having a different job to do for the common good.
It was with the rise of capitalism and the bourgeoisie towards the end of the 18th century, that the term "Familie", referring exclusively to "married couples and their children" come into usage and it excluded the farmhands and domestics. The emphasis was no longer on the economic and productive function of the family. Frevert points out how in the bourgeois literature of the Age of Enlightenment "the family" is clearly specified as a sphere of social interaction and reproduction outside work and is reserved exclusively for marriage partners and their children, from which servants were excluded as they "infect" the children with vices and diseases of the lower classes. The home became a "domestic domain" with the role of the wife redefined to exclude productive work; instead she had to regulate child rearing and create "a refuge of private and intimate life, which would complement the outside world of work, of competition for power and money." This process being aided by various types of literature "in the form of newspapers, novels, pamphlets and periodicals proclaiming the principles of enlightened bourgeois morality, education and upbringing and providing the basis for a detailed rule book of male and female duties and responsibilities". A detailed analysis of how conducts books and the literature of conduct extending from the middle ages to the present played an important role in the transformation of gender is to be found in Nancy Acmstrong's study "The Rise of the Domestic Woman". According to her,
these conduct books show how, beginning from the "devotional manuals for wives and daughters of the aristocracy" and the "courtesy books for would be court ladies" to the later domestic economies for women who maintained their household through their own labour as well as pamphlets on marriage and domestic life, finally later to books which took up "manners and morals of women who ensured the husband an orderly home and an emotionally gratifying family life", these instruction books were "used primarily to essentialise women, to fix their natures" and thus "to remove them from theater of political events that nature had apparently designated for men".37

Stressing the role of conduct books, other literature and novels as well in the process of formation of the bourgeoisie, Nanacy Armstrong says: they "helped to redefine what men were supposed to desire in women and what women in turn were supposed to desire to be". Most 18th century novels "took part in this ideological struggle which in less than a century allowed an emergent social group to seize hold of language of courtship and kinship and to make it articulate an alternative form of power. The new domestic ideal provided not only basis on which numerous competing social groups could each identify their interests but also provided a form of power exercised through constant supervision and regulation of desires, thus preparing the cultural ground in which capitalism could rapidly
Armstrong also draws attention to the fact that though conduct books were written by people of differing regions, sects etc., they all clearly represented the social world as one divided into public and private, economic and domestic, labour and leisure according to a principle of gender that placed household and gender relations under female authority."

And even after the "entrenchment of new middle-classes, representation of gender and regulation of desire continued since this became most effective form of social control." She concludes: "by the 19th century the bourgeois model of family and its gender roles began to be regarded as normal, natural and good."

Ute Frevert makes similar assertions and elaborates on other functions which this model of family served: the separation of occupation and family needed a redefinition of sexual division of labour with no longer "a close cooperation" of housemother and housefather in running "economy" of whole household, with the family dependent on the salary of the husband.40.

The new models of behaviour needed by this social section to "reinterpret and transform the structure and foundations of the male-female relations" existing in traditional society helped differentiate itself from other
classes and were especially important to the political and social consciousness of the bourgeoisie.41

This served other functions as well since right education of children in the social structure was a condition for achievement and this was dependent on childhood socialization within the family, with the differentiation in mother-role and child-role with its "loving and protracted contact between mother and child".42

Frevert points out, that it was this emphasis on the emotional support that women as wives and mothers were expected to give their husbands and children which was new in the bourgeois family, since actually the traditional sexual division of labour still continued. Even her economic talents were subordinated to this caring role, with even education, i.e. basic knowledge of history, literature, languages and bibliography, helping women to be understanding wives and intelligent mothers.43 Education otherwise had to be avoided, since it would make her neglect her female duties and develop needs which could not be satisfied in everyday life and as already ascertained by Barrett and Armstrong, Frevert also reiterates that the justification for this new sexual division of labour in the bourgeois family, which "assigned neatly divided spheres of influence" to men and women and allowed neither to step outside the prescribed limits", was no longer based on social or religious grounds but on "principles which ascribed the difference between the sexes to intrinsic, innate, natural
and therefore, universal characteristics. By nature, women were inclined to be passive and emotional, man active and rational. Sexual characteristics predestined women to work with people, as within the family, and men to engage in suitable productive activities in the realm of economy, politics, culture and science".  

Thus, the new image of women, constructed and legitimised through "eternal laws of nature", included both the "traditional role of old "Hausmutter", but without the historical and social context and the modern one of primarily wife and mother", the new type of feminity venerated for this role, which was "linked to revaluation of the family as a place of purely human values," being "in direct contrast to public, competition oriented sphere". This new image was then developed and popularized by educationalists, philosophers, doctors, layers and men of letters etc.

Pervert points out that though theoretically this concept of polarised gender characteristics did not in the beginning define positions of authority since the roles were supposed to complement each other, in practice it was quite clear that the model fitted in with claims of the male sex to authority, claims which historically could find their basis in religious ideology as well as German philosophy.

Eva Figes in her book, "Patriarchal Attitudes" for
example traces out the important role which Christianity played in the control of female sexuality, the form of this control changing over time from direct physical means to ideological ones, "this gradual shift from direct physical control to a system of complex and sexual taboos, being clear also "between Old Jewish and later Christian morality the Old Testament and the New". She argues that whereas in the middle ages, beating of a wife or daughter was still acceptable, by the 19th century an effective network of moral taboos for control of wives and daughters of upper and middle class had been set up, a lessening of physical controls such as harems, purdah, chastity belts seeing an increase in the the form of taboos.

