

II. GIFTS EXPLOITED BY THE MARKET

Capitalist Patriarchy and the Negation of Matriarchy

The Struggle for a “Deep” Alternative

In her important book, *For-Giving: A Feminist Criticism of Exchange*, Genevieve Vaughan states: “In order to reject patriarchal thinking we must be able to distinguish between it and something else: an alternative” (1997: 23). I fully identify with this statement as I, too, have tried “to think outside patriarchy” although being inside it most of the time. At the “First World Congress of Matriarchal Studies,” held in Luxemburg in 2003, where Vaughan and I first met, she stated, “If we don’t understand society in which we live we cannot change it; we do not know where the exit is!” Therefore, “we have to dismantle patriarchy.” In this article, I would like to add to Vaughan’s analysis of capitalist patriarchy and tackle the task of dismantling patriarchy.

“A Different World is Possible!”

This has been the main slogan of the worldwide civilian movement against globalization for years. I have to add: “A *radically* different world is possible!”—it is not only possible but also urgently needed. But without a *vision* of this radically different world we will not be able to move in this direction. Therefore we need to discuss, first of all, a radically different worldview. For this purpose we have to analyze what is happening today and why. Only then will we be able to define a really *different* world, worldview and vision.

“Globalization:” An Explanation

A radically different worldview is necessary because today we are observing global social, economic, ecological, and political developments that are completely different from what they should be. “Globalization” is obviously not a movement toward more democracy, peace, general welfare, wealth, and ecological sustainability, as its propagators are pretending everywhere. On the contrary, the opposite is true. Never in history are so many people dying from hunger and thirst, environmental destruction, and war, most of them women and children. Never in history have so many people been confined to poverty, income reduction, expulsion, expropriation, and extreme exploitation, again, most of them women and children.

Never in history has technological progress led to such intense and threatening destruction of the environment globally. Never in history has the nuclear threat been so acute. Never in history have the political systems been changing so clearly in the direction of authoritarian, if not despotic rule in many parts of the world. And never in history has such a tiny minority on the globe been so incredibly rich and powerful. For transnational corporations and their “global players” today, we, and the planet, are nothing but their “play material.”

This situation can be called the “development of underdevelopment” (Frank 1978). But this time underdevelopment is not only taking place in the South, but also in the North. It is the result of a “new colonization of the world” (Mies 2004) that did and does not happen inexplicably, but is actively and aggressively promoted by governments as their general and apparently “normal” policy, beginning in the 1980s of the twentieth century. This policy consists in a “continuing process of primitive accumulation” (Werlhof 1988) that leads to a forced economic growth through the direct expropriation of the peoples of the globe and the globe itself. The name of this policy is “neo-liberalism.” This new liberalism serves exclusively the interests of the corporations. For the rest of humanity it means just the opposite, totalitarianism.

Is this “New World Order” (Chomsky 1999) the “best of all possible worlds” that western civilization pretends to develop? Or is the current development of western civilization better defined as the peak and turning point towards its final decline (Wallerstein 1974)?

Capitalist Patriarchy: A Historical Concept

Many people have provided descriptions of globalization as global crisis and its dynamics (Chossudovsky 1966; Hardt and Negri 2000; Wallerstein 2004; Ziegler 2002). There seems to be “no future”—astonishingly enough even for the global players themselves. I call this situation *west end*: western civilization is in its final decline globally (Werlhof 2002). With the self-given “licence to loot” (Mies and Werlhof 2003; Werlhof 2000), the resources of the earth will come to an end. The decline of resources is already underway. With the resulting “resource wars” (Klare 2001)—the new global wars for oil and water—we are witnessing the beginning of the end of the “modern world system,” as a logical consequence.

But, there is almost no deeper analysis of the causes of this extraordinary situation or the dynamics that seem to exclude any alternative. There is no real, no deeper explanation of the world’s dilemma and its causes. For example, is the profit motive alone sufficient as an explanation? Why do most people believe that human nature is nothing but ego-centric? What about control and domination of nature? In what is it rooted?

I suggest the reason why most people do not know why this crisis is happening is due to the fact that the left as well as the right, and the sciences in general, have never really analyzed patriarchy. And not having analyzed patriarchy also means

not really understanding capitalism, because the two not only share a time of being together on this earth for 500 years now, but are deeply related to each other in a way that has not been understood by most people, even feminists. Therefore, it is time to take the necessary step of analyzing capitalist patriarchy from its roots and as a theoretical concept for the subsequent analysis of society. Only then can it be seen that patriarchy is much more than just a word for polemical purposes. It can instead be understood as a concept that explains the character of the entire social order in which we are living today, socialism included (Werlhof 2007).

Patriarchy: The Development of a “War System”

Recent studies of matriarchal societies and the development of patriarchy (see Göttner-Abendroth 2005) suggest mainly four things:

The Genesis of Patriarchy

Patriarchal society as we know it, did not exist “as such” and independently from, or even before, matriarchal society, but began to develop after the armed invasion, violent conquest, and systematic destruction of matriarchal societies by armed hordes that had lost their own originally matriarchal culture after having been exposed to “catastrophic migration” (forced migration due to climatic changes and other catastrophes). This process is reported from the fifth millennium B.C. onwards—concerning the “Kurgan” people and the Indo-European migrations in general—and it occurred in China, India, the Middle East, North and Central Africa, Europe, and the Americas as well (see Gimbutas 1994; Mies 2003). As patriarchal society, “as such,” did not exist, we need to examine the conditions that led to its development.

The development of patriarchal society is related to the invention of something that from then on has been called “war,” and since then patriarchy has been dependent on the ongoing existence of war(s) even in so-called “peace times.” Without war, the people of conquered communities and societies could easily liberate themselves from their conquerors’ rule. The logic of patriarchy is thus the *logic of war*, which means that all the social institutions invented by patriarchy are principally drawn from war experiences.

1) Patriarchy invented a *political system* based on the invention of the state, which meant the hierarchical dominance of armed men over the conquered people and the dominance of men over women, because women were at the centre of pre-patriarchal society and were responsible for the maintenance of its egalitarian principles.

2) Patriarchy invented an *economy* based on the the plunder of other peoples’ property, since then called “private” property (*privare* = to rob), and on an always more systematic exploitation of the conquered, especially the women, because women in matriarchal society had control over the means of production, were the producers and distributors, the providers of concrete wealth—life, food, and security—and were responsible for the integration of everyone into the com-

munity (Vaughan 1997).

3) Patriarchy invented a *society* split into social classes, “races,” generations, and “sexes.” This means, especially since then, that women were regarded as being subject to men *by nature*, a belief fabricated by the patriarchs in order to prevent women from ever again being able to re-establish a matriarchal society.

4) Patriarchy invented a “*God-Father*” or “male creator-religion” based on the “great warrior,” plunderer, proprietor, or “big man” (Godelier 1987), who was considered able to give life and was legitimized to take it. The Great Mother or Goddess was replaced by the idea and the ideology of an omnipotent, violent, and jealous single God, an abstract patriarchal “mother-father.”

5) Patriarchy invented a *technology* based on “war as the father of all things,” namely by beginning to transform the pre-patriarchal philosophy of *alchemy* into a patriarchal one. This means that since then men have systematically tried to use existing (female) knowledge about life and nature in order to appropriate it, to pervert it into a means of control over life and nature, finally, trying to *replace* life, women, and nature themselves through “technological progress” (Werlhof 2004a), the project of a “*second creation*.”

6) Patriarchy invented a *psychology* that defined the ways men could develop their “masculation” (Vaughan 1997), and their competitive, ego-logical patriarchal individuality (Girard 1992), opposing community, women, and nature.

The patriarchal order of society thus involves a total break with the matriarchal or gift giving social rules, traditions, and taboos, which had existed from time immemorial, and the development of a “war system” (Werlhof 2004b). And even if there have been times and places that did not at all fit this picture, the development or “evolution” of patriarchy has, nevertheless, been continuous, and women could not prevent it from happening. This can be seen more clearly today than ever before.

The Negation of Matriarchy

In patriarchal societies we can always find vestiges of former matriarchal societies—matriarchy as “second culture” (Genth 1996)—left over or newly re-organized after the patriarchs had started to deny the reality and quality of matriarchal society (Werlhof 2004b). This matriarchy as second culture can be observed everywhere, for example, in mother-child relationships, and other love relationships, and in gift giving generally (Vaughan 1997). It contradicts the patriarchal order, but also helps it to exist, because a society without *any* matriarchal relations could simply not survive. Therefore, patriarchies are always somehow “mixed” societies, whether to a higher or lower degree, and they are hiding this fact as much as they can—for obvious reasons. But today it is clear that patriarchy is trying to complete its negation of matriarchy in order to replace it with itself, a “pure” patriarchy, as much as possible. This destruction and the fading away of the second culture in patriarchy, and of much of the still existing gift paradigm within it, is one of the main reasons for the depth of the crisis of in contemporary civilization.

The negation of matriarchy consists in presupposing that there have never been

any matriarchal societies; that patriarchal society has existed from the beginnings of human life on earth; and /or pretending that a violent and evil “rule of women” had to be broken before patriarchal society could develop so-called “civilization” and “progress.” Due to this patriarchal mythology, most people today still think that matriarchy never existed, or that it meant “rule of women” instead of “rule of men,” which indeed was never the case in matriarchal society, but may be so in patriarchal society instead. Most people, therefore, do not understand that the terms “matriarchy” and “patriarchy” are not just referring to men and women, or “male” and “female,” but to the character of the whole social order, so that both men and women living in matriarchy have to be considered “matriarchal,” and likewise men and women living in patriarchy have to be considered as principally “patriarchal” in their thinking, acting, and feeling.

The negation of matriarchy furthermore consists in:

- *Destroying* matriarchal society as a social order on its own.
- *Appropriating* everything from matriarchal society that seems important to the patriarchs, robbing and usurping these things, especially the image and the abilities of the mother (and the goddess), because patriarchy does not have an original culture of its own and can destroy but cannot originate life on its own.
- *Perverting* everything matriarchal into its opposite, which is the way “patriarchal” is defined.
- *Transforming* the original matriarchal society into a patriarchal one by developing policies of “divide and rule,” by dissolving and abstracting the interconnectedness of people, communities, genders, generations, culture, commons, and nature in general; and by
- *Replacing* these and the entire matriarchal order with a “purely” patriarchal one.

The crucial significance of especially this last process of the transformation and substitution of nature and women has almost never been recognized.

The “Gnostic” Worldview of Patriarchy

Peoples’ experiences with patriarchal society, war, despotic rule, and ceaseless violence logically led to a complete change in the general worldview, too. The Gnostic worldview thus appeared (Sloterdijk and Macho 1991). Gnosis means recognition: It is recognized that the world is “bad,” “evil,” “low,” primitive, violent, sinful, and not worth living in. A better, “higher,” more developed, “noble” and civilized world, therefore, is the ideal for people living in patriarchy. However, this “higher” world cannot be found on earth, even less so in the matriarchal past or presence elsewhere. The “higher world” is thus perceived as a metaphysical world that can only be envisioned through the imagination.

A metaphysical world beyond physics was not thought of in matriarchal society. So, the words *mater* and *arché* together do not mean “rule of mothers,” but

instead mean, “in the beginning the mother,” life stems from mothers. *Arché* is beginning and “uterus” (Markale 1984: 207). Therefore, life, death, the mother, and the goddess, are always *here* in this world, and they all belong to each other, so that there is neither the need for, nor the idea of, another (metaphysical) world than the one in which we live every day (Chattopadhyaya 1973).

In patriarchal society, on the contrary, another world beyond the existing one had to be invented, because the words *pater* and *arché* together do not simply mean “rule of fathers,” but, instead, “in the beginning the *father*”—a word unknown in matriarchal times. Or, rather, life stems from “fathers” instead of from mothers; fathers are men with uteruses who are able to give life without needing women at all! (The Pharaoh Echnaton, for example, had himself painted as a pregnant man [see Wolf 1994]). Only on the basis of this fantasy would men be legitimized to rule over those who are not “fathers,” the people, and especially the mothers. The “father,” therefore, is defined as somebody who is a ruling man and as such not only able to take life, but also to give life.

In patriarchy the word *arché* thus did not only mean “beginning, origin, uterus,” but also “rule” and “domination,” too. This second meaning of *arché* did not exist before patriarchy, therefore, in matriarchy *arché* could have never meant domination, much less mothers’ or women’s rule. There simply was no domination, and therefore there was no word for it. Etymology shows that 1) a matriarchal society in which women were in power the way men are in patriarchal society never existed, and that 2) the “father” in patriarchal society has to be related to power as a *system of domination*, at least as long as he cannot replace the mother.

This means that the political system of patriarchal society can be regarded as a first step in the direction of the development of a *pure*, fully elaborated patriarchy, in which the fathers would really be “men with uteruses” or with something like “uterus-machines,” who would then no longer need to dominate, because they would be able to do without nature, women, and matriarchal society. The political system of patriarchy would only be needed for the period in which patriarchy moves toward its final realization, toward a “full patriarchy,” conceived of as the end of history. From this point of view, history is only the time in which patriarchy appeared and “evolved” until it became one hundred percent reality.

The patriarchal usurpation, destruction, and perversion of the mother and the wish to replace her thus led to an early sort of “science fiction”: to the idea that what is only—and absurdly—*supposed*, namely that life stems from the father and *not* the mother, is considered even *more real* than what is experienced every day, namely the opposite. This *credo quia absurdum*—I believe in the absurd—of the early church-patriarchs, began from then on its nearly uninterrupted career on earth.

Gnostic metaphysics and the belief in another, “higher” reality appeared everywhere, in every theological as well as philosophical tradition until today. Since then the belief in metaphysical assumptions has become much more important than knowledge about the world in which we live, even more so in the secularized modern sciences of today, as we shall see below.

The historically new concept of the “father” is a triple fiction: it imitates the

fiction of a powerful patriarchal “mother” and/or “goddess” and imagines to have successfully replaced her. This way the “father” is defined as a “patriarchal mother,” the god as patriarchal goddess, who—as a contradiction in itself—could never have been thought of before.

This shows that the father originally is not regarded to be a man who relates to a woman with whom he has a child. This type of a father, as we normally define him today, is much less the “idea” of the father than the early fiction of a man with a uterus. The reason for this “loss” in defining the father is very simple: It has until now really been impossible to have new life without women.

But we know that biotechnology and genetic engineering are working hard to resolve patriarchy’s main problem: the desire that only men should be the creators of life. Having to be born from women seems to be the biggest disgrace for patriarchal men and society (see Anders’ 1994 description of the “shame of being born instead of being made”). Our actual “soft” understanding of the father who is still dependent on a mother proves every day that patriarchy in reality *does not* yet exist at all the way it is supposed to. The world—at least in this respect—basically still functions in a matriarchal way.

From Idealism to Materialism

But the fiction is the program. The *idea* of patriarchy has become its political and technological project. Patriarchy as a society in which life stems from fathers and not from mothers has to be artificially produced, or it will never really exist. The project is this: life—or what is considered to be life—should be born from or be made by men. And, only what men produce is considered to be “real life” and to have a “value,” *as if* patriarchy had been realized already.

This way patriarchy becomes not only a *theory* (vision of God), but also a *theology* (the logic, the true words of God, his creation by the word that was “in the beginning”), a *theo-gnosis* (proof of the existence of God), and a *theophany* (God is appearing), and structurally *theo-morphical* and *theocratic*. Furthermore, patriarchy seems to prove its *entelechy* (its capacity to evolve its “naturally” given form to its perfection) and its potential for *eschatology* (end and new beginning of the world, death, and rebirth).

Once all this is the case, even the system of domination is imagined to eventually be abolished, because there would *really* be no alternative to patriarchy any longer.¹ Only if/when men become “real” fathers, will patriarchal society—in the long run—not have to fear women and matriarchy or the gift economy as an alternative any longer (Sombart 1991).

Since Aristototele, patriarchs not only pretended that their theory about life was true, even if they could not prove it, but they started to do something about it. This is how the Gnostic view became practical and “materialistic” in the patriarchal sense of the word. From the patriarchal viewpoint material is *mater* (matter), “mother-material,” generally called “raw material,” which is given by God/nature in order to be transformed into patriarchal “life,” being a “resource” for “value-” or life-production, for something like a “mother-machine” (see Corea 1985).

From this perversion stems *fetishism* as the confusion between dead things and living beings.

This materialistic becoming of the Gnostic worldview, nevertheless, did not mean a return from metaphysical adventures. On the contrary, it meant trying to realize on earth what had been imagined beyond it; Plato's "ideas," for example. The Gnostic view, therefore, was not abolished. It became *the* program for patriarchal society, instead.

It is as if today, for example, the electronic production of the "virtual world" were considered to be the only "real world," and the real world were considered to have already been replaced by the cyber world, continuing its existence as the former real world only in imagination—so to say as a new "metaphysical" world "beyond" the virtual world. But this time metaphysics are no longer welcome. On the contrary, they appear outmoded and old-fashioned, if not reactionary, because they remember the natural world. This would be the real patriarchal perversion! And it has entered the thinking of women as well, even if they did not care much for the invention of machine-technology (Genth 2002). But this form of so called "post-materialism" can be found in many "gender-studies" that criticize, for example, the discourse on "nature" as being "essentialist" which means being metaphysical, because nature is supposed not to exist in reality - any more! (Werlhof 2003; Bell and Klein 1996).

In short, the Gnostic view, which is so typical of all the other patriarchal ideologies until today, did not work against patriarchy, though it correctly "recognized" many of the evils that it brought to the world. For the conclusions drawn from of this recognition were no longer oriented toward a matriarchal world. The evils recognized by the Gnosis were not considered to be those of a patriarchal society. They were considered, instead, to be of society in general, of "the world," of people, and even nature everywhere. The difference between a matriarchal society and a patriarchal one, or between society and nature, or between the ruling and the ruled, was no longer thought of. At that time, patriarchy was already taken for granted.

The Gnostic view had accepted the State. It did not question it any more, and those who could afford it tried to flee its consequences and its ugliness. In this way, the two main tendencies in thinking about patriarchal society came about: *idealism* and *materialism*. The two should not therefore be regarded, as usual, as pure contradictions, but as two sides of one coin, the "Siamese twins" of patriarchy: the "materialistic" side fighting actively against the lasting importance of "matter," the mater-mother, nature, the goddess, and life, in order to get them under control, and the "idealistic" side propagating the ideal of a motherless world, a purely patriarchal utopian paradise that seems peaceful because it appears to have finally resolved the contradictions with the material, matriarchal world or what remains of it. Idealism thus proves to be no less violent than materialism, because it is formulating the *idea* that became the project of a *material realization*, which cannot be other than radically violent.

From then on nature and women were no longer respected in their own subjectivity, beauty, truth, goodness, and strength, their inventions, abilities, products and

culture, their *gifts* to the world since time immemorial. They were seen, instead, as representing the “chaos,” the “sin,” and the “evil” that had to necessarily be subjugated *under* and transformed *by* the socio-economic-political-ideological-religious-technological project of patriarchy. From this point of view, women and nature had to be oppressed, exploited, expropriated, transformed, and destroyed in a way that could be used as proof of male superiority, strength, and creativity.

Capitalism: The Latest Stage of Patriarchy

Having defined patriarchy, what does this mean for defining capitalism? From my analysis of patriarchy it follows that capitalism and modernity, including so-called socialism, far from being or becoming independent from patriarchy, are the latest stage of patriarchy. My hypothesis is that patriarchy crystallizes into capitalism. Capitalism is the period in which patriarchy becomes really serious. *Homo faber* is supposed to be finally replaced by “homo creator,” a sort of secularized God.

This means that with capitalism there is a break as well as a continuation in patriarchy. But both tend in the same direction, namely fostering patriarchy. The logics of patriarchy led straight to the modern epoch, because capitalism is the promise to finally realize the futuristic Gnostic utopia materially and on earth. It consists of the intent to produce a purely patriarchal society, “cleaned” of all its matriarchal vestiges, and propagated as a male-created second paradise, including the invention of a finally “good” patriarchal “mother.”

Metaphysics are to become the new physics. This is the propaganda of modern society as a whole, its politics, economy, religion—especially in the form of Protestantism—and technology.

Gnosticism becomes secularized. The content is the same, but the program has become one of action. The times of mere contemplation are fading away, the *vita contemplativa* is followed by a new kind of *vita activa* (Arendt 1987).

Since the Renaissance, the always increasing numbers of inventors and colonizers, scientists and soldiers, entrepreneurs and explorers, settlers and missionaries, merchants and money lenders are the modern activists on their way to the proposed, second, man-made and final paradise on earth (Rifkin 1998).

This is the beginning of the “Great Transformation” (Polanyi 1978) for which modern Europe became so famous. The new epoch was for the most part *not* seen as a continuation of an earlier one. It seemed, instead, to be the birth hour of a totally new society, not bound to history any more, a society that would be able to solve all the problems of mankind (indeed, not of womankind) for ever—like the U.S. today.

From the point of view of patriarchy, capitalism is the epoch in which women, nature, and life in general are finally successfully replaced by the artificial products of industry: gifts by exchange; subsistence goods by commodities; local markets by a world market; foreign cultures by western culture; concrete wealth—gifts by money, machinery, and capital—the new abstract wealth; living labour by machines; the brain/rational thinking by “artificial intelligence”; women by sex-machines and

“cyber-sex”; real mothers and/or their wombs by “mother-machines”; life energy by nuclear energy, chemistry, and bio-industry; and life in general by “artificial life” like genetically modified organisms (GMOs). The only problem that remains today consists in how to “replace” the elements and the globe itself.

Therefore, technological progress, through the development of modern sciences and the invention of the machine as a totally new techno-system, is the logical backbone of the modern patriarchal epoch. Patriarchy itself is progress, and all “progress” today is patriarchal. It serves the project of a materialization of metaphysical images via an industrial “life”-production which I call the “alchemical system” in development, because the idea behind it is as old as patriarchy and its first attempts to progress used the methods of a patriarchally-modified “alchemy” (Werlhof 2001).

