Chapter III

MARXIST FEMINISM IN THE CONTEXT OF MARXIST THEORY

In this chapter, I shall present the Marxist feminist theory and its history and examine the different trends within this theory in the broader context of the Marxist framework. The focus will be to understand the roots and limitations of Marxist feminism. In the concluding part of this chapter I shall raise questions which I believe expose the blindspots in Marxist feminism.

1. The Traditional Marxist Theory on Women's Question

1.1 The History and Exposition

The Marxist theory has been used as a guiding principle for women's liberation since the later part of the nineteenth century. The credit of developing Marxist theory on women's question go to August Bebel (1879) and Fredrique Engels (1884). Marx's formulation about the development of productive forces leading towards freedom from necessity had inspired August Bebel in Germany (1879) to write a book entitled, "Women and Socialism". In this treatise Bebel linked the development of kitchen equipment and the setting up of canteens at the workplace, with women getting rid of unpleasant and time consuming work, which tied them down to the 'necessity' i.e. 'reproduction'. Socialism, he thought would help to unleash the forces of production in this most private area, creating the possibility for women to be free, to participate in public life. He argued very vehemently that all social dependence and oppression was rooted in economic dependence or lack of independent property rights. Also, in his sweeping
history of the emergence of patriarchy, he dwelt upon the role of force and violence, established through arbitrary laws and cultural and religious norms. He argued that improvements in women's position would result in a decline of fertility. He also came out in defence of women's capacities and advanced the socialist feminist tradition inaugurated by William Thompson and Anna Wheeler. (Nancy Folbre 1993, p.106)

1.2 Engels's Two Theses:

Engels's feminist theory can be summarized in two basic theses.

i) Women's subjugation related to private property and state

ii) Women's emancipation related to participation in public production and development of productive forces

Engels's book 'The Origin of Family, Private Property and the State', written in 1884, was the first systematic attempt to analyse women's subjugation in a comprehensive manner and to look for its 'determinants' in history and linkages to the material causal factors. On the whole, Engels has influenced many feminist theoreticians, attempting to construct the theory of origin of women's subjugation.

Engels was heavily influenced by the work of the American evolutionary anthropologist, Lewis Morgan. At present, ethnographically, many of Engels's explanations are found untenable because of some wrong premises and also because many more new anthropological facts have come to light. Also, many old facts are interpreted newly, because of epistemological breakthrough in biology, in primatology etc.
Engels has expounded two main propositions. Firstly, he links women's subjugation to the monogamous system of marriage which he asserts, following the anthropologist Lewis Morgan, emerged and consolidated itself along with the private property and with the state which was required to protect and perpetuate the division of society into classes based on private property. Secondly, he states that for determining the relations between the sexes, division of labour in which women did reproduction work and men produce, was important. This division he argues, originally emerged as a biological, natural division of labour, giving women edge over men, in a situation in which reproduction was a major activity. Later it got reconstructed into a social hierarchy. Men became powerful on the basis of the invention and control over the 'productive forces' (technology), a control which allowed them to create some surplus wealth, and reduced women to servitude. As this happened, women became slaves of men's lust and mere instruments for the production of children. Engels pointed out that unless the sexual division of labour changes and women join men in public production, they cannot be liberated.

It is significant that Engels links the institution of private property, family and the state. The implication there of is that in Engels's view the state would protect the ownership rights of men through inheritance laws, and it could manipulate the laws to give preference to men in matters of property and incomes. Engels does not consider the state to be a neutral agency. According to him it serves class interest and patriarchal interests and with the help of control over
arms it maintains the power on behalf of a collective of propertied men. The state does not help the individual capitalists, but it protects capital and its interest in perpetuating surplus accumulation.

It is important to remember this ultimate essence of the state when under the name of development the state is trying to give space to women through many progressive laws and programmes and thus appearing to be benevolent. It is necessary to recognise that the state keeps on changing its strategy, in order to function in a basically patriarchal form, and in accordance with the needs of the capita. Capitalists, majority of whom are men, can after all accumulates greater wealth, by giving more space to women. In the last few decades, through the technological development and expansion of transportation, capital has become mobile and can operate everywhere in the World. This mobility plus the general development of productive forces enables capital to exploit and manipulate women in every foreign country, in every foreign society taking into account the traditions, cultural practices and values of those societies. In this process, the status of women changes, the form of family changes, but new vulnerabilities are added. Hence these changes cannot necessarily be interpreted as progressive, in an evolutionary sense.

Marxist feminists are aware of these subtleties and can see that technology under the dominance of market forces does not necessarily bring benefit and relief to women within market economy. But they consider this as a necessary evil in the
transition phase, before collective control is established over capital. They believe firmly that in the long run, that there is a close link between women's emancipation and development of productive forces.

The major contribution of the gender school is their assertion that it is not only the ownership of the means of production that matters but also the hierarchical way that work takes place, because that reflects preference for men. They assert that all positions are "gendered". For instance clerks are women and the bosses are men; programmers are men and the computer operators are women. In present day capitalism simply participation in production process is not enough. One has to ask at what positions women are working, and how much decision making power do they have.

There have been disputes over what too place first: the emergence of private property or defeat of women by men collectively as a 'class', and over how this defeat was related to the emergence of the state. Levi Strauss has analysed the process of reification of woman as an object of exchange of gift, which, he claims was the beginning of kinship societies where the key factors were the incest taboo and need to make alliances. He however, does not say at what stage and through what material causality, the reification occured.

Engels has traced history and periodized the institution of the private property, the family and the state just to prove that subjugation of womanhood was a social construction. For him the determining elements such as the emergence of surplus resulted from the development of productive forces (improved
technology). However, it is interesting to note that while he raised the question of 'when' i.e. the question at what stage in history women were subjugated and how this subjugation was operationalised in material terms of hierarchically ordered sexual division of labour, but he never raised the question 'why' women got subjugated by men nor the question why men did not get subjugated. He assumed conveniently that men invented the new tools which enabled the production of more wealth and accumulation of surplus, and this surplus became a source of power to control women. But several questions need to be raised here. Was a creation of surplus over and above the need to cover the risk periods a collective decision or was it coerced? By whom? And what were the means of coercion? Surprisingly, no Marxist feminist theoreticians but the Subsistenc Approach trio have asked this question. Mies has concluded based on data available, that men mainly invented tools of coercion, since they carried out big hunts. (to be discussed in the subsequent chapter in details.) Women also invented several technologies such as basket making, potter's wheel and weaving etc. which produced more wealth for the tribe than what men could produce through their hunts. She concluded that men's technologies allowed them to overpower, control and make others, both men and women, produce 'surplus' for them, which later could be turned into a source of power.

To understand the second point, i.e. the cruciality of the division of labour for determining the relations between man and woman, we need another quotation which many Marxists
mechanically isolated and used as a guiding principle to act for women's emancipation. In fact the present support given to the development fervour by Marxist activists the world over can be explained easily if we read this quotation. Engels wrote:

"The 'savage' warrior and hunter had been content to take the second place in the house, after the woman; the 'gentler shepherd, in the arrogance of his wealth, pushed himself forward into the first place and women down into the second. And she could not complain. The division of labour within the family had regulated the division of property between man and woman. That division of labour had remained the same; and yet now it turned the previous domestic relation upside down, simply because the division of labour outside the family has changed. The same cause which has ensured to women her previous supremacy in the house......that her activity was confined to domestic labour....this same cause now ensured the man's supremacy in the house. The domestic labour of the woman no longer counted besides the acquisition of necessities of life by man; the latter was everything, the former an unimportant extra. We can already see from this that to emancipate woman and make her the equal of man is and remains an impossibility so long as the woman is shut out from social productive labour and restricted to private domestic labour. The emancipation of woman will only be possible when woman can take part in production in a large social scale, and domestic work no longer claims anythin but insignificant amount of her time. And only now has that become possible through modern large scale industry, which does not merely permit employment of female labour over a wide range, but positively demands it, while it also tends towards ending private domestic labour by changing it more and more into a public industry." (Engels (1884), 1977, p.10)

There are many epistemological flaws in these argument and I shall deal with some of them in the next chapter, along with the Subsistence Approach, because Maria Mies, one of the founders has pinpointed them. The other ones have been pointed out by many other Marxist feminist theoretical attempts, which I am going to examine here.

