

WP #3

Beyond Liberal and Marxist
Leninist Feminisms: Towards an
Autonomous Frame of Reference

By
Sylvia Wynter

A paper prepared for the session, "Feminist Theory at the Cross-roads," held on the occasion of the Annual Conference of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, September, 1982.

(c) Sylvia Wynter, Sept. 7, 1982.

"The efforts to find a 'new Marxism' purified in the cauldron of woman's consciousness, is as natural to the women's movements as other 'separate attempts' -- separate women's trade unions and some kind of never-quite becoming autonomous women's movement' (Charnie Guettel, 1974)

"Women have served all these centuries as looking glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size...That is why Napoleon and Mussolini insist so emphatically upon women's inferiority, for if they were not inferior they would cease to enlarge...That serves to explain in part the necessity that women often are to men. And it serves to explain how restless they are under her criticism. For if she begins to tell the truth, the figure in the looking glass shrinks."

(Virginia Woolf, 1929)

I have divided this paper into two parts. Part One is an overview of an attempt to conceptualize contemporary social reality and its transformation from a frame of reference related to feminism in its own name.

Part Two attempts to put some of ^{the} major issues raised by the discourse of feminism in the context of a larger theoretical schema, one in which feminism can realize the specificity of its discourse without either being diluted in an "amorphous universalism" or "immured in a narrow provincialism". (Aime Cesaire, 1956)

Part One: Overview of The Argument

The main argument of this frame is based on the formulatio

by Gregory Bateson, made in his book, Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity (New York, 1979). Bateson here argues that social systems think themselves by means of abduction schemas or analogical systems; that, as in totemism, where this thinking is "literally in-formed" by the analogy between the social system and the larger ecological system of which it is a part, the constituting analogy of all socio-historical orders is "partly exact and partly fanciful and partly made real - by actions that the fantasy dictates" (Bateson, 1979).

The argument develops the concept of a governing morphogenetic fantasy, which, rather than the "human nature" of liberalism or the "economic forces" of Marxism-Leninism, is determinant in the last instance of the praxis and mode of sociality of the contemporary sociohistorical order.

It defines this order as a classarchy, that is an order based on the sovereignty of a middle class model of human identity, whether in its Liberal humanist definition (Man-as-Norm) or in its Marxist-Leninist definition (Labor-as-Norm). It coins the word classarchy both on the model of patriarchy and on that of monarchy. In the case of the first, the constituting analogy and symbolic construct, Man-as-Father (I) provided the organizing principle of the cultural order since the construct functions as the General Equivalent of Identity of that order. The structure of role allocations and related patterns of interaction then constitute themselves in relation to this construct as the major referent.

The cultural system of patriarchy as a whole is thereby indicated by the constituting analogy Man-as-Father. To be indicated as the marked state and major referent, there must be a construct which exists relatively, as its unmarked state. In patriarchal systems the construct of Woman as -Not-The-Father is crucial to the very indicability of the order; to the law of form (Spencer-Brown, 1972) of what might be called the fake 'speciation code' (2) with which the genus homo autodefinies himself as a culture-specific 'species'.³ In the abduction schema of patriarchal systems, then, Women play the role of key representant, the Symbolic Other to the Norm whilst men play the key role of the representant of the Norm in the structuring code.

The cultural system of classarchy was the first known, secular and global cultural system in the histories of human-kinds. The Western middle classes, enriched by ^{interalia,} Europe's expropriation of the lands of the Americas, by the purchase-sale and use of the forced mass labor of Africans, yet finding their self-affirmation as a group constricted by the aristocratic-monarchical order with its bonding-identifying principle of Royal/Noble - Blood - and - Birth -, effected a cultural revolution of unprecedented magnitude. With this revolution in an underlying abduction schema with its related 'magma of social imaginary significations' (Castoriadis, quoted by Howard, 1977) a schema in which they were as a group, one of the representants of the unmarked state, the Western middle classes delegitimated the earlier cultural system, replacing it with their own, turning the code in their favour' (Baudrillard, 1975:136).

This cultural revolution displaced monarchy, the sovereignty of a single ruler -- the term monarchy derives from monos, Single, and Archein, to rule, to be first -- with the sovereignty of a single cultural order, and its related meaning-system. This sovereignty was global.

The middle class cultural revolution was not only a rupture with the European monarchical order. It was a rupture with the traditional orders of things of all previous cultural systems of humankind. If the constituting analogy of Blood-and-Birth still functioned within the abduction system of consanguinity, i.e., the bonding principle of kinship - lineage societies and their outgrowths, as the defining indication of 'we-who are -the- same-blood,' the middle classes, excluded from Norm status in the power-prestige order (Berger, Rosenholtz, Zelditch, 1980:3) legitimated by the divinely sanctioned status characteristic of Noble-Lineage, were compelled to shift both the schema of consanguinity and the legitimating charter of Divine Sanction.

They replaced both with the abduction schema of connaturality and its related construct of Natural Sanction, displacing the symbolics of sanguinity with the metaphors of naturality. The constituting analogy of the new order -- class-archy -- functioned now to represent the status-characteristic of the mercantile middle classes, i.e., its accumulation of non-landed property, of capital, as the General Equivalent Signifier of Identity and Status, as the Place of the Phallus-the-Symbolic-Penis. This analogy was the construct of Man-as-Freeman, i.e., man in the image of the European 'intermediate caste' (James,

1971) neither the nobleman, nor the nobleman's man, i.e., the serf, but a freeman. The Freeman, Man-as-Liber, a precise historical and partial construct, was now universalized as 'Man' the Subject of the legitimating discourse of Humanism.

This particularity everywhere represented as a universal guaranteed its self-representation, for the first time in human history, not by a mythical or theological but by a cognitive charter. The Sanction which now 'elected' the construct 'man-born-free-in-the-state-of-Nature, with -both his freedom-and-his-varying-degrees-of-Natural-Reason pre-determined by Nature, the degrees of which determined the new power-prestige order, was a Sanction no longer guaranteed by religious, but rather by theoretical systems.

Man represented as the *res cogitans* (The thinking subject) in a relation to his symbolically inverted unmarked state, the res extensa (extended matter) in the Cartesian conceptual formation, now only had to follow Natural Law as revealed to him through that Natural Reason, allotted to him by Natura Cogitans in whose image he was made. In this abduction schema all that pertained to Natura extensa was represented as being made for his use, in the Calvinist reformulation of the Judaic anti-physis. (Baudrillard, 1975:63)

In the secularized Calvinism of the morphogenetic fantasy of classarchy, Natural Reason came to take the place of Noble Blood as the Norm-criterion and Major referent of the new power prestige order. As with degrees of Grace in the Calvinist theological schema of Divine predestination, so degrees of Natural Reason allotted by Nature came to be 'signified' by specific indicii,

the central one of which was the degree of property owned, and represented as accumulated in the State-of-Nature in the Lockean schema. (MacPherson, 1962) Whilst all men were born equal-in-the-State-of-nature, this equality lay in the fact that they were all equally-subjected-to-natural-Predestination, which determined the election of the norm of the order and the related determined heirarchical structure of social relations.

