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Abstract
My purpose in this paper is to critically review various theoretical perspectives contained in the literature to come up with implications for a comprehensive model that captures the intersectionality of race, gender and class in the International System with special emphasis on gender. My theoretical model links the U.S. gender ‘project’ post World War II: the construction of the post war ‘nuclear family’ and the reinvention of women’s ‘sacred domestic sphere’ to the maintenance of gender oppression globally by the U.S. in a world dominated by it. The common ingredient in such oppression is the use of women as productive and reproductive labor, within a militarized global economy, together with the use of elements of the cultural lag, structurally perpetuated, of earlier modes of production as value ‘master symbols’ to legitimize such oppression and keep gender divisions salient. Since core nations benefit from core-periphery relationships, they keep such an order intact, this means that the core nations with the U.S. at their helm as hegemon are deeply implicated in the oppression of women in peripheral countries.
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In his pioneering work, The Power Elite (1956), C. Wright Mills stated that the power elite involves an ‘uneasy coincidence of economic, military, and political power’ (Mills, 1956, p. 278). Mills looked at the elite not as individuals that conspire together based on personal interests, rather he saw the elite as occupying dominant positions among the dominant institutions (military economic and political) of a dominant country in the global system, leading to a uniformity of worldview and a ‘community of interests’ (Mills, 1956, p. 253) that bind the elite together despite factions, ‘even across the boundaries of nations at war’ (Mills, 1956, p. 283). These ‘communit[ies] of interests,’ proposed...
by Mills, led to decisions or indecisions that reproduce the U.S. social structure and have implications for other nation states within the international system as well. Given these social forces that are at play among them, the way they have emerged through a historical process that involved a changing U.S. social structure and the institutions that have shaped them, it is impossible for them to break away from the corporatized world and its interests in the decisions they make while in public office. These interests are driven by their worldview, the ‘military metaphysic,’ which has since the end of World War II, come to describe the economic life of the U.S. in the form of a permanent war economy (Mills, 1956; Melman, 1974).

Before his death, Mills was working on extending this explanation internationally. An extension of the model would involve the institutional links between the military, political and economic institutions of the power state (U.S.) and other industrialized nations with their counterparts in the nominally ‘independent’ nation states of the ‘Third World’. A militarized global system cannot be explained merely in terms of economistic reductionism that involves division of labor and commodity trade but needs incorporation of, as Mills stated, ‘An interplay of economic, political and military institutions’ (Mills, 1958, p. 67). We must not overlook the fact that the workings of global institutions that reproduce the international system and its stratification by class, race, gender and nationality include economic groupings like the World Trade Organization, institutions of global finance like the IMF and World Bank, political bodies like the UN as well as military alliances like NATO. It is only in their interplay that we can uncover the stratification-structure of the current international system.

Apart from the internationalized component of the model that was a work in progress, Mills did not look at the ‘racialized’ and ‘gendered’ structure of the world, a structure that as ‘social facts’ within the power state is reflected in the larger global structure dominated and largely constructed by the U.S in the post World War II period. Membership within the power elite itself is to a large extent racially exclusive (white only) and male dominated (Domhoff, 2007). Those among the devalued groups (‘non-whites’ and females) that are allowed in are usually re-socialized to predetermined characteristics that ensures cohesiveness of the elite group and similarity of world view for purposes of social manipulation (Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 2006; Zweigenhaft & Domhoff, 2011).
Domhoff, 2005). Similarly, the ‘underdeveloped’ majority world is composed of ‘non-white’ populations and their elite are in most cases detached from the masses through dictatorial decision making and lifestyle differences and the decisions or lack thereof, maintains ‘Third World’ military, political and economic dependency on the U.S. and Europe (Asadi 2005). As part of extending the Mills model to a ‘racialized’ world, the concept of race based stratification is a significant even though neglected area of research especially since the class consciousness of the power elite produces and reproduces such stratification in the structures that exist within the U.S. and around the globe.

Gender Roadmap: The U.S.’s link to Global Sexism

Gender stratification, an unequal access of women to power, prestige and property that is reproduced culturally and structurally within the U.S. and its link to the world is part of a global system analysis. Any World-Systems Analysis (Wallerstein, 1974) that neglects the racial and gendered structure of the U.S. (the power state) and by extension the world that has been constructed by it (post World War II) risks neglecting the underlying macro-structural causes of such stratification that have for all intents and purposes masked the most primary division in a capitalist society, the division based on class. This reality is masked through retaining divisions inherent in slavery and classical patriarchy that described the pre-Civil War (pre 1861) United States. These earlier relationships of production, carryovers from a European feudal era are enhanced through militarizing modes of production and are kept salient as contradictory processes within capitalism which is inherently (naturally) opposed to non-class based divisions:

The material bases of classic patriarchy crumble under the impact of new market forces, capital penetration in rural areas, or processes of chronic immiseration. While there is no single path leading to the breakdown of this system, its consequences are fairly uniform …Among the property less and the dispossessed, the necessity of every household member's contribution to survival turns men's economic protection of women into a myth. (Kandiyoti, 1988, p. 282)
Gender based stratification and its link to militarization in concepts of citizenship and nationalism where ‘masculinized memory’ (Enloe, 1992, p. 83) in military terms becomes not only the standard setter of citizenship but through that a driver of gender based stratification within the wider society (McClintock, 1993), cannot be ignored in uncovering gender based stratification. Similarly, the articulation of gender within the international system cannot be understood without reference to the political and the military based on which citizenship (and hence human worth) is determined. Mere economic division of labor explanations in terms of production, finance and trade as World-Systems theorists do (e.g., Pyle and Ward, 2003; Fernandez Kelly, 1989) are inadequate. Through incorporation of military men within the state, a warfare-based state with a civilian façade is setup (Mills, 1956). Similar to how ‘affiliation’ links colonized territories to imperial culture, by displacing indigenous ‘filiation,’ to use Edward Said's conceptualization (Ashcroft & Ahluwalia, 1999, p. 26), nationalism framed in masculine terms, sourced in the military as the hegemonic culture of a militarized political economy, reproduces through affiliation, a structure of gendered relationships within the wider society that is unique as a variant form of patriarchy that is based on violence. Patriarchy and racism are part of the cultural lag of pre-industrial, feudal relationships that are managed by the elite through changing definitions of ‘womanhood’ and ‘race’ and ensure stabilization of the periodic crisis in the capitalist political economy. This stabilization is achieved through internally dividing the working class and through a manipulative use of women’s labor with their cyclical inclusion and exclusion from the labor force and controlling them through a militarized definition of reality that materially incorporates male domination within a social structure through role restriction, in effect ingraining patriarchy in ‘world processes- empire building, globalization (and) modernization’ (Enloe, 2004, p. 6).

