

## **GENDER, POWER AND POLITICS: AN ALTERNATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

Gender, Power and Politics: An Alternative Perspective. (2001) In Gender, Peace and Conflict. Editors. Inger Skjelsbaek and Dan Smith. International Peace Institute and Sage Publications. Oslo and London. Pages 80-103

In Western liberal democracies, why are women so under-represented among elected representatives in parliaments when they constitute at least half of the voters? In these countries women have had the vote for over 70 years. Surely, this is enough time in which women's voters could have significantly altered the gender composition of elected representatives in the various parliaments. The puzzle is not relieved by the more recent democracies of newly independent countries. The same pattern prevails. Yet to suggest that the latter are imitating the former is to fly in the face of the integrity of political process in these countries, (Duncan and O'Brien, 1983). To unravel this conundrum, it is necessary to go beyond empirical reality and to theoretically re-examine and re-conceptualise gender and patriarchy and their relations to power and politics.

### **DEFINING PATRIARCHY AND GENDER**

While definitions seldom capture the complexity of the phenomena they seek to describe or specify, they are useful in setting the parameters of the discourse and of establishing common meaning between those engaged in dialogue. Given the widely different approaches that have been adopted towards the conceptualisation of both patriarchy and gender, it is necessary to set out as precisely as possible the ways in which these are conceived in this paper.

#### **Defining Patriarchy**

The seminal theoretical contribution of feminist scholarship to social theory has been that of the radical feminist in firmly placing patriarchy as an important category in social theorising and analysis. However, the problematic has become the definition of patriarchy. (Weber, 1947) had defined patriarchy as women and younger men being ruled by older men, who were heads of household. While a few feminist theorists have followed the Weberian definition, the more common approach has been to discard the generation difference between men, in Weber's formulation, and to define patriarchy as that system of social structures and practices in which men dominate, oppress and exploit women, (Dahlerup, 1987) and (Walby, 1990). In other words, the most prevalent tendency in feminist scholarship has been to adopt a narrower and more exclusive definition than the Weberian formulation.

To define patriarchy solely in terms of men's domination of women is to treat both men and women as two separate undifferentiated groups that have sustained their coherence over time and between different cultures. This posture has attracted sharp criticism

especially from Black feminists and post-structural and post-modernist theorists. (Hooks, 1984), for example, argued that while White feminists have traditionally conceptualised the family and the home as major sources of women's oppression, this is not the same among Blacks where the family is not a major source of women's subordination. Indeed, as more and more Black women become heads of households the family and the home have become major loci of their liberation from traditional patriarchal roles.

(Collins, 1990) extended the line of argument advanced by Hooks by observing that race, class and gender constitute three interlocking axes of oppression that are part of an overall matrix of domination. She further made the point that while most individuals have no difficulty identifying their own victimisation, they routinely failed to see how they contributed to the suppression of others. White feminists typically point to their oppression while resist seeing how much their white skin constitutes a social privilege. Likewise, African-Americans eloquent in their analysis of racism often persist in their perception of poor White women as symbols of White power. Failure to see gender as part of the matrix of domination leads inevitably to such contradictions in the approach to and perception of oppression.

Taking a different line, post-modernist theorists have maintained that neither men nor women are unitary categories. They argue that the categories men and women are a number of overlapping and cross-cutting discourses of masculinities and femininities which are historically and culturally variable. In their view, the notion of women and men dissolve into shifting and variable social constructs which lacks stability and coherence over time. Walby offered some rebuttal by her observation that the post-modern feminists draw heavily, theoretically, upon the deconstructionism of (Derrida, 1976), the discourse analysis of (Foucault, 1981) and the post-modernism of (Lyotard, 1978) who are all guilty of not paying serious attention to gender. Indeed, post-structural and post-modernism theorists have been no different from modern or classical theorists in their benign neglect of gender in social analysis. The weakness in the post-modernist conception of gender, as highly variably, is that, as Dahlerup aptly pointed out, men's domination of society is highly uniform across cultures and throughout history.

In earlier research, (Miller, 1991) I approached the definition of patriarchy from the opposite direction of the radical feminists by taking a more inclusive approach to the definition of patriarchy. I argued that the main limitation of Weber's definition of patriarchy was its omission of the kinship relations, factual or fictive, that usually exist between the older and younger men and women that constitute the household. In other words, patriarchy needs to be defined as that system of reciprocal social obligations in which final authority rest with older men of the kinship collective, who exercise that authority over its individual male and female members in the overall interest of the collective.

The differences between these three sets of definitions of patriarchy are the elements included. Most feminist scholars have confined their definition of patriarchy solely to gender. Weber's definition included the elements of gender and generation. My

definition included genealogy, gender and generation and insisted that recognition of genealogy is critical if the complexities of patriarchy and gender are to be better understood.

I argued that the gender and generation elements relate mainly to the internal relations of the collective while the genealogy element defines its external boundaries and relations. From one perspective genealogy extends kinship outside of the immediate circumstances of the household or family by establishing links with other collectives through common ancestry. At the same time, it defines collectives that are not-kin. This is a critical consideration both conceptually and empirically.

The essence of my argument was that conceptually and historically patriarchy did not only involve asymmetry in power between men and women, but also shared identity, group solidarity, common bonds and mutual obligations. These differentiated patriarchal collectives from one another. Further, historically patriarchal collectives had major difficulties with other collectives that fell outside the covenant of kinship, particularly with the men of those collectives. When patriarchal collectives interacted outside boundaries where kinship could be established, whether factual or fictive, then one group had to submit to the hegemony of the other. Failing such compromise, violent confrontation became the means of establishing dominance. I traced the practices of genocide, where one collective sought the physical elimination of another, the killing of male captives, the castration of male captives and the almost permanent enslavement of men, as historical outcomes of conflict between collectives which did not share the covenant of kinship or where that covenant had been breached. In all of these circumstances I showed that patriarchal collectives found it easier to incorporate women of non-kin groups than the men of such groups. I maintained that the external relations with men of hostile collectives are as much an element of patriarchy as the internal relations with women of the kinship collective.