For the first time in human history homo did not start off with an unconditionally guaranteed identity. The dynamism of classarchy, its incredible creativity and unparalleled destructiveness, derived from the fact that identity for the first time was put in play, was put in doubt. In the schema of Calvinist predestination, man could never know how much Grace he had been allotted, whether or not he had been saved. Equally middle class man could not know how much Natural Reason he had been apportioned, whether or not he had been 'elected' to the Place of the Norm. Degrees of capital-property ownership, of success became, however, a central signifier of the degrees of Natural Reason that had fallen to one's share; of the degrees of one's naturally allotted human merit, status, value.

Those who owned property were now indicated as a 'we-who-are-of-the-same-nature". This indication was sustained by the macro abduction system of connaturality and its related arsenal of significations'. Beginning with the Levellers of the English Puritan Revolution, a linkage was established between freedom and the ownership of property. Freemen were those who had enough property to put their own labor to work, those therefore, not coercable

by the will of others. Voting rights for the new political system of classarchy was therefore restricted to Freemen. In the abduction schema of Man-as-Liber, as it functioned in Europe, the unmarked State, the key representant, was no longer a single group as in patriarchy, but that of a category -- i.e. the Servants/Almstakers category (Macpherson, 1962). Women, not allowed to own property and the "wards" of Freeman 'were a part of the res extensa category; a key representant of "natural difference," the classificatory principle of connaturality.

Man-as-Liber functioned as the analogical construct of the Absolute space and time of the Newtonian represented universe, the cognitive charter which now subtended the socio-symbolic universe.⁴ In its Lockean reformulation, the sovereignty of the 'freeman' became that of the 'sovereign individual'.

The partial freedom of the individual Freeman took precedence over the freedom of the constituents of the social process-as-a-whole. This displacement of logical type by which a member of the class can be erroneously substituted for the class of classes⁵ was the key falsification, the area of the sacred and socially entrenched clause' (Gellner, 1974) crucial to the dynamic functioning of the laws of form of classarchy; to its systems of accumulation, distribution and related modes of calculation.

In the United States of America, as Jefferson revealed in the algebraic equation with which he represented Blacks as being able to acquire the rights of citizens (the vote) only through breeding 'upwards; through varying degrees of 'whitening', the key signifier of the status of Freeman was not the ownership of property.⁶ Rather one got the vote as a naturally-Free-because-

born-a-white man. The Man-as-Free-white-man construct needed, for its indication, the grounding distinction of the Black as naturally born-not-free-and-not-white. The America that Jefferson invented (Gorry Wills, 1979) was a recycled mode of classarchy in its FREE WHITEMAN form. The Black-as-Negro functioned in American classarchy as Women had functioned in patriarchy, as the key representant of Not-the-place-of-the-Phallus.

Incest had functioned as the key prohibition of patriarchy, one which sustained the indication 'we-of-the-same-blood' as against the They-not-of-the-same-blood. In the same manner the prohibition of miscegenation also functioned to define natural difference as the bonding-and-defining principle of the socio-symbolic universe of North America. Miscegenation, like incest, functioned at the level of the abduction schema as the prohibition of miscategorization, i.e., the crucial injunction against breaching the categories which subtend the laws of form of the order. Hence the rigidity of the 'native' cultural model of North American classarchy; a rigidity noted by the Eritrean anthropologist Asmaron Legesse:

"One of the many immutable prescriptive rules in America is the classification of human beings into Blacks and Whites. These are mutually exclusive categories in the sense that one cannot be both Black and White at the same time. One cannot help but be impressed by the extreme rigidity of this native model. It denies the fact that Blacks and Whites do marry and enter into elaborate illicit sexual liaisons. The myth of the two races is preserved by the simple rule that all the offspring of interracial unions are automatically classified as Blacks." (Asmaron Legesse, 1974: 258)

The world economic world system set in place from the fifteenth century onwards was also bonded and held in place by

the constituting analogy of classarchy and its related categories. Here the Freeman was naturally -- White-and-Western. Whilst this indication was secured by a strategy of symbolic inversion in which a series of excluded others (the unmarked state of the res extensa categories) represented and produced as such at both the symbolic, theoretical and empirical levels of the order, the main representant of the grounding division was again the Black, since he served to represent the White-Western Freeman construct as the Norm of the Human, whilst African "non-culture" served as the symbolic inversion of Western culture as the Norm of Human Culture .

Hence the centrality of the Black-White Distinction to the structuring code of classarchy:

"The black revolt aims at race as a code, at a level more radical than economic exploitation...No other culture besides ours has produced the systematic distinction of Black and White. And this distinction applies not as an afterthought but as a structural element which is reproduced ever more dynamically today under the appearances of a flattering liberal universalism. And the objectification of the Black as such is not that of exploited labor power, but an objectification by the code. One can easily verify that it is sustained by a whole arsenal of significations, irreducible to economic and political determinations. The emancipated and embourgeoisified black remains a Black, just as the proletarianized immigrant remains first of all an immigrant, as the Jew remains a Jew. Again the code re-emerges with more violence in everything that would seem to suppress it...(Baudrillard, 1975:136).

If the Black-White Distinction functioned to fix the Major Referent and optative identity for all groups and races, the gender-distinction, man/woman functioned to replicate the representation of 'natural Difference' which bonds the order, enabling it to function as a sociodicy, i.e., an order whose empirical

everyday praxis justifies the ways of the order to itself. Both the Black-White and the Gender distinction as well as the related 'naturalness' of heterosexuality to the 'unnaturalness' of all forms of non-heterosexuality, served to substantialize the order's discourse of justification. The discourse articulated in the cognitive charter of Liberalism, represents all socially constituted inequalities and hierarchies as the 'natural' result of varying degrees of innate Natural Merit. This construct of Natural Merit functions, like the Divine sanction of the European medieval world order, to legitimate the structure of social relations necessary to the reproduction and replication of the Norm-status of the property-owning middle class.

With the Russian Revolution however, a new intermediate caste, the intelligentsia as a class for-itself, redefined the 'constituting analogy' of Man-as-Liber. The freemen as Man-in-General was displaced by the construct Labor-in-General. In the new variant of the middle class abduction schema, man is represented as producing himself through his labor, as defined by this labor-identity. Man's productive-material-labor was now represented as the single source of economic and of metaphysical human value. Whilst Man-as-Labor was historically equal, a new power prestige order based on incremental levels of skill - trained skilled 'labor' was represented as increments of unskilled labor -- displaced the earlier variant of degrees of ownership capital/Natural Reason. Since Man's identity as labor was guaranteed by the cognitive charter of the 'scientific truth' of Marxism Leninism, the trained intelligentsia, able to decipher

this "truth" through their 'correct consciousness' were legitimated as the Vanguard-brain to the brawn of the working classes; as the new Norm-identity, the Party ideologue, bearer of the correct discourse whose inverted Other was the Zek, the deviationist; as the Kulak (8) was the inverted other of Man-as-Labor.

Thus at the global level, the secular sovereignty of the middle Western middleclass model of identity in both variants was secured by a strategy of inversion (9) in which a series of excluded others, represented and socially produced as such, at the symbolic empirical and metaphysical levels serve, by their patterns of interaction and normal everyday social praxis, to verify the "reality" of the order as "demonstrably true"; its mode of sociality as demonstrably "naturally" or "historically predetermined"; its "regime of truth" as universally objective, as scientific and therefore unconditional, "truth".