My purpose in this article is to critically review the various theoretical perspectives contained in the literature to come up with implications for a comprehensive theoretical model that captures the intersectionality of race, gender and class in the international system. In order to unravel these mass of interacting variables of division maintained by advanced capitalism, we need to situate them socially and historically within a global structure (Mills, 1959). Without such
rooting in social structure, mere historical translation of feudal patriarchy as explanation for gender oppression or slavery as explanation for racism would be inadequate and misguided and it would not allow us to understand the altered nature of the interaction between patriarchy and militarization that produces a unique form of violence based patriarchy, leading to a rape (and domestic violence) culture (Donat & D’Emilio, 1992; Kilbourne, 1999).

I approach this research with a macro-to-micro level translation based on an extension of Mills’ Power Elite (Mills, 1956) analysis. I also incorporate a reworked Internal Colonialism perspective (Blauner, 1969) into the model in that I argue that similar processes were involved in creating economic, racial and gender inequalities in the international system as were involved in creating systems of stratification in the United States. The traditionally elaborated model of Internal Colonization suggests that the state of minorities within the U.S. is a projection of the global state of people of ‘color’ traditionally colonized by a superordinate group (Blauner, 1969). Such a conclusion seems outdated and needs inversion: post World War II and U.S. global hegemony, the state of the majority world, i.e. the people of ‘color’ in the global system has involved a new formation that can be seen as an extension of the U.S. internal racial and gender ‘projects’. I reverse the Internal Colonialism framework to incorporate this change which has important implications (that are discussed below) for understanding gender based stratification in the post-modern world. This projection of the domestic onto the international is in tune with Marcuse’s observation:

The countervailing powers (of advanced industrial capitalism) do not include those that counter the whole. They tend to make the whole immune against negation from within as well as from without; the foreign policy of containment appears as an extension of the domestic policy of containment.

(Marcuse 1964:51)

Whereas diffusion or assimilation theory would predict that both inequalities and cultural consciousness would tend towards the mainstream in a society (Cornell & Hartman, 1998, p. 5), in other words gender and racial divisions would disappear as relics of the past
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under capitalism, Internal Colonialism predicts that both inequalities and cultural differences will persist because of structural precedent. This dual nature of the material structure, one that serves the colonial power and the other the colonized, similar to a segmented labor market that is divided based on gender and race (Blauner, 1969; Fernandez Kelly, 1989), ensures that culture among dominant and subordinate groups and resulting identities will remain separated as well (Lorber, 1994; Risman, 2004). Therefore, cultural beliefs that are either system created or carryovers from earlier historical periods (cultural lags) are actively maintained as ‘rules of the game’ (Ridgeway & Correll, 2004, p. 510) to manage the salience of gender and racial divisions. This biases evaluations in a society to produce average differences between performance of men and women which then serves as ‘empirical’ evidence to justify assimilation based on a predetermined hierarchy. Breaking out of predetermined stereotypes merely reinforces the existing ‘either/or’ gendered divisions. In other words, a gender structure (macro level) is in place that implicitly forces women to become, through bureaucratically circumscribed adaptation, willing participants in ‘doing gender’ as structurally prescribed (West & Zimmerman, 1987), acting the roles based on subjective identity maintenance (micro level) (Risman, 2004, p. 446).

The restructuring of the U.S. post World War II mirrors the restructuring of the international system, in other words policies enacted by the U.S. elite in the post-war era, in congruence with its relatively subordinated European allies (since the U.S emerged as the only post-war hegemonic power5), had grave consequences for the underlying populations of the United States and the world. The pattern of inequality that emerged in the U.S. through state sponsored restructuring post World War II, while not similar in magnitude was similar in form to the global pattern of inequality in the post-war world restructured by the same forces.

The United Nations (UN) Security Council constituted after World War II ensured through privileging the Allied victors of the war, with the United States at their helm, that no collective action would be possible against their personal interests through their veto authority. Subsequently, veto power was used by permanent members to protect their allies (Israel in the case of the U.S. on numerous occasions) from any UN enforcement measures, rendering the UN quite...
ineffective as an equalizing agent, while using it as a legitimation tool for validating the bourgeoisie liberal world order, global militarization and for punishing non-integrating ‘rogue states’ (Frederking, 2007, p. 30).

Classical colonization that represented the occupation of colonies by Western European powers that proceeded from the 15th century to the end of World War II, with a brief first phase decolonization and re-colonization (Fieldhouse, 1999), involved the application of explicit state power to force uneven exchange on the colonized. Classical colonization as explanation for racism therefore corresponds more to the slavery era as it relates to the experience of African American minorities in the U.S. and not to the current conditions faced by them (which involves a more implicit control) or to classical patriarchy in the case of gender stratification and not to the more implicit oppression faced by women in the U.S today. The literature, even though employing the concept of colonization, has failed to update the model to incorporate the strategies of neocolonialism, which would imply a more indirect, institutionalized political subjugation, economic exploitation, cultural domination, and racial (and gender) conflict (Hind, 1984), of the nominally ‘independent’ nations and the internally colonized minorities and women, post World War II. This changed nature of the world involved the U.S assuming hegemonic control in the post-war era through both intra-national and international restructuring, in which its racial and gender ‘projects’ proceeded concomitantly with the creation of a new middle class (Mills, 1951). These social constructions act as buffers between the bourgeoisie and the working class. Internal restructuring in the United States was paralleled by international restructuring through Marshall Aid that was denied to ‘non-white’ nations of the world, together with the division of the world into multiple artificially created nationalities who borrowed their state form extra-socially from their previous colonizing powers perpetuating dependency relationships with them (Tilly, 1985, p. 186). The unequal trade relationships offered to the ‘non-white’ nations of the world as well as dependency on Western imports of manufactured goods (Alexander, 1996) and militarization ensured that feudal relationships remained intact within the ‘underdeveloped’ nations of the world which had grave implications for the status of women in those nations.
The various social constructions that divide populations and give privileges to some while denying them to others, involve a kind of ‘divide, rule and bind’ program (Schneider & Ingram, 2005, p. ix) where one part of the citizenry is pitted against the other in a hierarchy of worth and therefore those higher up in the hierarchy are ‘bound’ to or vested in the system and buffer the elite from pressures for change coming from below. A similar division into European and Non-European nations, developed and ‘underdeveloped’ nations was accomplished in the international system for vesting the populations of the developed nations in the newly structured world order and alienating them from the rest of the world. Thus, the overdeveloped and globally quite unique national identity of being ‘American’ developed in the post World War II period with an ‘us versus them’ mentality as its logical extension. Such an emphasized national identity that denigrates other nationalities is similar to the black/white divide existing within the United States.