I took the position that within the patriarchal collective generation, age, in addition to genealogy moderates the relations between men in that, because age is mutable, in time the younger males succeed the older men. Genealogy and generation combine to define the younger males as potential heirs of the older men. Succession dictates male solidarity manifested in the older men grooming and apprenticing the younger men who reciprocate by waiting their turn. While genealogy and generation contribute to male solidarity within the collective through the process of succession, gender excludes women who are left marginalised within the kinship collective by virtue of such exclusion. Within patriarchy, therefore, women are marginalised in the internal relations of the kinship collective. However, the genealogical relations between men and women of the collective, ameliorates women's marginalisation by virtue of the filial bonds and the obligation to protect and provide for them.

Further, I argued that the genealogy element, defining the external relations of patriarchy, defined non-kin men as potential threats and possible enemies. In these circumstances of relations between unrelated collectives, where the covenant of kinship did not exist, the

subordination of one collective relative to the other, voluntarily or by violence, becomes the only means of establishing the bases of interaction. Therefore, patriarchy includes the marginalisation of men of the unrelated collectives, in one way or another.

The essence of my contention therefore is that patriarchy does not only involve the marginalisation of women within the kinship collective but also of men of unrelated collectives. Put another way, two elemental features of patriarchy are

- the marginalisation of women within their kinship collectives, and
- the marginalisation of men of those other collectives over which dominance has been established by whatever means.

The implications of this definition of patriarchy are that gender cannot be understood or interpreted solely in terms of men's domination of women. Gender analysis is not simply about the asymmetry in power between men and women. A gender perspective is not only about women's issues. To understand gender as being synonymous with women is to misconstrue or misinterpret the concept of patriarchy. The point is that gender analysis cannot assume solidarity between men and women belonging to different groups in society. This is because gender operates in conjunction with the other social criteria upon which societies are organised. These are critical considerations particularly when competition for political power in the focal point.

### **Defining Gender**

In defining gender, it is necessary to differentiate it from sex, although the Essentialist position is that sex and gender are almost synonymous. This biological reduction implies that sex differences between men and women related to size, strength, speed and stamina determine gender differences noted in masculinity and femininity. These differences all favour men and determine their leadership in society. It must be noted, however, that not only is there considerable overlap between men and women on these traits, but not even among men are these physical differences the defining features of leaders in society. Indeed, they more aptly describe the physiognomy of their body guards.

The position taken here is that sex is biologically determined while gender is socially constructed. One argument employed to support the claims of the biological construction of gender is if gender were only a social construct then one should expect to find such wide variations in masculinity in history and contemporary cultures that would defy unifying categorisations. However, there are common themes associated with masculinity and femininity across widely different cultures and throughout history. Such common themes it is claimed can only be accounted for by biology factors operating through genetics.

In earlier research I argued that the common themes in masculinity and femininity are not inconsistent with their social construction when gender is defined as the sexual division of power related to living-giving and life-taking. It is the universality of the life giving and life taking powers and not genetic determination that accounts for the commonality

observed across history and cultures. My reconstruction of the social construction of patriarchy and gender in antiquity can be summarised as follows:

- Early humans lived in small isolated groups in relatively hostile environments of which they had very limited knowledge. Their primitive technology and shelter made them particularly vulnerable to ecological calamities. Adaptive advantage rested in group living. Hence, early humans lived in descent groups essentially to ensure survival.
- Long life constituted a scarce and treasured resource in pre-literate communities of antiquity as the aged members of the group represented the resident memory of the group and its reservoir of information and past experiences in dealing with the exigencies of living. Men lived longer than women, largely due to the risks attendant on child bearing, (Lerner, 1986).
- Women were engaged in child bearing and child rearing from puberty to the grave, as the average life span of females at that time was less than 30 years. Fertility and a large number of offspring was another treasured resource of kinship communes attempting to survive the challenges of the time. The veneration of the Mother Goddess is one of the early motifs found in cave drawings.
- In addition to dealing with the bringing life into existence and preserving it, this small autonomous isolated group also had to deal with the issues of life-taking, as it related to the physical and ritual defence of the group. Since biology determined that women gave birth, and they were perennially involved in this activity, and the preservation of the lives that were brought into bearing, life-taking fell by default to the men, particularly to the older men of the group.
- The separation of life-giving and life-taking powers was the original sexual division of power that separated masculinity from femininity. Women were socialised principally in relation to all the life giving and preservation skills and knowledge, while men were socialised with respect to life-taking. Accordingly, the basic definition of femininity and its surviving common themes reside in the honing of such traits as caring, nurturing, gentleness, kindness, tenderness, co-operation, accommodation of differences, long-suffering, patience, acquiescence and passivity. Likewise, the basic definition of masculinity and its common themes resides in the development of such traits as assertiveness, decisiveness, ruthlessness, courage, valour, confrontation, toughness, conquest and the killer instinct. These latter traits are all related to the capacity to take life with impunity.
- While there was equality, and even a feminine bias, in the initial separation of life-giving and life-taking powers, in group dynamics over the long haul, life-taking proved more powerful than life-giving. While mothers were venerated from life-giving, a one shot event, fathers were feared in that they held the power to take life on any given day. Fathers exercising the life-taking power became the final authority in all matters pertaining to the descent group. Men and women participated in the separation of sexual division of power without anticipating its long term consequence for female marginalisation in the kinship commune.
- While the sexual division of power occurred in antiquity, the father's power to take the lives of the members of the kinship commune survived well into recorded history. The Druids, who were the priests in Britain before the Roman conquest had a saying

which stated that all masters of families were kings in their own households: they had the power of life and death over their wives, children and slaves. Early Roman law codified this power.

Gender defined as the sexual division of power departs from the commonly accepted definition of gender as the sexual division of labour, women's work being restricted to the private sphere of the household while men's work extended to occupations in the public sphere, (Dex, 1985) and (Reddock, 1994). This is not to deny that in the course of history sexual division of labour has occurred. However, this has come subsequent to and as a result of the prior sexual division of power. In other words, primacy is accorded to the power relations of gender and not to labour and work differences.

While the creation of patriarchy and the original construction of gender is shrouded in antiquity, with only circumstantial evidence to support contemporary speculation about the origination of these phenomena, the contention here is that the contemporary unravelling of gender and patriarchy is but a mirror image of the processes involved in their original construction. In this regard three observations are necessary with respect to the definition of gender as the sexual division of life-giving and life taking powers.

First, war is the supreme expression of patriarchy and the warrior the ultimate symbol of masculinity. Unmitigated rage, unbridled fury and unrestrained violence directed at life-taking is the quintessential masculine mode of resolving conflicts. Warriors, men most skilled and successful in taking-life with impunity, are the final arbiters and authorities in deciding differences and in determining what will prevail. The universality of war in history and across cultures, and its virtual exclusivity as a male enterprise, testifies to the primacy and pervasive nature of life-taking in defining masculinity and of establishing final authority in societal affairs.