As thought systems derived from the underlying morphogenetic fantasy of classarchy, both Liberalism and Marxism-Leninism function as legitimating discourses which inscribe and articulate the "regime of truth" (Foucault, 1980) on which the mode of sociality of classarchy is based.

Feminisms which function within the frames of reference of the "objective truth" of Liberalism or of the "scientific truth" of Marxim-Leninism, logically function to reinscribe and reinforce the very system which compels women to signify otherness, to put the code of the order into practice, into play.

An autonomous frame of reference, rather than protesting against "male supremacy" (Liberal feminism) or "capitalist supremacy" (Marxist-Leninist feminism) sets out to deconstruct and

decode the underlying morphogenetic fantasy which dictates multiple modes of supremacy---including the discursive supremacy of vanguard feminists (usually middle class, white, and western european) over their inverted excluded others, i.e., those who lack the series of norm-signifiers, and are non-middle class, and/or non-white, and/or non-western european. An autonomous frame of reference for feminism, paradoxically puts the discourse of feminism itself into question.

Part Two: Notes Toward a Particular/Universal Feminism
In Its Own Name.

"That this rupture can be in complicity with the Law or, rather, that it can constitute a point of departure for even deeper changes...that is the major problem" (Kristeva, 1974:494)

Alice Jardine quote the above statement in her introduction to Kristeva's article 'Women's Time' (in Signs, Vol. 7, No. I., Aut. 1981:5). In a footnote Jardine further explains that although Kristeva specifically referred, in that statement, to the 'rupture' made by "experiments in poetic language at the end of the nineteenth century", the question that she poses, i.e., rupture as a recycling of the Law of the abduction schema or rupture as exodus, expatriation (Jefferson) and entry into the new--constitutes for Kristeva" the principal focal point when thinking about all major forces of change" (Jardine, 1981:5 No. 1).

There are several tendencies in the discourse of contemporary feminism which promise a rupture constitutive of a point o

departure outside of complicity with the Law. However, since like all the movements of the Sixties, feminism functions as an autonomized particularity, rather than as a particularity constitutive of a new non-middle class mode of universality, these tendencies, can be 'neutralized and reduced' by their conjuncture with one or the other legitimating discourse as was the workers' movement of the nineteenth century (Baudrillard, 1975:152); and the twentieth century movements of national and cultural Liberation in the Third World.

If, as Baudrillard argues, the meeting of a radical theory of revolution with an objective workers' movements lead to a situation in which each 'rationalized in the image of the other' effected a short-circuiting of the dialectic of revolution, this short-circuiting has also been effected by the post-Sixties conjuncture of the multiple movements of intellectual and cultural Reformation that erupted in North America and in Europe, with the recycled theories of Neo-Liberalism and Neo-Marxism.

The short-circuiting of all these global movements is the short-circuiting of an emergent global popular cultural revolution directed against the cultural sovereignty of classarchy. Feminism, in its own name is a constitutive part of this worldwide popular cultural revolution.

Such a revolution logically calls for a breakout from the order of classarchy, whether in its 'free world' or 'Soviet Democracy' forms. Since the theoretical models of Liberalism and of Marxism-Leninism function reflexly -- much as the immune system functions with respect to the physical body -- to defend the 'order of things' of their respective variants of classarchy,

from whose laws of functioning they derive their correlative conditions of existence,¹⁰ an autonomous frame of reference for feminism, must, logically call these models into question.

Two such recent callings in question indicate a rupture attempting to free itself from the complicity of the Law. One of these is the call for pay for housewives and the call for 'comparable worth', i.e., equal pay for the same jobs done regardless of gender distinction. The other is the refusal to accept that definition of women's sexuality which limits it to the represented Norm of genital heterosexuality.

The force of both of these questionings lie^s in the challenge that they make to the abductive logic of the systems of representation; and the related mode of calculation and intra-evaluative competencies by which the hegemony, of the male over the female, of White over Black, middle class over non-middle class, of the West over the non-West, is legitimated.

FEMINISM IN ITS OWN NAME AND THE FORM REPRESENTATION:

WOOLF'S CONSTRUCT OF THE LOOKING GLASS VISION

Marx, Baudrillard points out, settled accounts with the bourgeoisie's representation of homo oeconomicus but left the form - 'representation' unanalysed. Yet, as Foucault argues, there can be no science of man except we study the ways in which, from within the life that he lives, within the forms of production that governs that life, man represents to himself that life. There is a disjuncture then between the form production and the form representation.

A feminism in its own name takes the form representation as the object of its inquiry. Not its sexuality or its role in the mode of production but rather the representation mode of these; and the role that these representations play in the legitimation of multiple forms of coercion, of social and psychic domination; its role then in the structuring code of the order, a code which, to borrow Richard Dawkins point with respect to the functioning of the genetic code, uses its human agents as its 'survival machines', as the mechanisms through which it articulates its own intentionality. (Hinde, 1982:262)

A feminism in its own name directs its revolt not against the agents of the code, male or capitalist supremacists, but against the code itself. Above all, it subverts the code by refusing its own prescribed role in the empirical articulation of its representations; in effect by coming out of the closet, moving out of our assigned categories.

For like the Black/White distinction, the gender-model distinction is crucial to the code's reproduction and replication.

"The revolt of women," Baudrillard writes, "aims at the code that makes the feminine a non-marked term...this revolt is no longer that of the economically exploited...it aims at...the imposition of the code which inscribes the present strategy of social domination. It is this mark that the women's revolt aims at, not the claims, democratic and rationalist, of political or sexual rights to equality...Not the accession of women to the code that is, the turning of the code in their favor, but the abolition of the code". (Baudrillard, 1975:136)

WOOLF AND THE LOOKING GLASS VISION: THE CHARTER OF FEMINISM IN ITS OWN NAME.)

Woolf's A Room of One's Own is the founding charter of a feminism in its own name. The revelation that she makes of the concrete coercive power of systems of representation remains unequalled. Before Bateson, her concept of the Looking Glass Vision had already analysed for us, the mode of functioning of the morphogenetic fantasy of classarchy; had seized the form representation as the primary object of critical analysis.

"Life for both sexes", she wrote, "is arduous...More than anything perhaps, creatures of illusion that we are, it calls for confidence in oneself... And how can we begin to generate that imponderable quality most quickly? By thinking that other people are inferior to oneself. By thinking that one has some innate superiority---it may be wealth or rank, or a straight nose, or the portrait of a grandfather by Romney---for there is no end to the pathetic devices of the human imagination -- over other people. Hence the enormous importance to a patriarch who has to conquer, who has to rule, of feeling that great numbers of people, half the human race, are by nature, inferior to himself. It must indeed be one of the chief sources of his power. Without that source of power, probably the earth would still be swamp and jungle. The glories of our wars would be unknown...Supermen and fingers of destiny would never have existed...(M) irrors are essential to all violent and heroic actions...That is why Napoleon and Mussolini insist so emphatically upon the inferiority of women for if they were not inferior, they would cease to enlarge. That serves to explain in part the necessity that women are to men. And it serves to explain how restless they are under her criticism. For if she begins to tell the truth, the figure in the looking glass shrinks, his fitness for life is diminished. How is he to go on giving judgement, civilizing natives, making laws, writing books unless he can see himself...at twice the size he really is. The looking glass vision is of supreme importance because it charges glass the vitalities; it stimulates the nervous system. Take it away and man may be like the drug fiend deprived of his cocaine (Woolf, 1929:35-37)

