Chapter- II
THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Child labour in general and girl child labour in particular is a complex issue which needs a thorough understanding of the problem before any tangible steps can be taken. For this, the exact location in a broader theoretical framework is necessary in order to derive valuable inference, which can be used in tackling the problem of child labour. Regarding the problem of the girl child labour, it is not an isolated one where the situation can be analysed independently without looking into the structures that operate in the society from which they hail from. This, it is necessary to study the problems faced by the women and trace historically why they were forced to work.

The present study concentrates on the girls why are working in their homes with or without pay and not going to school. To analyse this one has to foremost find out the reasons for women working for wages inside and outside their homes and simultaneously how they involve their daughters also into the profession. In addition it also necessary to find the exact exploitation they face due to their gender, age, nature of work performed and the kind of economic structure they are forced into.

The study also focuses on how the capitalist in the urge for the capital appropriation exploit and extract the surplus value of the local petty commodity producers especially the women and girl child’s’ labour. In addition to this the problem of how the labour of these women and especially girls are linked to the global capitalists who use both capitalism and patriarchy and have nexus with local is also probed.
The problem of child labour as such has so far been dealt under the Marxist and other approaches. But it is to note that while trying to analyse the girl child labour one cannot merely analyse under the Marxist or other approaches. This is because the girl child labour involves the ‘Women’s Question’ and it is apt and necessary that it is dealt in more gender approaches. As a result the study has to delve into the forays of Feminism which has the central goal of dealing the women’s oppression and subjugation in society and the ways of analysing and solving it.

The following pages will therefore begin with the approaches regarding child labour and then move on to the inadequacies of the Marxian approach regarding the analysis of women and her labour and the need for a comprehensive analysis of women. The relevance of Feminism in the study and the main different stream of feminism and the reason for adopting a particular stream, the development of this stream and the way it deals with the capital accumulation and patriarchy will follow. The whole problem will be seen in the Indian context and finally stressing the need for an alternate framework based on the wholesome study of women and girls problem globally and in Indian context.

Before going into the various debates that centre around women and their work a look into the brief classification of child labour is necessary to give an idea about child labour situation.

**Classifications of Child Labour**

Before going into the girl child labour problem a brief look at the broad school of thought regarding child labour is a must. Aseefa Bequele in her article has
categorised the critiques against an active strategy of combating child labour into three schools. They are the Marxist radical critique, the "abolish-it-now" and the evolutionary.

Accordingly, the view of the radical school is "Child labour is a manifestation and a result of the exploitation and inequality in incomes and wealth that are characteristic of capitalist systems, in which the exploitation of labour, including child labour, is essential for the survival and profitability of profit-maximising enterprises. According to this view, as long as these characteristics persist, legislative and other efforts by governments are unlikely to succeed".

The "abolish-it-now" school is a group who are impatient with the work of many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and international organisations comprise those who advocate the immediate abolition of child labour.

The evolutionary approach on the other hand is the reticent view prevalent among a wide group of people in Government, in employers’ circles and society in general, which favours a rather non-interventionist approach to the problem. Accordingly, child labour cannot be abolished so long as poverty persists. Legislation prohibiting child employment is likely to lead to clandestine employment and therefore too greater exploitation. The best that can be done according to this group is to legitimise child employment and to ensure that child workers are provided with legal protection. But since the present study is concentrating on girl child labour all the above approaches does not exactly fit into the mould, since girl child labour involves gender dimension which inturn is determined by socio-cultural factors along with economic factors.
Therefore the following paragraphs will try to look into other approaches regarding child labour and attempt is made to locate girl child labour problem into it.

Keeping this in the background an attempt is made here to categorise and locate the problem of girl child labour in the global and Indian context.

Olga Nieuwenhuys³ has cited three main perspectives from which the problem of child labour has been approached which is useful for this study because it helps us to get why the initiative of the government is still not effective. They are (i) the legal approach, (ii) the demographic approach and (iii) the neo-classical approach.

The legal approach emerged in the 19th century Europe to prevent the children from being exploited in the factory and workshops, which was not regulated⁴. The works not directly related with the above mentioned was left untouched by the legislation since it was considered as socialisation process of the children and was considered hazardous and therefore went unregulated. This dichotomy is even still continuing in the developed countries as pointed by Olga Nieuwenhuys, due of the colonial policy adopted where industrialisation was discouraged purposefully and the work in the household was encouraged. The second approach is the demographic perspective, which was found in the newly independent nations of the third world. In these nations there was strong belief that children of the poor as non-working dependants, was considered as the route cause of the high ‘dependency ratio’ which hampered the development in the third world countries. The children of the poor were blamed to eat up the resources of these nations. As a result various steps were taken to contain high fertility rates. This triggered the research to analyse the children from the perspective of the utility of children from the peasant household. This resulted in neo-
classical cost-benefit analysis of how very young children are set to work in agriculture or in the household. But as rightly pointed out by Olga citing various studies, brings the drawbacks of this approach: Firstly this approach which looked into the importance of children for the rural poor overlooked the historical, social and cultural role of children in society; secondly the use of the concept of the household as unproblematic unity, led to the negation of the internal contradictions within the family particularly among male and female and seniors and juniors; thirdly undue focus on the micro setting of the peasant household, and neglecting to provide an overall analysis of the wider socio-political parameters in which the actions of its members are embedded.

It is to be noted that the ethnography that was produced between the United Nations' Year of the Child and International Convention of Children's right ter: years has failed to generate any new developments in the contextual situation of children's work and continues to refer factory work as the universal standard for conceptualising child labour. This is problematic, because of the below reasons as pointed out by Olga, where the crucial issues such as the historical analysis of the process of transformation of children's work and the structural setting in which children's work, remains heavily under-researched. Added to this the poor children who are engaged from a tender age in work for marginal returns or no pay in the household, in small trade, in home industries or in the fields side by side with parents especially in countries like India where it is hardly reported is due to the popularity of the legal approach which is for legitimising international and national relations of production, in which children's work play a crucial, though unappreciated, role\(^5\).
Two major difficulties in analysing child labour are first, the distinction between suitable and unsuitable and its underlying valuation of work and second, the assumed universality and gender neutrality of ideals of childhood. These two in third world countries are shaped by the ideals of socialisation introduced by colonial powers in the former colonies and which were reflected in their own child labour legislation.

As result the activities of children are categorised accordingly and mostly the work done in the homes are not considered work at all in the third world countries. To make it more clear three categories of work cited by Olga can be taken:

First, activities that extract resources from the physical and social environment; second activities concerning the ‘unpaid’ allocation, preparation and distribution of these resources; and third activities concerning the care of human beings. It is to be noted that the last two activities which are not connected directly with the market are not considered work at all and therefore the children mostly girls who indulge in these two activities are viewed not as someone who contributes to the family income. But on the whole it becomes inevitable that these activities form an important aspect in adding value to the market indirectly since the children who indulge in these are not there, then the work must be done by elders in the family or hire labour which does not come for free. Therefore the work done by the children in the house does have economic value viewed in the interaction with the society as whole.