The invention of profit that could be drawn from this adventure of the whole world’s transformation convinced always more people, mostly men. But many people, especially women, had to be violently forced to participate in the new game. The political means consisted in processes of “original accumulation,” which deprived the peasants of their means of production, and the women, through “witch”-hunts, even of the control over their own bodies, leaving nearly no way to survive beyond capitalism (Federici 2004).

Through all this progress mother earth will be more and more destroyed. Some of this rapidly increasing devastation is already irreversible, especially if caused by nuclear and the genetic modifications (Anders 1995; Chargaff 1988). Artificial death and artificial wealth—the violent “nothing”—a lot of money, is all that is left. The earth is on the way to being transformed into dead “capital,” full of empty holes on the one side, and trash-hills for the next billion years on the other.

That all this is possible shows that most people believe in the violent nihilism of patriarchy and its dangerous delusion that has become “real.” This astonishing fact can only be understood when one considers that the “alchemical wonders” patriarchy is promising, do not stem just from modern times, but are prophecies already 5,000 years old. Therefore, the destruction and desertification of the global ecology, including the human one, has not led to a general panic. On the contrary, it seems that, at least in the West, it is believed that only when the natural world has gone, can the patriarchal one finally be constructed, in all its glory, in its place.

Capitalism—as well as socialism—with its activism, optimism, positivism, rationality, and its irrational belief in patriarchy, world domination, money, science, technology, and violence, is not just capitalism, but has to be defined as “capitalist patriarchy” (and, by the way, not as “patriarchal capitalism” because there is no non-patriarchal capitalism). This epoch is still on the march because it has not yet reached its destination. Therefore, there is no post-capitalist, post-industrial, post-modern or post-materialist epoch in sight—unless capitalist patriarchy is stopped by a breakdown of its resources, technologies, markets, and money systems, by huge natural and or social catastrophes, or by an upheaval of the people who do not want to lose their lives, their planet, and the future of their children. If the “matter” of capitalism, its *mater*, its mothers, its women, and its

matriarchal remains do not “obey” any more, and if nature fails to as well, only then will capitalist patriarchy disappear. And as capitalist patriarchy is obviously not a society for eternity, all this may well be happening today already.

The “Deep” Alternative

What Has to be Recognized

The alternative to capitalist patriarchy has to be a “deep” one, or it will fail. First of all, the “roots” of this war system will have to be recognized at all levels of society, individual life, history, and the globe. This will occur like a huge transdisciplinary research-project of and for the people. Out of this experience, the alternative will be a systematically non-capitalist and non-patriarchal one. It will be based on the remains of the “second culture” of matriarchy and of the gift-paradigm within patriarchal society, because they offer a body of concrete experiences people have been familiar with ever since humankind began on earth. Even though they have been underestimated, hidden and made invisible to most of us, they can be made conscious again, and this is happening already in many parts of the world (see Bennholdt-Thomsen, von Werlhof and Faraclas 2001)

Even if it appears overwhelming to overcome not only 500 years of modernity, but 5,000 years of patriarchal traditions, this is actually very little in comparison to the hundreds of thousands of years of human experiences outside patriarchy that we have to draw upon.

On the other hand, partial change/reform that maintains features of capitalist patriarchy will most probably, and quickly, lead back to the system that must to be overcome if we want to continue life on earth. Whether the alternative/s that can be found on this basis will again be matriarchal ones or not, cannot be foreseen. At least they will be *post-patriarchal*. At the moment it is historically open if matriarchy can be re-invented, and/or what a matriarchal society and a gift-economy would mean today.

What Has to be Done

What is needed is a re-version of a perverted parasitic society and (wo)mankind. The patriarchal “mother-father” as a “cyborg,” which is the alchemical materialization of a metaphysical fiction has to fade away as soon as possible. We can accomplish this in a number of ways, mainly:

- de-constructing patriarchal institutions, policies, economies, technologies, and ideologies;
- making visible matriarchy as the second culture and the gift paradigm and recognizing their importance in every day life;
- giving up the metaphysical Gnostic worldview, including the belief in patriarchal religions and the patriarchal philosophy of idealism-materialism;

- re-gaining a matriarchal spirituality that leads again to a recognition of the interconnectedness of all life;
- not defining technology/progress any longer as having to produce a substitute for life, women, and nature in general;
- not defining economy any longer as having to produce a “value” and a profit;
- recognizing that the paradise which is supposed to be invented, is already here: It is the earth as the only planet in the known universe that is full of life and the only one on which human beings can survive;
- taking action to save the earth from further human destruction;
- liberating ourselves from the idea that “material” [physical] life on earth is unimportant, sinful, humble, and something that has to be overcome;
- liberating ourselves from the delusion and the hubris that there can ever be a substitute for life and nature on earth;
- learning the lessons of nature again, recognizing that the destruction of nature for the purpose of its transformation does not lead to a better world, but to its destruction;
- giving up war, believing in violence, and seeking to rule over others; learning instead to live in commonality and organizing around egalitarian principles;
- taking seriously what we are doing in and to the world, and accepting our responsibility for the maintenance of life on the planet;
- learning to rehabilitate and love life, including our own, and the life of the earth;
- seeking creative ways for the maintenance and culture of life on the earth; acting in favour of and not in contradiction to them;
- giving up “masculation” (Vaughan 1997), “egotism” as the search for competitive “identity,” and identifying instead with gift-giving and the traditions of men and women in matriarchal cultures;
- learning that women can teach us a lot;
- giving up belief in patriarchy and joining with others in order to stop it; listening instead to the joyful song of mother earth.

We need to be able to perceive an alternative to capitalist patriarchy and see that this alternative is already in the making. Soon we will not be able to understand how or believe that men and women supported and even admired such a destructive delusion for such a long time!

The Struggle

Many alternative movements in the whole world are *already* in this process, for historical reasons most of them initiated by the global South (Kumar 2007) and most of them guided by women. This is the case because the South and women have and had to bear most of the negative consequences of patriarchy and especially

capitalist patriarchy. This is why they are at the forefront of the new movements. Additionally, for women it is still much easier to remember matriarchal society and culture, and gift giving, because the remains of matriarchal culture and practices have for the most part been maintained by them. The way into a post-patriarchal society, therefore, is much more logical and visible for women than for men. The thinking, acting, and feeling of women, especially of poor women in the South, often shows a high level of dissonance with western globalization and culture. They defend life on “two fronts” of the conflict: against the war system of capitalist patriarchy and in favour of a new society (Bennholdt-Thomsen, Werlhof and Faraclas 2001; Werlhof 1985, 1991, 1996).

At the University of Innsbruck a new international research project is planned, the title of which is “On the Way to a New Civilization? Examples Of...” For this research project, current alternative movements worldwide will be compared. Movements that are active on only one of the “two fronts” we are facing today, or that do not address the most important aspects and dimensions of life under patriarchal attack, will find themselves in crisis, sooner or later. This is still the case with many movements in the North and of those traditionally guided by men (Werlhof 2007).

It seems as if a larger and deeper movement in the North will only be possible when the illusions of moving upward within the system have been lost and the daily conditions of life have worsened further. But, in the meantime, extremists of the far right and “religious” fundamentalists everywhere are preparing their field of action, too.

Nobody knows what will be left of alternative movements and “deep feminism” in North and South when the patriarchal system and order of society is imploding and dissolving itself, and when the conflicts within it become increasingly violent. But if anybody has a chance to move in the right direction, it is the truly alternative *post-patriarchal* groups, communities, and movements worldwide.

Claudia von Werlhof is a women's studies professor in the Department of Political Science and Sociology at the University of Innsbruck, Austria. She has published numerous articles and books on a feminist theory of society, critiques of and alternatives to capitalism, and on globalization and patriarchy. Her most recent publications are There is An Alternative: Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization (2001), “Using, Producing and Replacing Life? Alchemy as Theory and Practice in Capitalism” (2004), and “The ‘Zapatistas’, the Indigenous Civilization, the Question of Matriarchy and the West” (2005), and “No Critique of Capitalism Without a Critique of Patriarchy! Why the Left is No Alternative” (2007).

Notes

¹ Compare, for example, the discussion about the “abolition of the state” and the idea of a “communist” society in Marx (Marx and Engels 1970: 415).

References

- Anders, Günther. 1995 [1956]. *Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen*. München: Beck.
- Arendt, Hannah. 1987 [1967]. *Vita Activa. Oder Vom tätigen Leben*. München: Piper.
- Bell, Diane and Renate Klein, eds. 1996. *Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed*. London: Zed Books.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, Claudia von Werlhof and Nicolas Faraclas, eds. 2001. *There is an Alternative: Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization*. London: Zed Books.
- Chargaff, Erwin. 1988. *Unbegreifliches Gebeimnis. Wissenschaft als Kampffür und gegen die Natur*. Stuttgart: Klett Cotta.
- Chattopadhyaya, Debiprasad. 1973 [1959]. *Lokayata: A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism*. New Delhi: Peoples Publishing House.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. *Profit Over People. Neoliberalism and Global Order*. New York: Seven Stories Press.
- Chossudovsky, Michel. 1996. *The Globalization of Poverty*. London: Zed Books.
- Corea. Gena. 1985. *The Mother Machine*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Federici, Sylvia. 2004. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York: Autonomedia.
- Frank, André Gunder. 1978. *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*. London: Basigstoke.
- Genth, Renate. 1996. "Matriarchat als 2. Kultur." *Herren-Los. Herrschaft—Erkenntnis—Lebensform*. Eds. Claudia von Werlhof, Anne Marie Schweighofer and Werner Ernst. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 17-38.
- Genth, Renate. 2002. *Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis. Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Gimbutas, Marija. 1994. *Das Ende Alteuropas. Der Einfall der Steppennomaden aus Südrussland und die Indogermanisierung Mitteleuropas*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft Sonderheft 90.
- Girard, René. *Das Heilige und die Gewalt*. Frankfurt: Fischer.
- Godelier, Maurice. 1987. *Die Produktion der Großen Männer*. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Göttner-Abendroth, Heide, ed. 2003. "Gesellschaft in Balance. Dokumentation des 1. Weltkongresses für Matriarchatsforschung in Luxemburg." Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Hardt, Michael and Antonio Negri. 2000. *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Klare, Michael. 2001. *Resource Wars. The New Landscape of Global Conflict*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Kumar, Corinne, ed. 2007. *Asking, We Walk: The South as New Political Imaginary*. Bangalore: Streelekha.
- Markale, Jean. 1984. *Die keltische Frau*. München: Dianus-Trikont.
- Mies, Maria. 2003. "Über die Notwendigkeit. Europa zu entkolonisieren." *Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung*. Eds. Claudia von Werlhof, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Nicolas Faraclas. Wien: Promedia. 19-40.
- Mies, Maria. 2004. *Krieg ohne Grenzen. Die neue Kolonisierung der Welt*. Köln: Papyrossa.
- Mies, Maria and Claudia von Werlhof, eds. 2003 [1998]. *Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen—MAI—Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft und was wir dagegen tun können*. Hamburg: Rotbuch/EVA
- Polanyi, Karl. 1978 [1944]. *The Great Transformation. Politische und ökonomische Ursprünge*

- von *Gesellschaften und Wirtschaftssystemen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Rifkin, Jeremy. 1998. *The Biotech Century*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam.
- Sloterdijk, Peter and Thomas Macho, eds. 1991. *Weltrevolution der Seele. Ein Lese und Arbeitsbuch zur Gnosis. 2 Bde.* Gütersloh: Artemis und Winkler.
- Sombart, Nicolaus. 1991. *Die Deutschen Männer und ihre Feinde. Carl Schmitt. Ein deutsches Schicksal zwischen Männerbund und Matriarchatsmythos.* München: Carl Hanser.
- Vaughan, Genevieve. 1997. *For-Giving: A Feminist Criticism of Exchange.* Austin, TX: Plainview/Anomaly Press.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 1974. "The Rise und Future Demise of the World Capitalist System. Concepts for Comparative Analysis." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 16 (4): 387-415.
- Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2004. Interview at the World Social Forum, Mumbai 2004. *Netzwerk gegen Konzernherrschaft und neoliberale Politik.* Info brief Nr. 15. March 2004. Köln: Demokratie von unten statt Post-Demokratie. 8-10.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 1985. *Wenn die Bauern wiederkommen. Frauen, Arbeit und Agrobusiness in Venezuela.* Bremen: Peripheria/CON.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 1988. "Women's Work: The Blind Spot in the Critique of Political Economy." *The Last Colony: Women.* Eds. Maria Mies, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Claudia von Werlhof. London: Zed Books. 13-26.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 1991. *Was haben die Hühner mit dem Dollar zu tun? Frauen und Ökonomie.* München: Frauenoffensive.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 1996. Subsistenz. Abschied vom ökonomischen Kalkül?. *Herren-Los. Herrschaft—Erkenntnis—Lebensform.* Eds. Claudia von Werlhof, Anne Marie Schweighofer and Werner Ernst. Frankfurt: Peter Lang. 364-393.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2000. "'Globalization' and the 'Permanent' Process of 'Primitive Accumulation.' The Example of the Multilateral Agreement on Investment (MAI)." *Journal of World-Systems Research* 6 (3) (Fall/Winter): 728-747.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2001. "Losing Faith in Progress: Capitalist Patriarchy as an 'Alchemical System.'" *Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization: There is an Alternative.* Eds. Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicolas Faraclas and Claudia von Werlhof. London: Zed Book. 15-40.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2002. "Go West End." *Der Tag, an dem die Türme fielen. Symbolik und Botschaft des Anschlags.* Ed. Christine Stecher. München: Droemer/Knaur. 274-280.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2003. "Haus. Frauen. 'Gender' und die Schein-Macht des Patriarchats." *Widerspruch* 44 (23, Jg./1 Halbjahr): 173-189.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2004a. "Using, Producing and Replacing Life? Alchemy as Theory and Practice in Capitalism." *The Modern World System in the Longue Durée.* Ed. Immanuel Wallerstein. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Werlhof, Claudia von. 2004b. "Patriarchy as Negation of Matriarchy: The Perspective of a Delusion." Paper presented at the First World Congress of Matriarchal Studies, Luxembourg 2003.
- Werlhof, Claudia. 2007. "No Critique of Capitalism Without a Critique of Patriarchy! Why the Left is No Alternative." *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism* 18 (1) March: 13-27.
- Wolf, Doris. 1994. *Was war vor den Pharaonen? Die Entdeckung der Urmütter Ägyptens.* Zürich: Kreuz.
- Ziegler, Jean. 2002. *Die neuen Herrscher der Welt und ihre globalen Widersacher.* München: Bertelsmann.

Big Mountain Black Mesa

The Beauty Way

I am Dineh (Navajo) from northeastern Arizona. I come from a community, Big Mountain Black Mesa, where our principles and foundations are based on a matriarchal society, and I was raised that way among my people by my mother and father. I come from a large family. I have seven brothers and three sisters, and so, in my life, gift, the beauty way, means not just human relations with one another, but rather, a recognition of universal interconnectedness. They say that the sun is our father; without the sun, there is no life on earth. The mother is the Earth, and in this way we try to remember that there is a balance because there is a female and a male in all our systems. We try to walk this beauty way of life being mindful of this balance, which is difficult right now because there is no longer harmony with this very government that we live under. We have been oppressed for the last 30 or more years in my community because of greed that is lighting up Las Vegas. We have a coal mining operation on our land that has devastated our community for many, many years, and even though our situation may be pleasant at times, our life ways are not the greatest. We still value the gifts of our sun, the gifts of the earth such as food, air, water, and the environment, all of which are being devastated right now because of greed that has no limit and that is affecting everybody everywhere.

How can we get this superpower, this country, to stop this? We don't really know exactly how. Maybe we should show them that just as mothers give unconditionally to their children—a mother's love is the gift we mothers give to all our children, our people, all people, young and old alike—we must give back, unconditionally, to the Earth. Yet, there is greed, there is hatred, there are people that do not understand this world and are going in a direction that depletes and destroys the Earth, never thinking about the next person, never thinking about the future generations.

How we, as the Black Mountain people, live is not recognized in this day and time. We continue to communicate with the earth, with the sky, with the sun, with the atmosphere, with the different seasons, and all the life that is here. Because we feel that we have no control, it does not matter if George Bush is the president. We still have to eat, drink, raise children, and live. In our community we try to exist now by denial; denying that there are all these policies that are affecting our

lives. If we let these policies affect us all the time then we are imbalanced because we are concerned, we are worried, and we may be depressed. So, in my world, I deny that this is happening to our people. The reality of my life is that I have to live, I have to provide, I have to in some way give back to the earth, to the air. I travel to different places speaking and encouraging young people to understand these ways and to value them.

Today it is very challenging because our atmosphere is deteriorating, and in our part of the country, our water is being privatized. There is a very little bit of good drinking water left and all these different companies are after our resources; they want to privatize them, for greed. What do they give back in return? Pollution. And pollution is affecting all the life on earth today. The air is not pure anymore, the water is not pure anymore. This is of great concern to me, and my community.

I feel for the mothers on the other side of the world that are being frightened by terrorists. How are we going to change this? Will it have to be the women who step up and say, "No! We need to stop this!" If this is what it takes, then we must do this, the sooner the better, because there are children, there are mothers, there are brothers, and sisters that are being killed, that are dying, for no reason.

And in Big Mountain the situation is the same. We are not literally being killed, but we are being oppressed, we are denied our human rights, we are denied religious rights, we are denied the right to grow our own food, and we are denied the right to gather a load of wood so we might stay warm through the night. Our life is being denied.

I have lost a lot of people—my elders, my children, my brothers, my sisters—as a consequence of this situation. My people are heartbroken. They don't know what to do. They don't speak English, so there's no comprehension of why others would want to destroy the land. We don't understand this at all. Why do they want to control the air, the water, and how we live?

As children of the earth we should share what we have. If we can give, we must give. If we cannot let go of all of it, we can break a piece of it and still give. That's what "gift" is to me, to my people. Our struggle has always been difficult, because we are up against great odds all the time. But if we pray, if we sing, if we eat, if we grow our food, if we harvest our firewood—that's what our life was like before colonialism—we can continue to walk the beauty way. And we teach this to our children, so that they will have hope to walk in these hard times.

Right now many, many of our children are sent overseas to commit huge crimes against humanity. We, as mothers, have to say something, as sisters we have to say something, as aunties we have to say something. We cannot stand by and allow this to continue, allow our children to be killed, and to kill others. Somehow we have to stop this. We need to unite locally and globally and say, "No! Stop this! Correct this!"

In the end—and we don't have very much time left, with the way things are going now—the greedy want to destroy everything, they want to take everything, but they don't know what lies beyond. Their scientists don't know either. I know

because my grandpa used to say: “Don’t let them take all the resources from the earth, because the moon controls the water wave. If we lose a lot of the resources on the earth, it will unbalance the earth and the moon, and then we are going to be in real trouble.” And that is where we are headed.

The Las Vegas lights, the power to light the city up, comes from my community, Big Mountain Black Mesa. We have no running water, we have no decent housing, we have no electricity, we have no school roads for our kids, we have nothing, but our resources light up Las Vegas. We are outcasts in our own country. But that doesn’t stop us. It encourages us to walk the beauty way and heed the cries of Mother Earth to heal the planet before it is too late.

Louise Benally is a 46-year-old Dineh mother and grandmother. She is a human rights activist, an environmental activist, a traditional educator/counsellor, and an herbalist. Currently, she is working for the Northern Arizona University on health promotion, diabetes prevention, and healing gardens. This is one way she teaches about a “healthy living world” for all the living beings.

The Tragedy of the Enclosures

An Eco-Feminist Perspective on Selling Oxygen and Prostitution in Costa Rica

This paper develops the premise that patriarchal capitalism, which understands conservation in terms of enclosure, uses it as another instrument for colonization of Third World resources, women's work, and nature. This paper connects two aspects of this process: the first is the enclosure of the forest for as an oxygen generator/carbon sink; and the second is the enclosure of women's labour through prostitution. As the forest and women's non-wage labour comprise the support system that local communities use for survival, selling oxygen and prostitution have become a war on subsistence and, consequently, an expansion of poverty. Presenting a case study of the interactive socio-economic-ecological-gender impact of land management on local communities in Costa Rica, I conclude that Costa Rica's foreign debt crisis provides grounds for restructuring accumulation in the industrial world by selling oxygen/carbon sink capacity as the technological solution to environmental destruction, and for repairing masculine anxiety, or "masculation" (Vaughan 1997) by selling its women's and children's bodies as a result/consequence of the inequality crisis.

Introduction

Since the Industrial Revolution humans have greatly increased the quantity of carbon dioxide found in the Earth's atmosphere and oceans. The major sources of these gases are being emitted by industrial processes, fossil fuel combustion, and the modification in land use, such as deforestation. If emissions continue at the present rate, current projections suggest that there will be a global increase in temperature of between, approximately, 1°C to 5°C by 2100 (PhysicalGeography.net; Pew Centre on Global Climate Change). Forest vegetation stores carbon that otherwise might trap heat in the atmosphere, driving up temperatures and speeding up climate change.

Selling oxygen from the rainforest to act as storage of carbon sink has become part of the sustainable development agenda as outlined in the Kyoto Protocol. Governments first agreed to tackle climate change at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. The Kyoto Protocol was the follow-up to the United Nation Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), which set a non-bind-

ing goal of stabilizing emissions at 1990 levels by 2000. This goal has not been met overall (Forbes 2003).

The World Bank (WB) defines sustainable development as the management of the entire cycle of life (humankind and nature) with the intention of expanding “wealth.” This definition of sustainable development allows for the management of a nation’s portfolio of assets. These assets include built infrastructure, natural resources (minerals, energy, agricultural land, forests, etc.), human capital, and social capital. According to the World Bank (1997), many of the critically important ecological and life-support functions provided by natural systems are not yet measured as part of the wealth of nations. Among those not yet captured is the forest. The forest must be embedded in the economic system as natural capital to become a resource for sustainable development. This is very problematic for rainforest dwellers that are not embedded in the market economy.