FEMINISM IN ITS OWN NAME: THE 'BEGINNING TO TELL THE TRUTH' OF
DALLA COSTA/JAMES AND MACKINNON:

With the call for pay for housewives, the Looking Glass began to 'tell the truth'. This call began as a movement in Italy in 1974. (Davis, 1982:233). The danger that this call represented to the system of representation of classarchy lead to the defence of the 'natural' order of things, i.e., the liberal order. There were reactive responses by Marxist Leninists, too. These responses sought to theoretically outlaw this heresy. Charnie Guettel's cogent and well argued booklet--Marxism and Feminism, Ontario, 1974 -- is an excellent example of the discursive strategies by which the heresy of the pay-for-housewives call was contained, by the abductive logic of Marxism Leninism.>

"Another strategy which starts from woman's role as house keeper". Guettel wrote, "is the movement for state pay for wives and mothers which sometimes justifies itself in the name of Marxist economics. Its most recent proponents are Manarosa dalla Costa and Selma James. By Dalla Costa's logic, women should be remunerated for producing labor power, for performing maintenance chores for children and husbands. But in Marxist economics we do not call reproduction of the family 'production' precisely because it cannot happen unless the family is supported by someone engaged in production, whether it be the man, the woman or both. Housework no matter how much work is involved, is still unproductive consumption economically speaking. Insofar as woman is relegated to the sphere of consumption her power is reduced. Measures must be taken that decrease women's role as reproducer rather than solidify here in that place" (Guettel, 1980:48)

What we must note here is the representation by the discourse, of housework as the Looking Glass Vision of the 'real' activity, i.e., of production. And the abduction schema of Marxism Leninism which is based on the central concept of exploitation--i.e., Labor is the true source of value, profit expro-

riated by the capitalists, is the 'surplus' value that results from the extra value of the worker's labor power, and the lesser wages paid him by the employer -- unravels when the housewives, calling for pay, suggests that 'exploitation' takes place in multiple forms inside and outside the factory, outside the process of production; which therefore suggests that the accumulation of value through production is a subset of multiple global and societal processes of such accumulation.

Thus Angela Davis, although more sympathetic to the call, must by the logic of her discourse, also stigmatize the housewives' call for the heresy that it is. She too reasserts an order of value between real productive labor, (the *res cogitans* category) and mere maintenance (the *res extensa* category).

"The demand that housewives be paid" she writes "is based on the assumption that they produce a commodity as important and valuable as the commodities that their husbands produce on the job...(But housework)...cannot be defined as an integral component of capitalist production. It is rather related to production as a precondition... The capitalist presupposes a body of exploitable workers..." (Davis, 1982:234-235)

MODES OF CALCULATION AND THE CLOSED SYSTEMS OF ABDUCTIVE THOUGHT:

Both Guettel and Davis go directly to the crucial point. For what is at issue here is the entire logic of classarchy's discourse of justification; and of the related mode of calculation and laws of distribution which enable the replication and reproduction of the global domination of the middle classes.

For the proposal of pay for housework calls into question a mode of calculation by which until hitherto, housewives were not

paid; by which women and other res extensa categories could not get 'comparable worth' remuneration. And yet until the women's challenges that mode of calculation had seemed objectively exact and unconditional.

If we note the close parallel between the representation of the housewives' mere maintenance role and that of the Third world, as only being engaged in the lesser production of 'raw materials' as contrasted to the 'real' productive activity of the First World, the point of the Marxist-Leninist distinction begins to emerge. For except an order of value is kept between 'real' production, and the rest of the related process -- as-a-whole in whose context the activity of 'production' takes place, an insoluble problem would arise. By which mode of calculation is the global social product, and the accumulated value produced by the coordination of the multiple contributing activities of all peoples, ^{to} be rationally redistributed? How can multiple factors, each symbiotically providing the conditions of existence for the other, none realizable without the network of the others, be assessed objectively? How else, except by a mode of calculation which elects one of the multiple factors as the Major Referent and General equivalent of Distribution - the investor of capital in the case of the capitalist mode of calculation; the owner of Labor-Value in the case of the Laborist mode of calculation?

It is here that the abduction schema of classarchy plays a determining role. For the Single Factor selected, is, in both cases, isomorphic with the Norm status characteristic, of the power prestige order ¹² of both variants of classarchy; isomor-

phic then with the Major Social Referent, about which the socio-symbolic universe of each variant of classarchy is organized.

Since property/capital is the signifier of the Norm in one case and labor the signifier of the Norm in the other, the process of production in which these factors appear central must be indicated as the marked state. Thus as Cutler, Hindess, and Hirst point out, the Marxian discourse which represents productive Labor as the Single Source of value and absolute Referent must function as a tautological and closed discourse, which presupposes labor time as the General Equivalent of value and then "proves" its presupposition:

"Marx," they write "conceives exchange as an equation, as the identity of distinct commodities in a third term which is a property common to both. Why must exchange be an equation? Why must one definite property (labor-time) be the form in which it is attained...? Exchange must be conceived as equation if the discourse of capital is to produce its particular concept of value...that concept...necessary to the theory of 'surplus value'. Exchange must be conceived in terms of labor-time, the equation of labor-times, if Marx's concept of value is to be possible. Thus labor-time and value as categories hegemonise in the discourse the analysis of exchange-proportionality...What makes ratios in which goods exchange against one another necessary rather than incidental? What makes these necessary proportions the forms of equations of labor-times?...In Capital value is a concept which both explains...and goes beyond exchange-relations. The reason for this necessary proportionality in exchange, and this equation of labor-times which underlies it is the "law of value" as a law of distribution of social labor...It is also necessary to all systems of social production. In the case of this 'law' taking the form of value (value-in-exchange) it expresses the fact of the division and the interdependence of the members of the society as independent producers. Why should the members of this society be united by the equation of their divided labors? Why should they, i.e., their labors, be equated and equated as labor-times? These questions pose the problems of the foundation of the form of the measure (labor-time)...

Marx's concept of exchange as equation makes possible a definite range of questions concerning profits. If profit is defined as the difference between the receipts from the sale of the product and the cost of production it may be asked what determines this difference? Various economic theories attempt to give a single general explanation of the difference and to connect it with the "revenues" of the different classes or "factors" entering into production. Thus profit may be conceived as the return on the factor of production 'capital' as the reward for entrepreneurial skill and as compensation for risk taking. All these explanations are dominated by a conception of bourgeois right in that they suppose 'profit' is the reward for effort spent, opportunities foregone or risks taken: such actions by the possessors of capital or skill require equity returns of a roughly commensurate or equivalent nature...Capital, in conceiving exchange as the equation of labor-times...sets the condition for discovering the origin of profit in labor-times...Central also is the notion that the socially necessary labor-time contributions of the producers determine the ratios in which commodities exchange, that the product can be represented as a totality of labor-times...This form and this foundation enable Marx to define the problem of the determinants of profit in such a way as to ascribe it to an origin in the labor contributions of the producers to the product...Without this measure...there can be no effective theory of surplus value...If one does not seek a single general determinant of profit, rejecting Marxist and orthodox general accounts of their origin and accepting that the profits capitalists enterprises actually make have no single origin...then there can be no a priori reason to conceive exchange in this way." (Cutler, Hindess, Hirst, 1977 Vol. 1:17-19)

SINGLE ORIGIN OF PROFIT? OR MULTIPLE DETERMINANTS?