Though Christianity ascribes procreation as the only function of women, here too, to reduce her importance the responsibility of the "Fall" is hers. Eve is thus held responsible for man’s morality and fall from Grace, this interpretation helping both in asserting his domination by punishing her for what she was supposed to have done and externalising all flaws and weaknesses in himself by making the women the embodiment of them, thus leaving himself the "morally superior". Since sexuality is always the problem in this way it is women’s sexuality which is most hated and feared giving rise to the image of women as "source of danger, externalised evil, as witch, demoness, scarlet woman", Schamer etc. Thus contact with woman weakens and enasculates a man and should be regulated to avoid excess.
Whereas male strength and power including sexuality were regarded as fixed and easily exhaustible woman is considered to be all appetite, sexually insatiable. Thus female modesty had to act as kind of control for the protection of man.48

Figes draws attention as well as to the fact of religion being a male cult, designing its rites and rituals specifically to exclude women and thus give men a compensatory activity for the female one of child bearing, both Herbraic and Christian religious rites being performed exclusively by men, women being only passive participants to be preached at.49

Making a distinction between Judaism, which did not try to diminish the importance of sexual love and early Christianity which advocated total celibacy as ideal, Figes reiterates that it was this basic disapproval of sexuality which diminished the standing of women and led to the total separation of spiritual and physical love, renunciation of sexuality being almost homosexual in its sentimental evocation of pure mother figure and its emphasis on the union and companionship of the 12 Apostles, - the writings of Christian saints being full of struggle of overthrow the torments of the flesh"50 - This then led to the common belief that man is reason, woman unreason, man being more spiritual whether in intellect or moral goodness than woman who is more physical, animal or sensual man having to
control woman so that he can control the "animal" side of this own nature. \textsuperscript{51}

Similar distinctions and evaluative split between mind and physical matter, with mind as male and body as female, had been made by the German philosophers of the 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Figes shows how this process found its culmination in Otto Weiniger's "Geschlecht and Character" at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, wherein he expresses the total division of man as mind and woman as matter, the process starting however, with the Idealists. Hegel for example, in this Philosophy of Right," though he does not deny her spiritual aspect, "Will" for him in an idealist sense is a masculine affair man active, woman passive. "Civilisation, the outward manifestation of the "Will" is also masculine." Though women can be educated, "but their minds are not adapted to the higher sciences, philosophy or certain of the arts, these demand a universal faculty. Women may have happy inspirations taste, elegance, but they have not the ideal.... If women were to control the boot, the state would be in danger, for they do not act according to the dictates of universality but are influenced by accidental inclinations and opinions.\textsuperscript{52} Immanuel Kant, however, goes even further to make a distinction, not only between male "reason" and female "reason", but also masculine and feminine "virtue". In the third section "Von dem Unterschiede des erhabenen und Schöner in dem Gegenwarts
verhältnis beider Geschlechter” of his essay Über das Gefühl des schönen and Erhabenen”.

Though he concedes that "das schöne Geschlecht hat ebensowohl Verstand als das männliche", he distinguishes it thus: "nur ist es ein schöner Verstand, der unserige soll ein tiefer Verstand sein, welches ein Ausdruck ist, der einerlei mit dem Erhabenen bedeutet".53

Explaining what he means by "schöner Verstand," he says.

"Der schöne Verstand wählt zu seinen Gegenständen alles, was mit dem feineren Gefühl nahe verwandt ist, und überläßt abstrakte Spekulationen oder Kenntnisse, die nützlich aber trocken sind, dem ensigen, gründlichen und tiefer Verstände. Das Frauenzimmer wird demnach keine Geometric lernen; es wird vom Satze des zureichenden Grundes, oder den Monaden nur soviel wissen, als da nötig ist, um un das Salz, in denen Spottgedichten zu vernehmen, welche die seichte Grübler unserer Geschlechts durchgezogen haben".54

A similar distinction must be made between the 'virtue' which men and women aspire to: "Die Tugend des Frauenzimmers ist eine schöne Tugend. Die des männlicheh Geschlechts soll eine edle Tugend sein. Sie werden das Böse vermeiden nicht weil es unrecht sondern weil es häßlich
ist, tugendhafte Handlungen bedeuten bei ihnen solche, die sittlich schön sein".55

Equating the female with beauty (das Schöne) and the male with the sublime (das Erhabene) he reiterates, nothing can be worse for the "Schöne als" "der Ekel" sowie nichts tiefer unter das Erhabene sinkt als das Lächerliche. Daher kann einem Manne kein Schimpf empfindlicher sein, als daß er ein Narr, und einem Frauenzimmer, daß sie ekelhaft genannt werde."56

Elaborating on the relationship between the sexes and the mutual influence they should have and justifying it through "nature" he writes:

Das Frauenzimmer hat ein vorzügliches Gefühl vor das Schöne, so ferne es ihnen selbst zukommt, aber vor das Edle, in soweit es am männlichen Geschlecht angetroffen wird. Der Mann dagegen hat ein entscheidenes Gefühl voor das Edle, was zu seinen Eigenschaften gehört, vor das Schöne aber, in so ferne es an dem Frauenzimmer anzutreffen ist. Daraus muß folgen, daß die Zwecke der Nature, darauf gehen den Mann durch die Geschlechterneigung noch mehr zu veredlen und das Frauenzimmer durch eben dieselbe noch mehr zu verschönen.

Ein Frauenzimmer ist darüber wenig verlegen daß sie gewisse hohe Einsichten nicht besitzt, daß fruchtsam und zu wichtigen Geschäften nicht
auferlegt ist etc. etc. Sie ist schön und nimmt ein und das ist genug. Degegen fordert sie alle dize Eigenschaften am Manne und die Erhabenheit ihrer Seele zeigt sich nur darin, daß sie diese edle Eigenschaften zu schätzen weiß, so ferne sie bei ihm anzutreffen sein ..... Dagegen ist der Mann viel delikater in Ansehung der schönen Reize des Frauenzimmers. Er ist durch die feine Gestalt desselben die muntere Naivität und die reizende Freundlichkeit genugsam schadlos gehalten, wegen des Mangels von Büchergelehrsamkeit and wegen anderen Mängel, die er durch seine eigene Talente ersetzen muß.57

Thus, in a marriage he feels they should complement each other though it must be governed by the "Reason" of the man and the "taste" of the woman. "In dem ehelichen Leben soll das vereinigte Paar gleichsam eine einzige moralische Person ausmachen welche durch den Verstand des Mannes und den Geschmach der Frauen belebt und regiert wird."58

Figes in "Patriarchal Attitudes" points out similar "prescriptions" by other philosophers for women and gender roles. Thus, Fichte though as a philosopher he glorifies the subjective ego as the only reality, argues also for woman's total submission to man, since partial submission would be humiliating. In an uncorrupted woman
the sexual impulse does not manifest itself at all, but only love; and this love is the natural impulse of a woman to satisfy a man. Her role as object of male sexual gratification demands a total abandonment, not only of all civil rights, but of her own personality. Condemning ambition in a woman since it is inimical to the "self sacrificing love for her husband," he asks her to will not to have any will. "The state, by recognizing marriage...... abandons all claims to consider woman as a legal person. The husband supplies her place, her marriage utterly annuls her, so far as the state is concerned, by virtue of her own necessary will which the state has guaranteed."

