

'Real Feminism' and Dalit Women

Scripts of Denial and Accusation

SHARMILA REGE

Chayya Datar's 'Non-Brahmin Renderings of Feminism in Maharashtra: Is It a More Emancipatory Force?' (*EPW*, Oct 9, 1999) is welcome on several counts. It returns us to some important questions in feminist theorisation and politics that have gone undiscussed for some time. Datar's commitment to identifying politically potent feminist alternatives is something one wholeheartedly shares. Nevertheless, on some important issues, there are sharp disagreements. These probably stem from divergent assessments of the enduring legacies of Marxism and second wave feminism as from divergent readings of caste, 'the cultural' and the nature of and alternatives to contemporary capitalism. This response addresses directly some of the arguments raised in Datar (1999) and underlines the misrecognition in the same of the dalit feminist standpoint (hereafter DFS) outlined in Rege (1998). Some of the broader issues concerning standpoint theory and feminist politics, questions relating to dalit resistance being conceived as 'the cultural' and those concerning the caste and gender underpinnings of alternatives to development are only raised here. A more detailed elaboration of the same is postponed [Rege forthcoming].

Datar (1999) misrecognises the DFS as being located within the narrow confines of postmodernism versus feminism, as also some kind of a scale of politically correctness on which 'real feminism' is sought to be measured, and as foreclosing all possibilities of emancipatory dialogues and interrogations. The DFS thus comes to be seen as a script of accusation (on the second wave feminist movement in India) and then as a script of guilt-ridden confession (by non-dalit women). As a result dalit feminist renderings on 'who can speak for whom' is misread as postmodernist. Datar's critique (1999) which focuses only on 'intra-caste patri-

archy' and the patriarchy in the dalit movements, becomes a script of historical denial and an erasure of internal critique. In proposing eco-feminism as the only radical standpoint, she brings to centre 'reproduction' – this no doubt is an important orientation but it is not a standpoint.

Eco-feminism and DFS

It has been argued [Datar 1999] that the review of feminist debates in Rege (1998) has been narrowly framed as feminism versus postmodernism and that in doing so eco-feminism has been overlooked. To the contrary, the review emerged from a concern with the emphasis on 'differences' in feminist politics and a postmodernist appropriation of the same. In privileging the historicisation of difference over multiple voices and relativism, we are in fact 'speaking back' to feminism – not allowing it to dictate the contours feminist debates. Eco-feminism was not overlooked, but collapsed as a particular variant of cultural feminism, one, which valorises sexual differences especially in relation to nature.

The eco-feminist argument as Agarwal (1992) notes is ideological, in its essential connection between the domination of women and that of nature. The important linkages between feminism and environmentalism outlined in Agarwal (1992) and Dietrich (1994) definitely enrich the DFS and as such one sees no contradiction between them. The feminist environmentalist position [Agarwal 1992] argues that the linkages between gender, caste and class, structure the organisation of production, reproduction and distribution – as also the effects of environment change on people. A DFS which is located in the structuring of experiences of everyday lived relatives of dalit women's live is obviously sensitive to the structural differences in access to land and livelihood and to a history of 'lokayatas' [for detailed analysis, see Ilaiah 1998].

Following Dietrich (1994) it may be argued that in grappling with the issues of production of life, castes, classes and patriarchies are important mediating factors. Caste in mediating the control over resources and the division of labour structures the divide between intellectual and manual labour. The interlinkages between caste-based division of labour and sexual division of labour control the production of life through the marriages circle and make way for patriarchal extraction of women's subsistence agriculture as a sign of strength.

Custers (1997) notes the same while also granting that valuable contribution has been made by eco-feminism in challenging the sanctity of western sciences and in establishing women as sustainers of agriculture. However, as he underlines, there are problems, both conceptual and empirical with positions such as Shiva's and that of the German feminist school. Shiva glosses over women's differentiated class positions and over all those forms of labour that do not fall under subsistence and thus makes invisible women's contribution to capitalist accumulation. The German feminist school of eco-feminism which places reproduction at the centre as does Datar (1999), does not draw out the interrelationship between procreation and production of working capacities [Custers 1997] as it comes to be structured in caste-class society. Dietrich (1999) establishes this inter-relationship in the materiality of caste, in the differential access to and appropriation of resources for survival by caste and in the marriage circle. Thus, she envisions the alliance with dalits and 'adivasis' as integral to eco-feminist politics and calls for an internal critique by both the dalit and women's movements. One is in full agreement with Dietrich (1994) about the urgency of such critiques in the context of an ecological crisis and co-option of dalits and women by brahmanical hindutva. DFS is only one step in the development of such critiques.