Coming to the Marxist assumption that the gradual disappearance of peasant in the face of Capitalism needs mention here to show how the peasant economy or
Marxist term pre-capitalist mode of production survived under the onslaught of capitalism. "Chayanov thesis" which was landmark stated that the reason for this survival. He stated that the final goal of the peasant household is to achieve an equilibrium between labour and consumption, which is determined by the size of the family, the proportion of the family members who work or do not work, and area and quality of land. This internal equilibrium he stated make very low returns per labour units acceptable, and these enable the peasant household to exist in conditions that would doom a capitalist farm to undoubted ruin'. By this, he explained the reason why the peasant economy is able to survive in spite of the expanding capitalism and capitalist agriculture.

But on the other hand the argument put forward by Rey where the domination of the third world countries is still in the colonial form minus the colonial revenue where the instead of the colonial power aligning with the ruling elites is replaced with the unequal exchange. By this he explains the reason why unremunerated work within the context of the family is the ubiquitous way in which the third world labour is exploited today. This analysis brings out a valuable inference that the work of the children should be placed in the context of mode of exploitation in which it is embedded and should particularly be seen against the different sets of class relations by which the mode is reproduced. The focus on articulation, and in particular on class alliances, clarifies the vital need of why employment is not the typical feature of children’s exploitation in the third world societies but unremunerated work within the family context. Therefore the role of class alliances is important to understand the
ideological dimensions of children’s work in the rural household and its subsequent exploitation of them.

But it is to be noted that, 'both neo-classical economic theory and Marxism approaches treat family as purely altruist unit and fail to recognise the importance of conflict and inequality. There is growing feminist literature that casts doubt on the neo-classical and Marxist perspective, and they give more importance given to conflict and bargaining within the family. The neo-classical approach has acknowledged that the legal and political institutions lend adult male considerable bargaining power within the family and gives them the leverage, not only to engage in remunerated work outside the ambit of home, but also to dispose of the cash returns of their labour. By contrast, women and children are at a disadvantage in the labour market and have to concentrate on the less rewarding tasks within the home. Feminists from a Marxist paradigm have rather concentrated on explaining the structural constraints of inequality and conflict and have identified patriarchy as the system that places women and children in different social and economic positions to men. In this analysis gender and age differences became analogous, though not identical, to class relations.

The gender ideology proves particularly powerful in disguising the value of work performed by girls that is intimately related to women’s. The gender distinction is introduced early in life. In India, in the process of learning to be women girls are taught to accept and internalise dominant conceptions of femininity and of the place of women in society. This ideology of gender permits the reproduction of a system based on sexual inequality where women are generally excluded from crucial
economic and political activities and their position as wives and mothers are associated with a lower status than men.

Work undertaken by girls is often not perceived as child work for the simple reason that girls’ childhood is so short. Therefore the focus should not only be on the nature and articulation of children’s work but also on how it is valued, on the setting in which work is undertaken on the one hand, and on the other, the ideological assumptions underlying it. Finally the analysis of girl labour in specific or women’s labour in general is not complete without the study of the role of patriarchy that operates in the society by which women are subjugated. The following pages will systematically look into the above-mentioned problems in larger perspective, and later narrowing down specifically to the Indian context.

Before going into the details of how the various debates of women’s work was brought into front, it is important to have an brief look at the theory evolved by Marx in regard to the labour of women and children. It is necessary to look into the views of Marx since later in the present study it will be easy to understand the reasons why some of the feminist while analysing the exploitation of women found Marx’s analysis to be inadequate.

**Marx analysis of the division of labour**

Karl Marx was one of the most comprehensive thinkers who had elaborately analysed the situation of the society at his time to bring out the major factors for the division of the society based on the relations of production. For Marx’s and for Marxism in general the most crucial factor in studying the society is class and class-
consciousness. Therefore while his analysis was based on how the capitalists (haves) exploited the proletariats (have-nots) and what are the ways by which they maintained and perpetuated this form of exploitation throughout history. For this he brought out the forms of the mode of productions which was used by the haves against the have-nots and how the relations of productions was based on this division of society.

In his analysis regarding women and children's work in the structure of capitalist society he termed them as 'reserve army of labour'. Our focus here would be in locating these two sections of labour force namely women and child labour and their role in the economy and how they are exploited thorough their work.

**Marx views on child labour and Women**

For Marx child labour was the result of capitalism and the technologies it created. For him child labour exists since the capitalists find it as source of profit and therefore it is inherent in a capitalist system of wage labour. Therefore his two central arguments, that the new technologies increased the demand for cheap, unskilled labour, and that the decrease in the rate of profit led the capitalists to increase the exploitation of labour.

As profits declined, he wrote, the capitalist buys 'with the same capital a greater mass of labour power, as he progressively replaces skilled workers by less skilled, mature labour power with immature, male by female, that of adults by that of young persons or children'. Children, along with the unemployed were part of the 'industrial reserve army'. 'Pauperism', he wrote, 'forms a condition of production and of the capitalist development of wealth. Within the capitalist system all the
methods for raising the social productivity of labour are put into effect at cost of the individual workers... so that they become means of domination and exploitation. They transform his lifetime into working-time and drag his wife and child beneath the wheels of the juggernaut of capital\textsuperscript{10}.

\textit{Marxism and Feminism: a Critique}

Marxism and feminism are theories of power and its distribution: inequality. They provide accounts of how social arrangements of patterned disparity can be internally rational yet unjustified\textsuperscript{11}.

Marxists have criticised feminism as "bourgeois in theory and practice, meaning that it works in the interest of the ruling class and argued that to analyse society in terms of sex ignores class divisions among women, dividing the proletariat. Since demands could be met within the capitalism, it is argued that their pursuit undercuts and deflects the efforts for basic change. The women’s movement’s focus upon attitude and feelings as powerful components of social reality is criticised as idealist; its composition, purportedly of middle-class educated women, is advanced as an explanation for its opportunism"\textsuperscript{12}.

On the other hand the Feminists accuse that Marxism is male defined in theory and practice, whereby it moves within the worldview and in the interest of men. Feminists argue that analysing society exclusively in class terms ignores the distinctive social experience of the sexes, obscuring women’s unity. According to Catherine A. Mackinnon, neither of these allegations is groundless, but the Marxists branding the whole of women’s movement as a group of educated and class-
privileged is wrong. Since she feels that the advocates of women's interest have not always been class conscious; some have exploited class-based arguments for advantage, even when the interest of the working class women were thereby obscured\textsuperscript{13}.

Most attempts at synthesis attempt to integrate or explain the appeal of feminism by incorporating issues feminism identifies as central—the family, housework, sexuality, reproduction, socialisation, personal life—within an unchanged Marxian analysis. The failure to contain both theories on equal terms derives from the failure to confront each on its own ground: at the level of method. Method shares each theory's vision of social reality. It identifies its central problem, group, and process, and creates as a consequence its distinctive conception of politics as such. Instead of engaging the debate over which came first, sex or class, the task for theory is to explore the conflicts and connections between the methods that found it meaningful to analyse social conditions in terms of those categories in the first place. Therefore feminism has to view a systematic explanation of sex inequality through an approach distinctive to its subject yet applicable to the whole of social life.