The West, the ‘Third World’ and Gender

The traditional colonialism model suggests that the state of minorities within the U.S. is a projection of the state of people of ‘color’ in a White dominated world, as a result of their history of colonization (Blauner, 1969; Hamilton & Carmichael, 1992; Hind, 1984; Calvert, 2001; Haley & Malcolm X, 1987). Regarding women, the usual explanation for women’s oppression in “Third World” countries, relies on cultural explanations of oppression in the form of an internationalized ‘culture of poverty’ argument: a culture is termed pathological but the underlying structure that produces it and maintains it is ignored (Parker and Kleiner, 1970, p. 525). Such (detached) explanations deny the validity of regional and historical distinctions, ignore the material conditions of a country’s subordinate status in the World System as well as its relationship to the power state (Schech & Haggis, 2000, p. 138). For example population control policies that result in disproportionate abortion of female fetuses and status and role ambivalence for women without creation of alternative avenues for them in the ‘Third World’ have been imposed through foreign aid programs of the ‘developed’ countries (and often involve the use of pharmaceuticals supplied by Western corporations). The UN agencies involved in population control routinely administer such aid and contraception
campaigns and the IMF and the World Bank make them part of their structural adjustment programs (Maessen, 2010).

Similarly, gay asylum seekers from Mexico to the U.S. are forced not only to prove that they are gay, but that they have a ‘well-founded fear of persecution’ in their homeland in hearings where the INS agents act as ‘gatekeepers and promoters of ideologies through which agents of the state dispense the ‘land of liberty’ myths’ (Cantu, 2009, p. 55). This inevitably leads to ‘pathologizing’ their home culture through implied cultural inferiority compared to the U.S. The process that leads to such imputed inferiority is manipulative since historically, in order to be granted asylum, gay asylees had to ‘prove’ that they were not gay. The discursive practices that flip definitions of assumed ‘ideal’ cultures for the political purpose of establishing ‘otherness’ keep shifting to further the colonial ‘project’ and involve a ‘bureaucratization of gender and race, specifically in terms of the institution of colonial service’ (Mohanty, Russo & Torres 1991, p. 16). I therefore find the classical patriarchal interpretation (the cultural explanation of women’s oppression) lacking in explanatory depth.10

Maintenance of dictatorial regimes by the U.S. in the global system, that have made use of the old tradition involving a political use of religion to deny rights to women, as in the case of Saudi Arabia (whose state is U.S. supported) or the Taliban (who were U.S. supported at the height of their atrocities11), is a projection of dominant/subordinate nation-state relationships and women’s oppression in such societies therefore cannot simply be explained in cultural terms alone. Also, by ignoring how non-Western women subjectively feel about their gender, as many Western academics have done since the 1970s, reduces the domain of dialogue to end oppression (Higonnett, 1994, p. 19) and can be seen as a form of ‘cultural imperialism’ (Connell, 2007). By circulating a stereotypical script, the elite can ensure through randomly picked ‘facts’ that their political agendas are justified using slogans of social justice or presenting women as victims, for the sake of rescuing whom, a war must be waged, as was the case with the U.S. war on Afghanistan in 2001, which was scripted as a war to liberate women (yet post ‘liberation’ women are still being oppressed in that country, as documented by the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan12). It is primarily for these reasons that many ‘Third World’ women reject Western feminism as
bourgeoisie ideology having no bearing on their situation (Schmidt, 1987, p. 481). Uma Narayan describes the Western feminist caricature of ‘Third World’ women being based on ‘colonialist representations’ (Narayan, 1997, p. 45) and that only an ‘authentic insider’ (p.33) can have a proper understanding of their oppression. However, bourgeoisie academic discourse, of which Western liberal feminism is a part, often does not treat these ‘authentic insiders’ as ‘authentic scholars’ (p.149).

Such ethnocentric generalizations regarding sexism by Western liberal feminists is similar to how micro theories that rely on contemporary observations and criteria of men and women in 20th century America lack explanatory leverage, ‘outside of a particular context’ (Collins, Chafetz, Blumberg, Coltrane & Turner, 1993, p. 186). Taking the socio-structural context into consideration tells us that without altering the structure, a mere transfer of cultural ideals would result in placing women at an exclusive disadvantage in such societies as they are vested in the relationships, which without structural adjustment would produce further isolation and exclusion. Brewster & Padavic (2000) make a similar observation regarding the situation of U.S. women prior to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (p.484).

A contrarian view is offered by Maria Mies who states that, ‘…I consider a feminist middle-class movement, both in the over- and in the ‘underdeveloped’ countries, as an absolute historical necessity’ (Mies, 1986, p. 206). Mies’s reasons for stating this are that in socialist countries of the 1980s, the condition of women approaches that of women living in capitalist or (classical) patriarchal (feudal) societies. She also states that middle class women are the ones through which the dominant family form, defining the housewife, is mainstreamed and the violence and exploitation faced by them is not less than that faced by lower class women. My contention with Mies’s assertion is that the U.S. middle class itself is a capitalist creation to buffer the bourgeoisie from the proletariat (Mills, 1951), created historically through state subsidy.