As forests become commodities for selling oxygen/carbon sink provision, the sexual division of labour and women’s oppression is affected in powerful and serious ways. Evicted from a forest, peasant families are forced to migrate toward cities to look for employment. Rural women and men need to find resources to assure subsistence and emotional support for themselves and dispossessed family members. In the exchange logic, according to Genevieve Vaughan (2004), those who do not succeed in the market, are seen as “defective,” less human, and therefore more exploitable (17). In this context, the gender relations of patriarchal capitalism have constructed peripheral women as cheap labour—cheap sex. In Costa Rica, patriarchal males find a place to practise their quest for domination. Their domination is expressed through their ego-oriented individual psychology, that Genevieve Vaughan has called “masculation.” Masculation expresses dominance of men over women’s bodies. Some males need to confirm their superiority through the use of sexual violence; this is done by degrading anyone in the position of other. In this paper, prostitution and sexual slavery are the enclosure of women’s and children bodies, because they no longer have decision-making power over their own bodies.

The advantages of selling oxygen/carbon sink capacities has been articulated by mainstream environmentalists. Environmentalists from the industrial world have adopted a political stance that sets them and the environmental movement above and beyond class struggle, gender oppression, colonialism, and imperialism. Practicing this narrow form of environmentalism has reinforced the dominant relations of power in global capitalism (Foster 1994). They are oblivious to exploitation, poverty, and the inequalities facing local communities, thus contributing to the displacement of communities on a global level through ill-conceived conservation strategies. In their view, the rainforest and its dwellers are seen as spectators only (Hecht and Cockburn 1990). As a result, the sustainable development agenda has defined the forest as “natural capital,” while rural women have been constituted as “cheap human capital.” Since capital has converted the sensuous world into an abstraction for the purpose of profit, the forest and women come to express alienated ways of being. The double enclosures of the forest and women’s labour

have become another war on the subsistence capacity of rainforest dwellers. This paper will connect the selling of oxygen/carbon sink capacities and prostitution of women and children in Costa Rica.

Capitalist Patriarchy in Costa Rica

Ecologists have provided evidence of the natural limits of the planet to industrial growth (Foster 1994) and consumerism (Wackernagek and Rees 1996), and rejected the belief in unlimited economic growth (Daly 1996). The natural limit is already expressed in the destruction of resources and absorptive capacities for wastes (Alvater 1994), and in irrefutable global warming. As economic growth continues to be central to sustainable development, two Earth Summits—one in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil and the other in Johannesburg, South Africa—to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, air pollution in the form of carbon dioxide, dust particles, and carbon monoxide have failed, making clear that traditional environmental movements are inadequate, and even dangerous in their propositions on how to confront the environmental crisis.

Ecologists and feminists plea for the reorientation of economic development to the goals of maximal reduction of energy and material throughputs for local self-sufficiency as opposed to export-oriented trade competitions—and for consumption norms that recognize “enoughness” (Sachs 1992; Shiva 1989), “sufficiency” as a good life (Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1999), subsistence economies (Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies, 1999), and gift economies (Vaughan 2004). Genevieve Vaughan (2004) argues that patriarchy fabricated an economy based on *private* property (in Latin *privare* = to rob) (see also Claudia von Werlhof on page 141 of this volume). Patriarchy artificially created scarcity in order to erase the gift economy, practiced generation after generation, because most labour in the world is still gift giving. These gifts are women’s non-waged household work; peasant and Indigenous people’s labour; industrial workers’ forced gifts (in Marx’s theory, surplus value is an unpaid portion of the worker’s labour, which is a gift); voluntary work; child labour; and nature.

Costa Rica has an export-oriented economy, however, due to its foreign debt, it is an example of export pressure on resources (Guha and Martinez Alier 1997). In terms of land ownership, United Fruit, a U.S. multinational corporation, enclosed the southern part of the country with banana plantations; the local business community enclosed the central valley for coffee plantations; and foreigners and local businesses enclosed the northwest for cattle ranching. These land grabs by foreign and local businesses deeply divided Costa Rica in terms of land control and power. Excluding the owners of one hectare parcels of property, 83.4 percent of land owners with less than a 100 hectares control 1.12 percent of the national territory, while 0.71 percent of the owners with more than a 100 hectares own 70.3 percent of the country’s territory (*El Estado de la Nacion* 1996: 68).

The sustainable development agenda has aggravated this unequal access to resources by intensifying earlier enclosure of the land through the Conservation

Area System created in 1989 by the then Ministry of Natural Resources, now the Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE). Through Sistema Nacional de Areas de Conservación (SINAC), the conservation area model was implemented to manage the country's wildlife and biodiversity. SINAC divided the country into eleven Conservation Areas, which incorporate wildlife, privately-owned land, and human settlements, and placed them under the current Ministry of Environment and Energy's supervision. In enclosing 24.8 percent of the national territory, SINAC expanded the enclosure model. The expropriated land has been organized along the lines of national parks in North America from which people are excluded and denied any role in sustaining the ecosystems contained therein (Hecht and Cockburn 1990). These expropriated lands are linked to transnational and political networks to forge local and global "stakeholders" through categories of management such as human patrimony, national parks, wet land, biological reserves, protected zones, forest reserves, and wildlife refuges. At the same time internal boundaries are established, separating local people who share volcanoes, waterfalls, rivers, hot springs, congo-monkeys, and turtle-spawning havens. The separated lands then become sites for mining (Isla 2002), research (Isla 2005a), ecotourism (Isla 2005b), and the selling of oxygen.

Enclosure of the Rainforest: Selling Oxygen/Generating Carbon Sinks

In the sustainable development framework, forests have become natural capital. But the forest, in the rainforest, is an essential mechanism for flood control. In the forest, trees are connected directly to each other through the multitude of creatures that relate to them as food, shelter or nesting place; through their shared access to water, air and sunlight; and through an underground system of fungi that links all the trees as a super-organism. Rainforest people are also members of this super-organism.

The Kyoto Protocol commits industrialized nations to reducing emissions of greenhouse gases, principally carbon dioxide, by around 5.2 percent below their 1990 levels by 2007. In the Climate Change Convention held in Kyoto in 1997, industrial countries agreed to create mechanisms to reduce the emissions of gases responsible for the greenhouse effect. Among these is carbon dioxide (CO₂), largely discharged by the industrial world. However, reducing gas emission implies high costs for industries that the industrial world protects. Thus, it was easier for the major emitting corporations, with the backing of their governments, to propose a self-interested "solution": create a global market in carbon dioxide and oxygen, focused on the forest of indebted countries. According to the scheme of the Climate Change Convention, countries or industries that manage to reduce emissions to levels below their limits will be able to sell their "credit" to other countries or industries that exceed their emission levels. Following the Convention, the Clean Development Fund thus evolved into the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), an arrangement under the Kyoto Protocol that allows industrialized countries with a greenhouse gas reduction commitment to "invest" in emission

reducing projects in developing countries as an alternative to what is generally considered more costly emission reductions in their own countries.

With the introduction of the Kyoto Protocol, the rainforest is valued economically through the securing of CO₂ strategies. Carbon emission became subject to trading in an open market. The use of the absorption of CO₂ by the forest to compensate for other countries' emissions developed easily in indebted Costa Rica.¹ Through international covenants, Costa Rica organized conservation, management of forests and reforestation, and sells environmental services to Norway, Germany, Holland, Mexico, Canada, and Japan (*El Estado de la Nación* 1996: 129). During Jose Figueres' administration (1994-1998), the Forestry Law (7575) and the decree DAJ-D-039-98 were signed to regulate payments for environmental services. Certification for forest conservation is legislated by Forestry Law, Art. 22, which is under the jurisdiction of MINAE. Under the Forestry Incentive Programs (FIP), MINAE receives, evaluates, and approves the terms of the program and promotes and compensates owners of forestry plantations. The decree recognizes the forest and forest plantation owners, small farmers (*finca* owners), and Conservation Areas (CA) as providers of environmental services eligible to receive payments for the environmental services they provide. MINAE also developed a law of expropriation, which outlines the limits placed on initiating any project on small and medium-size farms.

Since the industrial world is not held responsible for mitigating its own level of emissions, this "solution" has allowed the industrial world to continue polluting by means of the purchase of carbon credits from the indebted rainforest, while energy-related emissions produced by the increase in the amounts of coal and oil burned mainly in the industrial world, the leading cause of climate change, proceeds unimpeded.

Selling CO₂, to mitigate carbon emissions, is a colonial, class- and gender-biased practice that impacts on the nature of indebted countries, subsistence production, and on women.

Paying the Price of the Kyoto Protocol: Crisis of Nature

The selling of oxygen is transforming the rainforest. Forest farms have been established. Reforestation is particularly promoted among large-scale agricultural entrepreneurs in association with international capital, which also benefits from tax relief under Fiscal Forestry Incentives (FFI). FFI reforestation involves international capital, which uses foreign forest species of high yield and great market acceptance, such as *melina* (used by Stone Forestall, a United States corporation), and teak (used by Bosques Puerto Carrillo and Maderas). Big projects related to the planting of forests in general are also connected to the interests of big mining corporations. For instance, in Arenal-Huetar Norte Conservation Area, Industries Infinito S.A., a subsidiary of the Canadian company Vanessa Ventures, which obtained permits to operate Mining Crucitas over an area of 1,000 hectares, also has a reforestation project on 32 hectares where it planted 20,000 trees to profit from the Forestry

Incentive Plan (FIP). The corporations are allowed to log the trees after ten years of growth and transform them into wood for floors and/or paper.

Between 1996 and 2001, around 121,000 to 147, 000 hectares of foreign trees were planted; 50 percent percent of the species are *melina* and teak (MINAE 2001; Sage and Quirós 2001; De Camino, Segura, Arias, and Pérez1999), and the rest are eucalyptus. The government had enthusiastically promoted converting forest ecosystems into sterile monocultures by planting homogeneous forests, despite the fact that *melina*, teak and eucalyptus are not indigenous to Costa Rica's rainforest. In order to plant homogenous species, if the owners want to manage recurrence (return), the first step is to remove all the native trees and vegetation, which increases the extraction of nutrients, and with it the devastation of the productive capacity of the soil. Thus, chemical fertilizers are massively spread throughout the area targeted for the plantation. This choice was clearly dictated by industry (flooring wood and paper). This has negative effects on soil fertility, water retention, and on biological diversity.

The consequences of planting teak has been explained by Sonia Torres (2001), a forestry engineer, who explains how foreign trees produces erosion on flat lands. In the rainforest, biodiversity means a great number of leguminosae with differently sized leaves, which lessen the impact of rainfall and prevent erosion. She used the example of teak to illustrate the problem.

Since the planting of these foreign species, I have observed that teak has a root system that grows deep into the soil, but in the rainforest the systems of nutrient and water absorption are at the surface. In general, nutrients and water are concentrated between 70 and 100 centimetres deep. As a result, teak trees are encircled by flaked soil. In addition, when it rains, the size of the leaf accumulates great amounts of water that then pours violently onto the soil. A drop of water, at a microscopic level, forms a crater; when water falls from 15 metres or more it forms holes. Water descending on soft soil destroys the soil. The far-reaching spread of the roots and the shade produced by the leaves obstruct the vegetative growth on the lower forest layer, which could prevent the soil damage from the violent cascades.

Torres advocates the planting and protection of indigenous tree species that can also feed the indigenous population, animals, bacteria, etc.

Crisis of Rainforest Dwellers

The selling of oxygen scheme has also transformed local communities. In Costa Rica, the state's project of selling CO₂ expropriated the small- and medium-sized landholders without compensation to the owners has been exposed:

A symbol of pride of Costa Ricans, the national parks constitute a unique model in the world, which offer innumerable benefits to society in particular

and the planet in general, but they are in a critical situation due to the lack of resources to give them sustainability and cancel the debt to the former property owners whose lands were expropriated or frozen for the sake of protection. (Odio 2001: 2)

By August 1999, the government owed US\$100 million to evicted *campesinos/as* (peasants). Around that time, it offered to pay US\$6,703.45 per hectare to the dispossessed families (Vizcaino 1999). However, by 2001, 14,917 hectares of land were still not paid for, affecting approximately 745 families that have been made landless and impoverished by the conservation areas system.

Large projects related to the planting of forests in general are also connected to the interests of international mining corporations, large environmental NGOs, and government institutions (MINAE in Costa Rica). For instance, in the Arenal Conservation Area, organized by the World Wildlife Fund-Canada, national parks such as Arenal Volcano and Tenorio Volcano National Park, and forestry reserves such as Cerro Chato, sell oxygen. But to put the oxygen on the market, in 1994, the Arenal Volcano was declared Arenal Volcano National Park. From five hectares, the park was extended to 12,010 hectares. As a result, entire communities were forcibly evicted. While the majority of the land around the volcano was not arable or adequate for cattle ranching, small farms had existed in the area. *Campesinas/os* who had organized their lives by clearing land for agricultural production and pasture around the Arenal Basin were expelled by (MINAE). An injunction brought to Costa Rica's Supreme Court (Division IV of the judicial system), reported heavy losses by *campesinas/os* who lived in the Basin area of the Arenal Conservation Area. They lost land, pasture, houses, dairies, and roads. Former property owners have become hut renters (*ranchos*) or slum inhabitants (*tugurios*). The personal effects of the *campesinas/os*, such as cars and small electrical appliances, were taken by the commercial banks when they could not afford to repay their loans acquired for economic development (Monestel Arce 1999). When, in desperation, some of them returned to their land to plant yucca, beans, maize, and other subsistence foods, they were declared to have broken the law and some of them were thrown in jail (Siete Dias de Teletica 1999).

In 1996, La Cuenca de Aguas Claras was also declared a forestry reserve. In 2001, I attended a public Town Hall meeting in La Cuenca de Aguas Claras at which more than 200 farmers, men and women, arrived ready to be interviewed. Since they were too many to each be interviewed, the farmers chose Abel Fuentes and Luis Guimo² to speak on their behalf. They declared themselves witnesses of the following accounts. According to Fuentes (2001), MINAE had stated that:

our survival way of life is producing deforestation and pollution, and reducing the water level of La Cuenca de Aguas Claras. [But] MINAE exaggerated the level of deforestation to oust almost all the inhabitants because it is reforesting our land in order to sell the oxygen to other countries and get "donations."

MINAE's argument for expropriating their land was based on the claim of water reduction in the area. Water scarcity has been converted into a strategy to convince *campesino/as* to let MINAE reforest while the owners of the land are evicted.

Fuentes had witnessed the forced eviction of rainforest dwellers.

Until 1996, in La Cuenca de Aguas Calientes, 200 families lived and the land was organized as follows: 70 percent was pastureland, holding around 2,000 cows; 10 percent primary forest; and 20 percent combined secondary forest, which was used for beans and pig production. By 2001, we were only three families; the majority were forced into exile. And the land has been re-organized as follows: 90 percent is primary and secondary forest; 10 percent is pastureland with less than 200 cows; and land to produce beans has been extinguished.

Fuentes believes that his rights and his community's rights have been violated under the law of expropriation of 1995. As soon as the expropriation law was passed, some of the *campesino/as* went to MINAE's office to get more information about the law, but were purposely misled by the government. Fuentes declared that:

the government denied our right to know the law. When we requested a copy of it, a representative of MINAE showed us a giant book, saying that he couldn't give us a copy, because of the volume of the decree. However, later, one of our members found the legislation on the Internet and printed it on just one page.

Martin Guimo (2001), also a small landholder who still lives within the expropriated land, added:

When we ask MINAE officials for information, they decide when and where we can get it. When we propose a meeting, they decide when and where we can meet, then they change the hour, the date, or they cancel the meeting without telling us. Many of us live far from the meeting place and sometimes we have to ride a horse for three hours to go to a meeting and it is disappointing to arrive and learn that the meeting has been cancelled.

The snatching of the forest from local communities who use it to sustain themselves has become a death sentence for small and medium-size landholders. As a result, their needs are dismissed, and community members who used to live off the forest are declared enemies of the rainforest.

The eviction of the rainforest dwellers is justified by claims they will find employment in the cities. Rural community members know opportunities for well-paying jobs and upward mobility in Costa Rica's cities is a myth. They know that there is a surplus of people in the cities whose basic human needs cannot be met and whose human rights are violated (Robinson 2003; Bennholdt-Thomsen and Mies 1999). Maria Mies (1986) argues that community members in the Third World dispossessed from their livelihood cannot expect to become dependent

on wages. Peripheral landless women and men will not have the good fortune of their peers from the core countries to find a job and share the wealth extracted from colonies, because they themselves are the colonies.

Crises of Women and Children: Impoverishment and Prostitution

The power of the industrial world to re-design the forest as oxygen producer exacerbates inequalities. As a new structure of accumulation emerges, the disintegration of the ecosystem that supported the means of survival of local communities has powerful effects on the sexual division of labour and women's oppression. When families are violently disintegrated or displaced and impoverished, rural women are encouraged to migrate to San Jose and tourist areas in the hope of earning an income for themselves and their dispossessed families. Introduced into the cash base economy, impoverished women earn all or part of their living as prostitutes. Prostitutes in Costa Rica are women at work supporting children and family members. They are in the market not by choice but out of necessity. Along with them, there are an astonishing amount of children who are bought, sold, and mistreated by society (Casa Alianza 2001a). By complying with the desires of the so-called developed men, these women contribute to the global production of the tourism industry, and to the wealth of businesses and states, as we will see.

Pressured by the global institutions (the International Monetary Fund [IMF] and the World Bank), indebted Costa Rica has become the premier eco-tourism and sex tourism destination since the early 1990s (Isla 2005b). Eco-tourism promotion links conservation areas with tourism, and promises a world of leisure, freedom, and safe risk; while sex tourism portrays an image of women and children as exotic and erotic. This image of the country entangles the economic relations of domination between creditors (the industrial world) and debtors (the indebted periphery), and the psychological relations of hypermasculinity or "masculation" of fragile male egos that the exchange system develops. As Costa Rica becomes impoverished by its foreign debt, manufactured by the U.S and England in 1982 (Roddick 1988), we can see the marks of these changing international power relations on the bodies of Costa Rican children and women (Pettman 1997). Rich, white men move across borders for racialized sex tourism. Male sex tourists, in their 40s and 50s, come mainly from the creditor countries, such as the U.S, Europe, and Canada. In Costa Rica, most pimps that profit from sex-tourism are men from the patriarchal industrial world—U.S, Canada, Spain, and others. They bring with them the political economy and culture, material relations, and particular perceptions of how the world works (Pettman 1997: 96). On the Internet, there are currently more than 70 websites selling Costa Rican women.³

Costa Rica is also indebted to Canada; from 1992 to 1996, 313,525 Canadians visited Costa Rica. In 1997 alone, 36,032 Canadians (ITC 1999) visited Costa Rica, while by 2002 this number had grown to 50,000 (Malarak 2004). A 2004 CBC report by journalist Victor Malarek, made it clear that Canadian males engage in sex-tourism. According to his report, these men can be found at the

El Rey Hotel in San Jose, where secret videos for sex and teenagers are waiting to be bought and women are sold for \$10 or \$20 dollars. Prostitution in Costa Rica has become widespread; in San Jose alone 2,000 girls are working in the sex-trade (Casa Alianza 2001a). Trafficking is a growing problem. Many of the teenagers being sold into the sex industry in Costa Rica are victims of trafficking from Nicaragua, Guatemala, and Honduras. Traffickers threaten to kill their parents and siblings if they are identified. The “wealth” generated by those women goes back to the IMF and the World Bank as interest payment on Costa Rica’s outstanding foreign debt.

As the country slides into a more subordinated position, the entire country has become a paradise for pedophilia. Men interested in young girls, and gay male tourists (and so-called straight male tourists) who want to have experiences with boys travel to Costa Rica to engage in sex with or take pornographic pictures of children. Child pornography has become an established industry in Costa Rica (EFE News 2003).

More than a million tourists go to Costa Rica every year, and at least 5,000 are pedophiles....Women and children involved in sex work commonly contract sexually transmitted diseases or die of AIDS-related illness. (Casa Alianza 2001b)

By 2001, international groups put Costa Rica’s government under intense scrutiny for its lack of action against the sexual abusers of children, most of them tourists. In an economy increasingly based on enclosure of the Commons, complicit Costa Rican governments do not want to stop the sex-trade industry because they know that this is the only way left for women and children to earn a living. As a result, the government’s attitude is one of general indifference to recognizing and reporting the criminal activity. Ex-president of Costa Rica, Miguel Angel Rodriguez stated on an American television program in 2001 that there were only “20 or 30” children being sexually exploited in Costa Rica, even though the U.S. Department of State estimated 3,000 children were victims of commercial sexual exploitation in Costa Rica (see Casa Alianza 2001c). The Costa Rican government also protects the sex industries because it generates hundreds of millions of dollars per year that the state uses to pay its foreign debt.

Although prostitution is prohibited in Costa Rica by law, there is no enforcement to stop this oppression of the poor and marginalized members of society considered disposable. To endure their misery of sexual activity with five or six men daily, many of the enslaved women and children turn to drugs and alcohol. In 2001, three young street girls went missing and were eventually found dead, cut into pieces and strewn around San Jose (Casa Alianza 2001c) with seeming impunity. By 2001, there were only five people in jail (four U.S citizens and one Costa Rican) awaiting trial for the sexual exploitation of children, despite the 230 criminal complaints that Casa Alianza (2001a), a U.S. nonprofit organization in Central America that works with homeless children and kids at social risk, pre-

sent to the Costa Rican authorities. In addition, the police are often part of the problem. On August 10, 1999, the Costa Rican Special Prosecutor Against Sex Crimes received a judge's order to raid "The Green Door," a private club operated by a U.S. citizen that offered female "escorts" and minors for sex to businessmen and foreign residents in Costa Rica. Helped by the Minister of Public Security, Rogelio Ramos, the U.S. criminal escaped (see Casa Alianza 2001b). Further, when young girls are arrested, the victims are punished by police who demand oral sex (Malarek 2004).