Simone de Beauvoir wrote 'one is not born, one rather becomes a woman' and pointed out that gender, cross-culturally, was to be found to be a learned quality, an acquired characteristic, an assigned status, with qualities that vary independent of biology and ideology that attributes them to mature\textsuperscript{14}.

These are forced on women and they are inculcated early into the lives of the young girls who view their status in response sex. But it is to be noted that sexuality is the one which should determine gender and not the other way around which is
happening due to weak position of women in general, which is thrust on them. Therefore the main aspect which has to be analysed and rectified is the attitude of the males not as single individual who subjugate the female by as gender group which exercise their power over the females who are forced to accept without questioning.

Before going into the main streams of feminist debates it is better to understand what is exactly feminism and who are the feminist and whose cause are they fighting for. Later to make the study more focussed it would be better to find out the efforts that has gone through in realising the demands of the rights of women by the feminist in the West and locating the problem by tracing the factors that led women in the west to work vis-à-vis the situation of Indian women and the factors that made girls labour as an important component of capitalist exploitation.

The relevance of feminism in this study

Feminism is the quest to change the existing gender relations, which is based on the exploitation of female because of their gender and sexuality. Since the present study is based on studying the causes and basis for the exploitation of girl children’s labour in the society, analysing the problems faced by the women in course of their work is essential to understand the problems faced by the girl children. Both girls and women are exploited in their work places whether it is in their homes or outside their homes because of their gender and sexuality and specifically age in the case of girls. As a result looking into the arguments put forward by the feminist in enhancing and bringing parity and equality for women in general is vital to understand the girl child labour problem.
Kinds of feminism

There are many streams of feminist thought that are prevailing when one wants to study feminism and its implications for women in general. This also makes it difficult to understand and adhere any particular stream. Therefore the present study will very briefly look into the four major streams of feminism namely Liberal, Marxist, Radical and Socialist and try to bring out the salient features that can be incorporated into the present study.

**Liberal Feminism**

Liberal feminists’ major argument is that the treatment of women in contemporary society violates their rights to liberty, to equality, and to justice—as well as constituting an irrational and inefficient use of society’s human resources. Therefore they want to eliminate the sex-based discrimination in all areas of lives and to guarantee women equal opportunities with men to define and pursue their own interests. They questioned the widely prevalent rationalisation of women’s secondary position in the family and society. But however they failed to conceptualise adequately about the roots of gender oppression in society because due to the lack of focus on patriarchy which is dominant force in the subordination of women in society.

But this stream is often criticised for its failure to deal with the deep-rootedness of gender inequality and the interconnectedness between its different forms, like; the origin or reasons for persistence of patriarchal attitudes are not
systematically addressed\textsuperscript{16}. Therefore it is not useful for the present study, which deals deeply into gender inequality.

\textit{Radical Feminism}

Although radical feminism does not denote any cohesive ideology, the main focus under this stream of thought is their stress on the patriarchal control over women's sexuality and reproduction. This control over the female they point out results in their oppression, which in turn is closely linked with the socio-culture fabric of the society. They find strong objection to the gender difference based on the socially structured norms, which is manifested through the dominant masculine culture. Therefore they strongly feel that the oppression of women can end only if the structure of patriarchy on which it is based is destroyed. But their focus on reproductive biology as the site of women’s oppression lacks clarity as pointed out by Jagger and to quote him “yet paradoxically their ahistorical construction of biology has the contradictory effect of pushing sexuality and reproduction into the realm of ‘nature’, to separate them from ‘culture’ which is defined as a male creation. The corollary of this position is the view of patriarchy as a transhistorical structure. This could lead to arbitrary generalisations which fail to reflect specificities of women’s experiences in different cultures and in different points of time”\textsuperscript{17}

Moreover Marxist analysis was just another male analysis with no potential for liberating women. For them the class struggle, not the women question, became the red herring, a ruse to disguise its progenitor, the patriarchal society. The central issue
was the caste-like system into which men and women were ascribed at birth. This was the basis for the radical feminist position\(^\text{18}\).

Added to these, radical feminism is criticised for its tendency to essentialism, to an implicit biological reductionism, and to a false universalism which cannot understand historical change or take sufficient account of divisions between women based on ethnicity and class\(^\text{19}\). Sidelining the Marxist economic framework and concentrating more on the biological aspects of the gender will have inadequate analysis of gender, which the present study does not want.

**Marxist Feminism**

Under the Marxist feminist framework, class oppression is the most crucial and foremost. They argue that under the experience of women differ in capitalism where the bourgeois women oppression is not as same as the oppression of the proletariat women. They view the gender oppression as a product of historically evolved socio-political structure rather than the intentional actions of individuals. Since the adhere to the basic system of understanding they locate the oppression of women in the capitalist system and it modes of production and view private property as the basis for the sexual control of women and therefore advocate its dissolution as pre requisite for the empowerment of women.

Concerned primarily with the critique and the overthrow of the capitalist society, Marxist feminists focus their attention on the women’s situation under capitalism in which productive labour is organised around the working class and the capitalist class. Added to these they argue against the spatial divide created in the
capitalist system, which divide the work as domestic and wage. They find this
division was not there before capitalism since the family and the household was the
site of production was same before capitalism and the work of women was the crucial
and central to the welfare of the family. Therefore they voice for the rights for the
domestic work also and advocate wages for it. On the whole the Marxist feminist are
focus more on the work-related problems and concerns rather than on the sexual
oppression of all women. But the main lacuna, which this stream of feminism
encounters, is simplifying the oppression of women in the work sphere and not
encompassing the overall sexual oppression of women by men.

This stream of feminism also have their demerits, "it is criticised for too
narrowly focused on capitalism, being unable to deal with gender inequality in pre
and post-capitalist societies, and that it incorrectly reduces gender inequality to
capitalism, rather than recognising the independence of the gender dynamics". It is
to noted that both capitalism and gender inequality has to be taken judiciously, if one
wants to bring out the real exploitation of women in society. Therefore narrowly
focussing on capitalism and mostly on the waged work does not help in the focus of
the present study.

Therefore the only viable alternative that will be useful for this is to have a
theoretical model based on a judicious synthesis of both Marxism and feminism,
which is followed by the socialist feminist. This will help the present study to focus
on the issues like capitalism, patriarchy etc., dealt by using both Marxist framework
and also by having gender view of exploitation from the feminist angle. Socialist
feminism theory has the above-mentioned characteristics, which makes it easy to adopt for our present study, which is based on the above said considerations.

**Socialist Feminism**

This stream of feminist thought had emerged in order to evolve a comprehensive explanation of women’s oppression whereby it seeks to synthesise Marxist thought with that of radical feminism. Initially in their effort to develop a social-feminist theory they focussed on the family unit and the labour of housework and child rearing in contemporary capitalist societies. Therefore it seeks to combine the non-material account of patriarchy with a material account, it delineates the ways in which the changes in the economy affect the condition of women’s lives.

According to Mitchell, the earlier classical literature on the problem of woman’s condition is predominantly economist in emphasis and therefore she differentiated woman’s condition into four separate structures: production, reproduction, socialisation, and sexuality, where each structure develops separately and requires its own analysis. Together they form the “complex unity” of woman’s position. “Mitchell’s central contribution was to legitimate a perspective that recognises the ultimate primacy of economic phenomena, yet allows for the fact that other aspects of women’s situation not only have importance but may play key roles at certain junctures.”