Second, at the root of the contemporary controversy on abortion is the question of whether women should have the right to take life with impunity. The right-to-life side of the controversy is basically that women's commitment is to give life without reservation or caveat. It asserts the primacy basis of the definition of femininity and the essence of the ancient social construction of womanhood. The right-to-choose side of the argument fundamentally changes the ancient foundation of the definition of femininity and womanhood in that it combines the life-giving and life-taking powers. In this regard it not only changes the primary basis of the construction of femininity but it encroaches and threatens the very essence of the definition of masculinity. By excluding fathers from the choice, women's right to choose fundamentally changes the construction of gender. While the arguments concerning the rights of the unborn child should not be underestimated, the gender definition implications of women's right-to-choose ought to be recognised as being at the core of the controversy. The deep passions evoked testify to the centrality of the issues being disputed.

Third, in the course of the evolution of society the father's right to take life was transfer to the king or chief and eventually to the State. In contemporary times the right of the

State to take life has been challenged in the movement against capital punishment. In a way this can be interpreted as a tendency toward the reform of masculinity. At the same time, there is increasing escalation of the wanton taking of life by men in gangs, terrorists, enraged lone gunmen shooting numerous unsuspecting victims for reasons hard to identify or rationalise. In a measure of speaking the move to reform the fundamental life-taking definition of masculinity, by men and groups who have been empowered, is counterpoised, counteracted and even compromised by marginalised men seemingly reclaiming their manhood through life taking. Mass murder, terrorism, gangs engaged in savage acts of violence, the escalation of murder, the move to abolish capital punishment and the counter-move to re-institute it where it has been abolished, all stand in screaming contradiction. Reform and reaction to the life-taking in society is yet another example of the fundamental nature of the construction of masculinity and its continuing relevance in contemporary society.

Gender understood as the sexual division of power is key to understanding many of the great debates in contemporary society. It is also key to unravelling many knotty issues related to gender issues and relationships in society.

## **THE ETHNIC ORIGIN OF NATIONS AND THE NATION-STATE**

(Smith, 1987) maintained that the nation-state evolved by encompassing several ethnic communities in a single polity. Unlike the city-states of the Ancient world, the nation-state encompasses both city and surrounding country-side. Invariably nation states are comprised of several cities, with none having political primacy over the others, such that client relationships are required. Also the nation embodies cities, country-side, diverse ethnic groups and different religions while claiming autonomy and sovereignty in its relations with other nations. That is, it claims pre-eminence in allegiance and loyalty, over and beyond every other social and political entity.

Invariably nation-states are premised on the transcendental values of equality, human rights, social justice, and consent as the foundation of government. Further, the fundamental unit of national organisation is the individual national, the citizen. Each national by virtue of nationality is entitled to equal treatment, enjoys the same rights, guaranteed the same justice and is empowered as an elector in determining the government. These transcendental values are invariably enshrined in constitutional law. Further, the State has become the principal mechanism and chief executing agency of the values of nationhood.

By virtue of its construction the nation-state constitutes a frontal attack on society organised on the basis of patriarchy, that is, on the criteria of genealogy, gender and generation. The assault has focused mainly on genealogy as tribe, clan, caste, lineage, race and family are relegated officially to social categories devoid of constitutional or legal content. If the ethical vision of the universalist religions rendered these categories immoral, then the nation-state has added unconstitutional and illegal to their meaning in the political, economic and social conduct of the nation.

In the nation tribe, clan, caste, lineage, race and family are conceded as having only sentimental, nostalgic and cultural meaning. The family itself is reduced to a nurturing unit stripped of its political and economic relationships that surrounded kinship collectives in previous civilisations. On the other hand, non-kin forms of societal organisation are given positive political, economic and social meaning. These include the State replete with parliament, courts, military establishment, police force, and civil service bureaucracy and outside of these the political party, the corporation, the trade union, the school and the church. All of these are constitutionally and legally required to practice the transcendental values on which the nation-state is predicated.

At the same time, civil society within each nation carries the legacy of tribal, clan and lineage society. Kinship allegiance, clan honour, perpetuation of the lineage and patriarchal obligations continue to be the supreme values to a greater or lesser degree. In several societies the notion of kinship has been transposed to race, with the same assumptions of blood bonds, group solidarity and mutual obligations as in lineage society. In all versions of this type of society the family, organised on patriarchal traditions, remains the fundamental unit of social organisation. The social reality of nation-states, therefore, is that of civil society organised on the basis of kinship, clan honour, perpetuation of families, patriarchal authority and filial obligations and the State predicated on the transcendental values of equality, human rights, social justice and representative democracy in which sovereignty rest with the people. Further, civil society presumes the family to be the basic unit of organisation while the State is organised on the individual as the fundamental unit of its constitutional structure.

The national project, by definition, consists of transforming civil society from its ethnic roots, kinship structure and patriarchal traditions into nations in harmony with their constitutions mandating transcendental values espousing equality, justice, rights and consent. Indeed, the mobilisation of the nations reside in the implementation of the transcendental values of nationhood. It must be noted that the promise of material progress implied in nationhood, particularly to the mass of the dispossessed groups, has added yet another element of meaning to the values on which nationhood is premised.

The point that must not be overlooked is that the formation of nation-states has neither been the inevitable result of social evolution nor the wholehearted embrace of the high ethical vision of nationhood. Nation-states have all been constructed through the processes of dynamic interaction among groups within nations, where one or two groups become the 'chief nationalists'. While leading the construction of the nation on the transcendental values of equality, individual rights and social justice enshrined in constitutional law, the 'chief nationalists' invariably skew the construction of the nation in their image and garner substantial advantages to the groups to which they belonged. In this context the state, controlled by the 'chief nationalists', becomes the major instrument of constructing the nation in their image and to their advantage. The greatest promise for the success of the national project, and threat to its realisation, resides in the moral



conduct, or lack of it, from those groups claiming and exercising leadership in the implementation of the mandate of nationhood.