In Costa Rica, women are also sex tourists. Rich U.S., Canadian, and European women sex tourists take advantage of their superior class and race status to lure young boys and men. There are reports that young boys and men engage in "romance tourism" with these women, usually well-off, single, professional women who travel to resort areas and provide a willing male with drinks, dinners, shopping sprees, jewellery, and other luxury goods in exchange for sex and companionship. In this criminal environment, women can be as exploitative as men (Sanchez Taylor 2001), but women can also be endangered by their "romantic companions."

Resisting Narrow Environmentalism

The definition of forest as oxygen generator actually destroys sustainable ways of living, thus creating real material poverty, or misery, by expropriating or diminishing the capacities of the forest to sustain its dwellers. *Campesinolas* know that their human rights have been violated by MINAE and other organizations that call themselves environmentalist. Referring to these "environmentalists" organizations, Luis Guimo (2001) stated:

They used to come to us for information, and we provided it. I personally boarded people and allowed them to use my horses to move about comfortably. Things are changing; we cannot collaborate anymore. MINAE told me that I have to sell my finca to the state and at the price the state decides. We are not leaving. They have to kill us if they want our land.

Further, the creditors' power relations that encourage selling oxygen are written on the bodies of the forest, the women, and the children of indebted Costa Rica. As dwellers are evicted from their land, dispossessed and vulnerable women and children turn to the sexual tourism industry for survival, forcing them into sexual slavery. First world white males, with the complicity of local governments, thus exploit the economic hardships of the inequality crisis created by global capitalism with impunity.

The messages of power from the industrial world and its privileged males deem Costa Rican women and children, and nature inferior. Consequently, the enclosure of the Costa Rican forest, for capital accumulation, has condemned Costa Rica's rural women and children to destitution, prostitution, and/or death. Ironically, the situation of Costa Rica as country is the same as the situation of its prosti-

tutes—both are kept in financial debt by their pimps: the IMF, the World Bank, commercial banks, and powerful countries in the first case and brothel owners in the second. They live in debt bondage where the arrangements are such that neither the country nor the sexual slave can ever earn enough to pay off their debts or become autonomous beings.

But, Costa Rican women and men, with the support of local municipalities, are no longer silent. They are defending their rights to a secure livelihood. In their battle against losing livelihoods, men and women have uncovered the class, gender, and colonial relations of the sustainable development agenda in the alliances between their “national” government and international capital. At the same time, women and children’s battered and enslaved bodies have shown that the Kyoto Protocol that uses the rainforest as carbon sink is not separated from their subsistence and everyday life.

By pressuring investors around the world and by exposing the fallacy of “sustainable development” that does not acknowledge its class, gender, colonial, and imperialist bias, women from all over the world can join their Costa Rica sisters in their struggle for a just and healthy world. No blank cheque to the Kyoto Protocol! The women’s movement needs to support the Kyoto Protocol only if it is committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions by imposing limits on the gases produced by the factories and lifestyles in the North. It cannot be endorsed if it will continue with the expropriation of the rainforest that represents the basis of the survival economy of its dwellers.

Ana Isla’s current research specialty and interests are feminism, eco-feminism, women in development, Third World women, women’s micro-enterprises, political economy, political ecology, the Commons, enclosure in the twenty-first century, debt crisis, globalization and global issues, social justice, racism, economic development, sustainable development, debt-for-nature swaps, poverty issues, community organizing, the gift economy, bio-piracy, Indigenous knowledge, eco-tourism, mining and environmental NGOs. She is assistant professor at Brock University and a member of Toronto Women for a Just and Healthy Planet.

Notes

- ¹ Costa Rica had a small debt, US\$ 4,000,000 in 2000, but it is one of the highest indebted countries in the world due to its reduced population.
- ² These names are pseudonyms.
- ³ See, for example, the website of U.S citizen Alan Seaman, who organizes prostitution tours from a website called “Dream Getaway: Fantasy Resort Adult Vacations.” In his advertisement, Costa Rican women are constructed as a “body-for-others,” as body object of desire, or bodies for men’s use (Pettman 1997): “Dream Getaway Packages or Adult Vacation Packages can be mixed-and-matched to suit your most exotic, erotic dreams and budget. The packages here are merely suggestions. Dream Getaway works with you on a personal basis to truly make your dreams realities....

Please note that some people think these prices include companions. They do not.... The companions set their own prices, varying from \$200 to \$600 per day. If that is not what you want, we can offer a City Tour (in a nice casino hotel) and a Private Beach Club where you can stay in safety and pick your own girls by the hour or day. The cost is \$100/day.”

References

- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika and Maria Mies. 1999. *The Subsistence Perspective*. London: Zed Books.
- Casa Alianza. 2001a. “Man Charged in Costa Rica for ‘dishonest abuse’ of children.” January 9.
- Casa Alianza. 2001b. “Costa Rica policeman convicted for helping child pimp escape.” January 31.
- Casa Alianza. 2001c. “Third Street Girl goes Missing in Costa Rica.” March 14.
- Clean Development Mechanism (CDM). Online: http://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol/mechanisms/clean_development_mechanism/items/2718.php. Accessed February 14, 2007.
- Daly, Herman. 1996. *Beyond Growth: The Economics of Sustainable Development*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- De Camino, Ronnie, O. Segura, L. Arias and I. Pérez. 1999. “Forest Policy and the Evolution of Land Use: An Evaluation of Costa Rica’s Forest Development and World Bank Assistance.” Online: http://www.wrm.org.uy/english/tropical_forest/WorldBank.html.
- Dream Getaway: Fantasy Resort Adult Vacations. Online: <http://1dreamgetaway.com/packages.htm>. Date accessed: June 15, 2005.
- EFE News*. 2003, April 10.
- El Estado de la Nación en Desarrollo Humano Sostenible*. 1996. Primera Edición 1997. San Jose, Costa Rica.
- Forbes. 2003, December 9. “Factbox—What is the Kyoto Protocol?” Online: http://www.forbes.com/home_europe/newswire/2003/12/09/rtr1175321.html. Date accessed: June 15, 2005.
- Fuentes, Abel (pseudonym). 2001. Personal interview, July 22.
- Foster, Bellamy John. 1994. *The Vulnerable Planet. A Short Economic History of the Environment*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Guha, Ramachandra and J. Martinez-Alier. 1997. *Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South*. Delhi: Calcutta Chennai Mumbai.
- Guimo, Luis (pseudonym). 2001. Personal interview July 22.
- Hecht, Susana and Alexander Cockburn. 1990. *The Fate of the Forest: Developers, Destroyers and Defenders of the Amazon*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Instituto Costarricense de Turismo (ITC). 1999. Unpublished internal paper. Isla, Ana. 2002. “A Struggle for Clean Water and Livelihood: Canadian Mining in Costa Rica in the Era of Globalization.” *Canadian Woman Studies/les cahiers de la femme* 21/22 (4,1): 148-154.
- Isla, Ana. 2005a. “Conservation as Enclosure: An Eco-Feminist Perspective on Sustainable Development and Biopiracy in Costa Rica.” *Capitalism, Nature, Socialism*. 16 (3) (September): 49-61.
- Isla, Ana. 2005b. “The Tragedy is Enclosure: An Eco-Feminist Perspective on Eco-Tourism in Costa Rica.” Paper presented at Women’s Studies Paper Series, Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada, September 21.

- Kyoto Protocol. Online: <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/convkp/kpeng.html>. Accessed February 14, 2007.
- Malarek, Victor. 2004. "Prostitution in Costa Rica." Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Mies, Maria. 1986. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Ministry of Environment and Energy (MINAE). 2001. *Plan Nacional de Desarrollo Forestal 2001-2010*. San Jose, Costa Rica.
- Monestel Arce, Yehudi. 1999. "Campesinos Precaristas en su Propia Tierra." *Eco Catolico* January 17: 11.
- Odio, Elizabeth. 2001. "Modelo Unico en el Mundo." *Al Dia* August 24: 2.
- Pew Centre on Global Climate Change. "Global Warming Basics." Online: <http://www.pewclimate.org/global-warming-basics>. Date accessed: June 15, 2005.
- Pettman, Jan J. 1997. "Body Politics: International Sex Tourism." *Third World Quarterly* 18 (1): 93-108.
- PhysicalGeography.net. "Introduction to the Biosphere." Online: <http://www.physical-geography.net/fundamentals/9r.html>.
- Robinson, William. 2003. *Transnational Conflicts: Central America, Social Change, and Globalization*. London: Verso.
- Roddick, Jackie. 1988. *The Dance of Millions: Latin America and the Debt Crisis*. London: Latin American Bureau (Research and Action).
- Sachs, Wolfgang. 1992. *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge as Power*. London: Zed Books.
- Sage, Luis and R. Quirós. 2001. *Proyección del volumen de madera para aserrio proveniente de las plantaciones de melina, teca, y otras fuentes. Proyecto Mercadeo e industrialización de madera proveniente de plantaciones forestales*. TCP/COS/006(A)-FAO. 25.
- Siete Dias de Teletica*. 1999, January 19. Newscast.
- Sanchez Taylor, Jacqueline. 2000. "Tourism and 'Embodied' Commodities: Sex Tourism in the Caribbean." *Tourism and Sex: Culture, Commerce and Coercion*. Eds. Stephen Clift and Simon Carter. London: Pinter, Biddles Ltd., Guildford and King's Lynn. 41-53.
- Shiva, Vandana. 1989. *Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Torres, Sonia. 2001. Coordinadora Frente Nacional de Oposicion a la Minería, Personal interview.
- Vaughan, Genevieve, ed. 2004. *Il Dono/The Gift: A Feminist Analysis*. *Athanon: Semiotica, Filosofia, Arte, Letteratura* 15 (8). Roma: Meltemi Editore.
- Vizcaíno, Irene. 1999. "Deuda millonaria por las expropiaciones." *La Nación* August 29.
- Wakernagel, Mathis and William Rees. 1996. *Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth*. New Catalyst Bioregional Series. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- World Bank. 1997. "Measuring the Wealth of Nations." *Expanding the Measure of Wealth: Indicators of Environmentally Sustainable Development*. Environmentally Sustainable Development Studies and Monographs Series No. 17. 19-39.

Real Bodies, Place-Bound Work and Transnational Homemaking

A Feminist Project

In this paper, I walk on “hope’s edge.” I first focus on what has been “pushing our little planet closer to hope’s very edge” (Lappé and Lappé 2002: 11) by looking at the way migrant domestic workers or trafficked women are being used, abused, or used up. The second part of the essay looks at the radical political message that migrant domestic workers and trafficked women give us. They push our understanding of what Genevieve Vaughan (1997) refers to as “gift labour” a bit further by laying bare its physical, bodily, place- and earth-bound grounding, and how that can be, must be the grounding for transnational, global political connections. Their stories tell us that we need to be both place-bound and nomadic.

For the past three decades my main political interests and concerns have been with international and sexual divisions of labour around the notion of “subsistence work.” Because raising children, or motherwork, is primarily oriented towards sustaining life, it is a prime example of subsistence work. Within Vaughan’s framework subsistence work is paradigmatic for gift labour. Moreover, and that is my main emphasis here, it is place-bound work, and it is tied to the physical necessities, the blood, guts, and gore of real, messy life.

I previously investigated how this place-bound work is inserted in a political economy of race-class segregation in the inner city of Chicago, where I live (Hart 2002). Here mothers do place-bound work in a confined, sectioned-off space.

The “welfare debate” of the 1990s—culminating in the 1996 *Welfare Act* in the U.S.—did not criticize any racial-economic segregations or confinements. Nor did it criticize the relocation of jobs to cheap labour countries, jobs most inner city residents held in the steel or car industry.

It did, however, “criticize” by vilifying the place-bound nature of the work “welfare mothers,” also referred to as “welfare queens,” were doing. The government had to pay for work that made women get stuck in one place. They clearly had to become mobile, had to get away from their children—or disappear between the cracks of a punitive welfare system, and of economic realities that offered jobs only to some, and only for non-living wages.

It is not difficult to see a link between this enforced mobility and the growing internationalization of domestic and cleaning work. In order for the state to reduce its expenses, or to receive remittances badly needed to pay back loans to

the International Monetary Fund (IMF) or World Bank, mothers have to be torn from their children. The children then become the invisible and never-talked-about little figures being pushed around in an abysmal or non-existing childcare system, or being taken care of “back home” in the nether-land of a private household.

At the current stage in the patriarchal-capitalist game trafficking in women and the movement of migrant women across the globe are part and parcel of the overall transformation of national economies.¹ Motherhood and sexuality are an integral, logical part of import/export schemes that are typical for this new economy where poor countries export, or send, and rich (or richer) countries import, or receive. Mobile motherhood and mobile sex are intricately tied to capital mobility, and to the extractive nature of a predatory finance capitalism.

There are often tremendous cultural differences and geographical distances between so-called sending and receiving countries, and all countries have their own variation of patriarchal cultural practices.² However, it is the patriarchal-capitalist underbelly that provides the connective tissue of all—paid or unpaid—versions of a kind of labour that has always supported a capitalist interior infrastructure of service and servitude, one that has now simply gone global.

It is only logical that the U.S. military was the institution that introduced organized prostitution to the Philippines. Here ordinary guns are joined by hard (erect) penis-guns. We can add to this arsenal of guns the gene gun, and what Vaughan calls “the phallic-father-money” (1997: 219) of the financial money gamblers. These guns are all pointed at real, organic, imperfect bodies or organisms. They blast DNA coated particles into live, not-yet modified organisms, they make bodies do what is profitable (or pleasurable), penetrate them, and dispose of them once they are no longer useful, or they simply bomb them out of existence.

Global trafficking in women’s bodies, sex home-delivery to American GIs, and rapes of live-in “maids to order” (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001: 92) in the privacy of individual households are all variations of the same greedy contempt for women’s sexuality and birthing capacity.

Real life is extracted from real bodies by trading them as disposable sex toys (that get shipped back once American GI’s infected them), or disposable domestic workers. Extraction is part and parcel of keeping in check such real life, or real life capacity.

Profitable capitalist-patriarchal assaults on migrant women’s bodies often result in death. For instance, as reported by GABRIELA, a U.S.-Philippine women’s solidarity organization, one coffin per day is sent back to the Philippines with the body of a woman killed as a domestic or a sex worker.

Foreign domestics are aliens from a different culture, and they are non-citizens that marks and regulates them as bonded or enslaved labourers. Or they are undocumented illegals desperate enough to put up with any kind of abuse. Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo (2001) lists various agency names in the Los Angeles area, which she studied: *Mama’s Maid to Order*, *Domestic Darlings*, *Maid in Heaven*, or *Custom Maid for You*. She also observed that the name the maids themselves give to all of them is “Domestic Desperation” (92).

In the United States, the worker's immigrant status provides the most powerful axis of inequality, especially with respect to live-in domestic workers (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001: 13). The informal privacy of individual, isolated households deliberately invites keeping desperate undocumented immigrants in slave-like conditions. Live-in jobs, the typical point of entry for Latina immigrants, are therefore described as prisons, where *te encierras*—you lock yourself up (63). Moreover, the *Fair Labour Standards Act* (Sec.14(b)(21)) completely exempts live-in employees from overtime coverage.

There exist some limited protective labour laws. Not surprisingly, those who “work as personal attendants—for example, baby-sitters, caregivers to young children, or companions of the elderly and infirm” “are explicitly *excluded* from the right to earn minimum wage and overtime pay.” The laws cover “those who clean and care for material possessions.” If those who do private care work want to have the same legal rights they must show “that they devote at least 20 percent of their work time to housekeeping duties”(Hondagneu-Sotelo, 2001: 212-13).³

Officers of international money lending institutions such as the IMF or World Bank directly benefit from cheap, bonded, or enslaved labourers, especially in the U.S., the most powerful Minority World country. The provisions of special visas (A-3, G-5, and B-1) allow foreign nationals, diplomats, and IMF or World Bank officials to import domestic help. The State Department does keep records of the whereabouts of A-3 and G-5 domestic workers, but “this information is classified as confidential, for the privacy of the employer.” B-1 is a catch-all business category, and the State Department keeps no records of domestic helpers imported under its provisions. It not only allows foreign nationals but also American citizens with a permanent residence abroad to bring along domestic help when visiting the United States. The workers suffer some of the most blatant abuses, from having to sleep outside with the family dog, being sexually harassed, or working for sixteen hours per day, all week long, for \$100 a month. In contrast to A-3 and G-5 visa holders, workers employed under the auspices of a B-1 visa do not have the legal right to transfer to another employer which makes the women “live as prisoners in the homes they clean” (Zarembka 2003: 145-47).

All forms of hyperregulation, indentured servitude or enslavement are interwoven with seemingly endless variations of racialization practices, abetted by an equally diverse array of immigration policies, government-sponsored labour import or foreign contract labour programs, national regulatory regimes, and the actions of placement or employment agencies, brothel owners, or sex traffickers.

The “racialness of alien labour” may be camouflaged by labour importation or employment schemes by hiding behind terms such as “foreign” (Cheng 2003: 183) or by using the ability or inability to speak English as a code for national and ethnic-stereotypical preferences. When employment agencies advertise their “Malibu Mamas” or “Nannies By Design” by listing various important steps in the screening process (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001: 93), linguistic criteria are used to hide, or de-racialize, hiring selections that employ certain cultural or national stereotypes. An employer may have a racial preference for a Latina applicant

precisely because she does not speak English so she cannot understand what her employer family is talking about, thus making her presence more invisible (102). Filipinas may therefore be rejected because they are more educated, and thus more “uppity.” As reported by Wolfgang Uchatius (2004), formerly unemployed teachers, accountants, or veterinarians may have taken a course at Manila’s Women’s University on how to fold, tug, or line up the sheets when making a bed in an Italian household in order to find paid domestic work. Especially in English-speaking countries, their educational background and the fact that they also speak and thus understand English directly undermines their classification as subordinates who are incapable of doing anything but physical domestic labour.

Sex-touring and trafficking in women likewise feed off the notion of sex workers’ special proclivities. European companies’ brochure designers, or Internet advertiser on *The World Sex Guide* do not see any need to camouflage racialized attributes. In Germany or the Netherlands, for instance, they become advertising turn-ons that praise “slim, sunburnt, and sweet” wares because “they love the white man in an erotic and devoted way,” or as “little slaves” they “give real Thai warmth” (Bales 2002: 226, 227).

There is an alarming structural continuity between “taking a girl” as easily “as buying a package of cigarettes” (as advertised by Kanita Kamha Travel in the Netherlands), and turning the export of cheap prostitutes to Japanese brothels into a “robust business.” Businessmen who dwell in the stratosphere of pure financial calculations here join virtual hands with the body handlers by discarding a girl once most of the profit has been drained from her and she is no longer “cost-effective,” replacing her “with someone fresh” (Bales 2002: 227, 226, 220). The Internet adds additional stratospheric qualities to the sex industry. As Donna Hughes (1999) reports, geographic and cultural distances become as “virtual” as any effective barriers for regulating the global free trade on women and children, thus greatly benefiting the industry’s growth and profitability.

The free trade in women’s bodies is only part of the worldwide patriarchal script. The other part includes the patriarchal need to severely monitor and control women’s sexuality. In the case of foreign domestic workers’ sex life various national regulatory regimes or allocation systems are set up to fulfill this important function. A work permit may only be given if the imported domestic worker agrees not to marry a native-born man (Yeoh, Huang, and Gonzales 1999). She also has to be, or at least pretend to be, single (Lan 2003), or where she has children these have to remain in the invisible nether-land of her own private household back home where other invisible women are taking care of them.

It is rather ironic to see how pimping joins hands with Christian church imperatives that women give in to the body’s reproductive power rather than take control of it. As Ninotchka Rocha from GABRIELA told me in a personal conversation (May 8, 2004), the children of prostituted women workers in American military bases are treated as disposables, like their mothers. They grow up in severe poverty and without education or any other social services. When I asked her what the women can do to protect themselves from becoming pregnant, she said they

are discouraged from doing so because the Catholic Church does not allow any form of contraception.

As Claudia von Werlhof (2001) points out, at the core of the capitalist-patriarchal system lies its quasi-religious belief in “the power of money to force all of life into prostitution,” which “makes our system out to be a kind of Christian pimping” (34). We are here dealing with a rather dense knot of contradictions which, when unraveled, illustrate the perverse logic of the capitalist-patriarchal desire to control or do away with impure female bodies. According to this logic these bodies may need to be kept in a confined, tightly supervised space where they care for and clean after the products of higher-ranking female bodies’ reproductive capacity. The state, the church, or father-husbands may also mandate that women’s bodies keep reproducing. Where these bodies are prostituted, their reproductive capacity becomes entirely irrelevant in the overall scheme of control and exploitation, at least as long as it does not interfere with their primary purpose of serving male sexual desires.

It is now time to look down the other side of hope’s edge.

Instead of joining the capitalist “Stratos dwellers” (Korten 2001) by speculating on the utopian possibilities of a cybertechnology they created,⁴ I rather look at the fate of millions of people all over the globe. Most of humankind neither surfs the net nor has access to the disembodied experiences of a virtual reality. Women’s reality of being cut or penetrated is not a simulated version of cybersex, nor is it that of women who have their breast size reduced or enlarged. Both groups are at opposite ends of the patriarchal pole that nevertheless unites them. Both groups live the patriarchal script. How can we then move, I ask, from a (global) culture that glorifies virtual techno-bodies in corporate cyberspace and extracts the life out of real, flesh-and-blood bodies who keep moving from place to place, and who are picking up after the lords of cyberspace, the Stratos dwellers, and after their children? How can we stay grounded in our physical, bodily, place-bound reality *and* reach across vast geographical and cultural distances? Where is our anchor?

As an “alien resident” in the United States I have been studying various writings on diaspora living. “Home” is a recurrent motif in these writings. Some writers focus primarily on the “Big Home” (Magat 1999) and describe the anguish of national relocations or displacements, of living in exile or in a diaspora, of transnational migrations. There are, of course, also analyses of the “Little Home.” They address the presumably mundane tasks and experiences associated with daily living in a small place and space. As many if not most women know experiences in the Little Home are fully embedded in problematic normative assumptions and larger social power relations. Some writers such as bell hooks (1990), however, emphasize that a physical homeplace can also be the only place that provides safety, especially in a hostile social environment, and how homemaking therefore includes work that benefits the well-being of an entire community. The collection of essays in *This Bridge We Call Home* is exemplary for revealing the many hidden social, cultural, and political connections between the Big Home and the Little Home (Anzaldúa and Keating 2002).