Therefore to Mitchell one of their foremost social feminist thinkers, the monocausal theory to explain women’s oppression is inadequate and therefore she had
suggested a dual systems theory, that a women’s status and function are simultaneously determined by her role in production and reproduction.

Socialist feminists hold that the root cause of all oppression is economics and like any oppressed group women provide a pool of labour for low-paid and unpleasant work. Their works are viewed as secondary to their domestic roles. Moreover they point out that the institution of family perpetuates women’s oppression and their work within the household helps to sustain the capitalist societies. Therefore the socialist feminist analysis of women’s oppression is more comprehensive since it covers two mains steams of thought whereby both women’s role in production as well as reproduction and their oppression in these spheres is analysed systematically. The following paragraphs will try to highlight the main debate on the household labour, which is important for understanding the overall subjugation of women inside their homes, vis-à-vis the exploitation that takes place.

The debate on household labour

The first wave of the feminist movement was focussed in its struggle on the public sphere mainly in politics and economy. But the second feminist movement opened up the area of private sphere in the question of women’s struggle. Accordingly the new areas of concentration were abortion, wife beating, rape and molestation.

One of the main developments during the second wave of feminism is the domestic labour debate, which took place between 1973 and 1979. As it rightly pointed out by Mies these debates did not include other areas of non-wage work,
which are appropriated by the capital in the process of capital accumulation. Such as subsistence peasants, petty commodity producers, marginalised people, most of whom are women, in the under developed countries. Therefore it is true of Mies who justifies that most of those who took part in the debates did not transcend the Eurocentric view of capitalism. “According to this view there are other areas of human labour lying outside of capitalism and society proper. They are called ‘pre-capitalist’, ‘peripheral-capitalist’, ‘feudal’, or ‘semi-feudal’, or simply under developed or backward”.

Here it has to be noted that these debates were mainly focussed in analysing the work done in the family, which goes, unnoticed and has no direct monetary benefit. It was not linked to the wage done by the women as their occupation. It is important to study this aspect of women’s work since it has a wider implication in regard to their general work pattern, by which they are exploited in the name of doing service to their family.

In addition it brought out the fundamental weakness in Marxist economic theory, “the failure to give recognition to, and properly analyse, women’s unpaid domestic work and served as critique of Marx’s formula of value creation and the formulation of the thesis that women’s labour is all-embracing, that it encompasses more value creation than the toil of males”\textsuperscript{23}.

Therefore one has to study this process to bring out valuable inference such as women’s nature of work, time spent, the consequences or the impact it has on their family members especially the young daughters who are sucked or forced into this stereo typed work of their mothers.
The women's exploitation point of view also serve as useful eye opener to the injustice done on them branding non-wage work as part of their lives. But it is to be noted, that these debates have to be viewed in the western perspective since the analysis done were done keeping the developed western society in mind and not the developing countries like India were the household task comprise many more activities relating to material production.

One of the main argument put forward by the debate was ‘Housewives Produce Use-Values. Margaret Benston, an American feminist was the main person who questioned the role of domestic labour and way how it can be analysed. Benston pointed out that women, like peasants, produce use-values for consumption in the home. This production she claimed is socially necessary-in contrast to Marx who considered only a part of the wage-labour by the wage-slave to be socially necessary in capitalist economy, but pre-capitalist ‘in a very real sense’. Therefore Benston main contention was that women as a group work outside the money economy and their domestic labour creates useful products and services directly consumed by the family.

Another major work regarding the housework was the article produced by Peggy Morton in 1970 in which he argues family “as a unit whose function is the maintenance of and reproduction of labour power”, meaning that “the task of the family is to maintain the present workforce and provide the next generation of workers, fitted with the skills and values necessary for them to be productive members of the work force”\textsuperscript{24}. 
The main arguments that emerged during the debate a few years later were women were also producers of labour power. This view was strongly advocated by the Italian feminist Maria Dalla Costa. She pointed out that housewife does not just produce simple use-values, but the commodity labour power which can be sold by the husband on the labour market and moreover they do not stand outside the process of Marx’s surplus value of production because they constitute the very foundation of the process of accretion of capital through the hiring of labour power and its use by the entrepreneur\textsuperscript{25}.

This was one step ahead of what Benston pointed it out previously, that woman are creator of use-values. Thus Dalla Costa was the main person who brought to light the situation of women where they are subjected to two forms of exploitation, namely waged and non-waged.

But it is to be noted that Dalla Costa’s arguments are not without its inadequacies as pointed out by Custers\textsuperscript{26}. He points the slogan coined by her ‘Wages for housework’ did not question the sexual division of labour nor is it challenged the isolated position of housewives and more importantly she did not connect the role of women in both spheres of production namely waged and domestic labour. Her main aim he pointed out was to bring out the injustice of capitalism against the isolated housewives and did not propagate an alliance of women wage-slaves and domestic slaves, for the joint battle against capitalism and patriarchy.

Therefore what was needed was a comprehensive analysis of the situation of women who are caught in the capitalistic web of production both in waged and
domestic work, which was not done clearly by both Benston and Dalla Costa where they mainly confined themselves to the domestic labour.

Moreover there are several reasons that were brought out against the determination of domestic labour, which cannot be subsumed under commodity production. First, is that fluctuations in the price of labour power do not affect the performance of domestic labour. Second is because domestic labour is performed in addition to labour performed in capitalist production, and so is performed independently of the regulation of labour through the value of its product, it is not equal and interchangeable with other concrete labours and so it not abstract (value creating) labour.

This is due to the fact that the capitalist mode of production puts the responsibility of survival on to the workers and this in turn falls into the hands of the women proletariats, the domestic labour as result does not become equal with other concrete labours and so is not expressed as abstract labour.

It is to be noted that since under commodity production, abstract labour is the only form in which private labour becomes social labour and domestic labour, despite being materialised in a social use value, remains private.

Therefore domestic labour does not form part of the capitalist mode of production of commodities, but is rather one of its external conditions of existence, which it continually reproduces. “It is not Marx’s theory of value which marginalises domestic labour, but the capitalist mode of production. The separation of the worker from his or her labour, and its absorption into capital as its variable component, entails the separation of individual consumption (the production of labour power)
from productive consumption (the consumption of labour): the reproduction of
capitalist relations of production, then, entails the reproduction of the privatised,
technically backward nature of domestic labour. The abolition of this separation, of
the commodity form of labour power, is, therefore, a necessary condition for the
socialisation of domestic labour\textsuperscript{28}.

In addition the works of Benston, Morton, Dalla Costa and many in the
domestic labour debate was criticised for the following reasons\textsuperscript{29}. Firstly they
focussed mainly on the capitalist mode of production; secondly, they dealt exclusively
on domestic labour and women's oppression in the working class; thirdly, restricting
their analysis to the economic level; fourthly, the problem of child bearing was left,
since attention was paid only to housework and child care.

The main necessity in analysing women's oppression and subjugation has to
deal both the household labour as well as waged labour, in order to bring the exact
situation in which women are exploited in the society by their work. Therefore a
proper synthesis of radical feminism and Marxist analysis is needed regarding the
development of social feminist theory to give a suitable framework to analyse the
above said problems.