The stress on the causal realtionship between development of productive forces and the possibility of eliminating of domes-
tic work, which is a drudgery, is apparent in above quotation. The point Marxists make is that domination of man over woman will be eliminated finally and only after the rule of private property has been overcome, i.e. in socialism. But meanwhile, the division of labour can be altered by women if they participate in 'socially necessary labour', i.e gaining economic independence, which would be facilitated by reduction in domestic work. There is a some truth in this position. In a transition phase toward socialism, women do get some space because of economic independence. But it does not alter the basic division of labour and in fact women simply carry a double burden. There is very little awareness about the manipulative powers of patriarchy and capital, both operating as a part of the industrial mode of production. The mechanistic way of isolating a statement, abstracting from the total reality and holding this one statement as the illuminating light for the path towards emancipation has made Marxism and the practice of Marxist parties vulnerable to severe criticism from feminists.

The trivialization of women's domestic work as just unimportant 'extra', because the earning the necessitives is done by men, really reveals the arrogance of the belief in power of productive forces and the total ignorance of the process of human nurturance and need for socialisation.

Marxist parties remain stuck up in another abstract idea that women's emancipation requires capturing state power and abolition of private property, and they thus forget
to analyse the operationalization of the husband's power over his wife in day-to-day life. Subjugation of women is equated only with a certain type of work and exclusion from 'socially necessary labour'. Their subjugation within the family, in the private sphere is rarely analysed.

The term 'socially necessary labour' is frequently used and no analysis has been made to why man's work alone appears as 'socially necessary labour' and why women's domestic work remains invisible.

Thus although Engels's explanation was a good beginning for women, it also sent them on the wrong track looking for emancipation and freedom from domestic labour, to be achieved through the industrial mode of production. Also, it understood emancipation very simply, i.e. to be like men, who participate in socially necessary labour. There has been a general criticism of the Marxist concept 'free individual', a 'wage labourer who has nothing to lose but his chains' in the industrial mode of production. The experience of 'Already Existing Socialist' countries has proved that this free individual or wage labourer does not become the socialist man Marx had visualised as the product of his scientific revolution. Against this background to emulate such a man for equality does not seem to be worthwhile for women.

2.1 Critique of Engels's Position on the Women's Question: Two Trends

2.1.1 First trend: Marxist/Socialist Feminist

Marxism came under attack by feminists when the women's movement began in the late sixties. Latter originated in the
disillusionment with the left movement and the students move-
ment in the West. The male activists of these movements were
propagating the ideals of equality and justice in the world,
supporting the struggle of the Vietnamese against America, but
at the same time they were treating their women comrades as if
they were subordiantes.

The first phase of feminism in the early twentieth century
was seen by the Marxist feminists as a continuation of the
bourgeois revolution which promised equality to all and omit-
ted the women when it came to conferring them the rights of
franchise. They felt that the second phase in the early six-
tees continued with the same assumptions and drew its legiti-
macy from the fact that there is a discrepancy between the
potential for human emancipation inherent in modern democratic
societies and its factual non-realisation. Education and
cultural revolution were the most important elements in the
strategy of second phase, tacitly supporting the economic
growth model of their governments. This feminism was termed as
liberal feminism by the Marxist feminists. They unlike their
sisters were critical of the economic and political policies
of their governments in the West, and they were also becoming
critical of their male comrades. They became aware of sexism
in society.

Marxist feminists mostly concentrated on analysing the blind
spots in Marxist theory, and in that process, they also de-
veloped a theory of patriarchy based on the connection between
relations of reproduction and relations of production. The
criticism of the blind spots of Marxism really started with the movement called 'wages for housework' initiated by Mariarosa Dalla Costa, an Italian academic, and member of 'Lotta Feminista', who worked with the trade unions. Later she was joined by Selma James in London.

The main thrust of their argument was the questioning of the Marxist premise that because women as housewives remain outside the realm of the 'socially organised productive cycle' they are to be considered outside of social productivity. In the Marxist analysis of capitalism productive activity is defined as 'contribution of labour to the surplus value in the process of accumulation of capital', women's labour is seen as 'non-productive'. Against this Marxist premise, the two authors of the pamphlet 'The power of Women and the Subversion of the Community' opined that housework is the most necessary part of the capitalist economy because it contributes to the regeneration of labour power, which is used as a commodity by capital. They criticised the left parties and trade unions of ignoring the organising of housewives and they maintained that the latter thus contributed to the perpetuation of women's subordination. Their argument clearly states the centrality of struggle at the site of the family.

"If we fail to grasp completely that precisely this family is the pillar of the capitalist organisation of work, if we make the mistake of regarding it only as a superstructure, dependent for changes only on the struggle in factories, then we will be moving in a limping evolution that will always perpetuate and aggravate a basic contradiction in the class struggle and a contradiction which is so functional to capitalist development." (Costa and James, 1975, p.35)

On the basis of this centrality of the family as an institu-
tion of capitalist development, they suggested that women's struggles should begin within the activities of the family and housewives should demand 'wages for domestic work' as work producing labour power, so that their work is acknowledged.

The crux of the issue was how to understand this 'relations of reproduction' and how to show its links with capital. Also, a very important question was how to make women fight against capitalism, not just to complement their husband's trade union struggles but directly in their own right, based on their experience of capitalism (unpaid domestic work). The term patriarchy had already been popularised by the movement. It reflected several types of oppression within the family, special sexual oppression at the work place, division of labour leading to a double burden etc. But yet, the integration of these experiences in the Marxist theory of society was necessary in order to establish the seriousness of women's experiences. The material link between class and patriarchy was required.

Early feminists described patriarchy as asserted the all pervasiveness of these experiences. Juliet Mitchel was one of them whose article, "The Longest Revolution", in New Left Review (Dec.1966) paved the way for the Marxist Feminists to be accepted in the theoretical journal of the Left. Zilla Eisenstein (1979), Heidi Hartman (1981), and Michele Barrett (1982) can be described in this category. "Women's Oppression Today", a book by Michele Barrett deals extensively with the way patriarchal ideology pervades all social institutions today.
Women anthropologists like Eleanor Leacock, Karen Sack, and Gale Ruben started taking a keen interest in studying women's work and the changing status of women in the division of labour influenced by the penetration of market economy in pre-capitalist societies. These studies contributed to analysing how capital takes advantage of patriarchy which gets reconstituted in emerging new class formations, and supports capital accumulation.

2.1.1 Marxist Feminist Theory Building:

2.1.2 Patriarchal Relations Are Influenced by Class Relations

The writings of Mcdonough and Harrisons (1978) are an excellent representation of Marxist feminist attempt to reinterpret Marxism to include women's work of reproduction as a part of the production system. The authors find in the "German Ideology" that Marx was aware of three moments of human's production activity: i) production of means to satisfy basic human needs, ii) production of new needs (including need for new tools) iii) the third circumstance, which from the outset enters into historical development, is that men who daily remake their own life, begin to make other men, to propagate their own kind; i.e. the relations between men and women, parents and children, the family. The authors criticise Marx for having lost his earlier orientation and sliding into sexist interpretations in later writings.

They formulate a dualistic and lateral division between production and reproduction as two moments of the human production process. Relations of production are called class relations which are antagonistic. Relations of human reproduc-
tion, according to them, are analytically posited after the relations of production, so that they are subjected to the latter's influence. They conclude that though women are simultaneously placed in two separate (but linked) structures, those of class and patriarchy--it is their class position which determines the conditions of the forms of patriarchy that they are be subjected to.

They analyse the link between patriarchy and capital. According to them to situate social relations of human reproduction in the context of the relations of production means to understand the perpetuation of these structures in both, bourgeois and proletarian family. These structures are primarily determined by the need to control women's procreative capacity and her sexuality in order to ensure the birth of the heirs on the one hand, and the efficient reproduction of the next generation of labour power on the other. The dual notion of patriarchy, first as the control of women's fertility and sexuality in monogamous marriage; and second, the economic subordination of women through the sexual division of labour and male biased property rights ensures that the procreative functions are not subsumed under the sexual division of labour. It is clear from this analysis that the two authors do not accord the same status to patriarchy as it accords to the category class contradiction which they consider as a primary contradiction of the mode of production. The significance of their analysis lies in the fact that, they recognise patriarchy as a necessary element in the capitalist mode of produc-
tion. However, the authors do not answer the question posed by Costa and James, viz whether work under the relations of reproduction contributes to the generation and accumulation of surplus value or not. None of the Marxist feminists is willing to accept that patriarchal control over women ensures a special kind of 'expropriation' of surplus value generated by women. That is why, for Marxist feminists, patriarchy remains only an ideological force to fight against. According to the gender school, it gets translated into material terms in as much as all the institutions are genderised. That is an improvement.