Mies acknowledges that the bourgeoisie institutionalized their definitions of gender through their chosen middle class, therefore any movement that arises out of this ‘chosen class,’ no matter how well intentioned in its origin has greater cooptation potential (of being won over by the elite) because of the vesting of the middle class in bour-
geoisie structure, as well as the use by the bourgeoisie of the middle class to mainstream their ideal type culture. As far as middle classes in ‘underdeveloped’ countries are concerned, they are the banner-carriers of Western corporate culture, tied to a style of life completely detached from the life and culture of the peasant/worker class. Since class divisions in those countries are not masked through bureaucratic manipulation as in the U.S., circumstances have made class conflict quite visible; any feminist movement arising within these privileged classes will be automatically seen as deviant and oppressive. Further, the middle class that is minuscule in most of these countries is often the beneficiary of the World Bank’s women’s ‘liberation’ talk, while the vast majority of women workers are oppressed by such policies (Chussodovsky, 1997). If we seek undoing patriarchy then a ‘Third World’ feminist social movement must not have a middle class bias or it will not be able to effectively communicate across the class divide. This point is also stressed by Millie Thayer (2009) who traces the origin of ‘popular feminism’ (p. 12) in Brazil. Middle and upper class bias in a restricted social movement was transformed through cross-class contact by popular feminism, thereby overcoming the ‘cultural abyss’ (p. 62) based on class divide, making the movement much broader. This was achieved in part by linking feminist goals to other movements for social justice.

Paradigms of Economic Development and Gender

Approaches to economic development reflect two broad paradigms and both have implications regarding how gender is incorporated within development theories. The functionalist perspective sees things through the evolutionary lens of ‘modern’ (Western/industrial) versus ‘primitive’ (non-Western/‘Third World’) societies, a division that contains within it inherent value judgments. As solutions for empowering women, this perspective suggests importing Western culture, politics and neoclassical economics by the developing countries so they can ‘evolve’ and ‘civilize’ (Rostow, 1960). Those proposing such solutions would offer gender liberation through the image of the ‘modern woman’ prevalent in the West. The revolutionary decade of the 1960s challenged some of the assumptions of the modernization explanation in the ‘Third World’ when its promises of development repeatedly failed to materialize. Alternative explanations and ‘cures’
for underdevelopment relied on a Marxist interpretation of underdevelopment first articulated through dependency theory, that states that using ‘modernization’ prescriptions, the developing countries are kept dependent and subservient to the West. Modernization according to dependency theorists offers a false consciousness of ‘liberation’ through imagery of a ‘civilized’ West (even though their experience with the West has been anything but civilized), that involves no change of the underlying relationships of production, in other words no structural change is facilitated with the cultural indoctrination of modernization.\textsuperscript{14}

Another Marxist analysis, more sophisticated in its global outlook, emerged in the 1970s with Wallerstein’s World-Systems Analysis (Wallerstein, 1974). Borrowing from dependency theory’s ‘development of underdevelopment’ (Frank, 1966) 1989; Amin, 1976), Wallerstein suggested that the core (the ‘developed’/industrialized countries) exploits the periphery (or the ‘Third World’) for cheap resources, which are exchanged for either expensive military goods or overpriced capital. This creates trade, debt and technological dependency of the periphery on the core. Coupled with unequal exchange, a year’s worth of agricultural labor products exchanged for twenty hours of industrial labor products from the core, for example (Amin, 1976), serves to speed up surplus extraction leading to the formation of strong states in the core and weak states in the periphery (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 28). Political instability and poverty is concentrated in the periphery to keep this global order of exploitation intact. Political instability is a complementary process to the ‘active (economic) retardation’ (Skocpol, 1985, p. 292) of the periphery by the core. This ensures that the periphery remains in its subordinate position, even though developmentism maintains its agenda as cultural goal, ritualized attempts to attain which are always elusive and subject to repeated failure (Wallerstein, 2004, p. 55).

However, ignoring the role of women and race in the global division of labor, World-Systems Analysis ignored a significant portion of work that described the capitalist world order and its manipulations (Ward, 1993). Two new perspectives have since emerged, one is a repackaged functionalism disguised as ‘globalization’ theory, and offers instant industrialization to the ‘underdeveloped’ world through relocation of multinational corporations and its related implications.
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for ‘women’s liberation’ through labor market participation in low wage manufacturing or service jobs (Fernandez-Kelly, 1989). The other is neo-Marxist in orientation and is an elaboration of Wallerstein’s World Systems Perspective and incorporates the use of women’s labor into that model to extend its male-centered explanation of the proletarianization of ‘Third World’ workers. Using an eclectic analysis we can possibly combine the two models to uncover the dynamics of intersectionality of class, race and gender in the international system that is not covered by either orientation on its own (Wing, 2000). However, in order to understand intersectionality at the macro level, we need to unravel the various social constructions and differentiate between primary (reflecting the economic substructure) and secondary (involving the relatively autonomous superstructural) constructions, incorporated through cultural or structural ‘grafts’ or we end up with an inexplicable though interacting mass of stratification variables, in that they do not have a common origin in capitalism but represent adjustments by the power elite due to necessity of system-survival. This is similar to Barbara Risman’s (2004) criticism of intersectionality when she writes, ‘While various axes of domination are always intersecting, the systems of inequality are not necessarily produced or recreated with identical social processes’ (Risman, 2004, p. 443). If we examine the intersectionality of race and gender on a macro level in the U.S, we see that black women are invisible in social imagery as ‘females’ and females are described only in terms of white women. If black women want to become visible as female they are forced to imitate white women. As far as race is concerned, the social construction of the ideal type ‘other’ in the U.S. is the black male. In order to make black females fit into that ‘other’ image, black females are masculinized in terms of race by the mainstream culture. These two racial and gender divisions are socially scripted with differences so as to keep both of these divisions salient and to prevent blurring overlaps.

I correct for these obvious shortcomings in the extant literature by reworking the original Internal Colonialism framework, as well as reworking the World-Systems model which is based on a relatively outdated Marxian analysis of Victorian capitalism in my opinion. To do that I incorporate in the model, structural and cultural manipulations employed by the power elite in the current era and their implications on how race and gender is experienced in the developing world.
I also unravel intersecting stratification variables, race, class and gender to uncover primary and secondary constructions. Such a deconstruction that goes to the root foundational causes of the various divisions is essential if we seek to counter the various forms of stratification that exist in our world today. An overarching internationalized understanding of intersectionality will also bridge the communicative gap between the people of the ‘Third World’ and oppressed minorities within the ‘developed’ world, as it will between women across the international system.

The process of globalization does not only impact women in the United States\textsuperscript{16}, the way it is practiced, through its relationship to the division of labor, to suppress wages etc., such exclusionary participation offered to women causes gender divisions to get entrenched (Pyle & Ward 2003) in the global system. As women are incorporated into the formal labor sector in many developing countries following the promises of ‘modernization,’ they are exploited through below subsistence wages and are increasingly marginalized. The division between the ‘public and private’ aspects of women’s labor is an ‘ideological invention’ (Ward 1993:54) as such arrangements benefit those that determine relationships of women’s formal work in those countries, which are increasingly the multinational corporations. However these ideological inventions ensure that patriarchal relationships that enhance gender inequality are maintained even when women are incorporated into the formal labor market.