It is rightly pointed out by Mies\textsuperscript{30} that the nature of the woman's question is
that it cannot be added to any existing general theory but criticises all these theories
and looks for a new theory of society altogether. Therefore she argues that all the
attempts to integrate the woman's question to the existing have failed because of the
inability to grasp the true historical thrust of the new feminist rebellion, namely its
radical attack on patriarchy or patriarchal civilisation as a system, of which capitalism constitutes the most recent and most universal manifestation.

_Problems in synthesis_

Regarding the problem of synthesis the social feminist analysed two related namely patriarchy and reproduction. Some have suggested that there should be three levels of analysis needed regarding the concept of reproduction, namely, social reproduction, or the reproduction of the conditions of production; reproduction of the labour force; and human or biological reproduction but this has created some difficulty in maintaining the relationship among different aspects.

The second main difficulty regarding the synthesis is the problem of dualism like capitalism and patriarchy, the mode of production and the mode of reproduction, the class system and gender system. As it is rightly pointed out the main lacunae of social feminist theory is “it has largely focussed on the relationship between feminism and socialism, and between sex and class oppression, largely to the exclusion of issues of racial or national”. Therefore the challenge before them is still to bring out a unified dialectical material perspective on women’s liberation. It is also necessary to briefly understand the recent developments in the socialist feminism in the below paragraphs to locate exactly the position of women in contemporary society.

_Contemporary Development in the Dual Systems Theory_

One of the important works of that of Hartmann claims that both housework and wage labours are important sites of women’s exploitation by men. She has argued
that in the field of paid work, organised men to keep access to the best paid jobs for themselves at the expense of women use occupational segregation\textsuperscript{33}.

In addition Hartmann points out with her analysis that within the household also women do more work than men do, even if they have paid employment\textsuperscript{34}. It is to be noted that these two forms of expropriation also act to reinforce each other, since women's disadvantages position paid work makes them vulnerable in making marriage arrangements, and their position in the family disadvantages them in paid work. Hartmann argues that patriarchy pre-dates capitalism, and that this expropriation of women's labour is not new and distinctive to capitalist societies and hence cannot reduced to it.

Walby points out the socialist feminist impossibility to adequately sustain the duality of capitalism and patriarchy and finds, it is problematic in that it both underestimates the tension between patriarchy and capitalism and insufficiently specifies the different structures of patriarchy\textsuperscript{35}.

Therefore she suggests that the existing form of dual-systems theory is faulty because it does not cover the full range of patriarchal structures and therefore advocates a proper synthesis of both the aspects of radical feminism and social feminists which includes waged work, housework, sexuality, culture, violence and the State.

Moving to the structures that dominate the lives of women and girls in the family, patriarchy plays an important role. Therefore to understand it is a pre-requisite to really know how and by what ways women are really oppressed.
Concept of patriarchy in women’s life

“Patriarchy - the rule of the father - is at structure written into particular expression of the sexual division of labour whereby property, the means of production of exchange values, is appropriated by men, and whereby this property relation informs household and family relations in such a way that men may appropriate the labour and the actual persons of women”36.

Walby defines patriarchy “as a system of social structures and practises in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women”37.

She point out the degree of patriarchy has not alone changed but its form has also changed. Therefore she distinguishes between the private forms of patriarchy to public patriarchy, which has appeared in Britain. By private patriarchy she means the household production as the main site of women’s oppression, whereas public patriarchy is principally in public sites such as employment and the state38.

In addition she provides six structures of patriarchy: the patriarchal mode of production, patriarchal relations in paid work, patriarchal relations in the state, male violence, patriarchal relations in sexuality, and patriarchal cultural institution. She argues these six structures have an intimate and crucial role to play in the lives of women in capitalist societies like Britain. In her analysis of these six structures she had made valuable observations which influences the lives of women subjugating them even more. At one point she even brings out the inadequacies of socialist feminist analysis by citing the dualism of capitalism and patriarchy itself is confusing and practically difficult to achieve.
But for Mies “Patriarchy denotes the historical and social dimension of women’s exploitation and oppression, the capitalism is expressive of the contemporary manifestation, or the latest development of this system. It is my thesis that capitalism cannot function without patriarchy, that the goal of this system, namely the never-ending process of capital accumulation, cannot be achieved unless man-woman relationships are maintained or newly created”.

Therefore she points out that Feminism has to struggle against all capitalist patriarchal relations, beginning with the man-woman relation, to the relation of human beings to the nature, to the relations between metropoles and colonies. In addition she adds it cannot hope to reach its goal by only concentrating on one of these relations, because they are inter-related.

A further look at the evolution of women’s role and their status in the different stages of the society in general to know their position and subjugation is important here before going forward into the analysis of women.

Feudal Society

Many theories have been cited for the condition of women who are subjected for wages inside home and outside home. Marxism had been cited by many which had been the first to bring out the changes that affect the society due to the invasion of capitalism. The western society before the advent of capitalism was enmasse in the structure of feudalism. In the feudal society, both men and women were working together to supplement in the family income. The division of work outside and inside was not prevalent because, the work done during that time was done in their homes.
There was no division of work, because either men or women go different places to earn. All the work was done in the family that too in their confine of their homes. Therefore there was no question of external exploitation by anyone outside the family purview.

Mainly the economy at that time was depending on agriculture and therefore a heavy reliance on land. Added to this, the economy was domestic where there was no commodity production for the markets. Mostly the commodities produced were for the local consumption. As a result there was no question of wage, profit, exploitation etc., and both men and women worked for their livelihood. In short, the feudal family was a self-sufficient economic unit and the production and consumption were coterminous, inter-related and both embedded in the economy of the household.40

*Transition of Feudal to Capitalist Society*

During the close of the feudal society there emerged a division between the increase of two classes one within considerable capital accumulation to lead a comfortable life and the other the growth of the landless population, totally dependent on selling their labour power. In the first category it became the duty of the men to provide women emerged during this period due to the capitalist farmers paying inadequate wages and landowners unwilling for the poor relief. On the other hand the bourgeoisie capitalist enjoyed his accumulated wealth and the women of their household remained idle in their homes, a new trend of displaying their acquired status.
Capitalist Society

It is to be noted, as pointed out "the transitional period from feudalism to capitalism must be the point of departure for the study of the position of women in capitalist society: not industrialisation, not urbanisation, not modernisation, but the emergence of capitalism." This is because it brought the different roles played at different in different points in that mode of production, where the bourgeoisie were seen enjoying their wealth and comfort not working at all and the other hand the proletariat women were struggling to combine working and mothering in order to ensure their families survival.

Marxist perspectives had analysed how the mode of production determine the lives of women within their households both by defining its internal structure of households and by locating their position in the social system. The Marxist analysis had insisted that the position of women can be properly explored only through an analysis of the mode of production and, through an examination of those differences among women, which result from their place in the class structure. But Marxist analysis did not generate questions about the differences between men and women, about the different ideas a society holds with respect to women and men, and about how and why those ideas change; questions that deal specifically with female oppression.