I believe that replacing “domestic” with “home” can ignite a flare of radical political sparks. The very word domestic conjures up images of narrowness, smallness, docility, or violently enforced captivity. On the other hand, home can link the smallness of a concrete place with the largeness of a wide open space.

Gloria Anzaldúa (2002) writes that “‘home’ is that bridge, the in-between-place of *nepantla*, and constant transition, the most unsafe of all spaces” (574). She refers to the struggles of a traveler in transition to a new way of seeing herself, and herself in relation to others and to the world. Migrant domestic workers’ experiences speak more directly, and more brutally of home as not only the most unsafe of all spaces, but also of all places.

Yet these workers are also messengers of an embodied, grounded *nepantla*. They are walking hope’s edge. Many Filipina migrant workers, for instance, have shown that it is possible to develop “transnational bonds” or “transnational family ties” (Parreñas 2001). In other words, they live possibilities of transnational homemaking. At the same time, the work of migrant nannies/housekeepers⁵ also shows us that hope “isn’t clean or tidy,” that it has an edge, that it is “messy” (Lappé and Lappé 2002: 11) as it is woven into place-bound care work. Walking on hope’s edge therefore means more than being able to form transnational bonds. As many nanny/housekeepers have shown they not only take care of the foreign employer’s children but often also form emotional attachments to the children in their care. These attachments are certainly enmeshed in the pain, anguish, and longings for their own children who are far away, and whom they can see only once in a blue moon. Regardless, however, of the multi-layered complexity of experiencing loss and attachment the very ability to form strong emotional bonds with a foreign employer’s children demonstrates that it is nevertheless possible to walk on hope’s razor-sharp edge.

Despite cuts, bruises, and open wounds these women live a life-affirming hope, thereby touching the very core of the meaning of home: letting the children in their care be loved, be taken care of, be safe. They therefore also give a message to global feminism: We can, or should be, place-bound as well as moving, anchored in the body’s and the land’s multiple needs and gift offerings but also trans migratory, or nomadic. In other words, we can be at home both in our own place and space, and in the world at large by constructing a nomadic home.⁶ Such a transnational homeplace links the recognition and affirmation of a concrete solid place to the recognition and affirmation of many other concrete solid places in different social, cultural, and political spaces that together build the foundation of our world.

Sex workers, maids, and nannies have to navigate between many kinds of violently imposed norms and expectations regarding servicing employers’ or clients’ needs and desires. However, both care and sex work are inseparable from primary bodily events, that is, birth and sexuality. At the same time, there are fundamental differences between cleaning a house, servicing male sexual desires, and taking care of children’s well-being, whether corresponding norms and expectations are self-imposed or forced upon the actors. Caring for children is of a different order

than cleaning a house, and whereas sexuality can be experienced as a powerful life force that may or may not be linked to the creation of new life, celebrating that life force is nevertheless fundamentally different from the actual, physical giving of life. Likewise, assuming responsibility for one's own sexual or a sexual partner's well-being is also quite different from assuming responsibility for the care of new life. Once born a child reminds us daily and nightly of the bodily, messy grounding of life, of being alive. Care work is not simply about "reproducing" humankind. It is about sustaining life by making and letting it grow in a way that affirms its physical, material, bodily grounding.

My claim here is that if we want to not only be critical of neoliberalism and neo-patriarchy but also eager to advance new ways of understanding, we must foreground the existence and needs of children both in our theory and our practice. Regardless where they live and under what circumstances, children's need for care is universal. How we greet, carry out, and ultimately transform this universal need into work that sustains life in general is a question that points to larger, all-embracing responsibilities. The African American migrant women in the United State's East Bay community made that point quite clear by considering children as "the freshest link in the web of reciprocal obligations" (Lemke-Santangelo 1996: 146).⁷ It is these universal, collective, and reciprocal obligations that provide the concrete, physical-spiritual foundation for making connections between people and places that may be separated by vast geographical, geopolitical, and cultural distances. These connections can be expanded, translated into reciprocal obligations to safeguard, repair, or rebuild the conditions of life, that is, our future. In other words, they can become core elements of planetary homemaking.

Planetary homemaking means creating a life-affirming Big Home that is attentive to the universal yearning for being grounded, for being safe, for belonging, and for finding shelter, rest, and physical, psychological, and spiritual nourishment. It means caring for the foundations of life, for the air we breathe, the water we drink, and the land on which we grow our food. Safeguarding biodiversity and the integrity of individual life forms are therefore integral components of making the world a home for all.

Planetary homemaking is a transnational feminist project. It requires to journey across intellectual-categorical and experiential divides, and across often vast cultural and geographic distances. These travels to other places need to be fuelled by the desire to better understand and change a fragmented and interconnected world. They need to be based on the knowledge that it is possible to make translocal connections to local, place-bound, life-affirming actions. This desire, this knowledge anchor nomadic journeying and practical engagements in the shared commonality of living in a body as well as on and from the earth, the great giver, and in the willingness to not only take but continuously to give back to her.

Migrant domestic workers are travelers in constant transition. It is not their desire to cross a political and spiritual life threshold but brutal economic necessity that brought them to a place where their lives are regulated, controlled, and

supervised in bearable or unbearable ways. They do not engage in gift giving due to political convictions, but due to the fact that living bodies need physical attention and care. That's why the workers are messengers of an embodied, grounded *nepantla* that speaks of a future where diasporic and place-bound living are conjoined in dignified, life-affirming ways. In other words, they speak of the possibility of creating a nomadic home. They teach us that no matter where we are located, where we are at home collectively and individually, the universal need for physical, bodily place-bound care work firmly anchors our desire to turn home into a life threshold, thus enabling us to engage in political nomadic journeying to other far-away places.

Portions of this article also appear in my article, "Women, Migration, and the Body-Less Spirit of Capitalist Patriarchy" (Hart 2005b).

Mechthild U. Hart is Professor at DePaul University's School for New Learning. She moved from Germany to the United States in 1972, worked in a number of women's and community organizations, and has been teaching and mentoring at the School for New Learning since 1987. She has published several articles, book chapters, and two books on international and social divisions of labour, with special emphasis on poverty and motherwork.

Notes

- ¹ The term "patriarchal" certainly deserves some specification. Although I hope that its meanings unfold in this essay, I also refer the reader to "Women, Migration, and the Body-Less Spirit of Capitalist Patriarchy" (2005B) where I elaborate on the term within the context of neoliberalisms and modern Western patriarchal thinking.
- ² Migrant domestic workers have many different cultural and national backgrounds, and they always experience their own variations of national or cultural stereotyping, as do, for instance, Indian or Thai women in Singapore (Yeoh, Huang, and Gonzalez, 1999); see also Munira Ismail (1999), who writes about Christian, Muslim, or Hindu Sri Lankan women in the Middle East. Their stories are unique *and* they illustrate the universal fate of being super-exploited.
- ³ Laws regarding wages and working hours are also quite different. Some states "mandate higher hourly wages than does federal law. Others specifically expand the labour rights of domestic workers. New York, for example, extends overtime protections to live-in workers. Still other states, among them Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, and Kansas, exclude domestics from state minimum wage laws and from other protections" (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2001: 213-214).
- ⁴ See, for instance, Susan Hawthorne and Renate Klein (1999).
- ⁵ In Hondagneu-Sotelo's (2001) writings the term "nanny/housekeeper" is deliberately used in order to capture the fact that the paid domestic worker is doing the job of two for the pay of one.
- ⁶ I elaborate on this notion in my article, "The Nomad at Home" (2005a).
- ⁷ In my book, *The Poverty of Life-Affirming Work* (2002), I elaborate on this point, especially with respect to mother-activists.

References

- Anzaldúa, G. 2002. "Now Let Us Shift ... the Path of Conocimiento: Inner Work, Public Acts." *This Bridge We Call Home*. Eds. G. Anzaldúa and A. Keating. New York: Routledge. 540-578.
- Anzaldúa, G. and A. Keating, eds. 2002. *This Bridge We Call Home: Radical Visions for Transformation*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Bales, K. 2002. "Because She Looks like a Child." Eds. B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. *Global Women: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books. 207-229.
- Beasley, C. 1994. *Sexual Economyths: Conceiving a Feminist Economics*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Cheng, S. J. A. 2003. Rethinking the Globalization of Domestic Service. *Gender and Society* 17 (2): 166-186.
- Ehrenreich, B. and A. R. Hochschild, eds. 2003. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- GABRIELA Network. Online: <http://www.gabnet.org>.
- Hart, M. 2002. *The Poverty of Life-Affirming Work: Motherwork, Education, and Social Change*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Hart, M. 2005a. "The Nomad at Home." *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community* 30 (1/2): 127-141.
- Hart, M. 2005b. "Women, Migration, and the Body-Less Spirit of Capitalist Patriarchy." *Journal of International Women's Studies* 7 (1) (November): 1-16. Online: <http://www.bridgew.edu/SoAS/jiws/Nov05V2/Hart.pdf>.
- Hawthorne, S., and R. Klein, Eds. 1999. *CyberFeminism: Connectivity, Critique and Creativity*. North Melbourne: Spinifex Press.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 2001. *Doméstica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- hooks, b. 1990. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hughes, D. 1999. "The Internet and the Global Prostitution Industry." Eds. S. Hawthorne and R. Klein. *CyberFeminism: Connectivity, Critique and Creativity*. North Melbourne: Spinifex Press. 157-183.
- Ismail, M. 1999. "Maids in Space: Gendered Domestic Labour from Sri Lanka to the Middle East." Eds. J. H. Momsen. *Gender Migration and Domestic Service*. London and New York: Routledge 229-241..
- Korten, D. C. 2001. *When Corporations Rule the World*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Lappé, F. M. and A. Lappé. 2002. *Hope's Edge: The Next Diet for a Small Planet*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.
- Lan, P. C. 2003. "Among Women: Migrant Domestic Workers and Their Taiwanese Employers Across Generations." Eds. B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. *Global Woman: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books. 169-189.
- Lemke-Santangelo, G. 1996. *Abiding Courage: African American Migrant Women and the East Bay Community*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Magat, I. N. 1999. "Israeli and Japanese Immigrants to Canada: Home, Belonging, and the Territorialization of Identity." *Ethos* 27 (2): 119-144.
- Parreñas, R. S. 2001. "Transgressing the Nation-State: The Partial Citizenship and 'Imagined Global Community' of Migrant Filipina Domestic Workers." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 26 (4): 1129-1154.
- Uchatius, Wolfgang. 2004. "Das globalisierte Dienstmädchen." *Die Zeit* Aug. 19: 17-18.

- Vaughan, G. 1997. *For-Giving: A Feminist Criticism of Exchange*. Austin, Texas: Plain View Press.
- Werlhof, C. von. 2001. "Losing Faith in Progress: Capitalist Patriarchy as an 'Alchemical System.'" Eds. V. Bennholdt-Thomsen and N. Faraclas and C. von Werlhof. *There Is an Alternative: Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization*. London: Zed Books. 15-40.
- Yeoh, B. S. A., S. Huang and J. Gonzalez. 1999. "Migrant Female Domestic Workers: Debating the Economic, Social, and Political Impacts in Singapore." *International Migration Review* 33 (1): 114-136.
- Zarembka, J. M. 2003. "America's Dirty Work: Migrant Maids and Modern-Day Slavery." Eds. B. Ehrenreich and A. R. Hochschild. *Global Women: Nannies, Maids, and Sex Workers in the New Economy*. New York: Metropolitan Books. 142-153.

The Rural Women's Movement in South Africa

Land Reform and HIV/AIDS

The Rural Women's Movement (RWM) is a land-rights grassroots women's organization based in South Africa, in the province of Kwa Zulu Natal. The RWM is working with Indigenous, poor, rural, farm dwellers, and landless women whose communities were forcibly evicted from their ancestral land as a result of 1913 *Land Act* and other Acts that followed. RWM is currently made up of 500 community-based grassroots women's organizations, with a total membership of about 35,000 women between the ages of 16 and 78 years. RWM advocates for women's economic emancipation, land and property independent rights.

Faced by a legacy of apartheid systems, the districts we work in are characterized by a deep rural consciousness and social conservatism evidenced in strongly held traditional social values, including around gender roles and relationships. For the most part the women are located within patriarchal households. When we interviewed one of the chairpersons of the community land trust in one of the districts, he said, "I'm the manager of my household. I have knowledge about a number of things. Therefore I don't want my wife getting involved because she might fumble and mess things up. A woman will do things a woman's way and make things worse. She may even sell our land to her boyfriends, and the man will be held responsible. She would then be a problem in the community. When the police come, they ask for the man, so women should follow their husbands." This was very sad for us because when the land reform program began in 1995, the government made it very clear that women must be represented in all land reform projects and structures and their voice must be heard. But this chairperson, who was supposed to be assisting the project in his community, was against having women participate in the decision-making process.

The social and agrarian history of some districts in the province is marked by extreme social divisions in which land conflicts have played an important part. The deeply scarred patterns of contestation over land, territorial boundaries, and labour stretch back to the mid-nineteenth century. These patterns enforce not only conflict between black, landless, or land-hungry communities and white landowners, but also clan-based violence within black communities.

In one magisterial district where labour tenancy was abolished, more than 20,000 people were forcibly evicted from white-owned farms between 1969 and 1972.

Many of the people were dumped in resettlement camps close to their former land. The province I come from is one of the poorest provinces with more than 70 percent of its inhabitants living in rural areas, which are significantly worse off economically than urban areas. More than 30 percent of households in this province are headed by women, and women-headed households, in terms of poverty, are worse off compared to households headed by men. Their access to arable land, on which to live and grow food, is severely limited and this contributes significantly to women and children's increasing poverty in South Africa.

But it wasn't always like this. Pre-colonization, individuals could not own land. Land was regarded as a sacred gift from *Umvelingangi* (The Creator). For example, traditionally, when a baby was about to be born, the Grandmothers, symbolizing Mother Earth, would be the first people to take care of the newly born baby. While the mother is in labour, the grandmothers would dig enough soil outside to make mattress of earth in the hut. They would place blankets and sheets over the mound of earth and then have the woman in labour lie down on that earth-mattress. That earth would be kept in the hut for one week and could only be removed by the Grandmothers in the early hours of the morning while everyone was still sleeping. The Grandmothers would dig a big hole in the earth and bury it. The umbilical cord would be buried in the same way. The earth used for the mattress was regarded as sacred and only the Grandmothers know where it is buried after its removal from the hut.

Mother Earth was also regarded as a sacred home for our people who had passed on, and as the sacred source of food for the nation. Food was produced by individual families but shared with everyone in the community. When it was time for supper at night, the women, each bearing a bowl of food, would gather in the Great-Grandmother's house. Everyone—children, women, and men—would sit in a circle and each of the mothers would pass around their bowls, and everyone would eat from these bowls of different foods. In this way, there were no people suffering from starvation, because even if a family did not have enough food to bring to the Great-Grandmother's supper, they could come for supper without having to bring anything, and eat with the rest of their extended family, and neighbours.

In the past, communities stayed together and shared whatever resources they had. Mother Earth was regarded as a sacred gift and no one owned the land. People ploughed and tilled the land communally. The food that was produced from the land was shared among the families. If a woman had to visit her parents' home for a couple of days or weeks, she didn't have to go to someone and say, "Please look after my children while I am away." She could just let all the members of the extended family know that she would not be around, and her children could go to anyone's house and be fed.

When the youth who are looking after the livestock came back from the fields, they didn't have to go to their mother's kitchen to have their meals. They could go to any house in the community and find food ready for them. The heads of the households, usually men, were regarded as managers, but they could not make

any decision without consulting their extended family, including the children (girls and boys). Even the children had a voice in how the cattle could be kept, and their voices were respected by the elders. Women had access to property and they were treated with respect.

In order for communities to build houses, the people in the community would perform what used to be called *Ilima*. This is when the community would come together in support of a community member who needs to be assisted to carry out bigger tasks, like building a house. One week they would build one person's house and the week after it would be another person's house. This practice still exists in some communities but its beginning to disappear. The principle behind it, however, continues to exist in events like weddings, burials, and credit unions.

Colonization left women without access to land. It took away communities' togetherness. People became individuals, and land became privately owned; Mother Earth was carved into small pieces. About 87 percent of this land went into the hands of the few white men, and the majority of the nation was left with only 13 percent of barren land on which to survive. The tilling of the land was the only means of survival for our communities. To force our men into migration, the colonizers made it illegal for people to have more than five cattle. People had to reduce the number of cattle they had, on which they also depended for survival. With migration came the breakdown of communities and also the breakdown of family values. As Africans we began to look at our households as individual households.

This is when we began to see orphaned children, street children. In 1991 alone, there over 100,000 children in South Africa living in the streets of major cities like Durban, Johannesburg, Cape Town and some other small towns like Pietermaritzburg. Boys and girls had to sell their bodies in order to survive.

Before the land was taken away from the communities, the communities did not need to have money. People could survive without money. My mother told me that my grandfather sometimes worked for money for six month periods. Then he would come back and work at home, and it would be his brother's turn to earn money. They would negotiate among themselves who was to go and work for money that year, while the others continued to work at home on the land and take care of the livestock. The money earned by the person who had volunteered to work was not his own, because the others were at home looking after his cattle, after his family, and ploughing and tilling his fields. So the money my grandfather or his brother earned and brought back was for the entire extended family.

All of this is gone now because of the scarcity of resources and the scarcity of land. The breakdown of extended families is seen as the main cause of poverty, especially women and children's poverty in the rural areas. Women and children, 60 percent of the population, live below the poverty line in rural areas. As a nation, we are witnessing vast numbers of women evicted from their marital homes after the death of their husbands, and from their parents' homes after the death of their fathers and mothers, because of the scarcity of food and economic resources. A woman cannot inherit land because she is considered a minor. Traditional leaders

are turning a blind eye on this physical and psychological eviction. An example is a woman from Mbulwana in Greytown whose husband died of AIDS. After the burial, anonymous people threw stones at her window and roof until she was forced to leave the area and return to parents' home.

South Africa is currently experiencing one of the most severe HIV epidemics in the world. By the end of 2006, there were more than five million people living with HIV, according to UNAIDS estimates (www.avert.org/aidssouthafrica.htm). A recent study by the South African Department of Health, based on its sample of 16,510 women attending neonatal clinics across all nine provinces, estimated that 30 percent of pregnant women were living with HIV in 2005. Our province, KwaZulu Natal, recorded the highest rates, with a prevalence of 36 percent where the national prevalence is 30 percent.

The breakdown of family values and communities has also led to a high rate of teenage pregnancies. More than one-third of births in South Africa are to mothers under the age of 18. This is one of the highest teenage pregnancy rates in the world. Sexually transmitted diseases such as syphilis are commonplace among sexually active teenagers, and despite some public education efforts over the past ten years, condom usage among teenagers remains at around ten to fifteen percent. But there are many interrelated factors contributing to this environment of increasing sexual promiscuity. Abuse and violence among young South Africans, poverty, the breakdown of family structures, political liberation, and men no longer acting as role models are shaping the attitudes of our African youth.

The Rural Women's Movement recently established an HIV prevention program for youth in the district of Greytown. Our dream for this program was motivated by realizing that the HIV/AIDS pandemic, especially in KwaZulu Natal province where I come from, would affect labour turnout in agriculture and manufacturing, and mining which is predominantly migrant labour sectors of our economy. This would result in increasing malnutrition, adding to the problems of rural women, especially female-headed households, arising from division of labour, land rights and scarcity of resources, and deepen the debt crisis with increasing medical expenses for sick family members, and the increasing number of funerals.

The Rural Women's Movement main strategy is to get South African youth, particularly the youth between the ages of eleven and nineteen, to speak more openly about sexually transmitted diseases and the impact of HIV/AIDS. We strongly believe that this strategy will work because there is substantial evidence from different countries that HIV prevention programs work, but to be successful, prevention programs must be strategically targeted and sustained over many years in order to bring about lasting transformation. In South Africa, land reform organizations have not until recently needed to take into account of issues such as HIV/AIDS. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that HIV/AIDS is likely to present one of the greatest challenges to land reform and capacity building of community.

It is estimated that, as the nation, we will lose 600 loved ones every month to AIDS-related diseases, like tuberculosis and pneumonia. It is also estimated

that every day there are 1,500 to 1,800 new infections. More women than men are infected. Some of the reasons why are clear and can be traced to deeply held traditions that give men sexual authority in relationships. HIV infection among South African women has increased dramatically, especially among women aged 20 between and 39, and especially among poor African women.

Women who are poor are doubly vulnerable because they have no economic or social power. In a situation where gender inequality is culturally entrenched, women's poverty is frequently associated with violence and abuse, and this is further advancing the spread of HIV. In one of the workshops we held, more than 50 percent of the HIV-positive participants were married and were faithful to one partner all their life. Infected women in abusive relationships remain in those relationships for financial support, especially for their children. AIDS is also putting more pressure on women in other ways, as we have to make hard choices in allocating time between household needs, rearing and caring for children, and caring for the sick. When we lose valuable team members, our productivity is reduced, and we also find we are often depressed. Not one of us is untouched by the rising incidence of illness and death rapidly engulfing our nation. We are carrying a heavy burden of grief.