2.1.3 Confirming Engels's Thesis: Women's Emancipation Related to Development of Productive forces

Claude Meillassoux (1981), whose anthropological work on lineage societies has been influential, developed his exposition of patriarchy which confirms Engels's thesis, that development of productive forces will create conditions for patriarchy to wither away. All modes of production depend upon mode of human reproduction and hence those who control production try to control human reproduction. He has taken the example of 'domestic agricultural community' not producing for the market. He describes in a somewhat structuralist-functionalist way how in this community, where agricultural produce is stored for staggered consumption and for the risk periods, the relations of production give rise to a hierarchal structure based on 'age', i.e. elders appropriate the power of management in the production cycle. For the maintenance of this productive unit, a demographic balance needs to be arrived at.
The elders who control subsistence also try to control reproduction by controlling women, by incorporating wife's children in the husband's group, i.e. institutionalising male filiation. In his schema, in the final analysis, reproduction is subordinate to the constraints of production which remain the determinant.

Meillassoux's theory is built upon Levi Strauss's concept of reification of women, which he sees as the basis for 'peaceful circulation of women replacing both peaceful circulation of men and violent circulation of women.' His thesis is that in agricultural societies where women are wanted for their reproductive capacities, they are reified. Since they are valuable for exchange transaction in terms of friendship and alliances, they are guarded/protected and are therefore, dominated by the men of their community. Meillasoux argues that women are subject to two kinds of exploitation i) exploitation of their labour in that they lose claim to their produce, which is handed over to their husbands, who take control of it or pass it on to the elders and ii) exploitation of their reproductive capacities, since filiation is always established through men. Thus women are always seen as a part of social reproduction, and their exploitation becomes a part of the relations of reproduction. Meillassoux does not talk of patriarchy, but his analysis provides a theory of patriarchy, which is different from the mechanistic theory promoted by orthodox Marxism, where division of labour is perceived as the sole basis of subjugation. He has however not said how subordination was
achieved and why women could be subordinated and not men.

Meillassoux has been criticised by many feminist writers such as Maurine Mckintosh(1977), Maxine Molyneux(1977), Peter Aaby (1977), and Kate Young (1977). His view that relations of reproduction are determined by the development of forces of production, is found reductionist by Maurine Mackintosh and Peter Aaby. His stress on the need for control of social-biological reproduction in horticulture and agricultural societies, assumes that without reification of women these kinds of production would not continue. His critics say that this has been proved wrong by different ethnographers.

Many feminist writers attack the androcentrism of male anthropologists, who either fetishize reproductive activity or start from the stage of reification, but do not attempt to give explanation of how reification occured. Also, there is a tendency to identify reproduction of human beings with societal reproduction and hence they place women automatically in the sphere of reproduction which makes them invisible.

Felicity Edhlm, Olivia Harris and Kate Young (1977) have distinguished three spheres of reproductions; i) Social reproduction, ii) reproduction of the labour force, iii) human or biological reproduction. Any theory of production has to take account of and intertwine these three moments of reproduction, they insist. However, it appears that none of the efforts answered the question raised by Maria Dalla Costa, namely, whether doemstic labour contributes to the surplus accumulation process or not.
2.1.4 Need for a Theory of Society: From the Feminist Stand Point

Another effort to make Marxism more inclusive of differences in the activities of men and women, which form the basis of their identities, has been made by Nancy Hartsock (1989, p.283-310). She insists that any theory based on the male standpoint (male wage labour) would remain partial because it would not take into account the experiences of women's production activity, which is more strongly based on the unity and connectedness of humans and nature. She has used the psychoanalytic theory of 'object relations' to explain 'male ego, competition and death wish' as opposed to women's experience of connectedness and continuity to other persons and the nature. From this she draws the conclusion that unless men try to substitute death for life, e.g. participate in the activity of child rearing they will not be able to construct a theory of the whole. According to her, the female experience not only inverts that of the male, but also forms a basis on which one can expose abstract masculinity as both partial and fundamentally perverse.

She insists on using the term 'sexual division of labour' rather than 'gender division of labour'. She thinks that, the term 'sex' keeps us aware of our bodily aspects of human existence rather than allowing it to evaporated (Hartsock, 1989, p.299). This point of hers is a significant contribution in the debate on whether to use the term 'sex' or 'gender'. The gender school believes that woman's identity is entirely
constructed and does not want to recognise the importance of any difference in the bodily experiences, or in any activities due to reproduction work in the process of identity formation. Ecofeminists generally stress the biological aspect of sex as a basis for the difference in consciousness and also, for the colonising treatment received by women from the dominant male sex. It is also significant that Hartsock argues for a theory of society from the feminist stand point, which she believes would be more inclusive, than the Marxist theory.

Unfortunately, however, in the end she is hoping for a socialist revolution leading towards propertyless individual, and a society, 'where generalisation of the potentiality made available by the activity of women' can take place. She has not explained what she means by socialist revolution, and how she perceives this generalization taking place within the industrial mode of production. Attempts of this kind remain fragmented, partial and unsatisfactory, although they do add to our knowledge of formation of male and female individual identities in the industrial societies.

2.1.5 Engels's Thesis Rebuted: Development of Productive Forces Brought Domestication

The most important critique of the Marxist blind spot in regard to women's separate sphere of production, has been offered by Frederique Appfel Margalin. She claims that the 'reconstitution of division of labour on the basis of increase in productive forces' was really speeding the process of further domestication of women, which occurred at the beginning
of industrialisation. It deprived her of traditional knowledge of many production processes, and knowledge of her bodily processes. It made her passive and docile and finally she was called a 'housewife' dependent on man. (Maria Mies has also developed independently an understanding of this historic process, which I am going to elaborate in the next chapter.)

Margalin has quoted Emily Martin's study of medical metaphors at play in birth, where the latter is able to show that in this sphere processes were at work which were comparable to the time and motion studies of Taylorism. Delivery was an organic process, which had to be learnt by every woman who was active in the process delivering a child. A midwife handled and facilitated the process; there used to be a simbiotic link between the two, they had commonality of experience. But medical science has codified the relevant knowledge in quantitative terms to transmit to the obstetrician who since then has been controlling and managing the process of deliveries. Medical terminology perceives that it is the uterus which labours, not the pregnant woman. (Margalin, 1991, p.19)

Margalin examines also the impact of separation of place of work from place of residence. The domestic sphere was strongly feminised, the realm of the care of the body, and emotions was separated from the realm of reason, efficiency, achievement, and market relations. She feels that the 19th century saw a 'positive explosion in the ideology of domesticity as the 'natural' calling of women, and corresponding masculinisation of rationality.' (Ibid., p.21) Barbara Ehrenrich has also illustrated how domestication and deskilling of women were
taking place in America, during the early period of industrialisation, and factory manufacturing. The ideology of domestic science was promoted in the same period. (1979)

2.2 The Second Trend: Radical/Cultural Feminism

The second attack came from radical/cultural feminists with the position, that the left ideology has totally neglected the dimension of everyday violence against women. These feminists were also opposed to capitalism, but according to them since patriarchal violence played a crucial role in perpetuating capitalism, it was necessary to resist violence of men in all the institutions of society. They were also materialist in their conception of oppression, but the first site of oppression according to them was the body. They saw sexual control of men over women as a greater manifestation of oppression, rather than sexual division of labour. Hence their struggle concentrated on helping battered women, raped women and oppose pornography and later patriarchal representation of women.

The important contribution of this position was that they highlighted the domination of men over the reproductive processes in their true sense, not only, over domestic labour, but also over bodily reproduction, fertility and sexuality—all having bearing on women's identity. They brought forward the argument that compulsory heterosexuality was a part of patriarchal sexual control.