**Globalization of Poverty and Gender Inequality**

The gender and racial ‘grafts’ on the underlying material structure, old cultural relationships that define patriarchy and slavery being kept alive through structural adjustments (on a macro level), for material incorporation in people’s daily lives, impact how people ‘feel’ and ‘do’ gender and race on the group as well as the individual level:

Far from being dependent on the structure of institutions, modern elites may smash one structure and set up another in which they enact quite different roles. In fact such destruction and creation of institutional structures, with all their means of power, when events seem to turn out well is just what is in-
involved in ‘great leadership’ (in our era), or when they seem to turn out badly, great tyranny. (Mills, 1956, p. 25)

A power elite explanation of the ‘sub-structure’ would differ from a strictly (vulgar) Marxist interpretation in that it is not only the underlying economic structure as in classical Marxism but its fusion with the military and political institutions that have resulted in production being defined by a ‘permanent war economy’ (Mills, 1956), that militarizes social relationships. Within such a context, violence against women and the gendered structure of the military itself can explain the projected ‘super structure,’ that is the social constructions of gender inequality and the control of women through violence. The evolutionary perspective of gender stratification suggests that, ‘the more often a society engages in warfare, the more likely is social control to be vested in politico-military elites that exclude women’ (Huber, 1999, p. 71) also, in militaristic societies a ‘male culture of violence and coercive domination contrasts with female culture’ (Collins, et al 1993, p. 191). There is also a greater tendency for ‘sexual alliance politics’ (Collins, et al 1993, p. 197) in militaristic societies, in that women become commodities that are exchanged to build alliances, which together with the capitalistic objectification of women, reproduces the use of women as property making them susceptible to even greater violence (Kilbourne, 1999).

Citizenship has historically been linked to the military and its combat role. In ancient Greece those that ‘made the city possible by taking arms on its behalf’ (Kerber, 1990, p. 92) were model citizens. Since men monopolized combat roles, they became the model citizens by default. As citizenship got monopolized by men because of their link with the combat functions of the military, women were systematically underrepresented in all facets of public life. The image of the citizen soldier, who is always a man, translates into other facets of public administration as well. Citizenship is structured in a hierarchical fashion based on sacrifice to the nation with sacrifice being measured in terms of actual combat roles that then get linked to men because they monopolize such roles in the military (Elshtain & Tobias, 1990). This loss of citizenship by women in the modern nation-state has serious consequences for them since only citizens are given the status of full human being through an individuated identity, everyone else is
judged more or less categorically. Through militarization, the system robs women of their human status and therefore dehumanizes and objectifies them within the wider social and global structure (Arnold, 2004).

The power elite sponsored U.S. racial ‘project’ post World War II required that all whites within the U.S. be collected within a single white category to be institutionally separated from blacks (without the explicit overt racism of the past). Together with white upward mobility post World War II (Katznelson, 2006), and the creation of a new (white) middle class (Mills, 1951), segregation was implicitly enforced through ‘redlining’ of Black neighborhoods and the destruction of ethnic European neighborhoods, whose residents were allowed a one way move to the suburbs (Jones, 2003), a move denied in total to blacks (Massey & Denton, 1996). A very close international parallel was the development of war-devastated European nations through Marshall Aid (the international extension of this racial ‘project’) by the U.S., from which the ‘non-white’ nations of the world were largely excluded. Concomitant with the racial ‘project’, the U.S. gender ‘project’ through similar state support of the post war nuclear family, resulted in the reversal of gains made by women during the war.

The popular state sponsored construction of the post-war nuclear family was an innovative social intervention that involved the reconstruction of the ‘breadwinner/housewife’ model (Heiner, 2006, p. 76) and resurrected the sacred domestic sphere of the past (Coontz, 2000). This domestic sphere was engineered to correct what out of necessity occurred during World War II: women being active participants in the labor force in traditionally male dominated manufacturing areas which made them eligible for higher level wages due to war related demand. Gender and racial divisions were slowly being undone as capitalism progressed in the U.S, post Civil War era (post 1865) and reached a tipping point during World War II. This was reversed in the post war era due to purposeful manipulation by the elite. Mary Schweitzer writes,

By 1945 there were 4.7 million women in clerical positions, an increase of 89 percent over 1940, and 4.5 million women serving as factory operatives, an increase of 112 percent. The
number of women employed as production workers in durables manufacturing had more than quadrupled, from 340,000 in 1940 to 2,174,000 in 1943. (Schweitzer, 1980, p. 90)

The female labor participation pattern in the U.S. pre and post World War II reveals a segmented/dual labor market (Blauner, 1969) where a surplus female workforce is kept segregated for crisis use as a reserve labor pool exploited for extracting surplus, where exploitation and the resulting low wages and segmentation are supplemented by women's unpaid domestic work and low paid informal sector work (Lee & Cho 2005, p. 433). When crisis periods are over, women are either 're-domesticated' or forced into the informal sector which is considered in such a system, their normal use in times of economic prosperity. This is similar to the exploitive use of black labor as strike breakers by the bourgeoisie to weaken the power of unions in the early 20th century. These manipulations not only divide the working class against itself, they serve a real accumulation functions for the bourgeoisie in terms of unpaid and low paid labor (in the case of women).

In the United States, women entering the paid labor market (from the domestic sphere) move into highly gender segregated occupations based on how the labor market is segmented. This offsets the aggregate gains made by those few that manage to move out of female dominated occupations, that is those occupations in which females are disproportionately concentrated (and they happen to be work areas that are 'natural' extensions of housework). This is done in order to keep women subordinated through a division of labor based on reproductive labor (and its service/nurture based extensions). Those that leave paid labor maintain housework which is segregated by gender as well. Whether we include housework in assessing gender division of labor or not, the system maintains overall gender segregation (Cohen, 2004, p. 250).

A long run trend in substitution of female for male labor (after the deindustrialization of the U.S. in the 1970s) is also witnessed where the feminization of the labor force results in overall lower average wages for both men and women. The preponderance of temporary and 'part time' work as female labor is incorporated as a cost-saving arrangement into formerly male segments of the labor market.
that are then socially degraded leading to an exit of men from those professions (Van Wagner, 1993, p. 75-76) and a further reduction of wages. This process is similar to the phenomenon of ‘white flight’ from the inner cities to the suburbs leading to black segregation and the concentration of poverty within the inner cities of the U.S. (Massey and Denton, 1996).