It is this tension between efforts to construct nations out of civil society rooted in ethnicity and kinship and the acquisition and consolidation of advantage by those groups leading the construction of the nation that several important societal transformations have taken place. The essence of the transformation is from kinship to non-kinship forms of association and organisation. The national ideal and creed is that nationals of all families and ethnic groups within the nation should have equal rights to participate in the parliamentary affairs of the state, to receive equal justice through its courts, and have equal access to the bureaucracy of the State including the civil service, military establishment, police force, schools and colleges, and statutory bodies. Further, all nationals, irrespective of family or ethnicity, should be free and unencumbered to become members of political parties, religions, corporations, trade unions, clubs and all other non-governmental organisations operating in the public sphere.

The practical reality is that the inequalities of civil society organised on the basis of kinship and ethnicity, and the asymmetry of the power implied in this inequality, are not automatically swept away by applying the national creed. Some of the factors fuelling resistance to the full implementation of the national project can be listed as follows:

- The efforts of those groups that previously held power, commanded considerable resources, were accorded high esteem and whose culture dominated the society, to retain at least some of their former positions within the nation.
- The attempts of the newly empowered groups, not only to lead the construction of the nation, but to consolidate their position in the society and nation. Indeed, the democratisation of political power has invariably brought about more upward social mobility of those controlling and administering the machinery of the State than by the mass of the people themselves.
- The formation of alliances between the old and the new guard, to their mutual benefit, which are at variance with the transcendental values of nationhood.

It must also be noted that nations and societies are almost always organised on the basis of additional criteria to genealogy, gender and generation. Such other criteria include class or status group, religion or ideology, region and citizenship. The patriarchal criteria are nested within these other criteria which overlay them so to speak. The interaction between these several criteria create the complexities for which social organisation and voting behaviour are renown. This because groups and segments of the society and nation formed on the basis of the interaction of these criteria invariably form both horizontal and vertical alliances in the promoting and preservation of their interests.

Two additional points need to be noted with reference to the subject of this paper. First, gender is by no means primary or pre-eminent as a criterion in the organisation of societies or nations. It is embedded within other criteria. Second, gender operates in interaction with the other criteria upon which societies and nations are organised. In other words, in social and political behaviour in society and nations the actions of men and

women need to be interpreted within the context of the interactions of criteria such as class, race, religion, region, generation, ideology and any other criterion that may be involved. This is not to say that men and women actions are entirely predicted based on locating them relative to these criteria, since individuals may affirm or oppose or adopt a non-committal stance on any issue. Rather, the identification of the criteria, and their interaction, allows the parameters and frameworks of action to be delineated.

## **THE TRANSFORMATION OF PATRIARCHY**

In the course of constructing the nation-state from civil society structured on the basis of kinship and ethnicity, patriarchy is transformed mainly as a result of the operations of two processes. The first process relates to partnership between men and women of the groups holding previous advantage in the civil society and those newly empowered in the nation, in defending and preserving or enhancing and consolidating their groups' interests in the nation. These groups can be labelled the dominant groups in the society and nation. The second process relates to the exclusion of men of the subordinate groups in the civil society from much of the opportunities of upward social mobility offered in the nation. Each of these processes will be discussed in turn.

### **The Partnership Process.**

The main features of this partnership process can be listed briefly as follows:

1. Easy access to and first choice by members of dominant groups of the most powerful, strategic, prestigious and lucrative opportunities available in the particular nation.
2. Patriarchal rank operative in the dominant groups which determine that greatest access and first preference to these opportunities should go to access to older men while last choice and least preference will be accorded to younger women.
3. The magnitude of opportunities available to the dominant groups outstripping the supply of men of those groups to meet the demand.
4. Women of the dominant groups being recruited in these circumstances in which the supply of older and younger men of the groups is inadequate in relation to the demand.

The essence of this partnership process is that it operates in circumstances where the available opportunities to the dominant group exceed its capacity to meet the demand through its supply of men of that group. In these circumstances women of the group are co-opted and recruited to satisfy the demand. Women of the dominant group are recruited to meet the shortfall or hiatus in supply of men of that group. Failure to recruit the women of the group would result in such opportunities going primarily to the other groups competing with or challenging the dominant group for position. In other words, women of the dominant group are mobilised to assist the group to maximise its appropriation of available opportunities. In this process the defining feature is that men and women of the dominant group are co-operating and collaborating to advance or defend the interests or

position of their group. Put in the converse, men and women of the dominant groups are co-operating and collaborating to exploit the other groups in the nation.

The fact that men of the dominant group retain most of the top positions and most strategic occupations and women of the dominant group are assigned mainly to the intermediate positions and less strategic levels in the occupational structure highlights the demarcation between senior and junior membership of the partnership. The fact that women marginalisation in the dominant group is manifest in this arrangement, is secondary to the fact that men and women of the dominant group are acting collectively in the interest of the group and against the other groups in the society. This partnership process is first and foremost a mechanism for defending and promoting the interests of the dominant groups and not that of marginalising and exploiting the women of the groups.

Put another way, equality of access to opportunity within the dominant group is unlikely to make any material or substantial difference to the establishment, extension or consolidation of the hegemony of the dominant group over the other groups in the society. Men and women of the dominant group are united in their intention to advance the interests of their group against that of others. It is the marginalisation of the other groups in the society that is the primary mission, not the marginalisation of women within the dominant group itself. Men and women of the dominant group are partners in advancing the interests of their group, albeit with the women being the junior and men being the senior partners. As such the partnership process is neither negative or demeaning, but from the perspective of the dominant groups, an ennobling enterprise securing the interests and advancement of the groups.

### **The Exclusionary Process**

The second process involves the exclusion of men of the subordinate groups in society from most of the opportunities of upward social mobility. This results in most of the opportunities for upward social mobility going the women of the subordinate groups. This process has been described by (Miller, 1994). The core elements involved in this second process can be listed as follows:

- a) Conflict between the dominant and other groups in society concerning the basis on which the society is organised and challenges with respect to existing inequalities with respect to access to opportunity within the society.
- b) The imperative to respond to these challenges by conceding access to opportunities to the subordinate groups in the society. Concessions to such challenges are mandated by the constitutions of nations, required by the ethical vision of nationhood and usually necessary as a result of elective politics.
- c) Expansion in opportunities open to the subordinate groups and integration into the mainstream of society.
- d) Control by the dominant groups of the mechanisms and gateways through which members of the subordinate groups gain access to opportunities for upward social mobility.

- e) The willingness of some segments of the subordinate groups to accept the structure of opportunity for upward social mobility as fashioned by the dominant groups.