In sum, they highlighted the differences rather than essential unity between sexes, emphasised by the Marxist feminists for whom women's subordination was only a social construction.
The strategies for emancipation emanating from this position vary widely. For instance, some feminists hope for technological fixes that would liberate women from the problem of having to produce children which restricts women's mobility and ties them down to the 'necessity'. Another school proposes no benefits to be availed from heterosexual relationship. Women have to lead completely independent life. They advocate lesbian relationships.

This trend is generally known as radical/cultural feminism. Some of the more famous authors who contributed to this trend can be traced from Simon de Beauvoir (Her famous book, "Second Sex", was published in 1956), Kate Millet (1970), Shulamith Firestone (1970), and Christian Delphy (1980).

Radical/cultural feminism developed into many sub-trends after 1980. Ynestra King analyses the different dilemmas and issues which differentiate the diverse feminist paths, including ecofeminism. (King, 1990, p. 106-121) According to her radical feminists who believe in biologically caused domination of men over women, consider nature as the central category of analysis. They believe that subordination of women in society is the root of human oppression, is closely related to their being associated with nature. However there are two different positions within this sub-trend: the one believes that the woman/nature connection is potentially emancipatory, other one believes that it provides a rational for the continued subordination of women. The first position is called radical cultural feminism and the second is called the radical rationalist feminism. Simone De Beauvoir can be called the
mother of second position. After forty years of the publication of her book "second Sex", she reiterated her position, that "It is a sexist ploy to define women as beings who are closer to nature than men. She claimed that such associations divert women from their struggle for emancipation and channel their energies into subsidiary concerns' such as ecology and peace." (Beauvoir cited by King 1990 p. 111) This position celebrates the fact that women have finally begun to gain access to male bastions by using the political tools of liberalism and the rationalisation of human life, mythically severing the woman/nature connection as the humanity/nature connection has been severed.

Radical cultural feminists celebrate the life experience of what King calls the "female ghetto". They do not want to obliterate the difference between men and women. They take women's side, which they see as the side of non-human nature. They have attempted to articulate and even create a separate women's culture, through music and art. The feminist spiritualist movement is also a part of the same trend. It can be called a deeply woman identified movement.

Marxist feminists have been criticised by these two trends that they remain in the realm of 'productivity' and apart for domination between persons, never address the two other forms of domination; the domination of man over non-human nature, nor the domination of inner nature.

3. The Marxist Theory

We have noted that compared to the liberal theory of Women
and Development, Marxist Feminism has made a deeper analysis of the production system and has shown that the cause of subordination of women's labour is caused by patriarchy and genderisation of institutions. However, many short term solutions which are derived from this analysis are similar to those of the WID discourse, such as more economic growth and economic participation of women and ideological struggle against patriarchy within the institutions. Also, no explanation has been offered for the special impact of environmental degradation on women's labour. The trend of radical cultural feminism which branched into ecofeminism has analysed the closeness of women to nature and we shall have to examine the argument in detail in the next chapter, because it goes beyond the Marxist theory. To understand the limitations of Marxist feminism, we need to understand first Marxist theory and its basic premises so far as they relates to our concern of women's labour in the context of environmental degradation.

The Basic Premises of the Marxist Theory

According to the Marxist theory, analysis of the development of a society must begin with the process of production, which has two main aspects: the forces of production and relations of production. In Marxian political economy the forces of production are generally assumed to be the sum of raw materials, tools, machines sciences and technology etc. plus the human beings themselves with their knowledge and experience. The relations of production are the relations between human beings in the process of production, in exchange and distribution. The forces of production and the relations of production
together form the mode of production. This mode of production constitutes the economic structure, and this according to Marx is the determining factor. He uses it as his point of departure in the analysis of historical development.

The forces of production are developed and renewed continuously along with human knowledge of nature. However, a given level of productive forces requires appropriate relations of production, i.e. appropriate social relations which govern the use of productive forces. This implies that the social relations must be changed and adjusted to the level of the forces of production. The relationship between the two is conceived as dialectical and hence, the social relations too are seen as affecting the level of productive forces.

Surplus accumulation has been the function of class society based on the concept of private property, and class struggle has played a decisive role in the history of structural changes in society. When the production relations fetter the development of productive forces, social revolution takes place, through class struggle. Then new social relations emerge and the old mode of production is replaced by the new "higher" mode of production.

In order to provide a reasonable explanation of historical development by means of historical materialism, it is essential to analyse the social superstructure and how it affects development. It contains such factors as ideology, religion, state, politics, laws etc. In the final analysis its character is determined by the requirements of the economic base.
Feudalism gave way to capitalism which surpassed any earlier social formation many times over, in the matter of surplus accumulation and unleashed the unprecedented development of forces of production. It created the preconditions for socialism. Socialism is a transition phase to communism, the highest level of development of human society where the contradictions between nature and man, between man and man i.e. classes is over, and the opportunities are created for the realization of the potentials for every human being.

**Capitalism: Inevitable Stage in the Development of Human Society**

Marx thought that all countries of the world need to go through these stages of development. Colonialism was considered as an unavoidable brute force to usher primitive societies into the era of industrialism. These sleeping countries were not capable of starting the development process themselves. Marx has written in "Capital", in an euphemistic way, "The industrially more developed country shows the less developed one merely an image of its own future." Although Marx had analysed colonialism as a process of primitive capital accumulation, he had not given enough thought to its consequences for the colonised country.

Further ideas on the development of capitalism in less developed countries were developed by Lenin in the context of Russia. He found capitalism to be both politically necessary and economically possible, and showed by means of concrete studies that it was, in fact, developing in Russia. Actually, capitalist development in Russia was for the first time seen
not only as a process in which pre-capitalist structures were destroyed and replaced by something new, but also as a more complex process in which external and internal forces interacted. Lenin believed that once colonised countries became independent, progress of capitalism would be unhindered.

The Marxist Theory: a Part of the Modernization Paradigm

Marx's critique of capitalism is the capstone of his theoretical work. He explored the basic 'laws of motion' of capitalism, the dynamics of production, the source of surplus value, the character of class conflict and the contradiction and crises of capitalism. Marx's exposition of all the things contributes more insights to the understanding of modernization process, and his analysis also shares some of its weaknesses, because both of them have their roots in the period of 'Enlightenment' and the epistemology which emerged then. The commonality of both theories is that they have faith in industrialization and material growth as the right path of development of humanity. I shall assess the Marxist theory to understand the structure of production in terms of the four elements, which I have used earlier: i) economic growth ii) restructuring of institutions iii) nation-state iv) philosophical and epistemological underpinnings.

3.1 Economic Growth: Equated with Development of Productive Forces

For Marx economic growth means development of the productive forces: technology, human knowledge, skills and scientific attitude. Analytically, Marx has placed much emphasis on
development of the productive forces. They are the material base of human existence and changes in them affect all the institutions of society, economic, social, political, knowledge systems etc. The Industrialisation process begins with the capitalist mode of production, which has a tremendous potential for developing the productive forces. But it also produces cyclical crisis of overproduction, because of its greed to acquire more and more surplus value, which it satisfies by revolutionising technology and continuously reducing the number of workers and thus causing loss of demand for the goods produced. Overproduction wastes a country's productive forces, which lie idle, economic growth gets hampered. Eventually it causes a deep crisis of capitalism and social revolution becomes necessary. By means of collective ownership of the means of production (Marx does not mention state ownership) the producers/workers will be able to plan production, distribution, and economic growth more efficiently. They will have stakes in revolutionising machinery, so that everybody's 'socially necessary labour time' will be reduced. Thus according to Marx, equality in access to resources has a potential for better and meaningful management of productive forces and natural resources. Complete equality will be realised only at the stage of communism, when automation will have reached such a level that abundant supply of goods would be available for all to share. But in the transition period, i.e. in socialism, collective ownership would be established, the influence of market institution would be reduced, and thus hindrances to development of the productive forces would be
removed. So Marx never believed in the 'trickle down' theory of neoclassical growth economics.

Wallerstein has summed up the contradiction of capitalism which Marx had analysed, in a beautiful way.

