

# THE LIE OF THE LAND: NOTES ON GENDER, GLOBALISM AND THE NATION-STATE

Etienne Rassendren\*

## Abstract

*This analysis of the contemporary "Indian" context is occasioned by the visible rise of new forms of cultural chauvinism concerning women's lives and their bodies; as also a proliferation of different modes of commodification of women's bodies in global culture. Despite the insertion of modernity during colonialism, with its enlightenment ethic of rationality and individuality, postcolonial "India" under globalizing capital only redeploys a rarefied pre-modernity. I argue that the sudden interest in the dominant media to re-deploy the woman's body as sexual self-representation submerges an insidious commodity-fetishism, predicated on consumerist masculinities. Indeed the figure of the women in this era of globalization and nationalist democracy, I argue, continues to collapse into the continuum between masculinist control and the male gaze. Liberal global culture today revisits traditional patriarchy largely to revise its forms than to dislodge its content. It is this contradictory process of contemporary culture, that of masculinist and*

---

\* Department of English, St Joseph's College, Bangalore.

*male pleasure on the one hand and the discourse of self-assertion and emancipation on the other that I wish to track and delineate in this analysis. I also wish at the end to comment on sexual economy, gendered subalternity, masculinities and the cultural in order to expose its many serious cultural and political fault-lines.*

## Introduction

This analysis of the contemporary “Indian” context is occasioned by the visible rise of new forms of cultural chauvinism concerning women’s lives and their bodies; as also a proliferation of different modes of commodification of women’s bodies in global culture. Despite the insertion of modernity during colonialism, with its enlightenment ethic of rationality and individuality, postcolonial “India” under globalizing capital only redeploys a rarefied pre-modernity. Simultaneously, the sudden interest in the dominant media to re-deploy the woman’s body as sexual self-representation submerges an insidious commodity-fetishism, predicated on consumerist masculinities. Indeed the figure of the women in this era of globalization and nationalist democracy continues to collapse into the continuum between *masculinist control* and the *male gaze*. Liberal global culture today revisits traditional patriarchy largely to revise its forms than to dislodge its content. It is this contradictory process of contemporary culture, that of masculinist and male pleasure on the one hand and the discourse of self-assertion and emancipation on the other that I wish to track and delineate in this analysis.

## Globalization/Globalism: Some Preliminary Remarks

Over the last two decades, globalization, an economic process of capital formation, has been developed into a dominating ideology, called *globalism*.<sup>1</sup> In this new *discourse of power*<sup>2</sup> the already always individual freed from the ritual moralism of his/her context is projected as a liberal subject making “choices” that would re-define productively the social fabric of h/er nation. This new imaginary, it is argued, would transform marginalized segments, including the doubly burdened women, to develop autonomous agencies for self-empowerment. Globalists write this partial, yet evocative discourse of equality in order to legitimize market ideologies in the public realm.

One thus visualizes a democratized social sphere in which *women* would re-arrange their interests unburdened by patriarchal sexual-politics or restrictive economic insufficiency. The so-called free global market would hopefully sustain difference

but disrupt sexual hierarchies yielding social transformation as envisaged in this influential globalist discourse. But these imagined possibilities remain empty mystifications as the contrary unfolds in the 'everyday'. These promises have not translated into a productive dynamic in current society in "India". Women becoming producers of their own destinies, becoming small entrepreneurs; choosing their own employment and economic well-being; exploring and asserting their desire: such are the duplicitous images of globalism.

Global destruction of subsistence farming and farmer husband suicides; the politics of caste, class and gender in education; sexual assault/harassment, rape and murder; regulation and prevention of social mixing; brutal upper-caste self-pride: All these punctuate media reports even today and demonstrate a rise in crimes against women either based on *masculinist regulation* or the *spectacularization* of the women's bodies in the *male gaze*. The embattled position of the woman remains indeed unchanged.

## Deconstruction and the Public Sphere

Some deconstructionists<sup>3</sup> see the open markets as disaggregating the complex social hierarchies and by that gesture, sexual hierarchies too. They actively advocate the democratic ideal of late liberalism imagining that it will yield a freer civil society space, named *the public sphere*,<sup>4</sup> which women can appropriate for self-empowerment. They imagine that conservative cultural-sexual mores would be re-visited in an alternative ethic of justice. But that too has been elusive. Instead the markets restore a triumphalist moralism<sup>5</sup> as a differentiated regulatory order that re-deploys *gender* as the normative of the everyday. Modernist cultural protocols merely reshape conservative forms of the male order, its substantives remain intact. Therefore a deeply gendered hegemony dominates women in the context of globalism, as the nation-state withdraws from the cultural theatre where the failures of globalism are staged. Gender continues to be post-marked in the hyped imagery of democratization.