Nietzsche on the other hand though he hates asceticism, separates sexuality from emotion. For him woman is a "dangerous plaything". Man should be trained for war and woman for the recreation of the warrior; all else is folly - In his role of superman he despises and therefore fears not only woman but all aspects of humanity which he associates with woman. gentleness, love sympathy, suffering.

But it in Weiniger's "Character and Sex" that characterisation of women and gender dichotomies reaches its fullest extent by idealist thinkers. For him the distinction between maleness and femaleness is the ground work of his main thesis: Woman is matter, man is mind. Woman is a bundle of animal lusts merely in the world for
the purpose of procreation whilst the life of man is something more, for man aspires to that pinnacle of idealist aspiration, Genius. The female for him cannot possess genius, is little more than an animal: the life of the male is a more highly conscious life than that of the female and there is not a single woman in the history of thought, not even the most manlike who can be truthfully compared with men of fifth or sixth rate genius.  

Thus genius is a masculine "innate imperative" whereas pure woman equals pure carnality, and for the absolute woman sexuality is the be all and end all of existence. Of course, "she is also cunning, incapable of telling the truth, devoid of all notions of morality, beauty or even true mother love and is totally "under the sway of the phallus."  

Having asserted that "As the absolute female has no trace of individuality and will, no sense of worth or of love, she can have no part in the higher, transcendental life. The intelligible, hyper - empirical existence of the male transcends matter, space and time. He is certainly mortal,, but he is immortal as well, he finally concludes; "Women have no existence and no essence; they are not, they are nothing. Mankind occurs as male or female as something or nothing. The meaning of woman is to be meaningless. She represents negation, the opposite pole from the Godhead, the other possibility of humanity." Weiniger essentialised
Jews similarly since they were also womanish, devoid of a soul and equally incapable of Genius. 65

Though Nietzsche's is a very extreme characterization, by the end of the 18th century, the model of the modern bourgeois family based on a new form of sexual division of labour had been established, "which assigned to men and women neatly divided spheres of influence and allowed neither to step outside the prescribed limits." Legitimacy for such a division was no longer sought on social or religious grounds but through principles which ascribed the difference between the sexes to intrinsic, innate, natural and therefore universal characteristics. By nature, women were inclined to be a passive and emotional, men active and rational. 66

Frevert argues that "though on the theoretical level this concept of polarised gender characteristics" did not yet represent "social value and authority. man and woman, with their respective qualities together formed a harmonious whole", in practical terms it was clear that the model fitted in with the claims of the male sex to authority. 67

Educationists, philosophers, writers of the Enlightenment were also quite clear that it was the "combined will of nature and human society that man should be woman's protector and leader, and woman by contrast his true, grateful and obedient companion and helper, clinging
to him, turning to him and leaning on him. Thus, Frevert concludes that "by resorting to the eternal laws of nature and the universal history of mankind an image of woman was constructed which possessed traditional and modern traits in equal proportions." 68

On the one hand there was the desire to retain the model of the old European "Hausmutter" but, this was detached from its historic and social context, leaving only torso of perpetually occurring housewife, busily providing for husband and children. On the other hand, the needs of the new age had to be taken into account: The woman, moving increasingly to the fringes of economic and political activity was defined primarily as wife and mother, whose work within family would make possible and safeguard her husband's success outside the home. 69

Frevert reiterates that linked to the reevaluation of the family as place of purely human values, in direct contrast to public, competition oriented sphere "was the veneration of a new type of feminity which had nothing in common either with nobility's ideals of courtly culture" or with farmer's and craftman's household leitmotif of the "Haus mutter" working nonstop on the farm.

The reason for this partly modern, partly historical model in the 18th century remaining unaffected by the concepts of equality proposed by the Enlightenment,
Frevert argues, was that the rapid change in economic structure, the cultural and intellectual revolution and the political upheaval could only be shaped and integrated by the middle classes if the emotional side of family life was left intact. 70

Frevert reiterates that though this new 'restive' bourgeoisie represented less than 10% per cent of the total population it fostered innovative forces and developed new social forms which were gradually emulated by other classes and strata. In the 19th century "bourgeois" family structures and gender roles were to be found not only among academics, civil servants and industrialists, they gradually appealed to clerks and manuals workers and later even peasant communities, this "bourgeois model of the family providing guiding principles for women's actions and a measure of their worth well into the 20th century". 71

Whereas the men of this new bourgeoisie, the lawyers, doctors, priests, judges, professors etc. met in the institutions, associations and organizations of the bourgeois public which helped to create fora for discovery of its own social, cultural and political identity, women were excluded from these as well as social and educational associations - Thus, though bourgeois men were increasingly oriented towards world outside home both in their professional capacities and in their leisure time, they insisted that it was not fitting for women to appear alone in public. 72
Thus, within these structures, middle class women were "deprived of successful professional careers, monetary independence, had no say in the disposal of their properties", besides which motherhood kept them within the four walls of the home, especially, as it was turned into a profession by the bourgeois family and sexual ideology of the late 18th century.  

For the bourgeoisie, chastity of daughters also assumed importance so that the virginity of the bride had to be guarded as opposed to farming or rural communities where premarital sex was not taboo.

Frevert argues that this basic bourgeois model of the family and its corresponding gender dischotomisation remained intact with some variations which however, intensified these structures throughout the various historical and socio-cultural phases beginning with the Romantics at the end of the 18th century, through the Restoration, Biedermeier to the end of the 19th century.