I would like to share a short story about four children who lost their mother a couple of weeks ago. This woman was dying of AIDS after all her family members, including the grandmother and the grandfather of her children, had already passed on. She was the last one to pass on in the family and because she was the last, she resisted. She didn't want to die. In order for someone to enter her room, they had to have a broom because there were worms crawling on the floor and her bed was dripping with body fluids, her body finished. Four children, the youngest, a little girl four years old, had to witness this situation. She refused to die until she realized that her children will be taken care of even after she is gone. She said to the caregivers, "I have remembered, I can still die and my children would not suffer this much. I can remember that someone from somewhere would come and take care of my children." And she asked four women if they could please look after her four children. And they said they would be happy to assist her. A week later she passed on and four women came to collect the children and took them to their homes. Within a week's time the children had run away from their foster homes and returned to their mother's house. It was two days before the community members noticed that the children were back. The Community Health Worker telephoned me to tell me the children were in their own in their home and it seemed they hadn't eaten for four days.

In South Africa, about 29 percent of the productive active population is unemployed. As activists we know that 29 percent does not accurately reflect what we are seeing in the rural areas where we have people who haven't been employed for the last decade. While the government argues the 29 percent of the population is unemployed, civil organizations maintain that the unemployment rate is actually 43 percent. Perhaps government statistics refer to people who are still looking for jobs; and these statistics do not include those who have given up looking for

work. So, the community did have anything to share with these children. The Community Health Worker who called me did not even have enough food for her own children, and because we had a bit of money in our organization's account, I asked the chairperson if we could use some of that money to buy food for the children. The money in that account was not raised to buy food but rather to buy school uniforms and pay school fees for the children. We had to do something we were not supposed to do, in order to feed the children.

AIDS thus poses challenging questions to existing approaches for development, which is part of the reason why, as a lands rights organization, we decided to integrate HIV prevention programs into our work. In some situations, the epidemic has exposed the failure of previous development intervention to address persisting gender inequalities. In many cases existing inequalities have been exacerbated by the epidemic, such as widows being evicted from their homes.

Our work has shown that the impact of HIV has also raised the importance of inter-household entitlement to food and other resources, partly because of the number of orphan children being taken in by different families. Gender sensitive and entitlement-based approaches are now more urgently needed than ever before. The situation is scary, especially in the rural areas, and we need to do something about it now.

Sizani Ngubane is the founder and director of the Rural Women's Movement in KwaZulu Natal-South Africa. She worked for ten years as a gender specialist for the Association for Rural Advancement in KwaZulu Natal. Prior to that, she worked for the South African Women's National Coalition as a provincial coordinator. Her skills and abilities were recognized when she was appointed the first organizer in the Northern Natal Region by the Africa National Congress (ANC), which has recently been legalized. She has been an activist for women's rights for 40 years, and is particularly passionate about women's independent rights to land, property and inheritance. She has two grandchildren and currently lives in Winterskloof. As a Zulu-speaking child, she grew up in the rural areas just outside Pietermaritzburg. She was unable to complete high school because of her family's financial situation, but has made it a priority to educate herself.

Endangered Species

The Language of Our Lives

Democracy. Once upon a time the word evoked access, fairness, participatory representation. Once upon a time we could think of the United States as a democracy; and defenders of its policies proposed it as an example to nations around the world. This hasn't been true for decades, of course, but the cartel, which less than two weeks ago succeeded in grabbing control of this country for the second time, has managed to radically change the meaning of the word. Today "the greatest democracy" describes drastic curtailment of freedom and opportunity here at home and a politics of coercion, destruction, and death globally.

Democracy is not the only word or combination of words that criminals in high office have twisted beyond recognition. Others that come to mind are revolution, right to life, family values, sanctity of marriage, compassionate conservatism, health care, no child left behind, healthy economy, jobs for everyone, impartial journalism, weapons of mass destruction, freedom and liberty, count every vote and make every vote count. This discourse from an administration whose president boasts that he says what he means and means what he says is Orwellian doublespeak at its most outrageous.

As someone who expresses herself primarily with words, I find misleading or cowardly turns of speech particularly annoying, often dangerous. In a true gift economy speech that is truthful, courageous, filled with holistic vision, rich in linguistic beauty, and useful in that it offers choices and encourages positive change, is the most valuable currency there is.

We used to think of lesbian as the "L" word. Now it is liberal. One more in a long list of co-opted words. The neo-conservative patriarchy currently exerting its power over our lives—and over so many lives across the globe—has paid special attention to language and its influence. Repeating the lie is referred to as "staying on message." Sound-bite shorthand replaces in-depth discussion. Spend enough money imbuing words and concepts with meanings different from—often diametrically opposed to—their original definitions and people assimilate a language of lies. The unacceptable becomes acceptable.

My generation of feminists paid indignant attention to how language was used. Early on we demanded a discourse in which the pronouns "he" and "his" would no longer be common denominators, meant to represent all humankind.

We invented the generic “Ms” so that women wouldn’t have to define ourselves by whether or not we belonged to a man.

We urged that language assume responsibility for its acts: not the passive “I was raped” but the more explicit “so-and-so raped me.” Names. Places. Dates. Accountability. A feminist and egalitarian use of language spread throughout the world. Women from different cultures and with different linguistic codes made innovative contributions to this reclamation of self. Speaking the truths of our lives helped us understand who we had been and could become.

For many years I lived in Latin America, working for social change in Mexico, Cuba, and Nicaragua. There I learned that all the peoples of the continent call themselves Americans, a word long monopolized by the United States. In Mexico, *qué padre!* (in praise of the father) is an exclamation denoting excitement or approval, while *está de madre* (quite literally, “how mother-like”) describes something ugly or wrong. An advertising for a popular beer displays the words, *la rubia de categoría*: the high-class blonde. Prejudice reveals itself in speech in so many more ways than we are aware.

Latin American feminists have also righted some of these wrongs and returned denigrated images to their rightful meanings. An important example is La Malinche, the Indian woman whose family gave her to the Spanish conqueror Hernán Cortéz. Because she represented the mixing of the races—an Indian woman who “slept with the enemy,” i.e., the Spanish invader—the term *malinche* was used to signify betrayer in contemporary Latin American Spanish. A feminist rereading of this history pointed out that it was in fact La Malinche who had been betrayed: first by her family who gave her away, then by the Spaniard who raped her and kept her enslaved. For many of us La Malinche is a symbol of dignity and courage.

Today a fundamentalist reading of several different scriptures turns words and concepts inside out. We live in a time of redefinition and backlash. A powerful corporate media draws on unlimited financial resources and sophisticated psychological manipulation to make sure we go along with the game plan. A punishing system of injustice makes sure we don’t rebel.

Fear and hatred of others is sold as Keeping America Safe. Policies advertised as repelling terrorism only increase the anger other nations and peoples feel when faced with U.S. belligerence; such policies do not keep us safe, they provoke future attacks. Severe curtailment of citizen rights is described as a necessary sacrifice in The War on Terror. Invasion is sold as liberation. An environmental policy that is poisoning the air we breathe, the water left for us to drink, and the earth that is our home bears the name Clean Air Act.

How can we fight this rape of language? Even with a new and creative use of the Internet our resources are meager compared to those the system is able to muster against us. I believe in preserving and nurturing memory, in restoring language to its original meaning and, most of all, in the power of our stories.

I offer two examples. In the first I call your attention to an underreported event that illustrates—better than many—the ways in which our government usurps

and attempts to control our lives by usurping and controlling the authentic storylines of these times.

The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), a government agency established to support the art that sustains us, recently announced its latest project launched in conjunction with the Pentagon and funded almost entirely by Boeing Corporation. Military men and women, returned from Afghanistan and Iraq, will have the opportunity of attending workshops with professional writers. In these workshops they will presumably learn the skills that will enable them to write about their experiences of war. The best of this writing will then be published in an anthology. One can only imagine the promotional efforts that will catapult the volume to best-seller status. Along with embedding journalists with contingents of fighting troops and the treatment of misinformation as entertainment, this project will help construct the official stories of the wars being fought in our names.

At first glance this might seem to be a laudable endeavor. As in the case of the embedded journalists, won't these veterans be writing about what they've experienced on the ground? Isn't the protagonist always the most authentic storyteller?

But look more closely. Rather than use public monies to send these veterans to legitimate writing programs, where they may be able to gain some distance from their trauma, learn from mentors and peers, and eventually produce a literature tempered by time and self-reflection, the NEA's hurry-up approach takes men and women who are still living on military bases, still under military orders, and uses them to produce propaganda pretending to be art.

Veterans of America's war in Vietnam, who were able to write after years of struggle and healing, have denounced this project as the worst sort of language control. The very men and women in a position to share the pain and horror of today's "preemptive" wars are being forced to regurgitate that pain and horror undigested, unexamined, and removed from context. It will take years for us to disentangle the real stories from this constructed storyline. The NEA project is one of many examples of how the Bush administration takes our language, twists it to serve its interests, and uses it against us in its assault upon our lives.

The second story is a tender gift. I offer it here because it exemplifies the worst and best of our humanity, the horrendous crimes and power of resistance that have defined our lives. This is a true story.

In Latin America during the 1970s brutal dictatorships ravaged hundreds of thousands of lives. In Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay paramilitary forces captured young rebels, torturing and murdering them in clandestine prisons. "Disappearance" was a new type of state terrorism, designed to punish revolutionaries and instill fear and uncertainty in their communities. These revolutionaries' small children were often stolen and given to childless couples involved with the criminal regimes. In many cases pregnant women prisoners were kept alive only until their babies could be harvested. Then they were murdered, their offspring adopted by the very men and women against whom they'd struggled. These are Latin America's lost children.

The Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo in Buenos Aires is a tireless group of

women who for years they have demonstrated for the return of their grandchildren. With determination, hope, and DNA technology, some 60 lost children have been identified to date. Many wish to reconnect with their families of origin. Others—raised in a culture of hate—have been poisoned by an ideology that doesn't allow for them to reclaim the identities they never knew they had.

This is the story of Sara Méndez and her son Simón. Sara and her husband were Uruguayans, captured in Buenos Aires, Argentina on July 13, 1976. Like so many others, they disappeared. Their 22-day-old son Simón was taken and never seen again. But unlike most of the tens of thousands of disappeared, Sara and her comrade Mauricio Gatti survived years of torture and imprisonment. In May 1981 Sara was freed. Like all such survivors her process of reentry and healing would be difficult. She made finding Simón her life-long goal.

The Sara Méndez / Simón case became a popular cause. For years in Montevideo lampposts and walls bore flyers asking, “*Dónde está Simón?* Where Is Simón?” Sara was obsessed in her quest. Human rights organizations worked on this case along with hundreds of others. As months became years and years decades, some began to refer to Sara as “that crazy woman looking for a son who won't be found.” Tenaciously she appealed to governments and international institutions. Mostly they promised help but did nothing.

Several years ago a Uruguayan senator named Rafael Michelini decided to take up Sara's quest. His father and also senator, Zelmar Michelini, had been gunned down in the streets of Buenos Aires many years before—by the same criminals who had taken Simón. Sara Méndez was his friend. He didn't think she was crazy. He believed she had a right to find her son.

Michelini asked himself what he would have done with a 22-day-old infant had he been a paramilitary operative in Buenos Aires all those years before. It occurred to him that he might have delivered the baby to the nearest police station. Based on this hypothesis, he located the precinct closest to the scene of the crime and set about to identify the men who had been on duty the night Simón was taken. Four names surfaced, all belonging to officers now retired.

The self-proclaimed detective decided to call these men, one by one. As a member of parliament in neighboring Uruguay he had some prestige. A brief introduction was enough to convince the first man on the list to meet him at a bar. As Michelini told the story of Sara and Simón, the man's eyes filled with tears. “*Recuerdo la noche como si fuera ayer ...* I remember that night as if it was yesterday,” he said; and went on to describe the protocol they were ordered to follow when paramilitaries brought these children in. “We did the necessary paperwork and then sent them to a nearby orphanage,” he explained. It was clear that this man had been an honest policeman doing his job, not someone aligned with the dictatorship or who shared in the responsibility for its crimes.

The retired policeman went on to describe how he had gone home and told his wife about the “orphaned” child he had processed at the end of that night's shift. Childless herself, she told him “*Ay, Viejo ... son tan fríos esos lugares.* Those orphanages are such cold places! Couldn't we adopt that baby ourselves?” And so

it was that the policeman now telling his story to Michelini had gone and retrieved the child. He and his wife had raised him as their own.

They had never told their son he was adopted. He said, “He’s a good boy. We’ve had such a happy life together.” But Michelini could tell the story wouldn’t end here. The retired policeman promised to go home, talk to his son, and leave it up to the boy—now 26—whether he wanted to meet his birth mother. He promised he’d be back in touch.

A week later Michelini got the call. Simón’s adoptive father said the truth had come as a shock to his son. Upon learning of his origin, he’d left the house in confusion and gone to stay with his girlfriend. “It was she who calmed him,” the man said, “and convinced him to find out more.” He wanted to talk to Michelini, who assured him he would travel to Buenos Aires the following day.

And this is why, on March 8, 2002, as Sara Méndez emerged from a Montevideo radio station where she’d participated in an International Women’s Day program and was making her way through the heavy traffic of Avenida Artigas, she heard her cell phone ring. Unaware of how her life was about to change, she reached into her bag, retrieved the phone and said hello. On the other end of the line a young man’s voice asked, “Mother?”

The lamppost flyers in Montevideo now read “Welcome Home Simón.” This story and others like it, from many different cultures and profiling the human experience in its broad array of tragedy and hope, give us back our language freed from the distorting manipulation that would use it against us.

This is not a story told in isolation. Obsessed as we in the U.S. were with our own 2004 election, we may have missed hearing about the election in Uruguay. In that small South American country the stories of repression and struggle had been kept alive, passed from mouth to mouth, from generation to generation, even when uttering certain words was forbidden by law. Few families do not have victims on one side or the other. Many of the torturers remain free.

The dictatorship in Uruguay had been defeated when, in a 1980 plebiscite designed to perpetuate its power, 57.2 percent of voters spontaneously wrote the word “No” on their ballots. Slowly, steadily, people worked to revive an opposition movement. The Frente Amplio is made up of communists, socialists, Tupamaros,¹ social democrats, environmentalists, and others. For 31 years, through a succession of elections, they gained in strength. In 2004, with 51 percent of the vote, the Frente Amplio finally came to power. In the same election, Uruguayans resisted a sinister measure to privatize water.

The vote is obligatory in Uruguay. And there is no absentee ballot. Between 40,000 and 50,000 citizens who live in other countries came home to participate in this national decision. People danced in the streets.

This shows what can happen when real issues are discussed, honest dialogue is encouraged, and language has not been successfully co-opted; when people refuse to put up with doublespeak, pharmaceutical companies are not allowed to advertise on television, diet commercials do not follow on the heels of commercials featuring fast food, and grandparents and parents keep alive the stories

that inform their and our lives.

We must not let the power-greedy rip meaning from our words. We must not let them usurp our stories. Memory and stories are among our most precious tools for life. We cannot allow them to be turned into weapons of death.

Margaret Randall lived for much of her life in Latin America: Mexico, Cuba, and Nicaragua. She returned to the U.S. in 1984, only to face a deportation order due to the opinions expressed in some of her books. She won her immigration case in 1989 and has resided in her native Albuquerque, New Mexico since. Author of more than 100 books, among her most recent titles are When I Look Into the Mirror and See You; Terror and Resistance; Into Another Time: Grand Canyon Reflections, and forthcoming from the University of Arizona Press, Stones Witness, a multi-genre volume which includes poems, personal narrative, and photographs. She lives with her lifetime companion, artist Barbara Byers.

Notes

-
- ¹ The Tupamaros (MLN or National Liberation Movement) were an armed struggle organization active in Uruguay during the 1960s and '70s. Many of its members later transitioned into a political organization which is now an important part of the Board Front (Frente Amplio).

Facing the Shadow of 9-11

After a second stolen election and another murderous assault upon Iraq, the dark side of the U.S. government should be obvious. Yet, when confronted with news of a terminal illness, or disaster, individuals experience a range of emotions, the first being denial. Behind denial lies fear. Fear destroys rational thought; “war” itself is recognized as “collective insanity.” Wars, however, are not spontaneous, they are planned. They serve powerful interests. Aggressors are generally trained mercenaries, following orders. Historically, wars are engineered, benefiting the merchants of death and financiers. In Yugoslavia, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank prepared the way for the dismemberment of the country. Victors claim the spoils, while victims pay the price. The most lucrative business on earth is war.

The World Wars were marked by the rise of national fascism. This millennium is witnessing the rise of transnational fascism, where imperial powers share in the looting of conquered nations. In the era of “globalization,” new alliances pit corporate interests against the vast majority.

Aung Sung Suu Kyi wrote: “It is not power that corrupts, but fear—fear of losing power and fear of the scourge of those who wield it” (see Abrams 1997).¹

Behind the trappings of wealth, in limousines and mansions, are a frightened group of people who fear losing power and control in an increasingly “unmanageable” world. Protesters converge on significant gatherings where global policies are “decided.” The shutting down of the World Trade Organization in Seattle in 1999 was one of a series of global protests. A major protest was scheduled for Washington, DC in September 2001, but was cancelled in the wake of 9/11.

The surreal attacks upon World Trade Centre and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, were desperate acts by a frightened few, trying to cling to power, using their traditional methods of war and terrorism to frighten people into silence and submission. The *Patriot Act*, passed into law after the 9/11 attacks, mirrors the *Enabling Act* that Adolf Hitler passed after the Reichstag Fire; both were designed to dismantle democracy. Similar legislation has been passed in other countries to re-label dissenters “domestic terrorists.” Recently, in India, people rescinded their anti-terrorist legislation. In the U.S., four states and 357 cities and counties have passed resolutions against the *Patriot Act*.

The War on Terrorism benefits the arms, security, surveillance, and oil industries. Bogus terror alerts, war, have terrorized people, but no one can remain in “panic mode.” When people “come back to their senses,” and think critically about the War on Terrorism, they should be able to see that it really is a War of Terrorism against Americans and the world. The Big Lie cannot stand.

Vice President Dick Cheney believes (as did Napoleon) “You don’t have to suppress the truth forever, just until it doesn’t matter anymore.” The truth does matter now; the sooner people recognize it, the greater our chances of getting humanity off the war path.

Rachel Corrie’s father told a story about Rachel after she died. She was the young American peace activist crushed by a bulldozer as she stood in its path to prevent the demolition of a Palestinian home. As a very young child, just two-years-old, Rachel had posed a question to her father: “Is being brave part of growing up?”²

Many Americans have no idea of how much violence the U.S. government has sponsored, and do not know how to stand up against it. Rachel understood this. She stood in solidarity with the people of the world and stood for the values that America is supposed to stand for, inspiring a new generation of activists.

At the International Citizens’ Inquiries into 9/11, we³ showed that the government lied about 9/11, destroyed evidence, engaged in a major cover-up, and was complicit in the attacks. Our largest obstacle in getting out the facts to the press and the public has been fear and denial. However, each day more people are coming to the conclusion that “9/11 was an inside job” (see Hargrove and Stempel III 2006).

In brief, Al Qaeda was created by Saudi Arabia and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) through Pakistan’s Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI), and remains a CIA asset. The Money Man behind 9/11, the head of the ISI, General Mahmoujd Ahmad (who ordered \$100,000 be sent to Mohammad Atta, the alleged lead pilot of the attack) was meeting with top U.S. officials during September 2001, including Congressman Porter Goss and Senator Bob Graham, Chairmen of the Joint Inquiry on 9/11, on the morning of the attacks (Chossudovsky 2003). Those in charge of the official inquiry were people who should have been investigated. The so-called “Independent Commission” was worse than the Warren Commission, and the Commissioners had major conflicts of interest, particularly oil; they failed to address most of the key questions (Lynn 2004).

The failure of the military to intercept the hijacked planes was explained by the multiple war games being conducted that morning. One deployed fighter resources to Northern Canada and Alaska, another placed false blips on radar screens; the CIA was conducting a drill to respond to the simulation of a plane crashing into the National Reconnaissance Office, and a “live fly hijack drill” was underway.⁴ The multiple exercises combined to make it impossible for fighter jets to interfere with the attacks. Cheney was in command that morning. The book, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil*, by Michael C. Ruppert (2004), and the documentary, *The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*, by Barrie Zwicker (2005), detail Cheney’s

role in 9/11 and key facts that should have been headline news years ago.

Individually and collectively, Americans need to “be brave, to grow up,” to overcome fear, to think, to face the harsh realities that the rest of the world has witnessed. There is a disparity between American ideals and American policy.

People are rising up in the United States, and around the world, against war and the dominant institutions, the IMF, the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, transnational corporations, that clearly benefit a global elite, at tremendous human cost, and threaten the planet.

The Project for a New American Century,⁵ the neo-conservative cabal occupying the White House, wrote in detail of their imperial desires and the likelihood of resistance from the public, “The process of [military] transformation is likely to be a long one, absent some catastrophic and catalyzing event—like a New Pearl Harbor” (*Rebuilding America’s Defenses* 2000).

To pursue the militarization of the country and world conquest, 9/11 was the event they needed. It was also a gamble, and depended upon an acquiescent media to pull it off. John Galtung, peace activist, when asked about the differences between the Americans and the Russians, said, “In Russia when people hear the Party Line; they know it’s the Party Line. In America, they don’t.”⁶ In war, the first casualty is truth.

The quick passage of the *Patriot Act*, the rush to war against Afghanistan, Iraq, counter-terrorist wars against other countries, the construction of Homeland Security, the revamping of the intelligence agencies, the construction of a “Global Security State,” are being hurried through Congress as quickly as possible. The speed of the changes, the psychological war directed against the public has formed a crucible that is forging a vast resistance movement.

The craziest conspiracy theory of all was linking Iraq to 9/11, which Cheney used to sell his war. 9/11 is the Achilles’ heel of a failing paradigm, already suffering from loss of credibility and legitimacy.

Children can see “the Emperor has no clothes.” It was logistically impossible for a lone gunman to assassinate John F. Kennedy in 1963; 19 guys with box-cutters couldn’t possibly have outwitted the multi-trillion dollar U.S. defense department and brought down all those buildings.

What has happened is that people have raised questions that officials cannot answer. Through a vast cooperative effort, researchers from all over the world, activists in a multitude of cities, filmmakers, writers, artists, musicians have challenged the Big Lie. The spotlight on the darkness has exposed the secrets, the crimes, the treason committed at the highest level of government.