Datar's (1999) claim about both the left and the postmodernists being a part of the same mainstream which does not interrogate the industrial, technological paradigm is erroneous and seems so very similar to the postmodernist rejection of Marxism and Nazism (in the same breath) as metanarratives. The postmodernists' critique of modernity, which is sans a

critique of capitalism, throws the baby out and retains the bathwater. The left, it must be admitted has opened up to questions of ecological degradation and there have been attempts to fuse radical red and green politics and efforts to meld ecological, social and labour concerns in seeking viable alternatives to both global capital and the many forms of localism [for example O'Connor 1994; O'Connor 1998].

In the Indian context too the broad left (especially those seeking to underline the linkages of anti-caste, class and women's struggles) have in their practices and ideologies integrated ecological concerns, often mobilising reflexively around anti-brahmanical traditions. A range of alternative institutional arrangements are being experimented with [for details see Omvedt 1993; Patankar 1998]. Alternatives to global capitalism cannot view environmental degradation as merely a result of industrial growth and technology or faulty state policies but have to locate the degradation as an integral part of the existence, growth and constitution of contemporary capitalism [Bapat 1996].

The issue, therefore, is not one of who has the more complete alternative dalit feminists or eco-feminists, but of locating historically how the different new social movements have not addressed each other's issues. As Omvedt (1993) has shown, the anti-caste and women's movements have not addressed each other's issues and neither has analysed the problems of peasantry and nature. The environment movement has not dealt with the question of caste-community exploitation and the economic issues that trouble the peasantry and the working class, and despite the eco-feminist trend, as Omvedt argues, the movement as such has rarely confronted the oppression of women. For feminist politics, this means recognising in theory and practice interlocking oppressions and encompassing all the social inequalities that patriarchies structure and are structured.

DFS seeks to do this by tracing how and what divides women, also what connects them but does not easily unite them. It seeks a historical interrogation and revision and in doing so, is itself open to radical interrogations including those posed by eco-sustainable alternatives. As a standpoint located in the material practices of dalit women's lives it rejects a dichotomisation of the material and cultural which equates the material to environmental degradation and brahmanism to the cultural. Brahmanical patriarchies and caste-specific patriarchies are material in their determination of the access to resources, the division of labour,

the sexual division of labour and division of sexual labour.

Further as Gavaskar (1999) has contended, endogamy also structures and maintains the redistribution of resources. Hence DFS refuses to submit the analysis of patriarchies and to see 'undifferentiated communities' or 'groups of women' as alternatives to the ecological crisis or to the global market. A radical stance of decentralisation of the economy and polity and of anti-development as anti-capitalism, in the absence of any analysis of caste, class gender and the nation-state, articulates meaningful sensibilities but as a position collapses into a rhetoric. Pieterse (1998) has argued that critiques of and alternatives to development cannot be seen outside of development politics. Questions that are posed as 'to be for' or 'against' modernity underrate the dialectics of modernity and development and overlook the possibilities of reflexive development. DFS, rooted in the reflexive modernity of Phule and Ambedkar, seeks to develop such possibilities.

Script of Denial: Is There No Need for an Internal Critique?

In reviewing second wave feminism in India and the dalit movement, Datar (1999) recognises the importance of the anti-rape agitation but views sexual politics as a 'stray tendency' within feminism (p 2964). One of the cornerstones of the second wave of women's movement in India has been the underlining of the 'sexual' (in terms of issues of violence, conjugality, reproduction and to a limited extent sexual orientation) as political. A debate between the left and the feminists that was more or less cast in terms of 'class or gender' did open up debates on the structures of patriarchy. DFS argues that a thorough going analysis of the material basis of patriarchy, requires that the differential access to and control over labour, sexuality, and reproduction by castes, classes and communities be brought to centre. That, in the absence of such a critique of brahmanical, class-based heteropatriarchies, the political edge of sexual politics is lost. No politics committed to redistribution in a caste-based society can overlook sexual politics. It is therefore important to revision it rather than give it up or pose the upper caste women alone as the only needy constituents of such a politics.