Thus though the Romantic writers propagated a love which was a merging of 'friendship, sensuousness, passion and harmony', and marriage based on this love, which was a union of independent individual people responsible for themselves, the romantic concept, Frevert argues, gained little popularity and its impact was minimal. She reiterates that contemporary debate did not take up the
romantic idea of "feminity, which sought to moderate, if not completely neutralise, polarity of sexual characteristics and press for the perfection of masculinity and feminity into humanity as a whole". (Schlegal), with the experiment of "gentle masculinity" and "independent feminity" being short lived even in the early Romantic circles of the literacy and scientific intelligensia. 75

Frevert argues that by the 19th century this enthusiasm for innovation in male-female relations had totally waned with the search for national identity becoming more important after Napoleon's occupation. "Divisions between male and female preserves became more and more sharply drawn, with catalogue of womanly duties regulated down to finest detail." 76

Thus model of family and marriage that emerged fitted neatly into the new political climate of Restoration and drew on the strict gender specific differentiation of roles and characters of the pre Romantic age, without however incorporating products of Enlightenment and doctrine of natural laws. For the ideology of Restoration, Frevert argues, family was first, and a moral organic natural unit into which individuals were woven, that is mainly women. With rapid and radical changes in the external world in this period, (revolutionary innovation of railway, progress in industry and technology) and with an increase in men's professional and public activities disparities between
family life of women and vocational orientation of men became more distinct. 77

Men of the Biedermeier too occupied themselves with their business and after that in organizations with varied aims: cultural, religious, scientific, military, athletic, professional and economic - Biedermeier women however were almost exclusively immersed in the household creating the image of Biedermeier domesticity and idyllic family life.

With rapid expansion of the industrial economy since the 1850s, the socio-economic division of society into classes became more pronounced, with industrialists and entrepreneurs for example owning luxurious villas whereas their workers had to exist in badly lit, tenement blocks. It fell on the family of the entrepreneur and of the middle class public servants "to demonstrate and embody his wealth - marriage was used to write off debts, create business relationships etc., with wives being highly personal proof of prosperity and stability of her husband's business." 78

Frevert concludes that though a combination of social conditions had changed in the second half of the century: women waiting longer before marrying, structure of bourgeois family life changing, basic needs being commercialised and therefore no need of productive energies of daughters, unmarried sisters, cousins etc., there was still a bitter struggle for women's education, over grammar
schools for girls and university courses for women. The demand to allow women to study medicine and to enroll generally at University, not just for selected courses, raised opposition in the 1870s, on physiological, social, moral and economic grounds. Thus, once again it was women’s nature as well as women’s natural role, also a consequence of her physical attributes, which were considered reason enough. 79

Thus as discussed by Smith in a capitalist social formation in general and Frevert in German society in particular, by the twentieth century the industrial Revolution and the development of capitalism had brought about major socio-economic and cultural changes which however had contradictory effects on women.

In twentieth century Europe, the two World Wars also played a major role in further exacerbating these contradictions leading to certain gains such as economic and sexual independence, but simultaneously creating tensions between work and family, besides strengthening sexual stereotypes in the work place. Renate Bridenthal while analysing these changes and the contradictory effects they had on women argues that suffrage in many countries and World War I brought women into new fields of work, some of which remained accessible to them after the war. However, legislation and political events had less influence than slow moving but powerful economic and social forces, which
were not always beneficial to women.80

In the field of work she indicates how profit maximization led to merger and new technology in agriculture and industry displacing the smaller enterprises in which women could play a leading role. Rethionalization and mechanization created new unskilled jobs and mushrooming bureaucracies while commercial distribution created low level office or sales jobs all of which recruited women for their acceptance of low wages and docility.81 She points out the fact, however, of this new labour force being younger than before and more stereotypical feminine, since appearance and pleasing behaviour were important attributes in these jobs.

During the war however, women did gain though they shelved the woman suffrage issue since middle class women were taking up white collar jobs as well, working class women moved into better paid industrial jobs, farm girls into factories etc., with post war attempts to halt this trend not succeeding. After the war, in other ways too, winning the vote for example in Germany, Sweden, Russia and the Austro-Hungarian empire etc., as well as attaining sexual liberty, created the impression of equality, which was in actuality a complex situation, revealing some of the growing contradictions of modern capitalist Europe. For women it involved a shift from a mutually reinforcing into a conflictual relationship between work and family.
activities. While business and government took over the family's historical functions of production and socialization it became "a unit of consumption and an emotional fortress". Bridenthal argues that though this meant shrinking of this traditional domain, women recaptured that domain partly "by becoming wage-earners in those very institutions that eroded family functions". 82

Socio-economic factors such as decrease in infant mortality and hope of upward mobility brought about changes in the form of the family too, with smaller families in middle class and working class becoming the norm, since rise to a higher socio-economic level needed prolonged training for skill or a profession. Besides, urbanisation meant that fewer children were needed in cities that for farm work. Understanding about functions of the family had also changed in the post war period and with the decline of its other functions, focus sharpened on inter familial relations and personality development, with family sociology moving in the direction of Talcott Parson, who after World War II categorised men's role in family as 'instrumental' (manipulating the environment for the benefit of the family) and wife's as 'expressive' (facilitating emotional interactions within the family). 83

Bridenthal points out the role played by educators, psychiatrists, sociologists and social workers in studying failure of family with a view to saving it,
advising women for example not to deny their purported biological and psychological make up by slighting their families. Duty thus underscored nature. In the process, with women unable to cope with 'sophisticated motherhood' and socialising agents, these functions were institutionalised with middle class women finding jobs in childcare and teaching so that a layer of male directed institutionalisation now existed between women and their children.84

Thus, Bridenthal concludes that though women's work outside home had helped egalitarian companionate marriage replace patriarchy, this area itself had become smaller. "The family had been reduced in many of its historical functions: as a unit of production, as transmitter of economically significant property such as land or small artisan or trade establishments, and as the main socializing agent, production, socialization and many supportive services being carried on by big business and government, the family providing little other than companionship and mutual self help when larger social institutions failed, even this having begun to decrease as early as interwar period and before".85 Similar contradictions affected other aspects of the lives of women in the first half of the 20th century. Though they had greater economic independence it depended on age and behaviour; new sexual attitudes allowed them greater
freedom but also commercially exploited sexuality in the media; and though birth control spared them from a constant cycle of child bearing, their energies were redirected by more professional notions of parenting.