Here the call, as Dalla Costa puts it, for the housewife's" production of labor power to be rewarded, finds its theoretical legitimation as one factor in the multiple determinants of profits. This links the particular perspective of feminism to the perspectives of the multiple *res extensa* categories who function in the process-as-a-whole. And if, as Samir Amin points out, a Western-centered Marxism, by privileging production as the site

of the accumulation of value, oversees the multiple factors of accumulation in the global process-as-a-whole, Anuar Abdel Malek, from the perspective of the non-Western peoples, has also pointed to the same oversight of the global-process-of-accumulation, an oversight enabled by the Liberal and Marxian privileging of 'productive-labor' as the source of accumulation.

The Western world-system as it exists today, Anuar Abdel Malek writes, began with the west's military expansion from the time of the Crusades onwards. With the destruction of all alternative cultural systems and systems of power, the West effected a sustained process of coerced accumulation from the non-Western world over 'centuries of domination'. Yet the same marginalization that Guettel effects with the accumulation-role of the housewife is effected by Western revolutionary theory with respect to that of the non-West. For in its system of representation Marxism-Leninism displaces the class of classes--the historical global process by which a single network of accumulation was forcibly installed, with all the peoples of the planet harnessed to the accumulation-project that defines the middle class, model-of-identity, their life activities forcibly geared to the telos of accumulation through the interdependent processes of production, consumption and circulation -- with a member of the class, ie.e, the productive process of the West.

Thus Anuar Abdel Malek points out, Western revolutionary theory remains fixated on the construct of 'capitalist surplus value' as if 'the main thing in the history of mankind were the last stage of the class struggle in class societies, during which the capitalists were to exploit the workers" (Anuar Abdel Malek,

1979). With this representation, all non-Western movements are represented as marginal compared to the real class struggle of the Western proletariat; in the same way as housewives' work is represented as mere maintenance. This representation enables the imposition of a power prestige order of differential value between the Western class struggle, the Black race struggle, the struggle against sexism, and non-Western national-cultural struggles. And the abductive logic of the theory responds to the frame of reference of the constituting analogy of man-as-labor.

The frame of reference of Man-as-Labor, as the constituting analogy implicit in the discourse of Guettel and Davis, must logically privilege the process of production, according to the laws of its abductive logic. For in the abduction schema of Marxism-Leninism, man defines himself as human by the process in which he produces-himself-as-value. Equally in the abduction schema of Liberalism the work-productive ethic and site is imperative if man is to 'prove' the degrees of Grace, Natural Reason, Natural Merit allotted him. Both discourses must then function, above all, to 'produce' Production as the General Equivalent of all the contributing processes; to represent its 'accidental property' as the fixed reference.

The tautological point of this is captured by a point made by Kripke:

...Wittgenstein says something very puzzling about this. He says: "There is one thing of which one can say neither that it is one meter long nor that it is not one meter long, and that is the standard meter in Paris....I think he must be wrong...Part of the problem which is bothering Wittgenstein is, of course that this stick serves as a standard of length and so we can't attribute length to it...But there is no reason to so

conclude...For he's using this definition not to give the meaning of what he called the 'meter' but to fix the reference...He uses it to fix a reference. There is a certain length which he wants to mark out. He marks it out with an accidental property namely that there is a stick of that length. Someone else might mark out the same reference by another accidental property." (Kripke, 1972, 274)

Yet with the production-process as the fixed referent, the equal expenditures of their life potentialities, contributed by housewives and the Third World, with their life activities producing the conditions of existence for the production process as the production process provides the conditions of existence for their processes, had logically to be calculated as of minimal value.

Such a mode of calculation logically lead to the linked processes of enrichment and of impoverishment. Barbara Ward gave the figures of this socially produced ratio of difference between the First and the Third World, and her figures were quoted by Nyerere:

Seventy percent of the world's population--the Third World--commands together no more than twelve percent of the Gross World Product. Eighty percent of the world's trade and investment, ninety-three percent of its industry, and almost 100 percent of its research is controlled...by the industrial rich. The income gap is getting wider, even between the industrialized and so-called "higher-income" Third World countries. (Ward quoted by Julius Nyerere, 1980)

This ratio of difference finds its parallel in the recently noted 'feminization of poverty', even in the recent 'comparable worth' dispute where the metaphysics of the man as the 'real' breadwinner, (Guettel) sets up an order of value between respective life expenditures. In all cases it is clear that the mode of calculation responds to the abductive logic of the

constituting analogy and its related morphogenetic fantasy.

The call for equal pay for housewives, and for 'comparable worth' pay challenges, by implication, the system of representation of classarchy and the logic of the closed theoretical systems which make this mode of calculation, 'calculable'. The call for housewives and equal pay threater above all, to unfix the Referent.

Unfixing the Referent: Coming out of the Closet of Closed Systems:

Within the abduction schema of classarchy, the Social Referent of class supremacy is nowhere more firmly fixed than in the form of race, i.e., Black/White, and in the form of sexuality-difference. Homosexuality with its 'arsenal of significations' inherited from Christianity, plays, at the deep recesses of the psyche, a central role in the representation of 'natural difference', i.e., of binary distinction between 'natural' heterosexuality and 'unnatural homosexuality. Nowhere is the Norm Referent of the 'natural' more firmly fixed than in the representation of heterosexuality.

Here the signification system of the 'natural' is hard wired in the deep roots of the culture. As Schneider points out, Americans think their social order on the analogy of the 'natural'

"...in American culture...it is man's place to dominate nature, to control it, to use nature's powers for his own ends...In American culture man's fate is seen as one which follows the injunction, Master Nature. His science and technology and much of his life is devoted to that task. In American culture man is defined as being very much a part of nature, obeying the laws of

nature just like everything else. The antithesis of the first paragraph is thus denied in the second... (The latter is) one part of nature with which man has made his peace and in terms of which he is content to find his fate. What is out there in nature, says the definitions of American culture, is what kinship is. Kinship is the blood relationship, the fact of shared biogenetic substance. Kinship is the mother's bond of flesh and blood with her child, and her maternal instinct is her love for it. This is nature; these are natural things; these are 'the ways of nature'. To be otherwise is unnatural, artificial, contrary to nature." (Schneider, 1968:107)

The second 'rupture that attempts to conceptualize a feminism in its own name, to move outside the' complicity of the Law is that of Cathrine MacKinnon. Her discourse refuses the Fixed single Referent of heterosexuality, as the housewives' call for wages refuses the Fixed Referent of 'productive Labor'. Both 'ruptures' move in the arena of Woolf's analysis, coming out of the closet of the closed systems of the legitimating discourses of classarchy. Both ruptures tend, then, to unfix the Single Referent.

As Mackinnon notes, the partial representation of the potential sexual range of female sexual responses, enables a mode of measurement which establishes heterosexuality as the General Equivalent of sexuality, as the major referent. When she writes that the 'point is to avoid measuring Lesbian sexuality, hence women's sexuality, by heterosexual' (i.e., male-defined) standards, she, however, lets slip by the real rupture, i.e., the chance to relativize the Referent, to deconstruct its unconditionality. Thus women's sexuality would be here a class of classes able to contain both Lesbian and heterosexuality as different forms of each other.