Maintaining Patriarchy through Restructuring Labor

The family and its structure became the ideological battleground for the underlying labor structural adjustment in the post-war period. It is because a gendered split is grafted unto the labor force for surplus extraction, manipulated using alternating official debates involving the values versus freedom themes thereby pitting opposing groups against each other, while pushing the conditions producing such manipulations underground, that gender and gender justice issues have remained so elusive. Lois Rita Helmbold and Ann Schofield state, while discussing the role of ideology and the grafting of earlier ‘relationships of production’ unto a capitalist system,

Histories of feminized occupations all point to the role of ideology in structuring retail sales, clerical, and domestic work. The time-honored imperative of women's role to serve, made clerk, secretary, maid, and even prostitute natural extensions of women's position in the home. And, in contrast to rationalizing trends in industrial work, these jobs retained a preindustrial quality, that is, task-oriented and featuring a personal relationship with the employer thus making it more resistant to organization. (1989, p. 503)

Taking gender as a grafted super-structure unto a pre-existing capitalist structure, we can see why ‘gender traditionalism, varies across time and across space’ (Risman, 2004, p. 435). It is therefore possible due to such rapid social changes to locate areas where this change occurs in order for social movements to work at those ‘change levers’ for gender divisions to be undone. Mediating between household structure and the political economy are cultural norms (Kertzer, 1991, p. 174) that help maintain the stratification status quo. However, due to the increased ability with the elite in advanced capitalism, to
dominate structure by organizing opportunity (or smashing it) and dominating culture by controlling the cultural apparatus, the mass media and formal education\textsuperscript{18}, they can easily manage ‘facilitating’ culture (Mills, 1956), producing what Marx understood as ‘false consciousness’. In Habermas’ terminology, system integration overpowers all alternatives and forces the individual to conform by colonizing their life-world (Habermas, 1987) and thereby determining their identity, which for its verification needs structural authentication thereby reproducing inequality, this being the actual process behind ‘doing’ gender.

What emerged in the post-war period in the U.S., with relative ease in incorporation was a qualitatively ‘new’ family form in that new families formed at an amazing rate, the marriage and fertility rates increased, while the average marriage and motherhood age fell, as did the divorce rate. According to Coontz, ‘In ten years, the proportion of never married persons declined by as much as it had during the entire previous century’ (Coontz, 2000, p. 25). Supplementing the incorporation of a particular family form was the fact that women’s educational parity with men dropped significantly. From 1900 to 1930 due to teacher college attendance, women were at par with men in undergraduate education attainment in the United States. After the end of World War II with gendered (and racialized) federal support through the GI Bill, undergraduate men outnumbered women 2.3 to 1 (National Bureau of Economic Research).\textsuperscript{19} Even though women were recruited during World War II to work in heavy industry, jobs that were traditionally ‘men’s jobs’, there was need based segregation in the work place, with women filling in positions based on needs of the labor market only. After the war ended, women were removed from those positions because men were returning home, and gendered relationships were restructured according to roles prescribed by the ‘breadwinner/homemaker’ family model (Lorber, 1994, p. 9). In the post war era, the breadwinner/housewife model was constructed to represent the middle class ethos and the national (and global) ‘historical’ ideal.

According to Friedrick Engels in \textit{The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State} (1845), the family under capitalism is the source of the oppression of women due to their economic dependence on men in such a system. Therefore for achieving gender equali-
ty, women must make themselves economically independent of men. Engels thought that proletariat women were less oppressed than bourgeoisie women because of their relative economic independence vis-à-vis their husbands whose impoverished condition forced them to seek employment outside the home (Tong, 1989, p. 49-50), which translated into their enhanced status in the home.

The post World War II family ‘constructed’ by the power elite (through active state involvement, laws and material incentives) can be understood as the mainstreaming of the oppression of bourgeoisie women (as prostitutes within a household due to their economic dependence on men in Marx and Engels’ terms [1848]) to the general mass of women who were discovering their emancipation through the labor market and as such were a threat to the capitalist system. It is for this reason that many feminists claim that middle class women are oppressed more than working class women (Mies, 1986). The latent function of this family restructuring was to isolate and dilute any feminist movement that would inevitably arise as a result of the culture-structure mismatch under capitalist relationships of production and to keep women within the reproductive labor side of the labor divide, that got historically crystallized in the agricultural era before capitalism. By vesting a large number of women into traditional patriarchal relationships thorough the popular construction of the state sponsored nuclear family, it divided the female population against itself and thus damped the effects of any feminist social movement for change, which manifested itself in the state manipulated abortion debate that hinges around women’s identity based on reproductive labor, which ironically is the cause of their oppression.

Supplemented by economic exploitation, this new family form served also to institutionalize control of women through the family rather than through explicit state coercion which would prove costly and comparatively ineffective due to the constant struggle involved in explicit coercive control. Thus this institutionalization of individualism and the resulting cult of the ‘self-made man’ that required a corresponding ‘cult of a true woman’ (Coontz, 1992, p. 52-53), both defined in terms of the labor divide discussed earlier, led to a reentrenching of gender based divisions. Men were freed from traditional home based obligations while the home domain of the woman expanded to domesticated, underpaid labor and was separated from
‘men’s work’. Emotions were relocated to the home (the domain of irrationality and women in such a culture) while the economic sphere, ‘men’s sphere’ was de-emotionized, rationalized and at the same time the family depoliticized, thereby removing women from the public arena both explicitly and implicitly (Fraser, 1989).

Structural incorporation of such a family form over time assumed a reality of its own; in other words, patriarchy (macro level) became a ‘self-fulfilling prophecy’ of behavior (meso and micro levels) even under capitalist relationships of production. Patriarchy was maintained through a contradictory dual structure or a segmented/dual-labor market, where the social structure that women operate in is kept separate and subordinated to the one men operate in. As West & Zimmerman state: ‘…we conceive of gender as an emergent feature of social situations: both as an outcome of and a rationale for various social arrangements and as a means of legitimating one of the most fundamental divisions of society’ (1987, p. 126). By becoming a feature of a social system, this secondary construction under capitalism, achieves circulation in the form of scripts that shapes identities and guides biographies. Eisenstein writes: ‘Patriarchy today, the power of the male through sexual roles in capitalism is institutionalized in the nuclear family’ (Eisenstein, 1979, p. 25). I would also argue that a variant form of it is reproduced due to the altered sub-structure - that of militarized capitalism in the post-World War II era, given a permanent war economy, which is in tune with what Marx himself had suggested regarding the bourgeoisie’s struggle for survival:

The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production and with them the whole relations of society...