The 9/11 Truth Movement was nurtured by a free flow of information, analysis, thousands and thousands of people helping one another to put together the pieces of a vastly complex puzzle (see *Aftermath; The Great Conspiracy* 2005; Griffin 2004, 2005; Lappé and Marshall 2004; Thompson and the Center for Cooperative Research 2004). Truth and courage are needed to overcome fear and recognize the deeper problems we face, which are beyond left and right, beyond rich or poor, beyond gender or race.

Our current debt-based monetary system concentrates wealth and power, while destroying the planet; it is only supported by belief in the current system. When faith in the U.S. government collapses; dollars are likely to collapse, as well, with far reaching effect. Fear paralyzes people who cannot imagine a better alternative to the dysfunctional, criminal, financial system that surrounds us.

Money, next to brute military force, has been the most powerful tool of empire, but money is little understood, how it is created, how it works. The antithesis of the gift, debt-based money relies on fear and scarcity to maintain its value and power. The war economy fails to recognize the value of life. The failure of the financial system, the totalitarian corporations, the institutionalized violence, however, is giving new life to a more powerful force. Mahatma Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Cesar Chavez, Rachel Corrie, and others, are beginning to awaken to the power of truth, non-violent resistance, solidarity with others; recognition that respect and cooperation are essential survival skills, and bring joy, meaning and hope to our lives.

We are grappling with the Big Lie versus truth, fear versus courage, war versus peace. We must stand up to the frightened necrophiliacs⁷ that believe that if they cannot own or control something; they have the right to kill it. There is a rising consciousness that the hope of the world is to acknowledge and respect all people; that real security means healthy relationships between people, between people and planet, not the military domination of the many by a dysfunctional few. Americans should rein in their own government and call for compassionate impeachment, the lifting of the American boot off the throat of the world. Imagine redirecting the world's resources away from killing and controlling the planet, to healing.

The time for a Global Truth, Peace and Justice Movement is now. To help others overcome fear, we must help light the path, and encourage the emergence of genuine community that comes from the free exchange of gifts.

Carol Brouillet is a longtime activist. She has organized three gatherings on "Strategies to Transform the Global Economy," with an emphasis on money. She also organized (the first) marches on her Senators and Congresswoman in January 2002 to "demand a congressional investigation of 9/11." She has published Deception Dollars (over 6,000,000 in print), and co-founded the 9/11 Truth Alliance, and the Northern California 9/11 Truth Alliance. She also produced the musical comedy/benefit and film, Behind Every Terrorist There is a Bush and organized the San Francisco International Inquiry into 9/11. She is the mother of three boys, and ran for Congress in 2006 on the Green Party ticket on a 9/11 Truth, Peace and Impeachment platform. www.communitycurrency.org.

Notes

¹ The title essay in her collection, *Freedom from Fear* (edited and published by her husband, Michael Aris) begins, "It is not power that corrupts but fear. Fear of losing power corrupts those who wield it and fear of the scourge of power corrupts those

- who are subject to it.” In conclusion she writes that “truth, justice and compassion ... are often the only bulwarks against ruthless power” (see Aris 1991).
- 2 Craig Corrie told this story at the Herbst Theater in San Francisco at the Annual Veterans for Peace National Convention in 2003 when Rachel was honoured posthumously as a member of Veterans for Peace.
 - 3 I organized the San Francisco International Inquiry into 9/11 in cooperation with Canadians who organized the Toronto International Inquiry into 9/11. We worked with activists, organizers, researchers, and victims’ family members who were filing suit against the government for their role in the attacks. The Inquiry in San Francisco brought together the major authors, researchers, filmmakers, and activists—those active in alerting the public to the facts about 9/11 and the disparity between the official narrative and reality—together physically for the first time. 9/11truth.org, an international network to nurture the 9/11 Truth Movement, was basically born out of the Inquiry, and the Truth Movement continues to grow since then. “We” here means the 9/11 Truth Movement which became the 9/11 Truth Alliance. Physical meetings organized by the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF) members—Premilla Dixit and myself—launched the local New York and San Francisco groups that continue to spearhead visibility actions, events, marches, rallies, and produce films.
 - 4 See Michael Ruppert’s address at the Toronto International Inquiry, and at the Commonwealth Club, August 31, 2004. Online: <http://www.fromthewilderness.com/PDF/Commonwealth.pdf>.
 - 5 “The Project for the New American Century, is a non-profit educational organization dedicated to a few fundamental propositions: that American leadership is good both for America and for the world; and that such leadership requires military strength, diplomatic energy and commitment to moral principle.” Online: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/>.
 - 6 As told to me by my mentor Bill Moyer, author of *Doing Democracy* (Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers, 2001).
 - 7 Psychologist/philosopher Erich Fromm (1964, 1970) believed that the lack of love in the western society and the attraction to mechanistic control leads to necrophilia. Expressions of necrophilia are modern weapon systems, idolotry of technology, and the treatment of people as things in bureaucracy.

References

- Abrams, Irwin. 1997. “Heroines of Peace: The Nine Nobel Women.” Antioch University, September 22. Online: http://nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/articles/heroines/index.html.
- Aftermath: Unanswered Questions from 9/11*. Guerrilla News Network.
- Aris, Michael, ed. 1991. *Freedom From Fear and Other Writings by Aung San Suu Kyi*. New York: Viking.
- Cheney, Dick. Online: <http://www.ajr.org/Article.asp?id=788>.
- Chossudovsky, Michel. 2003. “Mysterious September 11 Breakfast Meeting on Capitol Hill.” Online: <http://www.globalresearch.ca/articles/CHO308C.html/>.
- Fromm Erich. 1964. *The Heart of Man*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Fromm Erich. 1970. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- The Great Conspiracy: The 9/11 News Special You Never Saw*. 2005. Prod: Barrie Zwicker.

- Griffin, David Ray. 2004. *The New Pearl Harbor: Disturbing Questions About the Bush Administration and 9/11*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.
- Griffin, David Ray. 2005. *The 9/11 Commission Report: Omissions and Distortions*. Northampton, MA: Olive Branch Press.
- Hargrove, Thomas and Guido H. Stempel III. 2006. "Was 9/11 an 'inside job'?" Scripps News Service, August 3. Online: http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/national/279827_conspiracy02ww.html.
- Lappé, Anthony and Stephen Marshall. 2004. *True Lies*. New York: Plume.
- Lynn, Jocelyn. 2004. "The 9/11 Cover-Up Commission: How the Foxes are Guarding the Chicken Coop." March 27. Online: <http://www.communitycurrency.org/joycelynn.html>.
- Patriot Act*. Online: <http://www.aclu.org/safefree/resources/17343res20031114.html>.
- Rebuilding America's Defenses: Strategy, Forces and Resources for a New Century*. 2000, September. A Project for the New American Century. Online: <http://www.newamericancentury.org/RebuildingAmericasDefenses.pdf>.
- Ruppert, Michael C. 2004. *Crossing the Rubicon: The Decline of the American Empire at the End of the Age of Oil*. Gabriola Island, BC: New Society Publishers.
- Thompson, Paul and the Centre for Cooperative Research. 2004. *The Terror Timeline: Year by Year, Minute by Minute: A Comprehensive Chronicle of the Road to 9/11—and America's Response*. New York: ReganBooks.

Heterosexism and the Norm of Normativity

In the 2004 U.S. presidential election, one of the issues used by the right wing to divide and conquer the electorate was the issue of gay marriage. If we can understand homophobia and heterosexism in terms of their connections with Patriarchal Capitalism and the market, perhaps we can strengthen ourselves for further political struggles, as well as clarifying our thinking regarding the gift and the exchange paradigms. In order to do this we need to go back to the social construction of gender as the basis not only of the division of labour but of the division of economies.

The construction of the male gender in opposition to the mother and the consequent denial of mothering gift giving as the main human principle and process, creates a norm of heterosexuality *and* an economic norm of the distribution of goods through exchange (not-giving), both of which are artificial and pernicious. The denial of gift giving and the privileging of not-giving blight the individual personality as well as the economy. The constructions of “male” in this deeply mistaken way and of “female” as its opposite and complement, are motivating privileged Euro/Americans¹ to destroy everything we would otherwise celebrate and love. Heterosexism becomes a way of affirming the Patriarchal Capitalist market. That is, it affirms the primacy of not-giving except according to the *upward* flows established by the market and male dominant heterosexuality. And conversely, Patriarchal Capitalism affirms this norm of heterosexuality, not only in its use of sexualized images for advertising and propaganda but also in its parasite/host structure, in its motivation towards competition and economic domination, and in its privileging of identity and penalization of difference, which is the logical and emotional matrix of homophobia. The values of heterosexism and the market promote each other, and this is made more powerful because the two derive from a common root in “masculated” not-giving.

Despite the gift giving done by lesbians and gay men to each other and to the LGBT movement as well as to the peace and social change movements at large, and despite the challenge to biological gender determinism that we offer, neither the movement nor most of the individuals in it have so far taken their true political positions as opponents of a destructively heterosexist economy. Recognizing a common derivation of the artificial constructions of heterosexuality and of the

capitalist market shifts the emphasis from the politics of the defense of personal preference to a much more general socio/economic/political engagement.² It can constitute a step beyond issue-bound identity politics to a deep commonality with the other progressive social movements. At the same time, thinking about heterosexism and its connection to Capitalism can serve as a new perspective for feminist and progressive thinking in general.

Masculation

An early change of categories for boys from the model of the mother to that of the father and thus from female (mother-identified) to male, makes masculinity a lifetime mandate or behavioural agenda (see Vaughan 1997 for a more complete discussion). In itself this change of categories, which I call “masculation,” seems innocuous enough, but I believe the projections and paradoxes to which it gives rise are now destroying the earth and all her creatures. We do not have much time left, if any. Yet in order not to worsen the problems we need to calmly understand them so that we can create change in the right direction.

Patriarchies place little boys in a category that is opposite to that of their mothers. Since in infancy and childhood mothers are doing most of the caregiving (gift giving) for their children, and this is the most important experience for the children at the time, it appears that in order to achieve a masculine identity little boys have to give up a model of behaviour, which is life sustaining and all encompassing. The rejection of the model of the mother becomes the rejection of the behaviour of unilateral gift giving, and in its place not-giving and domination are offered as “male” characteristics. The not-giver receives gifts without acknowledging them, on the basis that he deserves them because he is in a privileged (male) category. In fact, the mother continues to give to the child even if he will never be a mother, and she encourages him to behave in the not-giving ways of his father (or other significant males) to whom she also gives.

An alternative to gift giving is available to the boy child: hitting. Like gift giving, hitting is transitive. By hitting, one person touches another and establishes a relation, though this is a relation of domination rather than one of mutuality and trust. I realize that this description of the boy child’s socialization is an abstraction—but actually he is abstracted,³ his motherliness, his gift giving humanity, is held in abeyance indefinitely—as he is extracted psychologically from the mothering context. For the boy child, the norm of the mother is replaced or cancelled by the norm of the father (or other masculated male model) and this cancellation itself becomes part of the male identity as does a mandate for the boy to become the overtaking and canceling norm. This gender construction is Oedipal as well as economic. The privileging of the phallus, patriarchal law, and the norm of normativity all take place through an artificial construction of masculinity over and against a prior mothering, gift giving model. The pre-Oedipal stage is not just *jouissance*, a symbiotic merging between the child and the mother but an economically primary stage of gift giving-and-receiving, a proto and (in Capitalist

Patriarchy still) just nascent gift economy.

The Norm of the Norm

Recently there has been a current in cognitive psychology and linguistics called “prototype theory” (Rosch 2000 [1978]; Lakoff 1987; Taylor 2003 [1989]). Concepts are seen as organized around a best example of a category, the prototype or exemplar. So, in experiments in the U.S., in a mid-level category such as “birds,” the robin is taken as the prototype by most people. This current implicitly recalls an early (1920s) experiment on concept formation by the Soviet psychologist Lev Vygotsky (1962), in which he provided exemplars of experimental categories and asked children to select members of those categories by comparison with the exemplars. By tracking the various ways in which they accomplished this task, he was able to identify and describe different strategies of concept formation. I noticed (Vaughan 1981) the similarity of this process with the process of the market as seen by Marx (1930 [1867]) and his identification of money as the general equivalent—the prototype of value with regard to the many commodities which are related to it. Jean Josef Goux (1990 [1973]) wrote about the one-to-many form of the general equivalent as incarnated in social structures, for example, the relation of the king to his many subjects, of the general to his army, the patriarchal father to his family, and the phallus to the other parts of the male body. The exemplars or prototypes are the “ones” in the one-to-many structures and may be seen as norms or standards. People take on these roles, which also often permit them to impose legal norms and standards of behaviour. What I derive from looking at this proliferation of similar patterns is the startling conclusion that the form of a thought process, the concept, has become mistakenly embodied in human social structures.

In the area of the market, money is the standard or prototype of value and functions as “one” with regard to “many” commodities. This one-to-many structure is repeated over and over in our society. Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) and Mafia lords, film stars and rock stars, popes and presidents are all examples of one-to-many “prototypicality” and are used as behavioural norms by the many who serve or emulate them. There is a somewhat similar relation also between the owner of private property and the many items that are owned by h/er. Perhaps property relations are more similar to one of Vygotsky’s (1962) “complex” stages, which he sees as steps in the development conceptualization proper. In the case of property, this would be the “family name” complex⁴ where each item relates individually to the one exemplar, but this does not imply a common quality among the items. Similarly a person can own many different kinds of items (chairs, a sack of tomatoes, a reproduction of the Mona Lisa, a car), which do not have anything in common with each other beyond this property relation to the one owner. In the patriarchal family the “complex” of property includes people among the items, the “chattel,” which are related to the “one” *pater familias*.

Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt (2004) have recently written a book,

Multitude, in which they describe the “swarm,” which is their conception of the “many” beyond the relationship to the “one.” Unfortunately they leave aside heterosexist gender relations, which nevertheless condition the members of the “swarm” internally. Even if the multitude were to succeed in detaching itself from political one-to-many power structures altogether, these structures would still exist within individuals, families and among the masculated (one-to-many) males and correspondingly femized (many to one) females who make up the many.

The one-to-many norm, of which there are so very many instances in our society, self replicates at a higher logical level and becomes the norm of normativity itself (whatever is not normative is not normal). Being normal is being a “one” or being related as one-of-many to a “one,” as a star is related to her fans or fans are related to a star. This kind of relation is so commonplace that it seems natural. In the U.S. we use it in selecting our presidents, where the many choose which person (of two) will be the “one” and the candidate with the greatest number of votes of the “many” becomes the “one” for all.⁵ We derive our (normal) sense of identity from being in these relationships, playing one or the other role, as well as from being in one-to-many family or property relationships.

Patriarchal institutions such as the law, the prisons, the police and the military, schools and businesses, are all set up according to the norm of one-to-many normativity and they determine behaviour both within and outside their own hierarchical structures. However, in a strange twist in an already unwarranted use of the concept form, the market itself has displaced the concept of value from human beings to objects, and has incarnated the one-to-many norm of value in money. Thus the market broadcasts normativity to us in a transversal way, which is difficult to recognize and remains largely unconscious, though it is part of our daily behaviour.

In fact the market is a gigantic sorting mechanism, which includes commodities and excludes gifts, at the same time evaluating the commodities according to the quantities of the monetary prototype. Quantification, measurement, and the judgment of value according to the monetary norm become normal behaviour for everyone and people judge each other and even themselves in this way. The existence of this social sorting process influences the other one-to-many structures and vice versa, so that all of them become “natural,” “objective reality,” the way things are. Gift giving and receiving, which imply the value of the other, are left out of the picture and sorting by evaluation in terms of the norm, takes their place.

Those who cannot relate themselves to the monetary norm because they are unemployed or their (gift) work is not monetized, are sorted out, and they become irrelevant, beyond the pale. Similarly, those who are themselves neither the one nor one-of-the-many related to the one, as modeled in the patriarchal family, for example, are also beyond the pale, irrelevant. Anyone who does not accept the norm of heterosexuality can be seen as dangerous and socially deviant by those who do. In fact homosexuals step outside the norm of normativity itself, beyond the one and the many, challenging that structure in much the same way that the gift economy challenges the structure of the market and Capitalist Patriarchy. Of

course, many homosexuals and transgendered people performatively repeat the power relations they find in the society around them (Butler 1990). But being beyond the norm of normativity brings with it a revolutionary potential, which could be empowered if the connections between heterosexism and the economy of the market were made more explicit. Unfortunately the market and heterosexism validate each other in many different ways, which we may not identify as such, and it is easy to be trapped in a hall of mirrors without seeing the connections.

Those who are geographically and ideologically beyond the pale are now being considered as potential threats to the security of those within it, whether they are a many related to a “one” who is different from “our one”: another real or invented leader such as Osama Bin Laden, or an “other” monotheistic God, or whether they are simply “disaffected” individuals. Such individuals appear to be capable of immense destruction, given the level of development of arms technology (see my discussion of the “one” character of guns in my 1997 book, *For-Giving*). In fact, with this technology, it only takes one to kill many. The fear that many will avail themselves of this option drives the decision-making of the ones at the top who (in order to solve the problem!) are continuing to provide the model of national patriarchal aggression of one against the many on a grand scale.⁶

Since women have not been masculated, we are somewhat outside the one-to-many structure, unless we are placed in a relation of gift giving to a one. Thus perhaps we have a chance to do things differently especially if we do not cling to (home or homeland) security. However, young heterosexual women are socially encouraged at every turn to find the “one” to whom to relate themselves, and to whom they will give long term. Without this “one” they remain in an outsider position. Although this outsider position is made to seem inferior and women who are not married or in relationships are often punished with isolation, there is a revolutionary potential here as well.

I do not believe women should imitate masculated violence in order to change the system. We have to find other ways of dismantling the structure, or shall I call it syndrome, of patriarchy. There is no reason why the “one” prototype of a concept should be invested with special value or why someone in that position should be able to make decisions and act aggressively “for” all. Or receive the gifts of the many. Or fight against the prototype of others, the “one” related to other manys. We have misconstrued and misvalued this part of the way we think. Knowing that this is what we are doing can allow us to strategize to collectively change it in nonviolent ways.

I believe that by promoting the radically different worldview of the gift economy we can undermine the power structures of Patriarchal Capitalism. The attribution of reality and normality to these power structures constitutes one of the cornerstones of the edifice of the “master’s house” (Lorde 1984). We can challenge and dismantle the norm of normativity by which positions of power are validated. The values of the gift economy, espoused by the many, could reabsorb the exacerbated and over emphasized “ones” into the midst of the many—given that this reiterated one-to-many structure is actually a collectively constructed psychosocial

artifact. That is, though forming concepts is perhaps the human, species specific, development of a modeling capacity shared by all life (Sebeok and Danesi 2000), using a part of this process as a structure for social organization and individual ego formation, is a mistake and an unnecessary and aberrant form. Indeed the fact that there are many people beyond the norm of normativity (neither many nor one) shows that this use of the one-to-many form is not a biologically determined aspect of the human species. The general crisis to which these norms have led us must deeply trouble both the ones and the many and signals the need for radical change. In fact the swing towards Fascism that we have recently been experiencing may be a reaction to this crisis, a mistaken attempt to solve the problem by intensifying its cause.

On the other hand, beginning to practice the gift economy consciously and recognizing the many ways in which we have already been practicing it unconsciously, gives an accessible inroad into the alternative. It is not by behaving according to norms that we create community and live in peace and harmony with one another, but by satisfying needs, by giving and receiving at many levels. These levels are material, and perceptual as well as linguistic and semiotic; they are levels of gifts and services of all kinds as well as signs and signals, pheromones and colour changes, tones and gestures, all of which can be seen as gifts that satisfy our needs to know about one another. Our identities do not come from being assigned to a category or from being related as one of many to a “one” or even from becoming or having the potential to become a “one.” There is a whole other fabric of giving and receiving, which makes us who we are regardless of whether or not at the same time we are continually categorizing and being categorized according to a norm.

Our thinking has become excessively categorical due to the exchange-based economy, which excludes gift giving and thus (1) serves as a model of categorical inclusion and exclusion, with money as the prototype and (2) places gift giving on the outside where it is invisible. By (3) evaluating everything quantitatively, the market creates abstract quantitative categories of similarity and difference, which again serve as models for categorization. Then (4) the normativity of money and the market resonate with the other one-to-many normative forms, setting up a reciprocal validation.

The concept formation process functions by comparison and contrast, including each item of the many in a category by virtue of its similarity with the one, and finding the common quality among the many which are related to the one in this way. In the relation between commodities and money the same process takes place, as each product is evaluated quantitatively in terms of an amount of the money standard. Each person confronts the other either as holder of the “one” or as holder of an item of the many, as holder of money or of a product. The exchangers often change roles as sellers and buyers.

The exercise of evaluation according to a norm becomes commonplace. Not-giving to satisfy the need of the other and therefore not-implying the value of the other, also becomes normal behaviour. Instead we give in order to receive

either a product or the incarnated value norm (money), giving value to ourselves by implication. The exchangers are all similar to each other in this way. They thus belong to the same category and only differ according to the quantity of exchange value they own and exchange, while the transitivity of gift giving is excluded from the process. What has been put out at the door comes back in through the window as profit—what people “deserve” for having participated in the process—gifts reframed as rewards, i.e. exchanges. The forcing of the gifts upwards as profit seems to prove the superiority of those who have them and the race to the top, to be a human “one” through the accumulation of gifts (capital, which can then be reinvested) proceeds. The exchangers are placed in adversarial positions, and are detached from the needs of others, which their products might satisfy. Rather than creating community they create isolation by enacting these ego-oriented patterns of inclusion and exclusion over and over again. The man who is the “breadwinner” of the family, can be in a position of giving to the family in exchange for nurturing of himself and his property. This creates a situation of debt, dependency, and responsibility regarding his intimates, which is different from the relations created in (egalitarian) mothering gift giving. The nuclear family itself is fostered by market-based adversarial relations among families.