"whereas in the short run the maximisation of profit requires maximising the withdrawal of surplus from immediate consumption of the majority, in the long run the continued production of surplus requires a mass demand which can only be created by redistributing the surplus withdrawn. Since these two considerations move in opposite directions (a "contradiction"), the system has constant crises which in the long run both weaken it and make the game for those with privilege less worth playing." (Wallerstein, 1982, p.50)

The imperative of equality for the development of humankind is the reason why feminists accept Marxism. They believe that the terms of equality can be stretched further to include women, as a part of the development process.

3.1.1 Market Institutions: Boost to Economic Growth

One of the important features of the capitalist economic growth process analysed by Marx is the dominance of market institutions. In fact in capitalism 'production is mainly for sale', for the market. In the earlier modes of production also there was barter or exchange, but the whole life was not governed by the exchange economy. As Polanyi (1944) expresses it, under industrial capitalism, human society became an accessory of the economic system. The impact of the market system on human life was all pervasive. One of the most important features of industrial capitalism is that not only the products are for sale but also the elements of production, such as land and labour which are not really produced for sale but are part of nature. Thus human labour is commodified as 'labour power'
and measured in terms of hours, its price is paid in wages. Labour becomes a factor of production, and is called wage labour. Wage labour becoming a commodity has a significant impact on the organisation of human society and human psyche, which could not be grasped until the effects got accumulated.

3.1.2 Labour Power Becoming a Commodity: Basis for Free Individual

Marx has also stressed the importance of 'labour power' becoming a commodity, which makes it possible to accumulate surplus on a large scale, required for the process of industrialisation and development of mankind. Wage labour, as opposed to the labour of the serf/peasant or the craftsman in the guild, was the basis for the emergence of individualism. In this process, the labourer could be divided up - as a person in private life and as a supplier of labourtime that could be hired for production in public. As an individual he could have freedom to sell his labour power as a commodity in the market. At the same time, when the demand for labour power was less, he could be fired, or kept unemployed. Thus there was a flexibility in the use of labour power, which was necessary for revolutionising of technology. Capital was not responsible for the entire life of the labourer and his family but only for the reproduction of the labour power expended in the process of factory production.

Although Marx was aware of the negative side of labour power becoming a commodity alienation etc, he emphasised also its positive side of possibility of forming an association of
free individuals, i.e. unionising in the first place and then after revolution, implementing redistributive justice. Wage labour was the anti-thesis of private ownership of means of production. In his materialistic schema he laid great stress on wage labour, so much so that for him other forms of labour, including that of women's labour in domestic work and reproduction as a whole became pre-capitalist, merely residual, making no contribution to the surplus realization of value. He visualised in economic growth within capitalism the means to develop the productive forces and also turn people into wage labourers.

3.1.3 Invisibility of Women's Labour

Marx distinguishes between products which have only use-value and the ones which have exchange-value based on the characteristic that it is sold in the market at a price. For capitalism, things exist as long as they have a price, which can be compared and aggregated to measure growth. Feminists use this analysis to expose the blind spot in Marxism, namely that Marx got so much carried away by the phenomenon of exchange value that he never bothered to know how the commodity 'labour power' is produced, which appears as a commodity with exchange value in the market. Marxist feminists pointed out this blind spot in this theory. Particularly, they tried to grasp the phenomenon of reproductive labour of a housewife, which was a typical form of labour in the First World in the 1960s. The slogan for 'wages for housework' and the question whether housework contributes to the generation of surplus value or not were raised against this background. The question
was important, since women found themselves made invisible in a theory which was claiming to be a comprehensive theory of society. Also, their demand for wages for house work required stronger theoretical arguments. No satisfactory answer to the question was offered as we have seen earlier, because all the writers were trying to remain within this Marxist schema. The right answer has been given according to me by the 'Subsistence Approach', which I will discuss later.

Because they want to remain within the Marxist schema Marxist feminists never question the assumption that economic growth leads towards development of the productive forces, and thus towards emancipation, after the collective control is established. They support this assumption in the hope that they too will benefit in the process, as Bebel had hoped.

3.2 Nature of Institutions

Marx was aware of the changes taking place in the superstructure, i.e. in the area of family, religion, state etc. Here the underlying value systems as well as institutional forms were changing. However, he appreciated the changes, because he believed that they would offer more freedom to individuals, although he also knew that full realisation would not become possible within capitalist production system, where the majority of the people would be deprived of possibility of developing their potentials. Marx has talked of various forms of alienation of human being because of the lack of control over the production processes. These also he believed could be overcome only through the changes mentioned above.
Marx saw the process of modernisation of institutions as secularisation, which was very much appreciated by him because he was critical of exploitative social relations which he thought were perpetuated in traditional institutions. He thought man could attain true identity only in secularised institutions based on scientific knowledge and real mastery over nature.

Marx could foresee the changes taking place in family, when in the Communist Manifesto, he wrote that women's sexuality and procreation would no longer be controlled by the family when private property would be abolished, and no need would be felt at all to produce heirs for property. When he wrote about division of labour into private and public, he was probably convinced that great advances in technology, would abolish women's labour in the private sphere of the family.

3.2.1 Changing Nature of Institutions Was Neglected by Marx's Followers

However, Marx never analysed the institutions of the superstructure in detail as he did in the case of the economy, the base. He perceived only the positive sides of these changes at the cost of neglecting the negative sides in the process. It has caused several serious lapses, particularly because his followers tried to hasten the modernisation process through the policy of rapid development of the productive forces, but without giving much attention to the institutional side of this process. This was bringing contrary results regarding the unfolding of the potentials of individuals, so much cherished by Marx. The Critical Theory school had taken note of this
lacuna and started analysing the impact of industrialism on institutions. These lapses could be analysed much later, after the 1950s, when the negative outcome of these policies became glaringly visible in the countries which are known as 'Actually Existing Socialism' such as the USSR. I shall present this critique in the section entitled "philosophical and epistemological underpinnings".

3.3 The role of Nation-state

Marx had assumed a nation-state as a boundary for specific market which emerged as a part of the modernisation process, in the development of capitalism. He did not analyse the role of nation-state in capitalist development, which Lenin did. Lenin's model of development was called state capitalism, where the concept of nation-state was fully operationalised i.e. to create political boundaries for the purpose of accumulating surplus through the state, central planning and state control over the economy. Following Lenin, many Marxist economists believed in the 1960s, that independent growth of capitalism was possible in one country through opting for a mixed economy, and limiting trade relations with industrialised countries. Extensive foreign trade was considered to be a cause of drain of surplus value because of unequal exchange of trade relations. This belief was an extrapolation of Marx's dictum that backward countries would develop in the image of the industrialised countries once the colonial period was over.
3.3.1 Dependency Theory: Hope for Development of Capitalism in One Nation

This analysis implies two things: First, the role of the state is progressive in the beginning, once independence is achieved. Although power lies in the hands of the bourgeoisie, they are interested in developing productive forces fast and hence would offer concessions to the working class in order to maintain stability as well as to create purchasing power for their products. This is also an underlying belief with many Marxist feminism.

In India in the 1960s public sector provided secure jobs, with all the labour laws to middle class women, who supported the Marxist trade unions. Second, the bourgeoisie was also genuinely interested in an anti-imperialist stance and the concept of independent nation-state, because it wanted to create an independent base for capitalist development and then bargain for better trade relations with the industrialised countries. The Dependency Theory was built up on this premise. It advocated delinking of trade and technology transfer from the industrialised countries and to follow policies of import substitution and protection from foreign competition. All that did not work in the long run. But one developed a better understanding of the processes at work for 'underdevelopment' of the excolonised and late entrant countries in the process of industrialisation. To counterpose the Dependency Theory The World Capitalist System theory was developed by Andre Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein which has become more useful to understand the dynamics of capitalist development world over.⁴
I shall present it in details in the chapter on the Subsistence Approach. The gist of the argument by the Dependency Theory can be stated as follows,

"Due to the fact that the periphery was deprived of its surplus, which the centre could utilise instead for development purposes, development in the centre somehow implied underdevelopment in the periphery. Thus development and underdevelopment could be described as two aspects of a single global process. All the regions participating in this process were consequently considered as capitalist, although a distinction was made between central and peripheral capitalism." (Blomstrom and Hettne, 1984, p. 43)

This analysis is different and explanatory from the evolutionary descriptive analysis by the development theory. Latter analysis suggests that to overcome the barrier of lack of sufficient capital and to reach take off stage, the underdeveloped countries needed technology transfer and transfer of capital through loan and aid from the industrialised countries. Upto now, however, this policy has caused further drain of surplus.