In the decades after the second world war, i.e. after 1945, up to the early seventies, similar contradictions were experienced in Austria with a strengthening of stereotypical gender roles on the basis of biology on the one hand, and a questioning of the justification and moral legitimacy of the sexual division of labour and traditional gender roles by women themselves on the other, since in an in between the two world wars they had effectively performed in jobs undertaken by men. Karin Marie Schmidlchnner in "Frauen in Österreich seit 1945" elaborates on these contradictions: "Während sie die familiären Aufgaben teilweise auch nach der Rückkehr der Männer beibehielten, wurden sie aus den beruflichen Positionen zum größten Teil wieder entfernt, teilweise unter Zuhilfenahme jener biologischen Rollen stereotype, die eine Frau primär als Hausfrau und Mutter definieren. Nicht verhindert hatte aber werden können daß sehr viele Frauen aus ihren Leistungen als alleinstehende Familienhalterinnen während und nach der Kriegszeit Selbstbewuβtsein und Selbstbestätigung erfahren hatten und sich danach nicht mehr kritiklos mit dem herkömmlichen Rollenstatus zufriedengaben."
Other reasons responsible for this contradictory situation, according to her are: the advancing consolidation of political and economic situation in Europe and America after the war which had helped sensitivise towards the problems of individual groups: "Fragenkomplexe, wie die der Schwachen in unserer Gesellschaft und die, bei denen es um die Frauen geht, werden Gegenstand kollektiver Überlegung und ein greignetes Thema für die Massenmedien. Die wohlstandgesellschaft erlaubt sich, ihre Kultur in Frage zu stellen und bringt ein kollektives Schuldbewuβtsein hervor\textsuperscript{87} the scientific, medicinal and technical advances which played a major role in the change in situation of women since they reduced to a considerable degree the difference in the living situation of men and women traceable to biological facts: the various anti-pregnancy measures for example such as the Anti-Baby pill which made the exact planning of a baby possible, besides the development of ready made Baby food which absolved mothers from the responsibility of feeding the babies etc. Other factors include the increase in the life span of women, which influenced the course of their lives and gender roles, and with developments in technology and industry the total change in the meaning of housework - which lessened in economic worth so that it became more economically viable to be employed and to buy the necessary products and services rather than to produce them at home. Culturally and ideologically however no changes took place in the gender,
roles, with women now being loaded with the double burden of jobs as well as housework and motherhood - Schmidlechner points out that it was however precisely those women who were effected by the double burden who first questioned the original sexual division of labour. 88

Similar contradictions and gender specific discriminations existed in the post war years in incomes and the work place, despite legislation guareneeing free access of women to all sorts of jobs and equal pay for equal work which becomes apparent, were one to look at the federal services themselves, where women officers are active predominantly in the lower hierarchical levels and are clearly unrepresented in the academic and other posts, discrimination being even greater in private concerns. Schmidlechner points out the negative role of the mass media too in hindering the emancipatory process by its representation of women which is akin to the traditional ideal, whose essential characteristic is the traditional sexual division of labour, because of which the man is assigned the productive and the woman the reproductive sphere. Thus entry of woman into male dominated work areas is in no way encouraged, rather criticised, this image proclaimed by mass media being superseded more and more by slogan of so called 'Double role' which is in effect nothing more than modernization of the old woman's image and which helped relegate women to their primary sphere of household and family. So that profession represented only an
additional and always secondary sphere of action, which ensured that

"... in diesen sekundären Wirkungsbereich bleibt die Frau weiterhin ein Gast, Gastarbeiterin in der Männergesellschaft, mit allen Diskriminierungen, denen auch die ausländische Arbeitskräfte ausgesetzt sind: Sie erhält weniger Lohn und ihr Arbeitsplatz ist unsicherer als der ihres männlichen Konkurrenten. Der Gesellschaft wird durch das Schlagwort von der "Doppelrolle" jede Verpflichtung abgenommen, den Widerspruch zwischen den beiden konfliktierenden Rollen der Frau zu lösen, d.h. Alternativen zu schaffen die der Frau die Wahl zwischen den beiden Rollen leichter machen als bisher."\textsuperscript{89}

Schmidlechner concludes her analysis with the opinions of women who were asked about their self and role understanding in the year 1973: They felt that though the social position of women had changed in the last decades in the sense of a progressive emancipation the possibility "zur Selbstverwirklichung für die Frau in viel geringerem Ausmaß gegeben sei, als für den Mann. Als Frau müsse man auf seine Umwelt und die gegebenen Normen wesentlich mehr Rücksicht nehmen, Ansichten und Wünsche von Frauen werden in der Gesellschaft wesentlich weniger akzeptiert werden als jene der Männer".\textsuperscript{90}
Thus she reiterates that barring a few exceptions, despite the social scientific and other technology related changes in the situation of women in the course of the last decades,

"Kein nenneswerter Wandel der realen wirtschaftlichen und politischen Machtverhältnisse einhergegangen ist und in diesen Bereichen noch wie vor ein eklatantes Übergewicht der Männer besteht".91

Evidently the process of formation of gender dichotomies which was being carried out from the 18th century through the 19th and 20th century and which involved complexities of class formation and development of capitalism had upto the seventies succeeded in further deepening, ideologically and culturally, the earlier sexual division of labour leading to the exclusion of the majority of the women from the public domain even though differences in the material aspects of lives of men and women had narrowed down.

In India, however, this process of creation of gender dichotomies through the 19th and 20th centuries has involved not just class but caste, religion ethnicity, imperialism and nation formation with the lives of women as pointed out by Sangari and Vaid "existing at the interface of caste and class inequality, the description and management of gender and female sexuality being involved in
the maintenance and reproduction of social inequality". 92

Sangari and Vaid's analysis amongst others of these processes during the colonial period and in the course of the nationalist struggle leads to the conclusion that in the agrarian economy for example, compulsion of colonial rule to extract surplus, create classes conducive to its rule and produce legitimizing ideologies, an aggravation of existing unequal relations took place, these changes having helped in reconstituting patriarchies which further helped in the exclusion of women from ownership or control of means of production prevalent in the precolonial agrarian structure, measures undertaken to ensure this including: putting individual property rights primarily in the hands of men with women having only ancillary rights dependent on their subordinate relationships with men; transforming existing matrilineal systems to patrilineal patterns of succession etc. The impersonal bureaucratic rule of law further marginalized women from the public sphere as well as bringing them under its control thus intensifying their dependence on men. 93