In this context the taboo on Lesbian sexuality would result not so much because it threatens to "make men sexually irrelevant" but for more from the fact that it unfixes and relativizes both heterosexuality as the general Equivalent of Sexuality, and at a more complex level, it deconstructs and relativizes all General equivalents of identity; relativizes all referents.

Thus to come out of the closet as a Lesbian -- or as a Black who before had worn white masks -- is not so much to declare "loss of male sexual access," a concept which still moves in the property-rights schema of classarchy, but is far more to breach the great macro-distinction of Natural and Unnatural, to breach the distinction between the Norm res cogitans (productive labor, heterosexuality) and the pariah res extensa (maintenance-housework, Blackness, lesbianism) categories.

And in her analysis of the relation between a Feminist Studies stigmatized as 'subjective', as the symbolic inversion of the represented objectivity of the frame of reference of the order, McKinnon's theoretically breaches just such a distinction. Instead of disputing the 'subjective' stigma she calls in question the represented universality of the stigmatizers.

"Peminism," she writes, "does not see this view as subjective, partial or undetermined, but as a critique of the purported generality. disinterestedness and universality of prior accounts. It stands as a critique of the partiality, specifically of the masculinity of such views; and finally as a

critique of the imperative for universality itself: of a perspective as a strategy of male hegemony." (MacKinnon, unpublished ms.:41)

If we transpose the term Norm hegemony for the construct male hegemony, the "universality and partiality" of prior accounts can be grasped not as the particular perspective of individual men, but rather as that of the constituting analogy Man-as-Liber, a perspective which articulated its discourse through its Norm agents. In this context her formulation of the interrelation between systems of power and systems of representation, realizes Kristeva's call for a feminism able to call in question the very apparatus of the order. (Kristeva, 1981)

McKinnon first quotes Simone de Beauvoir: "Representations of the world "De Beauvoir wrote "like the world itself, is the work of men; they describe it from their own point of view, which they confuse with absolute truth".

McKinnon comments:

"The issue suggests that the parallel between representation and construction should be sustained; that men create the world from their own point of view that this then becomes the truth to be described. This is a closed system, not anyone's confusion. Power to create the world from one's own point of view is the paradigm of power in its male form." (MacKinnon, Unpublished MS.:41)

SEXISM AS THE GENERAL EQUIVALENT OF SUPREMACY

However as we have seen in the case of Guettel and Davis, the power to create the world from a point of view is not so much the power of males or of females, but rather that of a social group, whose norm point of view it is; the point of view of a

class; of its cultural system.> Here the point of view is dually objective -- it is the point of view of the construct Man-as-Labor, and subjective, that is, the frame of reference of women, in their implicit, class identity. And if Davis' point of view is more flexible than that of Guettel it is precisely because she must experientially move in multiple frames of reference, only one which, that of the intelligentsia, is the frame of reference of the Norm.

Hence Davis is able to chart the dangers of a Feminism that, Liberal or neo-Liberal, becomes 'immured in a narrow, provincialism' or that attempts to displace the class of classes, i.e., multiple forms of supremacy, with a member of its class, i.e., sexism.

Here too Guettel's Marxist perspective calls in question the strategy by which Shulamith Firestone attempts to make the sexism discourse acquire discursive supremacy; to, in fact, make it, like the Marxist discourse, the general equivalent of all modes of 'oppression'.

"For Firestone all other oppressions stem from the original oppression of the patriarchal family. For example racism is a justification for whites treating the blacks like children in the 'family of man'." This kind of feminist analysis, Guettel then points out by marginalizing racism, logically ignores the special position of Black women in a sexist, racist and class society. (Guettel, 1974) The paradox is that Firestone's sexism-model reenacts the autonomized labor-model in whose context Guettel makes her critique.

The consequence for a feminism -in-its-own-name of autono-

mizing a sexist frame of reference as an entity in itself, rather than as one specific form of resistance to the system of social domination as a whole, is that of falling into the ideology of all modes of autonomization (Baudrillard, 1975:148). This then makes it difficult for a feminism in its own name to make that final thrust to conceptualize itself outside of the complicity of the law.

For what the special position of the Black woman suggests, and the history of that position, is that the Marxian concept of exploitation, is only one form of multiple mechanisms of coercion and of domination. And as Foucault suggests, these forms of coercion exist and are implemented at all levels of the society; and we are all involved as coercers and coerced in a complex system whose system of representations and abduction schema themselves coerce us. (Foucault, 1978:96:97)

It is part of the cunning of the code of classarchy that it displaces hostility from itself onto its representant agents, who as Virginia Woolf glimpsed, are as coerced into their own roles as guardians of the boundaries of the category system of classarchy as are those whom they ceorce in the implementation of their guardianship.

Thus in commenting on the innumerable books written by male professors 'proving' the 'natural inferiority' of woman, Woolf comment:

"How explain the anger of the professors? Why were they angry. For when it came to analysing the impression left by these books there was always an element of heat...Anger I called it. But it was anger that had gone underground and mixed itself with all kinds of other emotions...Yet it seemed absurd...that a

man with all this power should be angry, Or is anger...the attendant sprite on power: Rich people...are often angry because they suspect that the poor want to seize their wealth. The professors or patriarchs...might be angry for that reason partly, but partly for one that lies a little less obviously on the surface. Possibly they were not angry at all. Possibly when the professor insisted a little too emphatically upon the inferiority of women he was concerned not with their inferiority but with his superiority. That was what he was protecting rather hotheadedly, and with too much emphasis, because it was a jewel to him of the rarest price." (Woolf, 1957:34-39).

Here, Woolf's recognition of the almost objective nature of the Professor's 'anger', links a feminist perspective, coming through its own frame of reference, to a Black frame of reference coming through its own. For Carter G. Woodson too, in his Mis-education of the Negro (1933) also noted the same compulsion, to 'demonstrate' the 'natural inferiority' of the Negro in the organization of the scholarly curriculum. In the scholarly system of representations, the Negro was compelled to function as the Looking Glass vision of the 'White'; a vision designed to enlarge. Thus as Woodson noted, if the White was everything, in the system of representation the Black was nothing. Not only were blacks socialized to have contempt for themselves, Whites too were socialized into being lynchers. There would be no lynchers, Woodson wrote, if the lynching had not been prepared by the representation of the Negro coded by the scholarly system. Why not lynch a race, Woodson asked, that every one has been taught is inferior?

His analysis of 'scholarship' on the Negro, noted that it followed a pattern. If the White was represented as the embodiment of Reason, in history, the Negro was represented as inca-

pable of subduing passion with reason, as being only fit for their roles as hewers of wood and drawers of water. (Woodson, 1933)

Both perspectives, that of feminism and that of Black 'personalism' both then seeing from a Liminal/other perspective, are able to grasp the nature of the abductive logic of the system; of the 'objective' nature of its laws of its functioning. Here Thomas Kuhn's recent point about the teaching of the history of science in the schools, and the long subordination of the concrete facts of that history to the "incurable Whiggisness" of a representation more intent on proving the victory of Reason-over-Superstition than with the history of science in itself, (Kuhn, 1972) also reveals the logic of an abduction schema, functioning as a positive unconscious beyond the conscious intentionality of its bearers. (Foucault, 1973)

Feminism-in-its-own-name takes the abduction schema of classarchy as the object of its inquiry; as the target of its struggle of transformation. It knows that there are no absolute victims or victimizers, that class supremacy articulates itself through multiple modes of supremacy in which we are all involved. Racial supremacy, cultural supremacy, sexuality supremacy, discursive supremacy, the line between Norm and Other goes through all our consciousnesses.