(Marx & Engels 1848)

We need to note that patriarchal relationships of reproduction and men’s control of production and distribution were diluting under capitalism until a conscious effort was made to retain them through structural and cultural entrepreneurship by the elite. There is no reason to believe that once this structural and cultural support is removed, patriarchal ‘relationships of reproduction’ will not disappear. The implication of my claim is that patriarchy serves a masking func-
tion by perpetuating false consciousness to keep the power elite in business, and that this function is facilitated by violence against women through militarized relationships of production. Once capitalism passes, patriarchy would, in my opinion become dysfunctional as would militarism which is a major engine, in perpetuating oppression of women and keeping the old culture and its relationships salient. Global militarism, commandeered by the U.S. in its continuous wars, also keeps ‘Third World’ countries across the globe ‘underdeveloped’, their militaries overdeveloped and their societies feudal, all these trends have grave implications for the status of women in those countries.

**The U.S. Racial/Gender ‘Project’ and the World System**

Just as the underdevelopment of African Americans at home is projected in the U.S. dominated world abroad in the form of underdevelopment of the ‘non-white’ nations of the world, the oppression of U.S. women at home is projected in the U.S. dominated world through incorporating cultural imagery without corresponding structural adjustment. Cultural components as system-maintenance mechanisms need to be incorporated within the traditional colonialism model, and these have involved a constant shift in racial definitions for the purpose of structure maintenance (Omi & Winant, 1994, p. 68). Like Omi & Winant talk of racial formation, we can similarly talk of gender formation through social-status enforced definitions of ‘hegemonic masculinity’ as the dominant social form based upon which both men and women shape themselves according to gendered requirements (Connell 1987, p. 183-185), women are narrowly intrinsically defined based on reproductive labor while everything else is associated with masculinity, making it a residual category with no intrinsic qualities of its own. Inequality is the key ingredient in socially enforcing such ‘difference’ (Ferber, Holcomb & Wentling, 2009, p. 137).

By using a co-opted image of liberation where liberation is associated with dress norms and the objectification of women as sex objects, women in the ‘Third World’ are constantly divided against each other as client-state dictators maintain their control over the masses. (Public) Issues affecting the rights of women in most of these countries are not mere cultural issues as much as they are structural issues that maintain a patriarchal setup based upon which a culture of
male superiority develops. Where such a setup is maintained through explicit coercion, chances for real liberation are greater than in bureaucratized social structures where oppression is made invisible and targets for resistance are made amorphous due to internalization of oppression. This is empirically verified by interclass difference in egalitarianism within U.S. families as a parallel to separation between Western women and ‘Third World’ women, where the former are controlled through a bureaucratized society while the latter are coercively controlled. Upper class women though not explicitly controlled are ‘content’ with their non-egalitarian setup whereas explicitly controlled lower class women are more resentful of their husband’s non-participation in household tasks and as a result are more likely to challenge assumed male superiority (Pyke, 1996).

In the case of ‘Third World’ women, it is impossible to empower women through images of Western emphasized femininity, when they don’t have access to health care and adequate nutrition, and maternal and infant mortality are high, education is unavailable and the roles assigned to women within a household and the wider social structure are ascribed more so than achieved through ‘doing’ gender as they are in Western societies. That a culture would arise as adaptation (Parker & Kleiner, 1970), regardless of religious or ideological prescription to maintain such relationships, is inevitable. Implanting images from an alternative culture, which itself is quite oppressive to women, where women are treated as objects and subjected to (militarized) violence (and rape) would result in masking the real issues that can alter the structure and thereafter the culture. If however the real issues are masked by emphasizing appearance norms or the outsourcing of home and family life to daycare centers in order to free extra labor for the corporate marketplace, (female) labor that is globally segmented and paid unequally for doing equal work, then few results will be obtained. It is for these reasons that manipulative capitalism enhances through design rather than diminishes patriarchal relationships from earlier modes of production in order to exploit women’s labor (Grossholtz, 1984).

In the international arena, the U.S. gender ‘project’ is translated for institutionalization by the World Bank, where its agenda involves changing not the structural relationships that cause gender oppression but involving merely private relationships between ‘men and
women as individuals within a household’ (Chossudovsky, 1995). Where women are dependent on the traditional extended family for survival, in high poverty societies without any state support or labor market opportunity, such altering of culture to one emphasizing women’s independence without structural support can be devastating to the well being of women and children.

Conclusion

For gender stratification to be addressed comprehensively and effectively in order to pursue social justice for women, we must not localize the issue of gender oppression within particular ‘Third World’ nations. In other words the focus must be international based on the logic of the global capitalist system (Cox, 1964). Just as the U.S. racial ‘project’ is projected in the form of an ‘underdeveloped’ ‘non-white’ majority world and the ‘developed’ white nation states, the U.S. gender ‘project’ projects itself into maintaining gender oppression globally regardless of variation in cultures and religions, across societies. The common ingredient in such oppression is the use of women as productive and reproductive labor, and the use of elements of the cultural lag of earlier modes of production as master symbols to legitimize oppression. A militarized division of labor is the key to understanding gendered stratification given the underlying mode of production in the United States defined by a permanent war economy. This link between division of labor, militarization and the maintenance of patriarchy within capitalism as a contradictory processes, is empirically revealed when we note the reduced salience of gendered divisions in old age when the system does not actively pursue the labor of old men and women and aggression and violence against women is also markedly lower (Thompson, 2006). The modern state system is largely a male state. The states in Europe got their structure after religious wars (Veblen, [1923]1997, p. 22-24) and the state-form was globalized through colonizing territories, later decolonized as countries. European settler states like Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the United States emerged in the 18th and 19th centuries (Pettman, 1996, p. 6). The entire process of state building was a war- and conquest-based enterprise undergirded by economic considerations. The historical context of a (state’s) structural formation is also key to understanding biographies enacted within such a structure in sociological analysis.
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(Mills, 1959). Militarization preceded the modern nation state building enterprise, which as a result was largely male dominated where conflict was setup between women and the public arena through violence and the threat or fear of violence. This gives us clues as to the direction of determination where militarization preceded the formation of a gendered capitalist state. The fact that all of these states emerge as masculinized states is therefore no surprise, given the handful of players involved in the creation of the modern nation state system, their militarized outlook and the incorporation of the military firmly within the economic substructure post World War II.