Even though the laws which were codifications of the customs of the dominant land owning and other rural groups, the "colonial regime gave juridical sanction to certain patriarchal practices regarding marriage, succession and adoption". 94 Thus, "the statutory Hindu Law" was actually a codification of high caste Hindu norms which were
"privileged over customary law to the disadvantage of all Hindu women, both urban and rural".95

Besides which, by integrating an existing system of feudal agrarian relations within the framework of colonial economic, though the reempowerment of the landlords, rajas, chiefs, tax collectors etc., an intensification in the oppression of majority of rural women took place through, not only such patriarchal practices as "distress sale of daughters" etc. but through maintenance of "caste and class based marriage norms and sexual morality". With landed aristocracy trying to be as 'liberal' as urban classes and trading communities, who later emerged as capitalists, similarities existed between "patriarchies practiced in town and village".96

Sangari and Vaid elaborate on the effects of industrialization as well on women: "edged out of traditional village occupations" they found only limited opportunities in the new sector and were soon forced out of new industries. Thus, many women of productive classes were pushed into "domestic sphere" replicating the division between "private" and "public" domain as defined by middle class ideologies.97

Middle class originating in rural society, the small landholders, village literati etc. with the urban middle class then developed "ideologies of "Hindu" and
"Indian womanhood in contradistinction to actual patriarchal norms prevalent among other classes and in opposition to western woman", the social reform and nationalist movements having helped to construct and popularize these"—They conclude: "middle class reforms undertaken on behalf of women tied up with self-definition of class, with a new division of the public from the private sphere". 98

Thus in India the process of re-structuring of gender dichotomies was one which involved not only the formation and self-definition of the middle class, but was one which was determined by the colonial experience and the nationalist response to it. Various historians Uma Chakravarti, amongst others, point out how and why the woman’s question had become a very important one in the colonial situation, involving the process of re-shaping of historical consciousness in the 19th century, the process finally ending with the creation of the Hindu-Aryan identity. The importance of this new self-image lay in fulfilling "growing need of emerging middle-classes, since it helped them contend with burden of the present, especially with the loss of self-esteem following the British conquest of India". 99

Tracing this process through the 19th century, Chakravarti analyses the three different phases involved through which a feminine identity was finally created, an image of Indian womanhood which however functioned then as
"historical truth."

The first phase upto 1850 saw the Orientalists, Anglicists, Evangelists and Protonationalists successfully construct in their works an "image of womanhood in lost past as counter to real existence of women in humiliating present," with Orientalists like William Jones and HT Colebrooke valorizing "sati" and Rammohun Roy and Mritunjay Vidyalankar arguing against it, using the Martreyi - Yajnavalkaya episode to oppose the subjection of women and show that "status" of women in ancient India had been quite high unlike that of contemporary women.\textsuperscript{100}

In this phase, gender relations became the arena in which, on the one hand, colonial rulers tried to establish their moral superiority by pointing out the low status of women amongst the natives, with the "bulk of colonial writing in India" focusing "on demonstrating peculiarities of Hindu civilization and barbaric practices pertaining to women". (Mill for e.g.), and on the other with the "beginning of cultural nationalism in the 1830s as a reaction against the Utilitarians and Anglicists as well as the threat of the missionaries, people like M.C. Deb of young Bengal group either blamed Muslim interregnum as dark ages in their effect on women or others like Pearey Chand Mitra argued that there had been women Sanskrit Scholars and debators in the past since women then had access to learning and scholarship\textsuperscript{101}.
The period after 1850 saw the Orientalists like Max Müller and two other European women writers extend the romantic reconstruction of the Aryan past to women, transforming "the Hindu Golden Age into an Aryan Golden Age" in which the "men were free, brave, vigorous, fearless, themselves civilized and civilising others, noble and deeply spiritual and the women were learned, free, and highly cultured; conjointly they offer sacrifices to the gods, listening "sweetly" to discourses and preferring spiritual upliftment to the pursuit of 'mere' riches. Additionally they represented the best examples of conjugal love, offering the supreme sacrifice of their lives as a demonstration of their feeling for their partners in the brief journey of life".102

With the emergence of cultural nationalism in the later period from 1850-1880, the writings of R.C. Dutt, Bankim Chandra Chatterjee and Dayanand for example highlighted the Kashatriya/Aryan values in the reconstruction of new identity for women. Differing from the universalism of earlier phase of Rammohan Roy and Brahm Samaj, in its aggressiveness, certain aspects of Hindu past were now valorized: the Aryan and Kshtriya values of "vigor and militancy" and "spiritualism of world affirming kind". Chakravarti points out how the reformers Dutt and Dayanand for example dealt with the problem of constructing a national identity for women since a different kind of
regeneration was required for her in the situation than for men for whom it was enough to be heroic, fighting foreign subjugation.

Counterpoising the contemporary status of women with evidence from the Vedas that women were educated, chose their partners and even contracted second marriages, Dutt valorises women of the past for their spiritual potential and their role as 'Sahadharminis' as well as for being heroic resistors to foreign rulers, choosing death over dishonour.

Dayanand similarly valorized the Aryan past, though his references to women of the past and their idyllic existence were part of his concern for reformed Hindu society as expressed in the institutions of the Arya Samaj differing however from the others in his emphasis of the role of women in the maintainance of race, and thus, concern about their sexuality, with motherhood being the rationale of woman's existence, since it was important to produce and rear a special breed of men. Thus, women's sexuality could be "constructively channelised", transformed from monastic tradition which believed it to be a threat against salvation.¹⁰³

Marriage then is only for procreation with the form of marriage "syayamvara" being linked with maximum probability of ensuing th best progeny. He also advocated the practice of Brahmacharya, since by not wasting
reproductive elements, one could ensure superior offspring.

On issues such as widow remarriage too, concern with motherhood and control of women's sexuality made him look for solutions in the institution of "niyoga". 104

Madhu Kishwar in her "The daughters of Aryavarta" reaches a similar conclusion: Dayanand's concern was not with women as individuals, only in their familial roles as wives and mothers, marriage being the key institution of society, with women the essential acquisitions for men, the monogamous form of marriage fulfilling several functions: hierarchical relations teach one group to serve another, (2) imposition of sexual restraint on women to ensure they produce "healthy" legitimate children for their husbands (3) presentation of private property which can be inherited only by rightful successors: "If institution of marriage did not exist all amenities of domestic life will come to an end. None will serve another, downright adultery and illicit connections will increase, all men and women will be afflicted with disease, physically and mentally weakened, and will consequently die young .... No one will have a title to succeed to another's property, nor will any person be able to retain possession of anything for any great length of time"105

Thus Chakravarti reiterates by the end of the 19th century, the question of feminine identity and role had
assumed more importance for the reformers, more than the reforms themselves with Vivekananda, another reformer, reflecting the experience of the 19th century in his construction of the image of Hindu womanhood at the beginning of the 20th century, as well as developing it further, contrasting "Hindu womanhood within image of a spiritual East", with "Western women in a materialist setting".