3.4 Philosophical and Epistemological Underpinnings

3.4.1 Constraints of the Enlightenment ethos

Marx was a product of the Enlightenment and was also constrained by its perceptions and epistemological orientation. Compared to the liberal economic theory of modernisation, he definitely had holistic vision of society and tried to establish cohesive linkages between the economic base, ideology and institutions. He passionately developed an idea of 'socialist man' as the ultimate goal of evolution of human society, the foundations of which are laid in the development of productive forces. It is important to understand the way he
analysed these linkages, because his formulations have become the basis for all Marxists in the world for developing a perspective and strategies for transforming the world. The idea of socialist man sounds very spiritual and gives inspiration to the struggles of disadvantaged groups. At the macro level, it relates to the idea of human liberation. However, Marx's insistence of development of productive forces, and on industrialisation has come under attack from environmentalists, who feel that this emphasis set the well intentioned people on the wrong track, which leads away from truely socialist society.

3.4.1 Dialectical Relationship with Nature: Use of Outer Nature to Realise Potentials of Inner Nature

Marx's theory of dialectical materialism deals also with the relationship between man and nature. This relationship has two aspects; the relationship of man with his inner nature and the concept of freedom as transcending necessity i.e. the constraints of nature.

Alfred Schmidth has quoted a significant passage of Marx's "Capital", from which he draws insight about Marx's dialectical understanding of relations of man with nature in its multidimensional aspect. Schmidtt has taken pains to show with a number of other quotations, that Marx wants to realise the potential of man's inner nature, by utilising outer nature, by developing it into productive forces in such a way that the 'realm of necessities' is reduced. The passage from Capital reads:
"In fact, the realm of freedom actually begins only where labour which is determined by necessity and mundane considerations ceases; thus in the very nature of things it lies beyond the sphere of actual material production. Just as the savage must wrestle with nature to satisfy his wants, to maintain and reproduce life, so must civilised man, and he must do so in all social formations and under all possible modes of production. With his development this realm of physical necessity expands as a result of his wants; but, at the same time, the forces of production which satisfy these wants also increase. Freedom in this field can only consist in socialised men, the associated producers rationally regulating their interchange with nature, bringing it under their common control, instead of being ruled by it as by the blind forces of nature; and achieving this with the least expenditure of energy and under conditions most favourable to, and worthy of, their human nature. But it nonetheless still remains a realm of necessity. Beyond it begins that development of human energy which is an end in itself, the true realm of freedom, which, however, can blossom forth only with this realm of necessity as its basis. The shortening of the working day is its basic prerequisite."

(cited by Schmidt, 1973,p.135)

All the underlined sentences are related to our purpose of understanding Marx's perception. As a true materialist, he does not condemn wants and believes that there is a need for sufficient equipment in order to live comfortably and without the worry of future deprivation, and in order to enable everybody to pursue creative interests. For him 'labour' is a means to satisfy necessities, and art is an end in itself, i.e. equated with freedom. This dichotomy between perceiving labour in production as necessity, for which one has to wrestle with nature and labour in artistic production which is helpful to go beyond or transcend nature, has created problems for his followers.

However, Marx is visualising this highest stage of reducing the realm of necessity, only under the conditions of organisation of production through rational interchange with nature.
only when nature has come under the common control of associated producers.

Schmidt asserts again and again that development of the forces of production was never an end in itself for Marx. Saving of labour-time should in the last analysis result in a restructuring of man, in the genuine emancipation of individuals, rather than a collectivist compulsion. Marx reminds us that free competition as ultimate development of human freedom is in reality negation of freedom, and the complete subjugation of individuality under social conditions which assume the form of objective powers, i.e. overpowering objects. (Ibid, p. 145) The author comments that this is where Marx's awareness of the alienation of man and the need to overcome alienation through ever increasing consumption is noticed.

Development of machinery has, in Marx's view not only a directly economic usefulness, but also results in humanisation of the labour process. He saw modern machinery as demystification of secrets of different trades. Schmidt points out that for Marx, consequence far more essential of this development would be the ending of lifelong subjection of the whole man to a single detailed operation. The narrow specialist should become the 'totally developed individual, to whom the different social functions he performs are but so many modes of giving free scope to his own natural and acquired powers.' (Ibid, p. 148)

In capital, Marx's awareness of disasters, modern technology is capable of causing is well reflected. He has been particu-
larly critical of modern agriculture. (Ullrich cited in Sarkar, 1983)

3.4.3 Critique of Marxist Practice: Socialism Does not Require Industrialism

Some Marxists have understood the problem with the present understanding of Marxism, especially with socialism as was practiced in the "Actually Existing Socialist" (AES) countries. They are since long looking for the socialism with a human face. For instance Rudolf Bahro, an East German theoretician in 1977 first time came out with a criticism of equating socialism with "industrialism" and asserted that socialism with human face was possible. That means the goal of developing the productive forces through industrialism need to be changed. That was the first clear statement showing the cracks in orthodox Marxism. Until then, Marxists like Habermas had been criticising the totalitarian and nationalistic politics of AES countries, the hierarchical structures of those societies which created new classes, and certain economic policies which hampered economies and efficiencies. The position expressed by Bahro however went beyond this.

Another major contribution to questioning industrialism as a basic requirement of socialism, as it was interpreted by the AES and the Marxist intellectuals world wide came from Otto Ullrich in 1979. It exposes some fallacies in Marxism as understood by Marx's followers including Lenin, although it does not criticise Marx's epistemology. Ullrich has first developed his own understanding of socialism, based on a thorough reading of Marx and then he scrutinised the socialist
practice. (Ullrich as cited by Sarkar, 1983)

The Marxist model of progress in history says that socialism/communism is possible only on the basis of a certain level of social wealth. That much wealth could not be produced earlier because productivity was very low. Capitalism contributed three things to increasing productivity. Firstly, the technology which could increase productivity of human labour. Secondly, the self-disciplined and diligent workers who could produce more than what was necessary for the satisfaction of their immediate needs. Thirdly, it was hoped that after a phase of misery and powerlessness the proletariat would wage class struggle. It was also assumed that forms of organisation and cooperation of the industrial system would be a ready made basis for building up socialism. Ullrich asks: if these three basic features of capitalism taken over, as they stand, by socialism, then why not call both of them together 'industrial mode of production'. Here the link between industrialisation and the institutions it throws up has been perceptively highlighted. Ullrich has cited Lenin who emphasised that big industry and capitalist technology are essential for building socialism. Lenin also emphasised the role of the state, which was to be different in nature, under socialism but nevertheless a strong state. According to this understanding, the first task in Soviet Russia was considered to be forced industrialisation. The cost in terms of human suffering was justified in the name of progress.

Ullrich has set up criteria of 'human development' to
evaluate the mode of production which professed to achieve higher development. He writes:

"Perhaps we could agree to measure the 'height' of a culture and society in terms of how free its members are from fear of hunger and oppression, how the burdens are distributed, whether some are not leading a better life at the cost of others, how far the people can themselves determine their destiny and are at least on the whole happy, whether the 'higher development' is not achieved at the cost of other societies and people, and whether the basis of life and the future are not jeopardised for the sake of ephemeral gains. (pp19-20)"

(Ullrich 1979, as cited by Sarkar, 1983, p.148)

Applying these criteria, Ullrich opines that 'socialism had become merely an ideology of industrialisation in the hands of the leaders of Actually Existing Socialism (AES)' (cited, Ibid. p.149)

3.4.4 Socialism: Ideology to Discipline Workers for Industrialisation

After questioning industrialisation as the material basis of socialism, Ullrich has examined every other concept used by Marxists to justify their support to industrialisation, such as productivity, work, need, individual and power.