Attributing direct cause of women’s oppression to religion, culture or individual men’s nature would be erroneous and would serve to reify gender rather than de-gender society as it ignores sociostructural causes of such oppression and takes facilitating variables as the actual underlying cause of oppression. Therefore, if ‘undoing gender’ (Deutsch, 2007) is the goal, cultural scripts widespread in U.S. society, those of viewing varying cultures ethnocentrically regarding women’s rights, need to be dropped. Those scripts more often than not serve as political tools of an elite that has little concern for the rights of women, much like the IMF and World Bank manipulate gender issues, for whom it has become a convenient slogan. On the micro level, we need to challenge the cultural ideals of the ‘hegemonic male’ and its complementary ‘emphasized femininity’ (Connell, 1987), but most of all we must resist the attempts by the elite to ‘divide and conquer’ through social constructions of difference. Whereas what is feminine is restricted through narrow roles, what is masculine is expanded as a non-feminine residual category (of advantage), such constructions of difference by the power elite are culturally restricting for both males and females.

In understanding the reality of women’s oppression in our world today, further research is needed to uncover the points of translation of the U.S. gender ‘project’ through its networks overseas and these networks consist of groupings of countries that are militarized in order to serve the function of systemic stabilization, together with accumulation within a global permanent war economy. The end product of this translation can be witnessed in the use of women’s labor by the multinational corporations, restricted based on their master status linked to reproductive labor and the many stereotypes that historically
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evolved around it. Perhaps in terms of ‘Power and Privilege’ (Lenski, 1984), post World War II, the control of the production and distribution of the means of life by white, male elite of the hegemonic state is the primary reason why countries with a majority ‘non-white’ population are ‘underdeveloped’, and their women are super-exploited.
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Endnotes

1. About women in the power elite, Zweigenhaft and Domhoff write, ‘First in non-profit institutions (and now in corporations), we see the intersection between gender and class in a way that serves the power elite by providing a buffer-zone between the wealthy few and the rest of society; (Zweigenhaft & Domhoff 2006, p. 39).

2. This cohesion of the elite and their uniformity of worldview is amply demonstrated in structural reproduction, uniformity of decision making regarding war and national affairs of consequence. This reveals ‘class consciousness’ of the power elite (Mills, 1956).

3. A social organization that considers males inherently superior to females based on
the supremacy of the father within the family, which is the 'base' of such organization.

4. Blauner outlines four components of internal colonialism, (1) forced entry by the colonizer, (2) destruction of indigenous culture and values by the colonizer, (3) extraneous administration of the indigenous by the colonizer, and (4) racism, where the colonized are seen as 'naturally' inferior and are exploited by a superordinate group (Blauner, 1969).

5. The Soviet Union due to the losses it suffered in World War II facing the major brunt of Hitler’s war machine, as well as the state of its economy and technology in the immediate aftermath of the war was not on an equal footing with the United States. Its equation of power with the United States required the social construction of an 'enemy' that was successfully managed by the U.S. power elite in the post war period.

6. Together with the racial and gender 'projects', the new middle class was created through structural manipulation and cultural support: devoid of property, psychologically 'homeless', standardized 'organizational' men/women (Whyte 1957) giving them incremental benefits and a feel of superiority over the working class of which they were members nonetheless (Mills, 1951, p. 16)

7. Why use the term 'Third World'? Chandra Mohanty (2003) suggests the use of this term is appropriate because it still 'retains a heuristic value and explanatory specificity in relation to the inheritance of colonialism' (p.144) compared to other popular formulations like North/South etc., in the region in question. Mohanty also suggests that this term, given the neo-colonial global capitalist division of labor that homogenizes women’s work life in the region termed 'Third World', represents their common identity.


10. The most pervasive form of gender control, according to Lorber is institutionalized control where ‘the process is made invisible, and any possible alternatives are virtually unthinkable’ (Lorber, 1994, p. 26).


13. How ‘socialist’ those countries were, is debatable. Synthetic ‘communism’ and ‘socialism’ without the process outlined by Marx and operating within a capitalist world order, where the major ‘communist’ country is involved with a capitalist ‘Cold War’ requiring military accumulation, can never lay authentic claims to socialism and like the counterpart of ideology represents utopia (Mannheim, [1936]2008)

14. Makiko Fuwa concludes that ‘...individual level factors may not be enough to achieve (gender equality)...without the reduction of macro-level gender inequality in economic and political power.’(Fuwa, 2004, p. 765).

15. ‘...to do any less would be to ignore the complex interconnections between first and third world economies and the profound effect of this on the lives of women in all countries.’ (Nesiah, 2000, p. 42).
16. Since 60% of the wage differential between men and women in the U.S. is explained by discrimination, the fact that deindustrialization lowers wages for both men and women, means that women in the U.S. also suffer due to globalization related deindustrialization even as average wage differentials between men and women get reduced giving the false impression that women have gains in the labor market (Greene & Hoffnar, 1995).

17. ‘Every social institution has a material base, but culture and social practices transform that base into something with qualitatively different patterns and constraints.’ (Lorber, 1995, p. 17)

18. This is made possible through concentration of ownership and information facilitated by a bureaucratized social structure.


20. The culture-structure mismatch can be explained by the biological analogy of the body attacking a transplanted organ that it considers alien. This is similar to patriarchy being alien to a capitalist structure and being rejected by the underlying mode of production. It is maintained by cultural and structural ‘injections’ by the elite similar to how the body is drugged into accepting the transplanted organ.

21. Cultural definitions of manhood described in terms of aggression and dominance, male entitlements over women as well as a cultural ethos that promotes violence (and militarism) as a means of settling disputes, produced and reproduces violence against women (Heise, 1998).

22. Similarly, applying the Western model of child labor without adequate structural adjustment that supplements family income would result in further exploitation of children (Pyle & Word, 2003, p. 475).


24. ‘State making was a competitive enterprise of war and politics…Being essentially a predatory enterprise, its ways and means were fraud and force’ (Veblen, [1923]1997, p. :22).
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