Datar's (1999) analysis of the dalit panthers and the women's movement naturalises the split of the dalit women's oppression. The 'caste' constituent of their oppression, it is argued, would naturally

be highlighted by the dalit panthers and the cross-caste-class 'patriarchal constituents by the women's movement. The double exclusion of the dalit woman is justified in terms of historical limitations. The Phule-Ambedkarite legacy is invoked to justify the largely high caste subject of the second wave of women's movement in Maharashtra. It is argued that in a region with a Satyashodhak-Ambedkarite legacy, it was the high caste women who needed a demystification and a revelation of their 'dalit' status. It is precisely because of the Phule-Ambedkar legacy that there is such a split between caste and gender which erases the dalit women's oppression; and this by both the dalit and feminist inheritors of the legacy.

The issue at stake is not one of how many feminist activists joined the 'namantar' struggle or how many cases of dalit and tribal women were taken by the women's movement. Despite the chronology of events – first namantar then Mathura, as is underlined by Datar (1999) – the absence of a revisioning, a reinscription of caste in feminist politics was largely absent. From Mathura to Bhanwari, the Indian women's movement has addressed the issues and cases of women of dalit, tribal and minority communities, but it is one thing to address their issues and another to revision politics to centre around the issues of the most marginalised of women. An internal critique does not call for non-dalit women to freeze into guilt or to celebrate an uncritical dalit womanism. Neither does it imply a submission to some 'imagined authenticity of homogenised dalit women's voice', it means a recognition of connections of power that exist between women. It means speaking, not just 'as one' or 'for the other' but within and about the space between the 'self' and the 'other' [Probyn 1993]. It requires not a narrow identitarian politics, but it is precisely to avoid such a narrow alley that a rewriting of our histories is called for.

DFS is about historically locating how all our identities are not equally powerful, and about reviewing how in different historical practices similarities between women have been ignored in an effort to underline caste-class identities or at other times differences ignored for 'the feminist cause'. As Ganguly (1995) put it "it is like walking on a tightrope of connection, distance and power". Datar's critique sidetracks these issues of an internal critique and takes on the issue of power within dalit women's organisations.

In noting the limits of dalit feminism, Datar (1999) collapses the standpoint into the practices of certain organisations and

argues that dalit feminism is limited to educated dalit women working in universities and white-collared jobs and questions their knowledge and concern about the 'material realities of the lives of rural dalit women'. Of course, lists of dalit-bahujan activists working with the 'authentic dalit woman subject' can be easily drawn up. But that will be trivialising the standpoint which is sensitive to both the historical trajectories of the neo-buddhist leadership of the dalit movement in Maharashtra and the need to broadbase the movement. A point that Pardeshi (1997) makes and which is completely misrepresented by Datar (1999).¹ Datar repeatedly underlines the alienating effect of the Buddhist cultural ethos on non-Buddhist dalit women. These are issues that have come up historically – time and again in the practices of different struggles and movements. It may be recalled that at the 1991 Calcutta Conference of the IAWS, Flavia Agnes and Razia Patel had questioned the 'Hindu hegemony' in the women's movement and had opened up space for an internal critique.

A denial of an internal critique also leads Datar (1999) to counter Neelkanth's (1998) allegation of the split between the theoretical brahmin feminists and the narrative dalit women with the simple logic of people in glass houses should not throw stones at others. The split between the educated dalit women as the spokeswomen versus the illiterate dalit women as the listeners as observed by Datar at dalit women's gatherings is underlined and further the women leaders of the feminist movement are graded as more democratic than those in the dalit women's movements. As for the more democratic leadership, Gandhi and Shah (1999) have analysed the issue of subtle hierarchies, division of work and group decision-making processes in the women's movement and have noted the impact of differences between group members in terms of class, political experiences and personalities. Neelkanth's argument has raised important questions about the politics of knowledge and power; questions that were at one time so central to the feminist movement. In countering the dichotomy of theoretical men and experiential women, feminists had proposed radical and revised epistemologies and methodologies. Questions about the dichotomy of the brahmin theoretician and the empirical 'shudra' in social sciences in India have led to the outlining of new dalit epistemologies [Guru 1998] and radical readings of the epistemological conflicts in history [Patil 1996; Ilaiah 1998]. Coun-

tering interrogations with a spirit of denial is neither in the spirit or interests of the women's movement.