These elements combine to shape the exclusionary process in that in circumstances where the dominant group has control of the mechanisms governing access to institutions serving the subordinate groups, and where access to the subordinate group is being expanded, thus increasing the demand. In these circumstances the former bias the employment process in favour of females of the subordinate group by excluding most of the males of the latter. Expanded opportunities afforded to subordinate groups constitute strong incentive to their participation given the limited scope of the opportunities for socio-economic advancement available to them. Acceptance of the opportunities afforded means the advancement of the group by way of their daughters rather than their sons. Many members of the subordinate groups willingly accept sponsored mobility on these terms.

The point to note is that men of the subordinate group are deliberately excluded from the expanded opportunities offered through to their group. The basis of that exclusion is the level of threat they pose to the dominant group for political, social, economic, ideological or cultural reasons or some combination of these. Such exclusion occurs in circumstances of conflict between the groups, or challenge by the subordinate, in the circumstances in which the dominant group is constrained to concede some measure of expanded opportunity to their challengers by virtue of constitutional, legal or political considerations arising from the imperatives of the nation-state.

Another observation that needs noting is that through the exclusion process men of the dominant groups establish alliances with women of the subordinate groups. The asymmetry of power relations dictate that the latter would be dependent on the former for maintaining their sponsored advancement in the society. Like women of the dominant groups, women of the subordinate groups will occupy middle level and intermediate positions within the private and public bureaucracies, and in the process operate as lieutenants of men of the dominant group occupying the top positions. These alliances generally earn the resentment of men of the subordinate group.

### **Implications of Both Processes for the Transformation of Patriarchy**

The partnership process redefines, extends and expands patriarchy within dominant groups to encompass the public as well as the private sphere. This is because their scope of authority and influence is expanded to encompass the subordinate groups. The rule of fathers in the family, lineage, or clan is extended to non-kin groups: political parties, trade unions, colleges, schools, corporations, the civil service etc. Accordingly, men of the dominant groups become the leaders of political parties, executives of corporations, heads of trade unions, heads of the civil service, top officers in the police force.

The essence of this transformation is the that non-kin associations and organisations within the public sphere of the nation come to have the same structure of kinship

collectives in the civil society. Patriarchy is transformed from being a feature of tribal groups and kinship collectives, into new forms within non-kin associations and organisations as fathers within the groups leading the nationalist charge or holding great economic resources seize or consolidate their places in the new nation. The end result is the patriarchal state, political patriarchy, corporate patriarchy, trade union patriarchy etc. as men of the dominant groups seize places in these areas within public sphere in the nation.

The movement away from the rule of fathers in blood bonded collectives to that of men in political parties, corporations, trade unions, colleges, schools, and other such non-kin organisations transforms patriarchy from being the rule of fathers to that of being the rule of men. In other words, in the absence of filial relationship the rule of fathers is transformed into the rule of men. (Dahlerup, 1987) noted the emergence of the patriarchal state and observed that its defining feature was that it functions in the interest of men. The position taken here is that the patriarchal state is commandeered by the men and women of the groups controlling its mechanisms, to serve their interests and prerogatives.

While the partnership process extends the patriarchy of the dominant groups from the private to the public sphere and advances or consolidates the hegemony of those groups over the subordinate groups in the society, by according some women of the dominant group the role of junior partner in advancing group interests in the public sphere, gender as a organising principle in society is compromised. These junior partners of the dominant group now exercise power over men of the subordinate group. At the same time, the junior position in the partnership raises the question of its justice, particularly in the context of the national creed professing equal rights and justice.

The second process, involving male marginalisation in the subordinate group, is even more radical in its undermining of patriarchy in that genealogy, gender and generation are all compromised as organising principles in the society. By sponsoring the mobility of members of the subordinate group to positions previously reserved for the dominant group, genealogy is compromised. By advancing young people over older folk, generation is called into question. By skipping young women over their fathers and brothers, and prospective spouses, gender is compromised.

The net result of such sponsored mobility is that some women of the subordinate groups become even more liberated from traditional patriarchal and feminine roles than their peers in the dominant group. Not only are they accorded roles in the public sphere but they also become heads of households in their own right and not simply substitutes in one generation until male succession is restored. Patriarchy in the private sphere is reversed in large proportion of the subordinate group as, through the process of male marginalisation, many men are without the means and symbols through which they can sustain their traditional masculine and father roles as prescribed by patriarchy.

The exclusionary process undermines patriarchy in the subordinate group. This is accomplished by the following:

- Breaching patriarchal rank by promoting women over their fathers, brothers and spouses.
- Undermining the material symbols by which the males of the subordinate group reinforce their authority within the group.
- Fostering matrifocal forms of socialisation in homes and schools, consistent with the structure of opportunity in which girls are most likely to succeed in accessing the socio-economic opportunities for advancement open to the group.
- Fracturing solidarity in the subordinate group by the differential rates of incorporation of males and females into the mainstream of the society which in the long term resulting in the men being blamed for their lack of socio-economic progress, and men resenting the advancement of females of the group ahead of themselves.

These two processes are by no means mutually exclusive. Indeed, they are highly compatible. The first process operates mainly, but not exclusively, within the dominant group, and those other groups in the society with which they establish alliances. The second process operates largely within subordinate groups in circumstances of conflict with the dominant group.

Ironically, at the same time that patriarchy is transformed and extended, by both processes, to encompass the private as well as the public spheres in the nation, it is also compromised and weakened. The factors related to this can be listed briefly as follows:

1. As the authority and power of the men of the dominant groups are expanded, there is the corresponding marginalisation of large numbers of men of the subordinate groups resulting in increased polarisation between men in the nation. While a few men become increasingly powerful, many men become part of an highly marginalised underclass. At the same time, the position of women become more equalised as many women of both the dominant and the subordinate groups come to occupy middle position in the public and private bureaucracies in the nation. While these women are subject to the glass ceiling imposed by the men of the dominant groups, the former are in a much more advantageous position than men of the underclass.
2. The masculine bias in the dominant groups and the underclass and the feminisation of the middle strata result in a state of flux in numerous relationships previously constructed on the basis of patriarchal norms. Patriarchy is compromised as many young women exercise authority over fathers, several wives become the chief providers of families, many mothers become heads of households, numerous women unable to find husbands of comparable social and economic status decide to become single parents and large numbers of girls outperform boys in schools.
3. The polarised position of men in the nation is marked by the criteria upon which the civil society is organised. For example, if the society is organised on the basis of ethnicity, religion, class, gender and generation then the men of the dominant group will tend to belong to one ethnic group, the upper class, a different denomination or religion and be older than the men of the underclass who will tend to be of other ethnic groups, lower class, a different denomination or religion and be younger. These bases of inequality stand condemned in the national creed and constitution. Hence the moral authority of the dominant group is undermined and diminished by changes of

corruption, patronage, clientelism, nepotism, discrimination and victimisation which they cannot successfully defend given the marked disparities.