According to Ullrich the belief that there was hardly any development of productive forces before the industrial revolution is a prejudice of modern man. The achievements of pre-industrial society were in fields other than mechanics, also in the work process itself, centred on human beings. Also, he feels that the pre-industrial economy offered what is termed by Mumford as 'not freedom from work but freedom in work'. (cited by Sarkar, 1983, p.155) He feels that it is difficult to say whether we are productive today in this comprehen-
Beneath the apparent productivity of large scale industry, there are various kinds of cost transfers, which are not easily discernible. Machines have congealed acquired labour of the past. Also, there are raw materials acquired from the Third World where unequal exchange has taken place. The damage to the biosphere would transfer costs to the coming generations. All these are sufficient reasons for Ullrich not to take over these technologies for the socialist society.

The quality of labour time should be our primary concern. At present, the labour time per unit of product is getting reduced because of industrial technology. So it should help reduce the working day. But the needs are increasing ever more, and the surplus labour time is utilised to produce more products to realise more capital. So to help produce more needs is the inherent tendency of capital. Ullrich reminds us that industry can produce many things but it cannot produce time. To consume more goods one would need more time. According to him life becomes more impoverished as a result of the effort to consume more and more goods. For Ullrich, needs created by the industrial system for its own purpose cannot form the frame of reference for a truly socialist development of productive forces.

For Marx, as interpreted by Ullrich, the higher development of a society is recognisable if it is recognisable in the simultaneous emancipatory steps of the individual. After examining the productive forces and organisations of the industrial mode of production Ullrich feels certain that
capital and its machinery get complete control over the producers.

Ullrich has also analysed the education system which reinforces the individual's helplessness in the process of disciplining him. The work organisation becomes more and more polarised—on the one side highly qualified scientists and engineers who may get satisfaction from their work, and on the other side workers who receive a short training and then just work as appendages of ever more sophisticated machines. According to Ullrich, such a production system cannot but be hierarchial, authoritarian and central-power oriented.

Within this framework and against this dynamics a particular kind of individual gets constructed. Ullrich writes:

"Human beings can enter into social relations with one another which, no doubt, they themselves created, but which work behind their backs or above their heads and lead to consequences which become independent of individual motives and goals. In respect of the social relations 'capitalism' it is well known to Marxists, but they do not want to see it in respect of the social relations 'high technology'. Above a certain degree of complexity, size and interweaving arising from division of labour, a technology loses its character as an instrument which is manageable and which permits an overview, and it becomes a man-machine system in which human beings degenerate into independent components of the system. This technology-social system can develop a dynamics of its own with unforeseeable and unwarranted consequences, and it generates compulsion-mechanisms which force a large part of the individuals into paths of undesired actions. (p.10)" (Ibid., p.163)

Based on these observations, Ullrich comes to the conclusion that there is "no lower limit of the development of productive forces which makes socialism impossible" as predicted by Marx, but there is an upper limit, beyond which socialist relationship between human beings become impossible.
3.4.5 Freedom Achieved at the Cost of Alienation from Community

Frederique Appfel Margalin has tried to analyse the construction of the psyche of this wage labourer. Her exposition is important, because she further analyses the process of complete polarisation of identities of male producer and female producer within the logic of the industrial mode of production, where their sexual division of labour gets reconstructed into different kind of hierarchy.

Margalin has gone into the historical details of the 17th to 19th centuries and found out that as a cumulative result of all the institutional changes and discourses the emergence of a new type of person with new habits, abilities and willingness was taking place to provide the form of labour required by its commoditisation. She has referred to the Taylorist project of scientific management, which encouraged fragmentation of tasks and established the total domination of management over workers. The Taylorist method of work organisation established the process of quantifying labouring activity instead of products, so that the performance of labourers could be controlled. The workers, under the vigilant eyes of supervisors, had to be taught to strictly separate labouring activity from activities such as socialising, chatting, resting, snacking and the like.

Margalin quotes Lenin approving Taylorism as something although coercive but inevitable for the construction of socialism on the foundation of industrialism.

"The Taylor system, the last word in capitalism in this respect, like all capitalist progress, is a combi-
nation of the refined brutality of bourgeois exploitation and a number of greatest scientific achievements in the field of analysing mechanical motions (sic) during work.............The Soviet republic must at all costs adopt all that is valuable in the achievements of science and technology in this field."(Lenin as cited by Margalin 1991, p.14)

She concludes,

"The new type of person has a tripartite structure: a self as the sole owner of a body and mind. The unitary proprietary relationship between a self and a body and a mind that excludes other's claims is what makes commoditised labour free as opposed to slave and serf about as well as to the claims on other's labour arising from kinship and other community based obligations."(Ibid. p.16)

Margalin says that Freud found this model of a person a healthy one and built his theory of colonising or domesticating inner passions on this basis. His ideal appears to have been a new individual, detached from community norms and rules.

Margalin explains the tremendous transformation brought about in a person through the process of wage labour, which was hardly recognised by Marx and Marxist practitioners of politics. On the one hand he becomes free from the community, free from his bondedness and his land, on the other hand his labour is commoditised, his body is separated from his mind, the private ownership principle is internalised, and inner passions are repressed and disciplined. This is the basis of a person who is guided by self interest and makes decisions based on the rationality of self interest, who is guided by rationality of competition, and whose needs are insatiable. He easily accepts the domination of big technology and complex and hierachical work organisation.He feels alienated and loses
touch with concerns beyond his market rationality, such as the degradation of environment, and justice for others.

This explains also the trade union mentality all over the world. Saral Sarkar has shown in his detailed study of the West German Green movement and its relationship with the trade unions, that in the midst of a big ecology movement, the trade unions remained aloof, continued to press for growth and more jobs, and more wages, without caring to look at the consequences of growth on environment and the ecological crisis the world is heading for. (Sarkar, 1993)

3.4.6 Wage Labour Promotes Consumerism

Mary Mellor has criticised the socialist movement in Britain for its obsession with 'productivism' (Mellor, 1992, p.220-223). She points out that after the collapse of socialist societies, and the repeated failure of trade union struggles in the recent past, some socialists turned away from productivism to embrace the politics of 'consumption'. This they did in the name of the celebration of the freedom of the 'market place', and in the name of the desire of individuals to celebrate their individual identities. Very few thought of greening Marxism.

These pendulum-like movements of Marxist intellectuals between increasing productivity through productive forces on the one hand and celebration of consumption on the other, can be easily understood if we realise that they are products of wrong theoretical premise. They have not given enough thought to the construction of the psyche of modern man, who is a confused person because of his inner void and embraces con-
sumption to celebrate his identity. In the Third World countries, it is probably the crisis of capitalism, and the lack of sufficient forces of production to get absorbed in consumerism that pushes him towards religious or ethnic fundamentalism, in search for identity.

3.4.7 Wage Labour Psyche: Splitting Human Life into Mind and Body

Ecofeminism has tried to grapple with some of these issues as they relate to reproductive technology and genetic engineering. The separation of body and mind on the one hand and the celebration of the choice of a consumer on the other have been an ideological basis for promotion of these technologies where the body is seen in parts, in fragments, and as a machine and permission can be obtained for tampering with or selling any part of the body on behalf of the person. It is justified under the principles of 'self determination' and 'choice' of an individual, who is deemed to be as a owner of his/her body, without having any moral or ethical qualms about it, e.g. hiring out the womb as a surrogate mother or selling one's sperms to the sperm bank. Ecological degradation does not only pertain to the outside nature but also to bodily nature, through the science of biology, medicine and surgery. It is an ethical crisis. This leads to the instrumentalist morality which does not perceive development as an inner process of realisation of potentials. Medical technology having become very complex and domineering, discarded the concept of integrity of the body. At the same time 'progres-
sive' people including Marxists are hailing these developments as scientific advances, and as development of productive forces. It has opened up a new uncharted territory for human invasion.