Therefore the following paragraphs will try to locate the after effects of capitalism which perpetuated the sexual division of labour and division of home and work place in respect to the gender of women and how it perpetuated the subjugation
of women in society. This analysis is important since the gender division of labour influences and shapes the society according to the work they perform. In addition the sexual division also forms an important component to witness how patriarchy is and was reinforced and developed over a period of time.

Gender and Division of Labour

Female wage labour is not only characterised by low pay. Women because of their domestic and childcare responsibilities mainly undertake assembly works on piece-rate contract in the home, arguably the most exploited work of all.

It is to be noted that family structure and ideology of domestic responsibility play an important part in determining the position of women as wage workers. This is because, women prefer part-time work and homework since it is their direct responsibility for taking care of children. Added to these the kind of job women work must or should be along the lines of ideology of ‘feminine’ gender. Along with these it has to be seen that household structure and familial ideology also plays an indirect part in the limitation of women’s participation in wage labour. This they do by influencing the relevant structures like the education or training systems to create a gender division of labour in wage work.

It is to be noted that concept of labour is usually reserved for men’s productive work in capitalist conditions that is mainly for the production of surplus value and the work done by the women is not taken into account in production of surplus value, since they are defined as housewives and as a result their work is non-work in capitalist sense and defined as natural activity.

Moreover, as pointed out by Mies, the neglect of Marx’s to take into account the non-productive which includes women’s labour has narrowed down the ‘capitalist concept of productive labour’ where the major base is made of the subsistence
production mainly performed through the women’s non-wage labour and other non-wage labour of slaves, contract workers and peasant in the third world colonies. In addition she points sexual division of labour should not be looked as mere problem related to the family only but as a structural problem of a whole society.

*Division of home and work place in capitalist societies*

The separation of home and work place was brought about by the large-scale production under the wage labour system and breakdown of the labour process on the lines of differentiation by level of skills, which is outcome of capitalist development. Therefore this separation pushed women to their confines of their homes and excluded them from wage labour. This has led to the questioning of domestic labour in the family as a possible source of explanation. This development has been important in the context of the relationship between the structure of gendered wage labour relations and the family structures, as they have evolved under capitalism.

It is to be noted the criticism brought against the stages discussed by Roberta Hamilton are: the first assumption that both serf and rich had produced mostly for their own consumption but in reality the goods were produced for the market also which played an important role in the income of the family; the distinction between home and work place brought by capitalism is not analytically coterminous with capitalist relations of production, but was historically brought about in the development of capitalism. Added to this is the ideological processes that have made the establishment of the privatised domestic area of the ‘home’ as the domain of women are thrust upon the responsibility of child care and idea of femininity and maternalism; finally the degree to which relations between men and women vary between classes in the transition to capitalism from feudalism is difficult to assess but can be safely assumed that gender divisions were somewhat less differentiated between classes than they became under capitalist production.
On finding these differences made many including the some of the Marxist believe that capitalism created privatised domestic labour for women as a precondition of capitalist production and this was reflected in the domestic labour debate.

Studies done prove that there was also some kind of division of labour existed even in the goods produced in the household. But the main difference as point out is that the “difference between this division of labour and that of capitalism is that capitalism not only took over and entrenched the differentiation of tasks, but divided the work force itself into wage earners and those dependent upon the wages of others. Capitalism did not create domestic labour, or the ‘feminine’ areas of wage labour, but it did create a set of social relations in which the pre-existing divisions were not only reproduced but solidified in different relations in the wage labour system”.

Two concrete explanation can be given to reason out the assumption of the lower value of women’s labour and their cost of reproduction were firstly male workers were more successful in organising themselves, like into crafts union which gave them advantage at the outset of industrialisation and low cost of food consumption among women and children.

Therefore both Marxist and the feminist arguments must taken into account in the analysis of women in society if one have to find solutions. The first is rooted in the social relations of production and the emergence of private property; the second is rooted in the study of how biological inequalities and differences are transformed into their social meanings and institutionalised. Therefore “the first requires a socialist revolution; these second, working on the precondition of developing technology,
requires an overturning of that which has been considered 'natural' since the beginning of time and conscious rediscovery for the individual and for the race of the experience of bisexuality."44.

Role of Patriarchy in the lives of women

Patriarchy in the lives of women play a very crucial role, since it determines not the place of woman in the society but it also involves the root cause for subjugation and her exploitation. Like pointed out by Lerner the "system of patriarchy can function only with the cooperation of women, this is achieved through the variety of means: gender indoctrination, educational deprivation, the denial to women of knowledge of their history, the dividing of women, one from the other, by defining 'respectability' and 'deviance' according to sexual activities; by restraints and outright coercion; by discrimination in access to economic resources and political power; and by awarding class privileges to conforming women"45. The above definition clearly brings out the all encompassing attribute of patriarchy in the lives of women.

For some the relationship between patriarchy and mode of production is problematic because "in that each inscribes a different notion of history, and the two structures can in no way be seen as homologous, nor can either be understood as determining"46. In explaining patriarchy Mitchell said "in our society the kinship system is harnessed into the family- where a woman is formed in such a way that it is there where she will stay. Differences of class, historical epoch, specific social situations alter the expression of femininity; but in relation to the law of the father
women's position is a comparable one. Her definition enlightens a valuable inference that women are conditioned to accept patriarchy.

Engels and patriarchy

Regarding the origin of patriarchy, one of the foremost that gave the explanation was Frederick Engels in 1884 in his book, *Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*. For him the women's subordination began with the development of private property, when accordingly 'the world historical defeat of the female sex' took place. In his view the division of classes and the subordination of women developed historically. He had divided the society into three phases - slavery, barbarism and civilisation.

In the first phase there was no marriage and no private property and basically human beings lived hunting and hunting for food and ancestry ran through mother. In the second phase there was a gradual development in the society where along with hunting and gathering of food, agriculture and animal husbandry had developed. For the first time women remained in home to look after children though they had power to control their gens, which had no division of classes but had conflicts among them. In due course when men learned the art of domesticating animals and developed improvised tools of hunting, they started to enslave animals and women as slaves from other gens. This had led to the emergence of private property. Therefore the mother right, which has existed, was thrown, and in this period both patriarchy and monogamy were established as a norm. As a result the modern civilisation, which came, was based on restricting women to produce heirs to inherit property and women
became completely dependent economically on men. On the whole with the development of State, the monogamous family has changed into the patriarchal family in which the wife's household labour became private service and women excluded in social production which they were participating and had powers of control.

Therefore for Engles the male supremacy is a phenomenon of private property, and for him the abolition of the latter would accordingly entail the disappearance of the former.

According to an argument based on Engles it is claimed that relations between men and women in non-capitalist societies are open to transformation as soon as household production ceases to be confined to use values, and a relation of patriarchal control obtains when the sexual division of labour operates so that the means of subsistence is in the male hands. Whereas in capitalism a separation is set up between the relations of production and the labour processes into two spheres household and industry, and the relation of exchange is displaced from household commodity production to the sale of labour power in exchange for a wage. Therefore the distinction between the production of use values and exchange values is concretised in two separate sets of relations of production, those of the family and those of the factory. The latter comes to be exclusively defined as work, partly because of the exchange value of commodity produced, but specifically in capitalism since the work is performed for a wage. On the other hand since wife is considered to be property of the male in the family the work done by her in the home is appropriated and considered an integral right of the male and therefore domestic labour is unpaid. The marriage then becomes a binding web of subjugation for the female who is control
through it and will remain so and it will be at the heart of both class and sex oppression\textsuperscript{48}.