Script of Accusation: Patriarchal Dalit Movement as the Worst Enemy?

Datar's analysis sees the explosion of caste identities in politics as a result of 'sanskritisation' and an unstable political atmosphere. Further, such a situation is seen as encouraging the assertion of intra-caste patriarchy by dalit men and the issue of separate quotas within quotas for dalit and OBC women comes to be analysed in this context. The debate on quotas within quotas comes to be read as patriarchal cunning of a dalit movement, limited as it is by its electoral and reservation politics, to restrict dalit women's entry into politics and the public sector. That an internal critique of patriarchy in dalit politics is much needed is beyond doubt and the importance of such a critique for political radicalism has been in fact overdetermined in Guru (1999). Assessments of dalit politics by activists and social scientists do recognise that the movement is at a crossroads in terms of issues to be taken up, constituencies to be cultivated and in terms of the ideological strands to be emphasised. Pandhere (1994) underlines the need for integrating agitational and electoral politics; Pendse (1994) and Palshikar (1994) caution against the Hinduist misappropriation of Ambedkar and attempts to communalise the dalit masses as 'canon fodder' while Salve (1997) underlines the need for dalit politics to view dalit women not as numbers but as revolutionary agents. There seems to be considerable agreement on the need for strategies to evolve a non-caste dalit identity, a caste-class bloc and a dalit-OBC bloc. As Alam (1999) has argued, despite "the nature of wheeling and dealing... the politics of the oppressed has also been responsible for the sustenance of traditions of interactions between the communities and the secular character of the polity (p 760). Caste appeal, far from being casteism is thus established as an important gain in the face of hindutva politics of intolerance.

A script of accusation, that only highlights the patriarchal character of the dalit movement also fails to note the significant 'spaces within the anti-caste struggle' [Sen 1992] made by dalit and bahujan women. What such a script fails to see is the radicalism of dalit women activists working at the local level, who sometimes challenge the patriarchal leadership, making spaces for feminism in the dalit movement and at other times privilege their dalit-bahujan

identity over gender. This requires an in-depth analysis of castes and distribution of power in Maharashtra; [for a detailed analysis see Palshikar 1998 and Dhamale 1997]. It will not be enough to gloss over the issue of quotas within quotas by accusing dalit male leadership, an engaged introspection within the women's movements is also called for as has been well argued by Bhagwat (1997), Pardeshi (1997), Lata (1998), Thakur (1998), Sonalkar (1999) and Deshpande (1999).

In mapping the cultural consolidation of castes and intra-caste patriarchies among the oppressed castes, Datar (1999) accords the phenomenon to Sanskritisation.² As Alam (1999) has noted, with the development of the forces of production, the labour and skills of women of OBC and dalit communities have suffered a downward mobility. There has been a relative deskilling in relation to men and their economic dependence on men has increased. This has been borne out by empirical studies on gender and caste-based occupations [see for example Bhagwat 1997]. In such a situation, there is an imposition of moral codes in communities, and women are faced with the threat of retaliation as the basis for compliance [Alam 1999]. This has at least some clues about the dangers, especially for women, of unconditional community control as an eco-sustainable alternative.

Datar's alternative envisions communities as the main actors, positions reproduction at the centre of human activity and calls for strong local markets as a strong base for negotiations with the global market. This according to Datar, would also resolves the question of increasing fundamentalism since fundamentalism is seen as a response to the feeling of emasculation in the face of global forces. In seeing undifferentiated, local, sustainable communities as alternatives, critiques of global capitalism are collapsed into critiques of industry and technology; and in seeing fundamentalism as a response to emasculation what is overlooked, to say the least, is the increasing participation of women in hindutva. But more importantly it has lessons for those who assume that communities are necessarily contradictory to capital. The need for decentralisation and redistribution is beyond doubt but communities are not already and always undifferentiated and as Joseph (1998) argues communities need to be re-appropriated for democratic politics.

Datar's contentions about anti-caste movement being cultural revolts is debatable for such a contention on one hand views brahmanism and the struggle against

it as located in cultural symbols and overlooks the caste-based character of capital accumulation and labour and of reproduction in the broader sense of the term. A dichotomisation of injustices into socio-economic and cultural, which had been radically challenged both by Dalit Panthers and the women's movement assumes thus a divide as if between a politics of redistribution and recognition. Such an opposition overlooks the fact that caste is cultural without ceasing to be material and a brahmanism in its production distribution and effect is economic. Thus Phule's call for reinventing a kingdom of Bali is at once material and cultural, integrating a politics of recognition and redistribution. DFS is committed to such a legacy and refutes the contention that the anti-caste movements are largely cultural revolts.