3.4.8 Limitations of the Labour Theory of Value:

Externalization of Nature from Economy

According to Robert Goodin, ultimately the limitations of Marxism can be grasped in its application of labour theory of value to build holistic theory of society. It attributes value to the goods for which labour has been expended, but externalises nature which provides raw materials and absorbs wastes. It becomes 'producer' based theory. (Goodin 1992, p.24) Also, labour is perceived as wage labour and all non-wage labour gets excluded, as if it is 'free' or 'natural' as Claudia Von Werlohf analyses it. (The Subsistence Approach) The implication of this narrow perspective is that the negative impact of modern technology and its social organisation gets neglected, or justified, in the name of eventual liberation of mankind. Polanyi thinks that Marx could not grasp the real impact of manufactories and the wage labour in terms of their assault on society, which Owen could see as his attacks on 'individualisation' reflect. Market institutions in the industrial mode of production created economic society, which was subjected to laws which did not appear as human laws, but as natural laws. Ever since, reintegration of society into human world became the persistently sought aim of the evolution of social thought. According to Polanyi Marxian economics was an essentially unsuccessful attempt to achieve that aim, due to Marx's
too close adherence to Ricardo and traditions of liberal economics. (Polanyi, 1952, p.126)

4. Critique of Marxist Feminism

The first limitation of Marxist feminist theory relates to its definition of patriarchy. It defines patriarchy as relations of reproduction which are a causal factor for the subordination of women's labour in the private as well as in the public sphere. However according to this theory manifestations of patriarchy are determined by class relations which are product of the mode of production. This definition does not state, whether these relations of reproduction are organically linked to the capitalist production process. Since under relations of reproduction, use-values are produced and not the exchange-values, the question whether the relations of reproduction form the part of capitalism or not is not yet answered. The question raised by the feminists who organised demand for 'wages for housework', whether housework contributes to the surplus accumulation process is not yet conclusively answered. The categories developed within orthodox Marxist economics are inadequate to answer this question. As long as the site of surplus value generation is defined as the wage labour engaged in industrial production inside factory, the question cannot be solved.

Radical feminists tried to draw attention to some other dimensions of patriarchy such as violence against women, their sexuality, control over their fertility etc. They accused the Marxist feminists of 'productivism'. The cultural rationalist
feminists drew attention towards the cultural domination of men over women, restricting women to the sphere of nature/immanence and denying them opportunity to contribute to culture. But, in the end, these feminists want to join the rationalist tradition of the mainstream of men and compete with them. Thus, although both the deviant feminist streams criticise the Marxist feminists, all of them belong to the broadly understood Marxist framework and to the ethos of Enlightenment. They differ from liberal feminism in that they demand structural changes of property rights and equality in distribution of income, which will help all women along with men to realise their potentials.

It seems that Marxist feminists are engrossed with the phenomenon of wage labour as a symbol of progress, and a part of development of productive forces. They are anxious to see the integration of women in the mainstream of wage labour as a part of their strategy to achieve equality. They would like to believe in the linear progress visualised by Marx and hence does not feel bothered to raise question whether the development process will lead to progress. Marxist feminists are critical about the conditions of women's labour in informal sector and women getting integrated into the international division of labour. Also they oppose the Structural Adjustment Programmes proposed by the World Bank in the Third World. But they are not able to find long term solutions since they are rooted in the industrialism, which is underlying philosophy of Marxism. It is a pity that the many Marxist parties and Marxist women accept the internationalization of sexual division
of labour as inevitable fact of life, after a failure of the Dependency Theory which advocated delinking from the international market, and continued their faith in industrialism.

This faith is so strong everywhere that its polarising effects especially on the lives of women are not taken seriously. On the one hand newer and newer gadgets are coming in the market and processed food has become a part of daily life in the North as well as for the elite women in the South, making Bebel's dream come true. On the other hand simultaneously more and more women are being pushed into poverty and deprivation due to environmental destruction. The phenomenon is very glaring in the South, but in the North too, peripheralisation of minority is apparent. This has evaded the attention of Marxist feminists. There are capitalism, and the wrong development policies to be blamed at, hoping that one day Marxists will capture power and plan development policies in favour of poor. In India the collapse of the AES countries has not jolted them out of their straight jacketed logic. The need is still not felt to question whether the process of industrialisation would ever bring equality to all women and also to question whether women would at all prefer that kind of equality. After all today a typical man is an atomised individual, an alienated wage labourer, consumer whose mind is separated from his body, and has proprietary relationship with it. Is it worth becoming equal to him? Margalin writes:

"For women to develop their mind and to achieve in the public sphere is to liberate themselves from one of the repressive entailments of the industrialisation of society, namely the ideology and reality of domesticity."
But that liberating movement does not put into question the internalised repression in the form of colonising ego. The white middle class woman achiever, liberated from bondage of domesticity has shown herself to reproduce the dominating discourses of dominant (mostly white) men, as the critiques of mainstream feminism by minority women in the U.S. has shown." (Ibid., p.21)
Chapter III: Footnotes

1. More on Taylorism is presented in the section on philosophical and epistemological underpinnings. Frederique W. Taylor had made time and motion studies for the certain operations of workers in the manufactories, which were later used for developing a monitoring and supervising system to increase production and discipline workers. His first book called, 'The Principles of Scientific Management' was published in America in 1911. Taylor believed in scientific planning of the work tasks, the selection and systematic training of suitable workers for the performance of the workers for those tasks, and a carrot and stick system of financial incentives to maximise productivity.

American Marxist Harry Braverman has criticised Taylorian scientific management as strengthening the dominance of capital over labour. In capitalist society, 'its fundamental teachings have become the bedrock of all work design'.

Margalin writes that Taylor's achievement was the invention of a method of appropriation of the embodied knowledge of worker by managers as well as its transformation into a different kind of knowledge, to which she calls 'episteme' borrowing the term from S. Margalin. She calls the knowledge of workers 'techne'. Knowledge system based on techne does not allow total dominance, whereas the knowledge system based on 'episteme', to which management alone has access, would provide the firm basis for managerial control. She has tried to trace the similar process ongoing in the area of medical practice by midwives and based on that practice, the knowledge
system created by male doctors.

2. The concept 'socially necessary labour time' used by Marx firstly takes into account the technological development of at the given moment, which determines the labour time expended for that part of production out of which the price for the particular labour power is paid. Secondly, it distinguishes between necessary labour time and surplus labour time. The the products produced during former are used for the payment of wages, and the products produced during the latter are used for profit or surplus accumulation.

3. Critical theory school took up the analysis of institutions, particularly those of the states and bureaucracies in the centrally planned command economies, which thwarted the process of self-realisation of an individual. It highlighted the hierarchies and centralisation as inevitable tendencies in these structures.

The critical theory school was founded in Germany in the 1930s by interalia Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas carried this project further into the 1960s. It wanted to reassess Marx's technological optimism and belief in material progress. It was worried about the domination and exploitation of people and nature, which, according to it, was as much a function of cultural ideas and attitudes as of economics. It believed that spreading the values of instrumental rationality increasingly dominated the life world of humans and their environment. However, it was concerned to 'rebalance' such rationality with concern for feelings, emotions and aesthetics; economic to be balanced with non-economic, cultural
values; and materialism with idealism. (Pepper 1993, p.65-66)

Wallerstein in his collection of essays, entitled "Unthinking Social Science", published in 1991 asserts that national development may well be a pernicious policy objective. This is so for two reasons. For most states, it is unrealisable, whatever the method adopted. And for those few states which may still realise it, that is, transmute radically the location of world-scale production and thereby their location on the interstate ordinal scale, their benefits will perforce be at the expense of some other zone. This has always been true up to a point. It is more true than ever today. He believes that core can never expand. If a new area comes in, an old area must go out. It is more than ever zero-sum game. He also asserts that popularly organised national movements cannot achieve greater equality and democracy. His solution is to attack the flow of surplus not between nations but at the point of their production, through anti-systemic movements.

He has analysed that Marx in his life work was caught up in the basic epistemological tension of an attempts to analyse large scale, long term processes of social change: simultaneously to describe the characteristics and the principles of a 'system' in its unique process of development. He feels that Marx resorted to the tactic of alternating emphases in his writings and hence it became easy to distort his interest by pointing to only one end of this pendulum. He feels that this is major factor, how people of different orientations; anti-systemic and those believe in economic growth and power could
come together under Marxist banner in the nationalist move-
ment, to help build the nation-state, to achieve 'development'. (Wallerstein, 1991, pp.104-124)

5. In India, the Left has given no thought to alternative
economic model other than state or market. It believes in the
process of industrialisation and economic growth. The state is
seen as the agency to steer the distribution, although it is
proved in a painful way that the desired effect is not
achieved by investing the decision of distributing money in
the hands of the state.