Therefore for Annette Kuhn patriarchal structures have their operations within history, but not within modes of production: they are over determined in particular modes of production by more immediate characteristic of social formation: in capitalism, for example, the family is the site of the operation of the structures of patriarchy and capital as they have specific conjuncture effectively.

Engel’s and later Marxists had explained women’s subordination only in economic terms and had ignored the sexual aspect. They had argued that the women’s participation in labour force and the abolition of private property would lead to the disappearance of patriarchy.

In consonance with Kuhn view cited above citing the important role of family, where Hartmann also points that “Capitalism has somewhat shifted the locus of control the family nevertheless remains a primary arena where men exercise their patriarchal power over women’s labour”\textsuperscript{49} She argues that the studies have failed to concentrate the sources of conflict within family, which is important, and have viewed family as a unified interest group. But she argues that family as a locus of struggle, and it must be seen as a location where production and redistribution takes place and adds family members have distinct interests arising out of their relations to production and distribution, those same relations also ensure their mutual interdependence.

Moreover she points out that basically Marxism is involves with production of things as such but she points that in the society the division of labour between the
sexes involves primarily in wage labour beyond the household and women primarily within the household due to organisation of society by patriarchy as well as capitalism.

Hartmann has also cited that, over next twenty years there will some conflicts and changes but on the whole patriarchy will not eradicated. To quote "despite at least a century of predictions and assertions that capitalism will triumph over patriarchy-a situation in which all production would take place under capitalist relations and all people would be wage earners on equal terms patriarchy has survived"50.

Finally, a valid observation made by Hartmann which needs mention is her point when she says that men as a group has reduced their work effort when the wives work for wages and the situation has created a ‘double burden’ for the wives who has work both for wages and housework. Here she pins the point, that the beneficiaries of the recent increase in women’s labour are not usurped mainly by their husbands but by the capitalist to create surplus value. Therefore in the end the decentralised home system becomes a causality of gender and class struggle. On the other hand she cautions that this division between the men and women in family, which creates conflict, also creates interdependence as the basis for family unity.

Delphy also argues that since men appropriate the unpaid labour of women through the institution of marriage, the material oppression of women lies in the patriarchal relations of production within the family 51 by this Delphy focus the patriarchy aspect more on the social rather the biological aspect.

The above view of Hartmann, Delphy etc., emphasising the importance of family and analysing patriarchy in the household has to be taken note, since the
present study aims to find the causes that lead to the exploitation of women in the household based labour, where family plays an important role.

**Patriarchy in India**

Exchanging the changes in the patriarchal system in Britain, Slyvia Walby\(^{52}\) enlists out certain features, which seems to be applicable to South Asia as well. She points out that there have been changes in the degree and form of patriarchy in Britain where it has seen a movement from a private to a public form of patriarchy over the last century. Private patriarchy is based upon household production as the main site of women's oppression. Public patriarchy is based principally in public sites such as employment and the State. The household does not cease to be a patriarchal structure in the public form but it is no longer the chief site. In private patriarchy expropriation of women's labour takes place primarily by individual patriarchs. In public patriarchy it is collective. This can also be witnessed in the beedi industry taken for the present study, where being a mere a household industry it has now been heavily commercialised locally and also globally.

Uma Chakravarti\(^{53}\), in an analysis of the structural framework of Indian patriarchy, argues that caste and gender hierarchies were the organising principles of the Brahmanical social order, although they did not always exists in the form in which we see them today.

Moreover she points out that during prehistoric women role in production and reproduction was recognised as important part of society and also during hunting and gathering there was no division of labour. In addition the female as a whole was
worshipped due to their importance of motherhood and procreation, which was considered as the source of female power. Only after this a gradual decline of women in general was seen when the Aryan patriarchy ideology was dominating in places where they settled and conquered the local inhabitants. Uma points out that the first large group, which was enslaved in the early history, was women. This subjugation of women in general continued and was deeply entrenched and reinforced during the Rig Veda times. It is to be noted that the observation made by Uma regarding Indian society, which needed private property, and caste purity to subjugate women at three different levels through three different devices needs mentioning. The first device being ideology women’s chastity and wifely fidelity was considered highest expression of selfhood. The second device is the law and custom, which was outcome of the Brahmanical social code to keep the women under the patriarchal control. The third device being the State itself through which the patriarchal control was established and maintained. It is to be noted that the post-caste-class Brahmanical that defined the female power in wifehood and the post-class society, which located in motherhood even, continues to the present period. This dichotomy or dualism has complicated the situation of women in general in India.

Lastly the following pages will try to place the position of women and specifically girl child in their labour aspect in the Indian context keeping in mind the above theoretical arguments.
Labour development and Women in India

The clarification of the concept of unorganised or informal sector of the workforce in Indian context is vital when we analyse the concept of women's oppression and liberation. This is because the present study of girl child labour is be focussed in the unorganised sector where they are more and their work remains invisible.

Unorganised sector is an term which covers wide range of activities, ranging from those who work in agriculture mainly the peasants, petty commodity producers or manufacturers working in their homes or places which does not come under any laws or legislations, those who are scattered in trade and services etc. Therefore the workers covered under unorganised are difficult to categorise in systematic manner. On the other hand informal sector can be segregated broadly that those who work as self-employed workers in manufacturing, services and trade. But the real problem that comes in categorising the workers of informal sector under one section is denying the dynamics that operate in the form of relation regarding production, distribution and consumption.

Emergence of capitalist domestic industry

The delay in the emergence of the commodity production in India and the separation of industry from agriculture unlike the fifteenth century Britain was due to the self-sufficient village economy, the typical feature of Asiatic societies as pointed out by Marx. Therefore the closed character of the Indian economy began to change only in the sixteenth century and the developments that took place after that was not
conducive to the growth of the artisans and the general workers. The merchants' capital, which made in roads into the economy, was beneficial to few who try to exploit the artisans and producers. The system mainly remained pre-capitalist and the method that was used successfully to exploit was the 'dadni' where the money was advanced to the producers and thereby making them bondage to them.

The study done by Chicherov\textsuperscript{55} has identified three forms of Indian industrial production in the seventeenth and eighteenth century is useful here to understand the economy prevalent at that time. The first was the bondage of the artisans to the merchants who were supplied with raw materials instead of cash advances. By this system the merchants became organisers of production and de facto owners of the workshop. The second was the capitalist simple co-operation where the wage labour was unified in a workshop. The third form of production was the capitalist centralised manufacture, where the enterprises have a division of labour and employing wage labour.