And power as Foucault argues, "comes from below with no binary opposition between rulers and ruled." Instead "manifold relationships of force constitute a general line of force" with major dominations resulting as the hegemonic effects of all these confrontations.

However, where there is power, there is resistance, and the multiplicity of power relationships lead to a multiplicity of points of resistance, present "everywhere in the power network".

Because of this, Foucault argues:

There can be no... "single locus of Great Refusal, no soul of revolt, source of all rebellions or pure law of the revolutionary" > Instead there is a plurality of resistances, each of them a special case... And it is doubtless the strategic codification of these points of resistance that makes a revolution possible." (Foucault: 1978:96-97)

No point of resistance to its own specific mode of coercion can be fought in the terms of the other, as Foucault and Deleuze suggest in a recent interview. Thus if all modes of resistance are defined as a struggle against exploitation, one form of the struggle becomes hegemonic, i.e., the labor mode of resistance. This mode then defines the targets, methods, places and instruments of confrontation. Other modes, accepting the position of the 'labor struggle, also accept its... ideology and its motives for combat. As a result this leads to "total identification".

If the struggle is directed against power and its forms of coercion however, then "all those on whom power is exercised to their detriment, all who find it intolerable, can begin the struggle on their own terrain and on the basis of their proper activity (or passivity). In engaging in a struggle that concerns their own interests, whose objectives they clearly understand, and whose methods only they can determine, they enter into a revolutionary process." (Foucault, 1972:10)

However, a feminism in-its-own name, if it is not to be immured in the narrow particularism of an autonomized frame of reference--and here Angela Davis gives an excellent analysis of the temptations to White supremacy that such a feminism faces; to the 'centricity' of a Brownmiller who in defending women against rape, remains oblivious of the role she plays as the 'angry female professor' recycling, against her will, the most violent representation of all, that of the black-male-as-rapist (Davis, 1981:178); oblivious then of the massive psychosocial coercion inflicted on the lower class Black male socialized to desire 'pure white womanhood' as the status characteristic of true' manhood in a world in which he is empirically deprived of all the signifiers of humanhood in its middle class mode -- must nevertheless seek to effect a strategic universal coding of the multiple points of resistance.

In such strategic coding an autonomous feminism displaces the concept of capitalism -- the economic expression of a cultural order -- with that of classarchy. It displaces the concept of exploitation with that of a mode of calculation made to seem legitimate by multiple mechanisms of coercion, chief of which is the system of representations cycled and recycled by the scholarly system¹² according to the governing categories of the morphogenetic fantasy.

Since this fantasy is encoded not only in our everyday praxis, modes of self perception and desire, but in our very mode of identification, rooted in our subjectivities---and we must not, Foucault warns us, think of 'subjectivity as quite deep and

natural and not determined by social and political factors. The subjectivity that psychoanalysts deal with...we must be liberated from that type of subjectivity. We are prisoners of certain conceptions of ourselves and of our behaviour. We have to change our own subjectivity, our own relation to ourselves (Foucault, 1979:5)-----a shift out of this fantasy, this abduction schema where thought itself becomes impossible (Bateson) cannot take place without a conscious cultural revolution on the part of all the Liminal categories.

For it is the Liminal categories of every order who are alone able, Asmaron Legesse points out, to remind us that 'we need not forever remain prisoners of our prescriptions'; it is the liminal category who 'generates conscious change by exposing all the injustices inherent in structure' (Asmaron Legesse, 1973:271)

If the specificity of feminism lies in the specificity of our experiences as women in a male-defined world, this world is only one of the forms of a class-defined world, represented through a series of Norm definitions. Such a world depends for its normalcy on the Looking Glass Vision of multiple Liminal categories, including the Liminal category of the Proletariat who, as Baudrillard points out, is as locked into his class status as the Black in Race, the woman in gender. (Baudrillard, 1975)

This dialectic between the particularity of our own experience as women in a male-defined world and our universality as a constitutive part of the Liminal category in a Norm-defined world, reveals that we cannot seek a separate peace, as we hav

been tending to do since the Sixties, that our liberation as women must be necessarily co-evolutionary with a general liberation of concrete men and women from the governing categories of Western classarchy; from the master conceptions of its "global tyrannising discourses". (Foucault, 1980:83)

Edward Hall in Beyond Culture (1974) continues in the 'field of discovery' opened by the movements of the Sixties, and calls for an end to cultural illiteracy, i.e., our illiteracy about the cultural model, in which we live, about its standard presuppositions, and its 'deep undercurrents' which structure our lives, attitudes, actions, decisions 'in subtle but highly consistent ways that are not consciously formulated...(and)...that are only now beginning to be identified.'" He goes on to point out that man must embark on the greatest separation feat of all, the separation from the "grip of an unconscious culture (Hall, 1974:240)

A feminism in its own name takes as its primary theoretical task, that of creating the awareness called for by Michael Real, the awareness of the coercive force of symbols, of systems of representations; of their violence even. We must become conscious, Real argues "of the long range and large scale effects of establishing the dominant symbolic configurations in the minds of entire societies providing either constructive or destructive understandings of, and approaches to violence, sexuality, personal identity" (Real, 1977:269)

A feminism in its own name therefore turns 'materialist logic' on its head. Not the contradiction between the relations of production and the forces of production as the spur to change,

but rather the non-congruence between the intentionality of a cultural model, rapidly changing historical forces, and the major aspirations of women towards freedom in our age. (Edel, 1980)

A feminism in its own name therefore seeks that Copernican revolution in the human sciences which can enable us to control and govern those morphogenetic fantasies which now determine us. It defines its role as that of acting as a constitutive part of the global popular cultural revolution, one which will offer to mankind a breakthrough that goes even beyond the invention by the Western middle classes, of the natural sciences.