## The Nation and Global Economics

The nation-state in the 1970's had initiated its withdrawal from the economic theatre of nation at life attempting to enhance creative methods of producing income. The State now actively disengages itself from providing social entitlements<sup>6</sup> like education and health, constitutionally guaranteed for its masses. The nation-state has ceased to intervene in the economic process fielding exploitation as creativity, guarding transnational profit as investment and sustaining capitalist power as international

trade. This principle of non-intervention and its attendant hands-off approach was displayed politically in Gujarat 2002 when the absent-state remained a menacingly mute, if not a colluding, spectator to violent religious fundamentalism, that burned, raped and violated minority women, dismembering the secular fabric of the national ethos.<sup>7</sup> As a postcolonial nation, the State as guarantor of people's rights and freedoms is severely compromised and the democratization of the public sphere remains elusive. As Gujarat burned, the nation feared and mourned; but the State adopted the *neo-liberal* view that 'things will sort themselves out', so popular in democracies today. And women in their silences became the sites on which fundamentalist belief and global economics were played out.

In the rest of my analysis I wish to locate the three important terms of my title, namely *gender*, *globalism* and the *nation-state*, in the contradictory episteme of the national-social and the global-economic in order to stage the politics of the social sphere. I will draw heavily from media reports to situate a critique of masculinist globalism and the gendered nation-state; and in the end comment on the patriarchal optics of national and global culture.

## The Cultural: Some Formulations

It is impossible today to characterize "culture" as a universal norm of the human. We can only juxtapose its representations as a relational system of thinking and practice. Hence to privilege one or the other notion would hegemonize both context and its people. It is however possible to ambiguate notions of the *cultural* as an intellectual dynamic without over-determining its significance or overstating its arbitrariness. Hence the *cultural*—unlike *culture*—as a critical category defies all fixity of meaning and coherence and is inescapably provisional depending on its interpretative contexts and agencies.

Most anthropologists like Claude Levi Strauss claim that *the cultural* is a set of practices dialectically engaged with the norms and prohibitions of a community which shapes a consciousness for productive human activity. This implies that people live in communities rooted in their material conditions than in their belief systems. In other words, going beyond 'real' life entails being rooted in it.<sup>8</sup> The English critic, Terry Eagleton re-articulates it differently claiming that transcending *into* culture consists in being rooted in the "base-structure" of material history in order to break into the "superstructure" of "culture."<sup>9</sup> Post-colonial theorists propose language as the *eyeglass* of material condition for the identity politics of culture.<sup>10</sup> This dialectical notion of the cultural and its rootedness in the material-condition is instructive though it suggests a hierarchical system of governance. It overlaps with the Marxist dialectic relationality between the "material being" and "the social being."<sup>11</sup>

Consequently 'culture' is not a transcendental signified but a material process rooted in a socio-economic context. The cultural then can never operate outside history and society, material production and political activity.

The other notion comes via Jacques Lacan's theories about *self* and *other* that inflected postcolonialism. For Lacan culture is a process of relational power that manufactures the subjectification of the *self* to the objectification of the *other*. This relational process transacts a politics of language producing imperial or nationalist vocabularies defining a discursive dynamic of oppression and control. To be free as subjects, sexed or otherwise, the others in the imperium recover/discover counter-vocabularies as alternative epistemologies of otherness. For post-coloniality, language in its relation to identity politics marks the *cultural*, foregrounding social and/or sexual hierarchies as complexes of gender, formulizing the dynamic of self and other. The masculinization of language in the self writes the feminization of the other. Thus the cultural in the Lacanian paradigm constitutes the gendered social at once.<sup>12</sup>

"Culture" for Raymond Williams is neither civilisational nor aestheticist but a "symbolic system" that governs the "social."<sup>13</sup> It justifies/discredits ideas and performances that either manufacture consensus or mobilize resistance. Williams' nuanced argument combines discursive power in Foucault with hegemony theory in Gramsci, to posit *cultural-materialism*. Emergent culture would employ the symbolic to frame differently its ideological and linguistic foundations in the social sphere.

In the Indian context the cultural can be reframed in terms of Sankritization, an ideological frame, which displaces the symbolic into the social classification of caste. Proposed by MN Srinivas this redefinition of caste contests the purity/impurity axis proposed by Dumont<sup>14</sup> and expresses how in "India" the cultural is inescapably linked to caste and its implications. Moreover caste itself as cultural institution is structured on the bodies of women invoking gender as its representational instrument. Hence the cultural forges the language of material conditions with the discursivity of power, symbolically configuring women as the site of self-definition. With all its implications in caste and class, gendering becomes the ideological process of the cultural. It shapes the cultural refiguring the other as woman.

This elaboration above explains how the cultural as social process is a constituent of the social sphere; the cultural as ambivalent—as against culture as universal—is a sub-set, an integral constituent of the social sphere.