The period after independence saw the growth of Indian economy in the form of central planning, which played a major role in shaping the economy. Due to this industrial policy of 1956, there was equal emphasis on the heavy industrial and the local village and small industries. As a result the growth of unorganised sector, which falls in the village and small industries, was manifold. It is rightly pointed out by, "that it is due to protection granted in the industrial policy of post-independence India that unorganised industries started to revive, passing through all those various forms and stages which had already ceased to exist in England from the middle of last century"\textsuperscript{56}. 
It is to be noted that the Beedi industry in India has one of the peculiar features in terms of its function, since as norm of capitalist development it is always seen that in Britain the workers who were induced into the workshop form of production then moved on to the factory form and later into the manufacture form of production. But in the case of beedi industry the trend of workshop production was prevalent, but due to the strikes of the workers the nature of the industry changed. It moved from workshop and did not shift into factory but in turn reversed into domestic production. This is due to the two reasons present in Indian society; first, the low division of labour and second, abundant supply of cheap labour.

Marx has divided the development of labour process and forms of development into four division namely domestic or household production, workshop production, and factory production and fourthly manufactures production. In relation to this Manjit has tried to place these four processes in the Indian context. The first is the ‘independent artisan’ or ‘small petty-capitalist production’, where the producers work with his or her own tools, and supported by family labour. It is to be noted that these petty-commodity producers sell their fruits of their labour in the market and not the labour power as such. This is due to the fact they have the formal independence and therefore they cannot be categorised either in Marx’s ‘co-operation’ or to classical putting out system. The examples of this are the sandal and coir industry.

The second, is the capitalist domestic industry, which has the same characterisation of British putting out system. Here there is a clear division of labour within the family only. The workers own the manufacturers supply the tools and raw materials. It is to be noted that in this type does not reflect the exact manufacturing
model of Marx's since the manufacturers lack control over the means of production and labour process. The example of this is the beedi, carpet industries.

In the third group of unorganised industry, the raw materials are not advanced to the workers but are given in the workshop were the workers are made top work. Here the workers become pure wageworkers and sell their labour power for wages. This is categorised by Manjit as the 'capitalist modern manufacture'. The example of this is the matchstick, firework and agarbathi industries.

The fourth is the 'decentralised factory system' of production or the modern putting out system, where the use of machinery and labour of few, mostly family members is taken. The division of labour is detailed in this form, and work is assigned to different small units. Here the employer usurps the part of the surplus but the majority is pocketed by the merchant-manufacturer who gives the raw materials. The example of this kind of system is the garment export industry and the cotton hosiery industry.

From the above detailed division given by the Manjit Singh it can be seen how the labour process and development of Indian industry have been progressing after independence. But the main focus here, which is essential for the present study, is regarding the forms of labour process and how women, especially are exploited in the beedi industry as such. From Manjit's categorisation it was clear that he has placed the beedi industry in the capitalist domestic form of unorganised sector. But he has failed to link this form of capitalist exploitation to the global capitalist exploitation. This is because the product of beedi though is manufactured by using the domestic labour of mostly women and girl children in India do not restrict the capital
accumulation of the local capitalist. Since the overall nature of the capitalist labour process is to exploit the labour of the workers, the nature of the beedi industry as a result has changed over the years, where there has developed a link in the capital accumulation of the local and global capitalist in the form of exports and imports of this product.

It is also to be noted that the difference between the capitalist penetration of developing countries affects women and family household quite differently in the developed countries like Canada, where the new international division of labour has created a new female proletariat in the Third World whose cheap labour power is drawn upon while their husbands remain unemployed is applicable in the beedi industry in India.

In addition, to this the exploitation being informal has also strange ways of controlling the labour process, because even though the capitalist as such does not exercise control over the workers directly they control and exploit women and girl children through the system of patriarchy, which later in the forth coming chapters can be seen clearly.

Role of State

Finally the role of State is very important in labour because the policies and plans reflect the exact motive of whether they are serious of gender equality and empowerment. State also plays important roles in empowering or suppressing women through its policies and structure of its operation. State provision and regulation of education plays an important part in structuring the different opportunities open to
men and women, the ideology of women's dependence upon a male bread winner, and in constructing women's 'dual relationship' to the class structure\(^59\). Therefore the issue of girl child labour attains a gargantuan proportion in the Indian society.

Girls who work in unorganised beedi industry without going to school even for attaining primary education reflects the failure of the state regarding it gender sensitive policies. The pending of universal Primary Education Bill in the parliament is a hard reality to digest when the actual Governmental and non-governmental figures show that there is wide gap between boys and girls. In addition although pioneering works of Myron Weiner\(^60\) and Dreze and Sen\(^61\), have given a detailed description of how child labour can be overcome by the introduction of compulsory primary education, the state has failed its duty to learn lesson from the experiences pointed out in some developed and developing countries.

The question of sexuality, and its relation to procreation, is also one of the many areas in which the State plays an important role in gender division. In addition to these there are specific mechanism like the law, judiciary and the penal system by which the state control the women in general. It is to be noted on analysing the British society it was found that the kind of state emerged was closely associated with British capitalism and more generally, with the reproduction of women's dependence\(^62\). In addition it was pointed out that by not interfering in the internal affairs of the home the State can operate through the construction of a family exercises primary, informal control and need not use the method of secondary means of repression and control. But the state sees to that it frequently defines a space, the family, in which its agents will not interfere but in which control is left to the man. Therefore the \textit{relationship}
between the State, the family household and the wage labour system is important to understand the women subordination in the society.

The present study which has taken the labour of the girls in the beedi industry will show how the State by its policies of encouraging home based work has paved way for the subjugation of girls and women into the patriarchal-capitalist framework in society. This also is important to locate the position of girls and their labour as we had tried and found that mere adopting of concepts of wage and domestic work is not enough but to understand the specificities and intricacies of the problem of women and find sincere methods and approaches which can improve and place women and girls in the same pedestal like that of men and boys. Like it is pointed out “The challenge for feminist social theory today is to analyse the localised contexts of women’s everyday existence and the meanings women give to their lives without sight of the structural patterns of dominance and subordination”.

To sum up, the above pages began by the classification and approaches regarding the problem of girl child’s labour particularly in the household setting; secondly, it analysed the concept of labour and his views regarding women and child labour; thirdly, it brought the criticism of Marxism and Feminism and its streams; fourthly, a particular feminist theoretical model i.e., socialist feminism was adopted and discussed in detail whether the problem of women in general can analysed satisfactorily and effectively; fifthly it was seen that after going through the various debates inside the feminist debate like domestic labour debate, dual systems theory etc., it was found although a complete synthesis of Marxism and feminism is difficult, but it pointed the importance of analysing both wage and non-wage work in the
household which is crucial in determining the nature and structure of women’s exploitation through capitalism and patriarchy; sixthly, the concept of patriarchy was analysed and it over riding influence was seen through it various manifestations in the society even before the advent of capitalism and how the capitalist use it to increase their capital accumulation, later in was placed in the Indian context; seventhly, the nature and development of Indian labour was traced and problem of exploitation and subjugation was situated in the nature of the household industry, which being the main site for oppression taken for our study; finally the faulty policies and attitude of the Indian State was situated especially in the context of girl child labour and their education, since it continues to perpetuate girls entry into labour market without attaining education, thereby resulting in their continuance of their exploitation. By using the above theoretical framework, will help to understand the problem of girl child labour and primary education in a more deeper gender perspective in the beedi production industries in Tamil Nadu where many have failed to taken a holistic view of the problems mentioned above.
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