4. Political, corporate, union, school and other non-kin association bonds are relatively weak compared to blood bonds, assumed in kinship collectives. Given this weakness there is the tendency for non-kin associations and organisations to fracture and disintegrate in the face of sustained resistance or gross failure to comply with their mandate.

### **Conflict Within the National Project**

The essence of the argument here is that the State led construction of the nation commences with an assault on the inequalities of civil society organised on the basis of patriarchal norms and results in both the transformation and extension of patriarchy as well as compromising and weakening it. At the root of this paradoxical situation is the actions of the dominant groups, or chief nationalists, leading the State in its construction of the nation but at the same time seeking to preserve or promote, defend or consolidate the position of their groups within the nation and society. Indeed, the self-serving actions of the dominant groups compromises the transcendental values and the high ethical vision of the nation, and bring into question and discredit the morality of its chief executing agency, the State.

In the flux which results from patriarchy being transformed and compromised on the one hand, and the moral failure of the State and its leaders to uphold the ethical vision of the nation, conflicts develop with respect to the directions that should be taken. One direction is to complete the national project. Related to this direction are movements focused on the elements of patriarchy: genealogy, gender and generation. That is, movements whose mission is seeking to eliminate ethnic, tribe, race, and caste discrimination; movements seeking to promote women's rights and securing appropriate punishment from crimes of rape; movements promoting children's rights and eliminating child abuse. The other direction is returning to civil society organised on patriarchal norms, that is, the abandonment of the national project. Related to this direction are movements advocating some form of ethnic cleansing or racial partitioning; desiring the return of women to home duties as wives and mothers; and asserting the primary of the families in directing and determining the upbringing and discipline of their children.

### **GENDER AND POLITICS**

Gender and patriarchy have always been part and parcel of politics. As kinship communes integrated and amalgamated, usually on the assumptions of common ancestry, the patriarchal principles were extended to the governance of the emerging entities that were formed. One clan owned the government based on descent from a common ancestor and kept it by heredity. While royal clans were displayed by other clans, who captured the ownership of the government, the principle of genealogical descent was kept in place. Within dynasties patriarchal rank determined that males of the clan should ascend to the throne. If there was a hiatus in male succession, then some female of the clan or lineage

would be chosen to succeed to the throne until the hiatus in male succession was corrected. Through this process of partnership, government was preserved within the dynasty until it was overthrown, usually by violent means. The history of monarchies is therefore replete with its episodes of queens within the litany of kings. The point being made here is that throughout the period of recorded history governance has never been about the rule of men, but rather about the rule of one group over others. In this regard, loyalty to the group has always taken precedent over gender solidarity. Women succeeded to thrones where group interest was at stake. Patriarchal closure was relaxed where group survival was threatened.

The history of government by consent of the governed still has chapters to be written of this form as it operated outside of the Western tradition. For example, the Akan peoples of West Africa has a tradition in which it was the most able member of the royal clan, and not the eldest, that would succeed to the throne. Moreover, commoners had a voice in the succession process within the royal clan in which the Queen-Mother played a critical intermediary role between the royal clan and the commoners. Bearing this deficit in political history in mind, when one examines the evolution of representative democracy within the Western tradition it is not possible to overlook the operation of gender at every stage.

If one takes the example of the United States, and its Republic, founded in 1776 on the notion of government for the people, of the people and by the people, one finds that up to 1815 only four States of the Union granted voting rights to all White males. In all other states voting rights were qualified by ownership of property and payment of a certain amount of taxes. In essence voting rights varied with the interactions of race, class and gender. It was the admission of Western States into the Union that prompted change. These states, without old estates or large fortunes, invariably wrote White manhood suffrage into their constitutions. White male suffrage therefore became an issue in Eastern states. By 1825, only Rhode Island was without such a law among North Eastern states, although in both Massachusetts and New York there had been strong resistance to the empowerment of this landless, non-taxpaying and largely unlearned mass of White males.

The election of General Andrew Jackson as President in 1828 marked a turning point in American politics, as a sufficient number of states had enacted White male suffrage to allow the election of a “man of the people”. With the exception of General Washington, all Presidents to Jackson had been college graduates, that is members of the aristocracy of learning and of the families that constituted the colonial elite. They all came from Massachusetts, New York and Virginia. Jackson had little more than a basic education and was from the West. He was elected by men who shared his social background and probably had less education. Jackson won handsomely again the 1832 and by that victory underscored the fact that the change represented a permanent shift in the nature of power and politics in the Republic. White male citizenship in the Republic was now unqualified. Ironically, the social heirs of the Founding Fathers were the first to feel the full political force of the equality so eloquently articulated in the Declaration of Independence and Federal Constitution.



Manhood suffrage was broadened to include Black men in 1869, during the period of Reconstruction following the Civil War and emancipation. Interestingly, subsequent challenges by States, and rulings by the Supreme Court, led to limits being imposed on the franchise to Black men in several States, by the 1890s, as disqualifying conditions were added to their right to vote and become representatives, a course of action without parallel among Whites and in Western democracies. In effect qualifications of class were applied to Black men, which disqualified large numbers of them.

Woman suffrage did not materialise until 1919. This followed a long campaign for such rights that can be traced by to Seneca Falls in 1848. In this matter the American Republic was following and not leading Western nations. Several Western European nations had approved woman suffrage prior to 1919.

Worthy of note is that voting, which is the most basic right in a Republic predicated on the principles of liberty and equality, took over fifty years for poor White men to exercise the franchise, just under a hundred years for all Black men to be added and then with some subsequent subtraction, and one hundred and forty three years to be extended to all women. What is highlighted is not only the time lag between policy and implementation, but the discrepancies between statements of principle and practice based upon those principles, when implementation is dependent on those who will be dispossessed by compliance with the intent of the noble ideals.