On the ideal of womanhood he says,

"The ideal of womanhood centers in the Aryan race of India, the most ancient in the world's history. In that race men and women were priests "Sabatimini" (Sahadharmini) or coreligionists as the Vedas call them. There, every family had its hearth or altar. There man and wife together offered their sacrifices... In India it was a female sage who first found the unity of God and laid down this doctrine in one of the first humans of the Vedas".106

"The Aryan and Semitic ideals of woman have always been diametrically opposed. Amongst the Semites the presence of a woman is considered dangerous to devotion.... According to the Aryan, man cannot perform a religious action without a wife".107

And in the nationalist context, a further
counterposing of materialism of the West and spiritualism of the East takes place:

"On the one hand materialism through foreign literature has caused a tremendous stir; on the other through the confounding din of all these discordant sounds she hears in low yet unmistakable accents the heart-rending cries of her ancient Gods, cutting her to the quick. There lie before her various strange luxuries... her manners, her fashions, dressed in which moves about the well educated girl in shameless freedom. All these are arousing... desires. Again the scene changes and in its place appear with stern presence Sita, Savitri, austere religious vows fastings, the forest retreat, the matted locks and the orange garb and search for the self... On the one side is the independence of western society, on the other the extreme self-sacrifice of the Aryan society"

Like Dayanand, he associated motherhood with chastity. Here too, ill-treatment of western women is contrasted with the high status of Indian women, since "Hindus as a race could not have produced image of Sita without revering women"108

Thus Chakravarti concludes that in the changed
political and social environment the image of womanhood was more important than the reality, since the nation's identity lay in the culture and more specifically in its womanhood. And by the twentieth century, the process was completed to ensure "that the image also came to be perceived as the reality". 109

How this nationalist discourse of 'material-west' versus 'spiritual East' helped create other dichotomies and finally the gender dichotomy, which was a specific response to the colonial situation and which took the traditional gender dichotomies a step further, is elaborated upon by other historians like Partha Chatterjee. According to him the resolution of contradictory pulls on nationalist ideology in its struggle against the dominance of colonialism was built around the separation of the domain of culture into two spheres; material and spiritual, the logic being: whereas it was necessary to learn superior techniques of organising material life i.e. science, technology, rational forms of economic organisation etc. since these had helped European countries subjugate non-European ones, and to incorporate them into one's own culture, to overcome this domination, one did not have to imitate west in everything. Rather, as already discussed, Indian nationalists and reformers of the late 19th century argued, by establishing that East was superior to West in the spiritual domain it was not even necessary to do so. Thus, what was needed was to cultivate materialism of modern Western civilization
while retaining and strengthening distinctive spiritual essence of national culture.

Chatterjee argues that in the nationalist discourse this material/spiritual distinction was condensed further into an analogous but ideologically far more powerful dichotomy: that between outer and inner, the material domain outside being a mere external which influences and conditions man and to which one had to adjust, but which ultimately was not important, the spiritual within being the genuinely essential.

Applying this inner/outer distinction to concrete day to day living, he argues, helped to create the separation of social space into "Ghar" and "Behir": home and the world. Thus, world become "terrain of pursuit of material interests" whereas home represents 'inner spiritual self', woman being its representative.110

Chatterjee reiterates that the colonial situation and the ideological response of nationalism gave an entirely new meaning to these terms, which are typical of gender roles in any traditional patriarchy, and effected their transformation, the material/spiritual dichotomy to which terms, "world", "home" corresponded, acquiring "very special significance in the nationalist mind".

The middle-class too, emerging under conditions of colonial rule needed new norms of family life "more
appropriate to external conditions of modern world and yet not mere imitation of West", since "mere restatement of old norms would no longer suffice.\textsuperscript{111}

Bhudev Mukhopadhyay in Bengal for example distinguished between human and animal nature and talks of natural and social principles which provided basis for "feminine" virtues: modesty or decorum in manner and conduct he says is specifically human trait, doesn't exist in animal nature, with human beings, more especially women, attempting to cultivate spiritual or God-like qualities in opposition to behaviour seen in animal nature. These spiritual qualities, characteristic of civilized and refined human society, were supposed to find expression in the appearance and behaviour of women. Chatterjee thus draws a parallel between the material/spiritual dichotomy and animal/god-like qualities which then correspond to masculine/feminine virtues this in turn assuming the following form in the specific nationalist context:

"In a society where men and women meet together, converse together, at all times, eat and drink together, travel together, the manners of women are likely to be somewhat coarse, devoid of spiritual qualities and relatively prominent in animal traits. For this reason, I do not think the customs of such a society are free from all defect. Some argue that because of such close
association with women, the characters of men acquire certain tender and spiritual qualities. Let me concede the point. But can the loss caused by coarseness and degeneration in the female character be compensated by the acquisition of a certain degree of tenderness in the male?¹¹²

And he further emphasizes:

Those who laid down our religious codes discovered the inner spirituality which resides within even the most animal pursuits which humans must perform, and thus removed the animal qualities from those actions. This has not happened in Europe. Religion there is completely divorced from (material) life. Europeans do not feel inclined to regulate all aspects of their life by the norms of religion; they condemn it as clericalism... In the Aryan system there is a preponderance of spiritualism, in the European system a preponderance of material pleasure. In the Aryan system, the wife is a goodness in the European system she is a partner and companion.¹¹³

Thus, Chatterjee concludes that solutions to the concrete problems arising out of the rapidly changing external and internal situation in which new middle class family found itself "were drawn from a variety of sources:
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a reconstructed "classical" tradition, modernized folk forms, utilitarian logic of bureaucratic and industrial practices, the legal idea of equality in a liberal democratic state" etc. with the 'new woman' defined in this way subjected to a new patriarchy\textsuperscript{114}.