The compare-and-contrast thinking processes, which people engage in regarding the norm of whatever category concerns them at the moment, is repeated in the compare-and-contrast process of commodities and money in the market, which feeds back into the thinking processes, and the categories people form regarding themselves and each other. Judgment according to a norm seems to be the most important process in community and communication, while transitivity and needs are set aside. We are really barking up the wrong tree.

In spite of their seeming ubiquity, however, this tangled collection of normative structures is actually rather fragile and therefore needs to be protected from the possible alternatives. Think of the “threat” communism was supposed to pose—though in fact communism (as State Capitalism) was also set up according to one-to-many structures. We do not need these psychologically invested norms⁷ and the norm of normativity is false. Rather we need to allow and value processes of giving and receiving which will let us all become completely human. And we need to understand our thinking as based in these processes not just on categorization.

In the construction of heterosexism, imposing the male prototype of the category human actually leaves out the female as a category altogether. Canceling the female prototype leaves females as uncategorized, seemingly *pre-categorical* and thus “childlike”! It thus appears that not-giving and prototypicality go together while gift giving implies irrelevance to categorization. Gift giving seems simply not important enough to be categorized. While males have been taken away from, abstracted from the gift context, and the patterns of abstraction have themselves been abstracted and used for understanding the world, the patterns of gift giving have not been abstracted and used for understanding. This leaves large lacunae in what we think of as knowledge. Why do we not know how words relate to the

world, for example? Too many explanations for experience and for human relations are still being stuffed into the black box of biology because gift giving/mothering is not being used as an interpretative key.

The Binary Norm of Heterosexuality

The norm of normativity is the norm of over valued prototypicality, a “one” invested with special significance, with regard to which the many are related as similar members of a category. This relation is binary (or polar)⁸ as an item is either the “one” or one of the many. The norm of exchange is either money or commodity; and the binary relation of property is similar with two aspects: either object or owner and either mine or others’ (not-mine).

Heterosexuality is a common example of normativity but it is imbalanced towards the male “one” since part of the character of maleness in our society lies in being the “one.” Of course oneness cannot actually stand alone, but is relational. The heterosexual norm requires at least two of which one is *more* one than the other. It has binary poles of which one pole, the male, is the “one” while the female functions as the eclipsed norm and eclipsed giver, sorted out, but giving to the one, who dominates. She can function as a giver of many things but, more importantly, she herself is one-of-many when, having been cancelled as the original prototype, she is grouped together with her children (or with property) as “many” with regard to the “one” husband/father. She can also be one-of-many women regarding a Don Juan male figure. In a way, in masculation, the privileging of the category “male,” functions to make all women “many,” to whom every male is (or “deserves” to be) related as “one.” On the other hand the male “one” is nothing without the many, and he also needs the eclipsed gift giver in order to maintain his position. Following this model, playing these roles, in the family, in the media and in the market, people unknowingly help maintain a norm of dominance and privilege, which subjugates gift giving. Homosexuals as the third or fourth sex, both/and and neither/nor, form a plurality, which destabilizes the distorted binary heterosexual norm.

Once established, the psycho-logic of heterosexuality can be turned around so that regardless of biological gender anyone who takes the “one” not-giving position appears as “male,” while anyone who takes the “many” or gift giving position is “female.” Since in patriarchy the many serve or give to the male one, the position of the many appears to coincide with “female” gift giving. In fact what we call “power” is the ability be the “one” and to force others into the femized gift giving position, whether the “one” is biologically male, female or an abstract entity such as a corporation. The power of the corporation over the many can therefore be seen as male, or masculated power, even though the corporation itself is not a human being but a legal entity, which does not have physiological genitals. The “male” one and the “female” many are thus relational positions that are imposed as stereotypical sexual and economic roles.

Power relations make egalitarian gift giving and receiving difficult. However,

positive communication and community depend on human beings treating each other as (communicative) givers and receivers. In our linguistic communication we construct our variegated similarity ad hoc through the gift process, having in common an egalitarian point of departure as speakers of the same language. As speakers and writers we exercise a gift giving agency that has its fruition in the understanding of listeners or readers whose communicative needs are both elicited and satisfied by our linguistic gifts. They are able to receive these gifts because they themselves are also communicative agents who in their turn construct similar gifts for others, using the common verbal virtual gift mode of a particular language.

The performance of the masculated and femized roles beyond biological gender might be considered a social bricolage, a game of exploration—here of the one-to-many relation and of the relation between gift and exchange, in the intimate interpersonal arena. Since, in Capitalist Patriarchy it is possible for women⁹ to achieve the “one” position, as a rock star or a prime minister or in the family as the (usually economically disempowered) single mother of many children, it is clear that the capacity to be the prototype is not biologically determined as male, nor is the capacity to be gift giving and one-of-the-many only female. Creating these roles as conscious performance and even as parody calls the roles into question; the ability to relate to one another outside the norm can be an assertion of the generic human. It can also provide the kind of egalitarian relations that are necessary for the liberated practice of the gift economy. Though heterosexuals do also often relate to each other beyond the stereotypical roles, the roles themselves in their case still seem deeply embedded in biology. It is perhaps a special gift of the LGBT movement to show the way to the unmasculated gift giving human.

The Norm of the Un-Normative, Beyond The Pale

We could dismantle the binary norm of heterosexism, *first* by extracting gift giving from it. That is, we would recognize that gift giving is of a different order, a different logical status, in that it is a human process already the possession of everyone, whether male or female, one or many—an “operating system” put into the “computer” very early on—and therefore it is pertinent to everyone beyond the binary norm, not an aspect of gender. Looking at language as transposed gift giving (as I have been trying to do for many years), confirms the pan-human character of gift giving because the capacity for language itself is not determined by gender.

Second, if we could restore gift giving to the concept of “human” we would no longer construct maleness in opposition to gift giving in a binary way, and therefore would not misuse an exemplar of a not-giving father in opposition to the gift giving mother, to construct the accepted masculine identity for boys. If the prototype of the father did not take over and cancel the prototype of the mother, the “one” position would be less emphasized and the father himself would be seen as less dominant. He and like him, his sons, would also not be expected to replace gift giving with hitting. As happens in matriarchies, the mother would be

seen as the model of the human practice of gift giving for *both* males and females. However she would not need to be dominant, as her capacity to be the model would not have to cancel a polar opposite model. Moreover, since gift giving is other-oriented, it is not a self-centered dominant model, not focused on being “one.” It includes others, and therefore is a link in a similarly constructed gift giving “many” (which does not exclude males who in a gift-based society would not be masculated anyway).¹⁰ We could do away with the norm of normativity altogether, constructing ourselves and each other through gift giving-and-receiving processes at many different levels. In this way we would produce a kind of subjectivity and agency very different from those we are now creating under the dictates of the norm and the logic of exchange. Constructing ourselves and our genders differently would allow us to defuse the motivation towards domination and accumulation. It would also help us recognize the deeply dysfunctional configurations of our institutions and would clarify the ways to change them.

Relations

The process of gift giving and receiving allows each person to influence and participate in the other’s development. It creates relations of mutuality and reciprocal recognition while exchange creates relations of competition or mutual indifference (in which recognition is only “given” through a struggle). In the gift process, needs are valued, not considered in terms of effective demand as the means for making a profit. New needs develop according to the specific satisfaction of old needs. The agency of each person develops during the process in which s/he, as a giver is able to recognize the needs of the other and fill them creatively. Then the giver also becomes a creative receiver in h/er turn and is able to use the gifts of others, as well as to see the others as the source of the satisfaction of h/er need. S/he is also able to know specifically the object or the service s/he has been given, often by actually incorporating it. In fact I believe that the response to the gift, which at a conscious level is gratitude, may be considered at a less conscious level as knowledge. It is this giving and receiving interaction, this mode of distribution, that socializes us as human, rather than the more abstract and adversarial interaction of exchange, with the equations and categories of which we continue to identify and which we over-value as self-reflecting consciousness. In fact I believe we should be called *homo donans*¹¹ instead of *homo sapiens* or we should realize that the two are really the same thing, that we cannot know anything without first receiving and beginning to learn to give the gifts that satisfy our physical, perceptual and emotional needs and those of others.

Actually, the process of giving and receiving *is* the process of knowledge. Our perceptual needs are satisfied by our experience of the world around us, and this experience also brings us the methods and means for satisfying our more complex needs for knowledge. Thus *homo donans* and *recipiens* come before categorizing *homo sapiens* and should be recognized as more descriptive names for our humanity. We have been projecting the objectification we have learned from the market onto

the universe rather than projecting the mother as Indigenous gift-based societies have done. Just as the male we have invented cancels female humanity, exchange cancels gift giving, and the market economy cancels the gift economy.

The Market and Masculation

The logical contradictions in the constitution of binary heterosexism derive from the misuse of the concept formation process in masculation. Logically there can be only one “one” but there are many people, especially masculated males with the same mandate to achieve that position. Social hierarchies are created so that at least some of the contenders can achieve the top position. The one-to-many aspects of concept formation are externalized, and transferred onto the plane of interpersonal relations and the construction of gendered subjectivities.¹² Lived out, these artificial and mistaken heterosexist constructions of gender, which are also re projected into group relations and institutional structures, cause huge social problems, yet perhaps because of their similarity to aspects of the concept formation process, they seem to give meaning and structure to the lives of the individuals who are their bearers. The market as one of the projections of masculation, provides a field in which the not-giving masculated identity of individuals can exercise its mandate to get to the top. Corporate entities also act out a disembodied masculated agenda though they have not gone through a gender construction as such. Competitive capitalism is motivated by masculation.

In Capitalism, goods and services are produced by labour, which for Marx (1930 [1867]) is abstract (not-gift) labour. The common relation of commodities to each other is quantitatively assessed in money. If something cannot be assessed in money it is irrelevant to the market, uncategorized. It is as if the market replays the moment of transition from the gift giving mothering (non) category to the category “male,” with the commodity playing the part of the boy. The money standard/norm plays the part of the father norm, the one to which all commodities are related as many, and to which “female” gifts are or appear to be irrelevant. It is in this sense that the market appears to be a replay of the construction of heterosexism. It repeats and rebroadcasts its mistaken logic into our minds and behaviours from a different, object-based dimension—one that seems to have very little to do with gender. The market also seems to be neuter or neutral because women can participate as well as men in its not-giving (or gift-canceling) mode of distribution. The emphasis on objects that the market promotes, objects from which gift value has been deleted through the process of exchange, leaves us with the idea that the market is objective, giftless, and “fair.” Nevertheless many gifts of profit are channeled through the market, and value is thus surreptitiously given to the ego-oriented exchangers and to the market itself. Moreover, since gift giving is hidden or misnamed, the market appears to be the only mode of distribution, and therefore also production for the market appears to be the only mode of production. Similarly patriarchal heterosexism seems to be the only mode of gender construction possible. The two social constructions

back each other up in such a way as to make both seem natural and unavoidable. It follows that challenges to the market disturb the masculated identity and challenges to masculation disturb the market.

It is part of the market's seemingly neutral and independent dimension that there is an emphasis on equality after the fact. That is, after gift giving has been sorted out, the equation of value between different commodities and different kinds of productive labour or services becomes a moment of a process in which all the market participants engage on a daily basis. The value given to, and seemingly by, equality with the (money) standard becomes itself a model for human relations. Unfortunately this is an equality, which is established after gift giving has been excluded from the picture. Thus the fact that someone works harder and longer than someone else for the same pay is not interpreted in the light that h/er extra work is a gift to h/er employer. Rather it is seen as deriving from the fact that h/er job is less important or that s/he is less skilled or less educated—or the wrong gender. In fact the jobs which have most to do with gift giving such as housework, childcare, and teaching, are notoriously poorly paid—as if to emphasize their inferiority and irrelevance to the masculated market. The extraction of gifts is treated as “injustice” because the payment does not reach the standard of quantitative equality, while the gifts that permeate the market, and are extracted at every turn, are invisible. Even if the wrongs are righted in some cases, justice cannot solve the problem in general because the market itself is a mechanism for gift extraction. It is not by giving value to equality from which gift giving has been removed that we can create better selves or a society where the needs of all are satisfied. Instead we need a shift from a market-based to a gift-based society.

Politics

There are two main opposing views in the U.S., as demonstrated by the two-party system. These views very generally retrace the opposition between the gift paradigm and the exchange paradigm, which retrace the construction of heterosexuality, which we have been describing. However our understanding does not go far enough to allow us to take a radical gift giving standpoint, because those on the “Left” typically think that women are equal to men according to the male (masculated, giftless) standard, and those on the “Right” think that women should be femized, nurturing men in their masculated roles. The femized woman is the one the Right sees as gift giving. The masculated adult man protects her as he protects his property (and his country). The gift giver has not been seen or recognized as the human standard, the human prototype, though s/he pervades the society. That is why the Right says that the Left does not have values—and the Left believes the values of the right are false and based on cruelty, greed, deception—and the stereotypical roles of heterosexism.

If we cannot find a radically different point of view from that of the masculated men of the Right wing, we cannot hold back their rush to domination. But we on the Left also need to go beyond the equality with the masculated norm

of the equation of value from which gift giving has been removed and beyond normativity itself. We are *all* wearing the eyeglasses of Capitalist Patriarchy. To find the alternative we need to reveal gift giving as something that has a status and logic of its own, which is (at least) as important as the logic of the market. We need to understand and embrace gift giving as autonomous, not see it as an adjunct to exchange.

We have appealed to the legal system devised by Patriarchy to restrain some of the worst aspects of masculation. However, law and justice are based on crime and payment by punishment, on the logic of exchange, and do not offer a real alternative to exchange. The perspective of the gift, where we actively investigate needs in order to unilaterally fill them in an effective way, is more basic and is as powerful as the perspective of exchange. Reprisal, vengeance, exacting payment for a wrong done (“bringing the perpetrators to justice”) are part of the exchange paradigm reasoning of balancing the accounts, and they leave aside gift giving. War with its attacks and counter-attacks is the logic of exchange played out large. The cold war arms race was also a replay of exchange, in which the equation between weapons systems was repeatedly established, re “valued” and re established. By unilaterally giving way Gorbachev at last broke through the escalation and satisfied an impelling need for peace. Unfortunately Patriarchal Capitalism immediately extended its parasitic tentacles to the former Soviet Union to take the gifts that had been made available by many years of socialism.

We are playing out the masculated syndrome large, causing worldwide devastation. We need a point of view that is radical enough to offer a real alternative. The gift paradigm can satisfy that need. Instead what we have now is the Patriarchal dominance model and the market equality-and-justice model.¹³ We need to go farther than that, to the gift paradigm. The reason for this is that the dominant father model and the market model are really part of the same paradigm. Money has the place of the norm in the market, while the father has the place of the norm in the family.¹⁴ Heterosexism is the imposition of the masculated norm bolstered by the norm of normativity, while femization is the casting of gift givers—women and men—in the roles of the many who adapt to and nurture the masculated norms. (These norms are both individuals in top positions and the one-many structures projected into society at large. Masculated men and ideologies of course attempt to keep women, and other men in gift giving roles, roles of the many, which they control and dominate.) We need to imagine and construct ourselves outside the norm(s), recognizing and validating gift giving, the unmasculated and unfemized gift giving of women, of men, of the many.

For the transition to a gift economy we need to take the mother as an easily available prototype of the gift giving human, but not the only one—disestablishing the hegemony of the norm of normativity. We can do this by showing how widespread gift giving is in society at large and by considering normativity not as important in itself but only as an element of the process of concept formation. In this way we can create a gift economy, in which boys are not required to reject mothering, and the economy of adulthood is nurturing. In gift economies, where

there is no market based on the (mis)construction of the male gender, sexual orientation is sexual and affectional, not economic.¹⁵

Genevieve Vaughan is an independent researcher, author of For-Giving, a Feminist Criticism of Exchange (1997) and Homo Donans (2006). A documentary on her life, Giving for Giving, has just been released. Her books and many articles are available free on her website www.gift-economy.com.

Notes

- 1 Heterosexism exists of course in many other groups but it is presently in the European/American culture that the structures of dominance at many levels have united to form a collective non-nurturing mechanism of power over the many. There are alternative constructions. Discussing the continuation of matricentric structures in a number of African societies, Ifi Amadiume (1997) says, "The presence of these fundamental matriarchal systems generating love and compassion also means that we cannot take the classical Greek Oedipal principle of violence as a basic paradigm or given in the African context... (156).
- 2 The same may be said for the feminist movement and abortion rights. See that discussion in the Introduction. In fact the exchange economy pushes us into hyper individualistic positions.
- 3 I think this is similar to what Alfred Sohn-Rethel (1965), talking about commodities, called a "real-abstraction."
- 4 Vygotsky's (1962) discussion of complexes in the '20s is probably prior to Wittgenstein's (2001 [1953]) conceptualization of meanings as family resemblances or strands in a rope, and both came long before Lakoff's (1987) discussion of similar categories. Vygotsky sees complexes as developmental stages of thinking coming before conceptual abstraction.
- 5 This U.S. election process is strikingly similar to the way the model of the father is "chosen" over the mother as the prototype of the human, for boys and eventually also for girls who accept their secondary status. The president and the party that win the election are thus "male" while the ones who lose are "female" and give way.
- 6 It is just the paradox of the mandate of masculinity that in order to achieve their gender ideal males have to become the "one." The patriarchal family provides this possibility at an individual level and a number of hierarchies are available for this purpose at a societal level. In fact by separating fields of activity from each other and creating vertical hierarchies, the possibility is given to some of the many to become "ones" even though logically there should be only one "one." With the break down in the patriarchal family and the present scarcity of jobs in the system, there are not enough "one" positions available. Thus people enact the one-to-many activity of group killing, as when schoolboys shoot their classmates. They do this to become normal. Nations do it as well.
So we can see a kernel of "truth" in the contention of the Right that feminism "causes" male violence by challenging male dominance, ie, not allowing males to take this "one" position in the family. However the construction and belief in this "one" position, masculation and the norm of normativity are what are actually causing the

problem. It is not surprising that the “one” pope of the “one” church of the “one” God would promote such a belief.

- 7 Judith Butler (2004) thinks we do need norms for community though she would like to change the ones we have. I believe that while we may need prototypes for developing concepts, the investment of the prototype with normativity, and with a special value and the power to elicit or force gifts from others, is unnecessary and unwarranted. Categorization itself is only half of the picture of thinking, to which the transitivity of gift giving needs to be restored as the other half. Giving-and-receiving creates relationships of mutuality and trust from which community as co-*muni*-ty and communication as co-*muni*-cation arise. (*Muni* means “gifts” in Latin).
- 8 Marx (1930 [1867]) discusses this configuration when he is discussing money: “the character of being generally and directly exchangeable is, so to say, a polar one, and is as inseparable from its polar opposite, the character of not being directly exchangeable, as the positive pole of a magnet is from the negative” (41).
- 9 Or corporate entities or nations.
- 10 The very characteristics of gift giving, which penalize it in a context of exchange: for example its inclusiveness and lack of a drive towards domination become functional in a context where exchange and masculation are not dominant.
- 11 See my book by that name (2006). In her essay in this volume Kaarina Kailo suggests instead using the term *femmina donans*.
- 12 The prototype is not “better” than any of the other items of a category. However masculation *invests* it with value. The people who use the prototype and aspire to be a “one,” attribute value to it and the many who are not the “one” give value to it by giving to it.
- 13 George Lakoff (2004) has proposed the Dominant Father and the Nurturing Parent models as typical of the Right and Left in the U.S. Significantly he does not identify the female mothering model as such.
- 14 We seem to be looking for a nurturing dominant father, trying to make Patriarchal Capitalism nurturing look at Dr. Phil, Bill Gates, perhaps even the Bushes themselves. The creation of nurturing males to be done by socially dismantling masculation, however, and not by including the nurturing father in the package of masculation. A more truly gift giving male leader is Hugo Chavez. Not surprisingly he is of Indigenous heritage.
- 15 Even where there is a market, but women are in control, heterosexuality is less oppressive. For example, see Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen’s (1994) work on Juchitan, Mexico, where women are in control of the market, the queer *muxes* are highly respected and considered a blessing for the family in which they are born.

References

- Amadiume, Ifi. 1997. *Reinventing Africa: Matriarchy, Religion and Culture*. London: Zed Books.
- Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika, ed. 1994. *Juchitan-Stadt der Frauen*, Hamburg, Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing Gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Goux, Jean-Joseph. 1990 [1973]. *Symbolic Economies: After Marx and Freud*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider*. Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Marx, Karl. 1930 [1867]. *Capital*. Trans. E and C. Paul, London. J. M. Dent and Sons.
- Negri, Antonio and Michael Hardt. 2004. *Multitude, War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Press.
- Rosch, Eleanor. 2000 [1978]. "Principles of Categorization." *Concepts: Core Readings*. Eds. E. Margoulis and S. Laurence eds. Cambridge: MIT Press. 189-207.
- Sebeok, Thomas A. and Marcel Danesi. 2000. *The Forms of Meaning. Modeling Systems Theory and Systems Analysis*. Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sohn-Rethel, Alfred. 1965, April. "Historical Materialist Theory of Knowledge." *Marxism Today* 114-122.
- Taylor, John R. 2003. *Linguistic Categorization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vaughan, Genevieve. 1980. "Communication and Exchange." *Semiotica* 29 (1-2): 113-143. The Hague: Mouton.
- Vaughan, Genevieve. 1981. "Saussure and Vygotsky via Marx." *American Semiotic* 4 (1): 57-83.
- Vaughan, Genevieve. 1997. *For-Giving: A Feminist Criticism of Exchange*. Austin: Plainview/Anomaly Press.
- Vaughan, Genevieve. 2006. *Homo Donans*. Online: www.gift-economy.com.
- Vaughan, Genevieve, ed. 2004. *Il Dono/The Gift: A Feminist Analysis*. *Athanon: Semiotica, Filosofia, Arte, Letteratura* 15 (8). Roma: Meltemi Editore.
- Vygotsky, Lev Semenovich. 1962. *Thought and Language*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2001 [1953]. *Philosophical Investigations*. London: Blackwell.