In almost all of the colonies of Western imperial nations, voting in the colonial period was restricted on the basis of ethnicity, class and gender. It was only in the post-war period that adult suffrage was constitutionally granted prior to political independence. Like the U. S. experience of the 1828 adult suffrage in the colonies, and newly independent countries, changed the face of politics, particularly its colour, as newly the empowered voted almost en bloc to remove the holders of political power on the restricted franchise.

### **Gender Solidarity and Politics**

It is within the context of the conceptual framework outlined above, and the brief historical sketches of the evolution of patriarchy, gender, nation-states and voting franchise, that consideration should be given to the question, why are women so underrepresented as in parliaments in liberal democracies although they constitute at least half of the voters? The question can be interpreted to imply and assume that the utopian ideals of equality and social justice, constitutionally decreed in nations, exists in reality and that women are exercising their franchise within this ideal framework.

The stark reality is that inequality and injustice is the context in which women and men exercise their political franchise. Further, the bases of inequality and injustice become the foci around which men and women of different groups display loyalties and common cause that supersede gender considerations. Put another way, men and women acting

individually in elective politics display much in common with the actions of patriarchs acting on behalf of their kinship collectives in councils of elders. In both circumstances group solidarity, whatever their distinctive and defining characteristics, is accorded greater priority than gender.

Given the foregoing discussion the question arises, in what circumstances is it mostly likely that gender equality will be accorded priority resulting in higher proportions of women being elected at all level including the highest representative bodies in those nations? In this regard, at least three interlocking and intersecting continua appear to be critical.

1. The degree of diversity that marks the civil society that constitutes the nation. At one end of this continuum would be nations in which there is great homogeneity with respect to criteria such as race/ethnicity, religion and region and where the criteria upon which the nation and society are organised are relatively few, probably class, gender and generation. At the other end of the continuum would be nations in which all the criteria named above are fully operative in determining the social structure.
2. The depth of the sense of shared identity across groups comprising the nation. At one end of this continuum would be a deeply held common identity historically shared between all segments of the society and nation such that it is almost taken for granted. At the other end, would be a recently constructed common national identity which though supported by great rhetoric, is still relatively shallow and self-conscious.
3. The quantum or material resources and its distribution across social groups in the nation. At one end of this continuum would be affluent nations in which there is equitable distribution of wealth across the social groups, while at the other end would be relatively poor countries with great disparity between social groups.

In the interaction between these three continua one would expect equality in representation of women and men in political directorates, at the highest level of political power, in those nations with the little or no diversity, a deeply held common identity historically shared among all members of the society and which enjoy great affluence in material resources that are equitably distributed across social groups in the society. The voice of gender equality in the political process could be expected to be heard loudly in this type of setting because the filters of ethnicity/race, religion, region, class and the like would be virtually none existence and the generation filter is sufficiently permeable to allow effective transmission.

On the other hand one would expect the lowest proportion of representation of women in parliaments in those nations in which there is great diversity in its social composition, a recently constructed common identity among groups which historically did not cohere and limited material resources in the context of great disparity between groups in the society. In these circumstances the voice of gender equity could be expected to be muted to no more than a mere whisper as the filters of ethnicity/race, religion, region, class, caste and others block transmission in the face of vigorous, if not hostile conflicts, between groups in the nation over scarce resources and their inequitable distribution.

Patriarchal patterns would be expected to prevail at all levels of the political apparatus as group solidarity and loyalty stifle notions of gender equality.

Between these two extremes all the other nations could be located based on the permutations arising from the interaction of their specific location on the three continua. Probably an empirical survey would not find any nation at either extreme. All nations would fall at some point between these two poles. While no empirical studies have been done to test the validity of this scenario or hypothesis it may be that these explain the relatively high proportion of women in representative politics in the Nordic countries in contrast to the lower proportion in say the United States and the very low representation in some Third World nations.

## **CONCLUDING DISCUSSION**

The main point of the arguments presented in the foregoing discussion is that gender has to be understood as the sexual division of power. Also that gender is but one of the several criteria upon which society is organised. Further, gender is not the primary criterion upon which society is organised and is therefore almost always nested within other criteria with which it interacts. Accordingly, gender must always be qualified by the other criteria that define the social structure of the societies of which they are part. For example, if a society is organised on the basis of toe length, gender and age then in studying gender relations in that society it is not appropriate only to address men's and women's issues in aggregate form but it is almost mandatory to disaggregate relations within the framework of interaction between these criteria beginning with older long toe men and ending with younger short toe females or vice versa.

The essence of this argument is that in recognising women's inequality in representation in the political process at the highest level of the exercise of power, it necessary to simultaneously recognise the other bases on which inequality exists and operates within the particular context, and to examine the interaction of gender with these other criteria. Put another way, it is critical to understand gender in terms of its dynamic relationships particularly with respect to its interaction with the bases of oppression in the particular context. To examine gender disparity in isolation is not only static and naïve but also myopic and misguided. So too are policies and interventions that focus entirely on gender without regard for or being situated in relation to the other bases of injustice and inequality in the particular society or nation.

Because gender is defined in terms of power and is nested within the other criteria on which societies and nations are organised, any major or fundamental shift in power can be expected to include corresponding changes in gender relations. Recent developments in the Russia amply illustrate the validity of this observation. In 1985 women were 50 per cent of the deputies of the territorial, regional, provincial, district, municipal, village and rural soviets. They were 40 per cent of the deputies of the soviets of the autonomous republics and 36 per cent of the deputies in the Union Republics. In the Supreme Soviet of the USSR they were 33 per cent of the deputies. However, women were less than five per cent of the Central Committee of the Communist party and were virtually absent from

the all powerful Politburo. Only two women had ever been members of this body, (Gray 1990). While women had achieved gender equality at local level and made considerable advances at the intermediary level of the autonomous and union Republics, and the Supreme Soviet, they were almost absent at the pinnacle of political power in the Soviet Union, (Miller, 1991)

In the transformation that has taken place in Russia to a market economy and multiparty representative democracy, women's proportion at all levels of the political apparatus has been drastically reduced. Not only are they absent from the pinnacle of power, but only marginally represented at the intermediate and local levels of political decision-making as their proportion has dropped to less than 10 per cent even at the local level. This has taken place in free and fair elections in which women were half the voters. On the surface it would seem that in this forward move in political economy women have taken a backward step in the political arena. Clearly this is not a result of any male conspiracy, but an outcome achieved with the full participation of women.