Normative literature in the form of conduct books which appeared in the 19th century was used by the nationalists to establish the fit behaviour for this new woman. Tharu and Laitha draw attention to the fact that in such literature, every detail of the middle class woman's life was commented on, with surprising similarity between the modernists and the traditionalists on this: the need for sexual decorum and restraint and the need to pay careful attention to rearing children to be proper citizens. Also important is the idea that a woman should be a companion to her husband\textsuperscript{115}, a person he might height turn to when he needed to unburden himself, etc. these norms helping to distinguish from "immediate social and cultural condition in which majority of people lived, since 'new' woman was quite reverse of 'common' woman who was coarse, vulgar, loud, quarellsome, devoid of superior moral sense, sexually promiscuous subjected to brutal physical oppression by males". Thus it was not just westernised women, but Indian women too, maid-servants, washerwomen, barbers, prostitutes etc. who were parodied in the literature of the 19th century\textsuperscript{116}. 
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Besides normative literature in the sphere of female education too, factors of caste, with class, religion, and nationalism intermingled to serve as a major tool in the creation of gender dichotomies. Here too, colonial ideology played a crucial role throughout the 19th century, interlinking western patriarchy with the indigenous one to help revolve the woman's question and to create the middle class housewife and mother.

Thus Chatterjee points out that "formal education became not only acceptable but in fact a requirement for the new 'bhadramahila' in Bengal when it was demonstrated that it was possible for a woman to acquire cultural refinements afforded by modern education without jeopardizing her place at home".117

He reiterates that the "nationalist construct of the new woman derived its ideological strength from the fact that it was able to make goal of cultural refinement through education a personal challenge for every women, thus opening up a domain where woman was an autonomous subject".118

Formal education for middle class women was thus supposed to help achieve cultural superiority over several different groups of women, the western woman for example for whom it was believed education meant only acquisition of material skills in order to compete with men in outside world and hence loss of feminie (spiritual) virtues: Superiority over the preceding generation of women in their
own homes who had been denied opportunity for freedom by an oppressive and degenerate social tradition and superiority over women of lower classes who were culturally incapable of appreciating virtues of freedom.

Such assertions of superiority however required that educated women develop not only the feminine virtues of chastity, self-sacrifice, submission, devotion, kindness, patience etc.; but the typically 'bourgeois' virtues as well of disciplining "orderliness, thrift, cleanliness, personal sense of responsibility, the practical skills of literacy accounting and hygiene, the ability to run the household according to the new physical and economic conditions set by outside world." 119

Thus she was to acquire enough knowledge to go into world outside but without allowing that to threaten her feminity. And since in the colonial context, man had been forced to change their class, food habits, religious observance and social relations, these had to be compensated by an assertion of spiritual purity on part of women, so that they were not supposed to eat, drink, or smoke in same way as men and were supposed to continue observance of religious rituals which men could no longer carry out as well as maintain cohesiveness of family life and kin. 120

A similar project for female education was carried out in Punjab throughout the 19th century with reformers like Dayandand and the Arya Samaj using it to create the new
middle-class wife and mother who could be a companion to the man and a good mother to the children. Here too, countering colonial ideology through valorisation of the Vedic past was essential as elaborated on by Madhu Kishwar. For Dayanand, the importance of female education lay in the fact that an ignorant wife could not participate as an equal partner with her husband in social and religious duties as women in Vedic age did. Other reasons being: "If husband be well-educated and wife ignorant or vice-versa there will be a constant state of warfare in the house".¹²¹

Further, he felt "without education, women could not distinguish right from wrong, behave themselves agreeably towards their husbands and relatives and beget children properly, train, nurture and bring then up well, do or see domestic duties done as they ought to be done".

Thus the stress was on 'feminine' version of education that men were receiving so that institution of family could take the stress being produced by the wide schism being created between private world of home and family and the increasingly Westernized public world of employment and politics. Kshwar points out how Western patriarchy interlinked with the indigenous one in the creation of gender roles. Thus even in the British system of education, education for men was with view of creating new social base for British rule, whereas for girls it was not meant to equip them for profession or for government service, but was an attempt to transplant into Indian soil
the Victorian ideal of woman as 'housewife', this being the ideal posed before Indian women as part of effort to "civilize" them.\textsuperscript{122} Kishwar points out how mission schools, as compared to government schools, "served as more direct instruments of actual and ideological domination", the stress on education being for domestic purposes and the opinion that "in all girls' schools... actual cooking and housekeeping should be given an importance above any book learning" "Education introduced by colonial rulers was not meant to expand horizons for women but to narrow them. 'In a country of female seclusion it is hardly worthwhile for girls to learn by heart the countries, cities mountains etc. of the world. Only such instruction should be imparted to girls as may help them in becoming good house-wives. Moral education should have first place'.\textsuperscript{123}

Kishwar points out how this same training to be model Victorian housewives was given to women of lower castes and classes as well, without taking into consideration the fact that they could not be merely wives and mothers and had to earn their living.

Also, since in the changed situation, it had become even more important for women to be the 'bulwark' of religion, Orientalists and Arya Samajists agreed that it was better to have girls instructed in indigenous religious schools.

In the Punjab, then, Kiswar concludes, it was the tussle between the Punjabi elite, government and the
missionaries which made the Arya Samaj take up reform in women’s status, with women’s education as central theme, with the strengthening of patriarchal family being the motivation behind the reforms suggested since evils of child marriage, life of compulsory widowhood, prostitution, (especially of upper caste homes), increasing distance between husband and wife due to spread of colonial education, were all threats to stability of patriarchal family of upper castes and classes. Thus, for Arya Samajists, upper caste women were the main focus in the cause of female education, curriculae in Samaj Schools catering to perceptions of these castes and classes, with heavy dose of religion and domestic economy and general education course being geared not towards employment, but production of a ‘modernized’ educated housewife. Even on question of higher education fear remained that it would result in “overculture” which would become not only "cause" of domestic aberation, but also of annihilation of race itself, because effect of education would be physical deterioration among women, since it was important, that... "the education we give our girls should not unsex then" The justification for these gender roles once again being that ‘nature’ had determined different roles and positions for men and women in social organisation, so that these were not seen, by Dayanand amongst others, as social creations.