Conclusion

The history of standpoint theory both in Marxism and feminism is a history of interrogations. Feminist standpoint theories which originated in the 'standpoint of women' have been revisioned as it became apparent that the constitution of the subject woman is the result of a complex interplay of individuals and large-scale social forces [Hartsock 1997]. Standpoint theory at this point, seemed better suited to politics of race and class and not for feminists who were faced with the task of constructing standpoints across differences [Collins 1997]. Feminists of colour developed the powerful resource of 'intersectionality' of structures of domination. (e.g. Hooks 1981; Anzaldúa 1987; Collins 1991). In the Indian context, Sharad Patil's epistemology of *Marxvaad*, *Phule-Ambedkarvaad* (1994) provided one such powerful resource of intersectionality of caste, class and gender domination. DFS like any other standpoint, therefore, is not to be seen in terms of aggregates of individuals, it is a collective subject position that requires an always contingent transformation of complex subject positions. As Weeks (1996) puts it "the standpoint is a project not an inheritance, it is achieved, not given". [PW]

Notes

- 1 Datar (1999) refers to Pardeshi (1995) as 'pardeshi', Pardeshi (1996) in Rege (1998) refers to the work of Pratima Pardeshi of the Satyashodhak Mahila Sabha which has been always working with dalit adivasi women and writes within a Marxist/Phule/Ambedkarite position.
- 2 Sanskritisation in the 1990s has been seen by some as a challenge to domination (see for

example, Karanth in Srinivas (ed)). While some like Ilaiah have turned the concept on its head by putting forth a 'dalitisation' paradigm (see for example, Ilaiah nd).