Viewed solely from the perspective of gender, these changes in the proportion of women in representative politics in Russia, present a conundrum. However, the puzzle begins to be solved if the conceptual tools of the partnership and exclusionary processes are applied to development in the Soviet Union after 1917 and the political patriarchal structure of the Communist Party and the State is understood as one of the outcomes of the operation of these processes. Further progress is made in the solving of the puzzle if it is recognised that men and women acted in solidarity to remove the Communist Party from power and to dismantle the structures of the State that had been created in the governance of the nation. This included not only the men who populated the upper echelons but the women at the intermediate and local levels as well. In this action gender equality was not the priority. The holders of power were removed as a collective, by others also acting in a collective manner.

The case of the Soviet Union and Russia raises yet another important point. That is, in gender analysis it is foolhardy to adopt conceptual tools based upon the notion of permanent progress. Gender relations are neither linear nor unidirectional nor permanent. This is because gender operates in dynamic interaction with the other criteria upon which societies and nations are organised. In addition, the bases of the organisation of society are periodically re-negotiated in the course of history. This includes gender and all other relations.

In returning to the question of why women are under-represented in the parliaments in democracies where women have had the vote for a considerable amount of time, it is probably more important to suggest an approach to the answer rather attempt to advance one. The critical elements of a fruitful approach appear to be:

- To respect the integrity and rationality of women's choices and actions in these situations. Not to do so is not only to impute blame but also to imply that the women involved are mindless minions easily manipulated by masculine conspiracy of which they are totally unaware.

- To recognise that women's marginalisation and oppression in society is linked to other forms of marginalisation and oppression which invariably involve some men. To ignore this is either an act of great misconception or an unwillingness to take responsibility for confronting these other forms of oppression. Worse, it may be intervening in the circumstances, knowingly or unknowingly, on the side of one group while using women's issue as cover.
- To resolve take account of the complexities of gender relations and not to embrace single factor and simplistic explanations.

Finally, it is necessary to ask, if women are acting rationally and with integrity in the election of men, why raise the question of women's under-representation in political parliaments and other elected bodies? There are at least three lines of argument that can be raised with respect to this question.

First, it could be argued that women voting to elect men may be rational and valid given women's historic exclusion from political arenas until recently, and the consequential inexperience of women representatives in the electoral process compared to men. As such this situation dictates the need for compensatory action to redress the deficit such as quotas constitutionally mandating a minimum proportion of women representatives. The counterpoint to this argument is that from the foregoing discussion in this paper it has been shown that women's under-representation in parliaments and council is not related to any deficit or inexperience on the part of women but instead to the alignment between groups contesting advantage and advancement in society and the solidarity existing between men and women with respect to these common causes. Quotas and other artificial devices in these circumstances could simply be means by which those holding power consolidate their position by forming coalition with women of disadvantaged groups, thus fracturing the solidarity of those groups and further marginalising the men of those disadvantaged groups. Should the latter succeed in displaying the former then a backlash against women could be expected.

Second, it could be argued that the low representation of women represents a deficit in representation itself because women have special qualities to contribute to political affairs that are not being tapped. Femininity begin constructed on the basis of living giving and life preservation bequeathed to women skills of accommodation, co-operation, conciliation and inclusiveness that are solely needed in arriving at political and not military solutions in conducting human affairs. The culture of peace would be better served by gender equality, or even plurality, in the political apparatus of nations. While the empirical basis upon which to test this hypothesis is very slender, because gender is socially constructed reasonable doubts should be entertained concerning the fact that women holding ultimate power will act differently from men. Faced with the same loyalties, parameters and constraints women, of whatever group, may act in like fashion to their men. Certainly, this has been the experience in several countries over the last 70 years. Further, the promise that women would make a difference imposes a burden on women that is not imposed on men.

Third, the strongest argument is that the under-representation of women in parliaments and other political councils represents inequality even if women themselves are participating in the process by which this outcome is produced. Equality is the only ethical and just basis on which to construct and operate society. Hence, unequal numbers of men and women in parliaments and councils are symptoms of injustice and immorality in the operation and construction of society, states and nations.

The main burden of the alternative perspective offered by this paper is that gross inequality in the representation of women in politics is not symptomatic only of gender inequality but also of gross inequality in the other criteria upon which a society or a nation is organised. Equality is a unified whole. It cannot be conveniently divided into segments related exclusively to gender, or class, or religion, or region, or generation, or race, or tribe or clan. In assaulting gender inequality, it is obligatory to confront the other inequalities as well. To do otherwise may be pragmatic but it is unethical and in the long term reaps its own devastating consequences.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought*. New York: Routledge.
2. Dahlerup, Drude. 1987. "Confusing Concepts - Confusing Reality: A Theoretical Discussion of the Patriarchal State." Pp. 93-127 in *Women and the State: The Shifting Boundaries of Public and Private*, edited by Anne Showstack Sassoon. London: Hutchinson.
3. Derrida, Jacques. 1976. *Of Grammatology*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
4. Dex, Shirley. 1985. *The Sexual Division of Work*. Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books distributed by Harvester Press.
5. Duncan, Neville, and Kenneth O'Brien. 1983. *Women and Politics in Barbados 1948-1981*. Cave Hill, Barbados: Institute of Social and Economic Research, Eastern Caribbean, University of the West Indies.
6. Foucault, Michel. 1981. *The History of Sexuality*. Harmondsworth: Pelican.
7. Gray, Francine Du Plessix. 1990. *Soviet Women Walking the Tightrope*. New York: Doubleday.
8. Hooks, Bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: from margin to center*. Boston: South End Press.
9. Lerner, Gerda. 1986. *The Creation of Patriarchy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
10. Lyotard, Jean-Francois. 1978. *The Postmodern Condition: a report on knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
11. Miller, Errol. 1991. *Men At Risk*. Kingston: Jamaica Publishing House.
12. Miller, Errol. 1994. *Marginalisation of the Black Male*. Kingston: Canoe Press.
13. Reddock, Rhoda E. 1994. *Women, Labour & Politics in Trinidad & Tobago: A History*. Kingston: Ian Randle Publishers.
14. Smith, Anthony. 1987. *The Ethnic Origin of Nations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
15. Walby, Sylvia. 1990. *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: Basil Blackwood Ltd.
16. Weber, Max. 1947. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation*. New York: Free Press.