"The self-conscious human organism," Michael Real writes, "possesses unique communicative abilities, an animal symbolicum as Ernst Cassirer summarized it... Previous cultures may have been born of necessity. With the growth in human ability to understand and control symbols, and, through them, the environment, present and future cultures become matters of conscious choice." (Real, 1977:269)

FOOTNOTES

1. As Juliet Mitchell points out, in patriarchy it is "...fathers, not men, who have the determinate power. And it is a question neither of biology, nor of a specific society but of human society itself." (Juliet Mitchell, 1974: 408-409)
 2. I have developed the concept of a speciation code for humans from Louis Mayr's book on the variation of the species. I have argued elsewhere that cultural systems act as "isolating mechanisms" and therefore act essentially as "speciation" systems. The abduction schema of the order therefore begins with this specific mode of self-definition; and is derived from it.
 3. Rorty quotes Charles Taylor's idea that man is a self-defining animal so that with every change in his definition, there are changes in the terms in which he must be conceptually grasped. (Rorty, 1981: 350)
 4. See bibliography for the Mayr reference. Cf. Paul Goldstene's linkage of the Newtonian paradigm to the Lockean formulation. He argues that Lockean Liberalism emerged out of the Newtonian revolution in which "all realms of human concerns are subject to the natural laws which control the universe, the earth and man." (See Goldstene, 1977: 11-12)
 5. In his discussion of the work of Bateson, Lipset refers to Whitehead and Russell's proposition that when a class of classes - such as machinery - is confused with a member of its class, such as typewriter or record-players, a logical contradiction develops. (See Lipset, 1980: 189-190)
 6. The Jeffersonian algebraic formula is given to show how many "units of white blood" was necessary to "breed" a black man into a citizen. For the formula, see Gary Wills, 1979.
 7. Occidentalism, i.e., Western chauvinism, reenacts gender, class and race chauvinisms at the level of culture, i.e., culturalism. Fanon discusses the role that "the unilaterally decreed normative value" of Western culture plays in the power-prestige hierarchization of the world system. See Fanon, 1964.
- Asmarom Legesse analyzes the way in which the a priori assumption that Western culture is superior to all other cultures leads to a closed discourse made unscientific by unacknowledged "cultural loyalties." (See Legesse, 1973: 273-274)

For the formulation of the concept of a closed system w. discourse, the "closed predicament" vs. the "open predicament of a scientific framework" see Robin Horton, "African Thought and Western Science," pp. 153-155 in B. R. Wilson, ed., Rationality, Evanston, New York, 1970.

8. Solshenitsyn reveals the ways in which the metaphysical use of the label "kulak", i.e., as the antithesis to the norm of productive labor, enabled the legitimation of the reduction of the peasantry to the object of "primary accumulation." See Solshenitsyn, 1973: 55.
9. Renato Rosaldo develops Middleton's concept of "symbolic inversion" in which "the colonizers used the nomadic Ilongots as the opposed term to their own 'morally ideal' characteristics. See Rosaldo, 1978:254.
10. Hindess and Hirst conceptualize the relation between a discourse or theoretical system and its related forms of social praxis, with each providing the condition of existence for the other. See Hindess and Hirst, 1977: 271-276.
11. Cutler, Hindess and Hirst point out that "if agents are to engage in monetary calculation then, since monetry calculation is not an inborn attribute, definite modes of calculation must be culturally available." See Cutler, Hindess, Hirst, 1977: 271-276.
12. Baudrillard argues that "the scholarly and cultural systems are permitted to have formal autonomy (...theorized as democratic and universal truth. . .) so that through this autonomy-effect, the system can better carry out 'its ideologicall function' and renew most efficaciously the dominant social relations." He reverses the terms of the analysis. Instead of the economic system producing relations of production, it is the scholarly system tht plays "the decisive role in the production of social relations," whilst on the other hand the "economic can appear in our societies as the ... place ... of least conservatism in social relations." See Baudrillard, 1975:142.

Bibliography

- Abdel-Malek, Anuar. "Historical Surplus Value," in Review, Vol. III, No. I. New York: Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economics, Historical Systems and Civilizations, 1979.
- Amin, Samir. The Law of Value and Historical Materialism. Trans. B. Pearce. New York. M.R.P. 1978.
- Bateson, G. Mind and Nature: A Necessary Unity. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1979.
- Baudrillard, Jean. The Mirror of Production. Translated by Mark Poster. St. Louis: Telos Press, 1975.
- Berger, J. and Rosenholtz, S. and Zelditch, M. Status Organizing Processes. Technical Report No. 77. Stanford University, January, 1980.
- Cesaire, Aime. Lettre a Maurice Thorez. Paris: Presence Africaine, 1956.
- Davis, Angela. Women, Race & Class. New York: Random House, 1981.
- Edel, Abraham. Exploring Fact and Value: Science, Ideology, and Value Vol. 1, New Brunswick, Transaction, 1980.
- Fanon, Frantz. Black Skins, White Masks. New York, 1964.
- Foucault, Michel. The History of Sexuality. Vol. I: An Introduction. New York, Random House, 1978.
- Foucault, M. and Deleuze, G.: "Intellectuals and Power" in L'Arc, No. 49, March 4, 1972.
- _____. The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences. New York: Random House, 1973.
- _____. "Reason in the Service of State Power" in Campus Report, Stanford, CA, October 24, 1979.
- _____. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and other Writings, 1972-1977. Trans. Gordon, Marshall, Mephan, Soper. New York: 1980.
- Firestone, Shulamith. The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.
- Gellner, E. The Legitimation of Belief, London, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1974.

- Goldstone, Paul N. The Collapse of Liberal Empire: Science and Revolution in the Twentieth Century. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1977.
- Guettel, Charnie. Marxism and Feminism, Ontario: Guettel and Canadian Women's Educational Press, 1974.
- Hall, Edward. Beyond Culture. New York, 1974.
- Hinde, R.A., Ethology: Its Nature and Relations with Other Sciences. New York/Oxford: O.U.P. 1982.
- Hindess, Hirst. Mode of Production and Social Formation, 1977.
- Howard, D. The Marxian Legacy, London, Macmillan Press, 1977.
- James, C.L.R. Notes on Dialectics: Hegel and Marxism. Detroit, Friends of Facing Reality Publications, 1971.
- Jardine, A. "Introduction to Julia Kristeva's "Women's Time" in Signs, Vol. 7, No. I., Autumn, 1981, pp. 5-12.
- Kripke, Saul A. "Naming and Necessity." In Semantics of Natural Language. Edited by D. Davidson and G. Harman. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel Publishing Co., 1972.
- Kristeva, Julia. "Women's Time" in Signs Vol. 7, No. I, pp. 13-35.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. "The Relations Between History and History of Science." In Historical Studies Today. Edited by F. Gilbert and S. R. Graubard. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1972.
- Legesse, Asmarom. Gada: Three Approaches to the Study of An African Society. New York: The Free Press, 1973.
- Lipset, David. Gregory Bateson, The Legacy of a Scientist. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State: An Agenda for Theory". Unpublished M.S. April, 1981.
- MacPherson, C.B. The Political Theory of possessive Individualism: Hobbes to Locke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Mayr, L. Evolution and the Diversity of Life: Selected Essays, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976.
- Mitchell, J. Psychoanalysis and Feminism. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.
- Real, M. Mass-Mediated Culture, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Rorty, R. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature. New Jersey, Princeton University Press, 1979.

- Rosaldo, Renato, Jr. "The Rhetoric of Control: Ilongots Viewed as Natural Bandits and Wild Indians." In The Reversible World: Symbolic Inversion in Art and Society. Edited by B. A. Babcock. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Schneider, David. American Kinship: A Cultural Account. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Solzhenitsyn, Aleksandr I. The Gulag Archipelago 1918-1956: An Experiment in Literary Investigation, I-II. New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- Spencer-Brown, G. Laws of Form, New York: 1972.
- Wills, Garry. Inventing America: Jefferson's Declaration of Independence. New York: Random House, 1979.
- Woolf, Virginia. A Room of One's Own. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., 1929.
- Woodson, Carter G. The Miseducation of the Negro. New York: A.M.S. Press, 1977 (reprint of 1933 ed.,)