References

- Agarwal, Bina (1992): 'The Gender and Environment Debate: Lessons From India', *Feminist Studies*, Vol 18, No 1, reprinted in Menon (1999).
- (1998): 'Disinherited Peasants Disadvantaged Workers: A Gender Perspective on Land and Livelihood', *EPW*, March 28, Vol XXXIII, No 13.
- Alam, Javeed (1999): 'Is Caste Appeal Casteism? Oppressed Castes in Politics', *EPW*, March 27.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria (1987): *Bordalands/La Frontera*, Spinsters/Aunt Lute, San Francisco.
- Bapat, Ram (1996): *Arthkarnachya Badalatya Disha*, Dr Ambedkar Academy, Satara.
- Bhagwat, Vidyut (1997): 'Sarvdharmatil Dalit-OBC Streeyana Hakkachi Pradhinitva Have', (Dalit-OBC Women of All Religious Must Have Representation), *Maharashtra Times*, July 27.
- Collins, Patricia Hill (1991): *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Routledge, New York.
- (1997): 'Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited', *Signs*, Vol 22, No 2.
- Custers, Peter (1997): *Capital Accumulation and Women's Labour in Asian Economies*, Vistaar, New Delhi.
- Datar, Chhaya (1999): 'Non-Brahmin Renderings of Feminism in Maharashtra: Is It a More Emancipatory Force?', *EPW*, October 9.
- (1998): *Nurturing Nature*, Earthcare Books, Bombay.
- Deshpande, Rajeshwari (1999): 'Politically Sensitive Gender Discourse', *EPW*, March 6-13.
- Dhamale, Kishor (1997): *Brahmanavaad Viruddh Bahujanvaad*, Krantisinh Nana Patil Academy.
- Dietrich, Gabriele (1994): *Women, Ecology and Culture*, paper presented at the IV Conference, IAWS, published in Menon (1999).
- Gandhi, Nandita and Nandita Shah (1999): 'Organisations and Autonomy' in Menon (ed), *Gender and Politics*, OUP, New Delhi.
- Ganguly, Indrani (1995): 'Some Thoughts on Feminism and Racism', *Connect: Newsletter of the Australian Sociological Association*, 3(2):4.
- Gavaskar, Mahesh (1999): 'Manavi Hakaani (A) Nagari Samaj: Borgawamadhil Dalit-Savarna Sangharsh' (Human Rights and Civil Society: Dalit-Upper Caste Conflict in Borgaon), *Samaj Prabodan Patrika*, January-March.
- Guru, Gopal (1998): 'The Theoretical Brahmin and the Empirical Shudra', a paper presented at a workshop on 'Methodology', Mangalore University, Mangalore.
- (1999): 'Looking Critically at Dalit Activism', *Hindu*, January 12.
- Hartsock, Nancy (1997): 'Comments on Hekman's Truth and Method: Feminist Standpoint Theory Revisited: Truth or Justice', *Signs*, Vol 22, No 21.
- Hooks, Bell (1981): *Ain't I a woman? Black Women and Feminism*, South End, Boston.
- Ilaiah, Kanha (1998): 'Dalitism vs Brahminism: The Epistemological Conflict History' in Ghosh (ed), *Dalits and Peasants: The Emerging Caste-Class Dynamics*, Grassroot Politics, Issue No 2.
- (nd): *Why I Am Not a Hindu*, Samya, Calcutta.
- Joseph, Sara (1998): *Interrogating Culture: Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Social Theory*, Sage, New Delhi.
- Lata, Pratibha Madhukar (1998): 'Striyansathi Arakshan: Atmaparikshanachi Garaj', (Women's Reservation: Need for Interospection), *Maharashtra Times*, July 27.
- Menon, Nivedita (1999): *Gender and Politics in India*, OUP, New Delhi.
- O'Connor, Martin (1994): *Is Capitalism Sustainable?*, Guilford, New York.
- O'Connor, James (1998): *National Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*, Guilford, New York.
- Omvedt, Gail (1993): *Re-inventing Revolution: New Social Movements and the Socialist Tradition in India*, M E Sharpe, New York.
- (1995): *Dalit Visions*, Orient Longman, New Delhi.
- Palshikar, Suhas (1994): *Dr Ambedkaranchya Hindukaranchi Chikitsa* (Dr Ambedkar's Critique of Hindutva), Dr Ambedkar Academy, Satara.
- (1998): *Jaat Va Maharashtraatil Sattakaran* (Caste or Power Politics in Maharashtra), Sagata.
- Pardeshi, Pratima (1997): 'Dr Ambedkar aani Streemuktivad' (Dr Ambedkar and Women's Liberation), Krantisinh Nana Patil Academy, Pune.
- Patankar, Bharat (1998): 'Dalits and Peasant: The Emerging Caste, Class Dynamics' in Ashish Ghosh (ed), *Dalits and Peasants: The Emerging Caste – Class Dynamics*, Grassroot Politics, Issue No 2.
- Patil, Sharad (1994): *Marxvaad Phule – Ambedkarvaad*, Sugava, Pune.
- (1996): *Abrahmani Sahityache Saundarya Shastra* (Aesthetics of Non-brahmin Literature), Sugava, Pune.
- Pendse, Sandeep (ed) (1994): *At Crossroads: Dalit Movement Today*, Vikas Adhyayan Kendra, Bombay.
- Pieterse, Jan Nederveen (1998): 'My Paradigm or Yours? Alternative Development, Post Development and Reflexive Development Development and Change', Vol 29.
- Probyn, Elspeth (1993): *Sexing the Self: Gendered Positions in Cultural Studies*, Routledge, New York.
- Rege, Sharmila (1998): 'Dalit Woman Talk Differently: A Critique of 'Difference' and Towards a Dalit Feminist Standpoint', *EPW*, October 31, WS 39-46.
- (forthcoming): 'Caste, Gender and Culture: From a DFS'.
- Salve, Dinkar (1997): *Chakravyuhat Dalit Chalval*, (Dalit Movement in a Maze), Krantisinh Nana Patil Academy, Pune.
- Sen, Ilina (1992): *Spaces within the Struggle*, Kali, New Delhi.
- Sonalkar, Wandana (1999): 'An Agenda for Gender Politics', *EPW*, January 9.
- Smith, Dorothy (1987): *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*, Boston.
- Srinivas, M N (ed): *Caste: Its Twentieth Century Avatar*, Vikalp, New Delhi.
- Thakur, Rekha (1998): 'Ucchvarniyanchi Dambhikta' (Hypocrisy of the Upper Castes), *Loksatta*, July 28.
- Weeks, Kathi (1996): 'For a Feminist Standpoint' in Save et al (ed), *Marxism Beyond Marxism*, Routledge, New York.