## Gender and Culture

Feminist thinkers have systematically faulted cultural discourse for its discursive regulation, violation and exclusion of women from cultural histories of emerging nations. Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid, in their "Introduction" to *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History* (1989), argue for a feminist historiography that would include gender questions in history-writing. They interrogate presumptuous "gender-neutral" cultural histories as subsuming women's stories, *invisibilizing* them from their historiography. There seems really no option but to refigure women as integral to history, which then will redefine the principles of history-writing itself. To silence gender and invisibilize women in history would only produce partial histories of the masculine.<sup>15</sup>

Contradictorily, Sangari and Vaid disclose that women's bodies are constituted as the pivotal "site" that inscribes "culture" as the authentic self of the emerging Indian nation. In the debates over Sati in colonial India, women are embodied as *visible repository of Indianness*, preserving the integrity and the difference of the homeland distinct from the westernized modernist intrusions. Burdened symbolically for 'Indian' morality, they also become the name of the cultural. This contradictory process of culture-formation normalizes gender in the cultural-material discourse of "Indian" subjectivity and identity.<sup>16</sup>

Illuminating this perspective, Gayatri Spivak represents the model of "asceticism" in the feminization of the national struggle as symbolically regulating female desire, domesticating gender in the public/private strategies of identifying the cultural. Gandhian non-violence refigures the Vedantic wife/widow as metaphor of national liberation, masculinizing colonial rule and gendering cultural process. Restoring female sexualities to their appropriate fixity performs a hegemonic function that restricts the self-exploration of female subjectivities.<sup>17</sup>

The exegesis above attempts to explain that gender is constituted through, (1) the invisibilization of women from self-empowering discursivity, (2) the refiguring of women as bearers of culture, and (3) the regulation of female desire in the public sphere. I also deliberately focus pre-colonial and post-independent cultural histories as a symbolic displacement of gender in highly fundamentalized social discourse today.

## Gender and the State

To further my analysis I wish to travel through media reports of gender violence to disclose how the post-colonial State and post-independent globalists either invisibilize or spectacularize women for the sake of economic profit and social gain.

Pedda Narsamma is a dalit woman-farmer from Andhra Pradesh who single-handedly farmed her family's small patch of land, simultaneously working as a farm-laborer in neighboring "fields." She worked the fields tirelessly, and cared for her children and grand-children. The crops failed and unable to pay off her debts, Narsamma, committed suicide. The State failed to recognize her death as farmer-suicide, because legally "the farmer is a landed male" and she failed to "fit in that category" and denied her family any compensation. Though women constitute nearly 90% of the productive agrarian farm-labor and/or are subsistence farmers, the state reifies farming as male enterprise officially legitimizing maleness by gendered omission.<sup>18</sup>

For most women, the insertion of new agrarian technologies—genetically coded seeds, import of scientifically-enhanced planting systems—has replaced their innovative expertise in seeding and planting.<sup>19</sup> With the reduction in farm subsidies and formal institutional credit, severely restricted, feudal money-lending processes have grown into a complex spiral of harassments including bonded labor and dowry deaths.

PA Sainath's reports published between July and August 2005 cite the confusion among Human Rights groups that fail to document such episodes even as the state remains absent for the gendered subaltern. Concurrently women encounter so-called "responsibilities."<sup>20</sup> As farmers' suicides bring on the violence of masculinity in the crude logic of land-grabbing, urban migrations and dowry-demanding, reinforcing sexual violence on women in the domestic space. As one informant claims: "the worse the farm crisis got the more the dowry problems grew."<sup>21</sup>

The loss and denial confronted by women appears unanalyzable for the sheer enormity of its human costs. But if we are to advocate social alternatives, we have to explain crucial social processes that refer to my earlier remarks on gender and culture. I read *three* subtle gendering processes here. The first concerns *the double burden* experienced by women in a patriarchal nation-state. Farmers' suicides do not merely propose an economic crisis but masculinizes it, as if men alone endure it. The *visibility of male bodies* is grounded on the *invisibilization of women*. That apart, the inability to mobilize adequate instruments of documentation is a failure of ethnography that performs *an epistemological violence* of exclusion on the gendered subaltern. Women like Narsamma endure an unjust system of oppression and economic production, formed and sustained by the class/caste axis of society. Despite claims to modernity, the nation-state choreographs by its absence the menacing spectacle of pre-modern systems of capital-formation like land-grabbing, money lending, and bonded labor.

Secondly the nation state helplessly watches the absence of any democratic process of economic life; sometimes it diverts attention using the *rhetoric of choices*. That is *omission by diversion*. Women are absent in the state's legal-social discourse justifying female *invisibilization* as women own no "patta"; and "a farmer is a landed male with a patta."<sup>22</sup> This reification of *the male-body* legitimizes the state's category of private ownership, excluding women as farmers.

The third aspect concerns the failure of civil and political society to address social issues such as dowry. Despite women being economic producers, they still encounter a social system where kinship institutions concern economic power invested in male authority. What began in history as *streedhan*, a method, which guaranteed women property rights is now deployed differently. Dowry configures women's bodies as the preferred site for capital accumulation. Erasing women from productive process, economic domination by the male zamindarri and the socially deprived system of dowry minimize women as *mere bodies* in the gendered state. Hence farmers' suicides, male or female, integrate social conditioning with state processes into a pan-national patriarchal regulation that transacts social intersections between women's absence in economic activity, (no women are farmers) the glamorization of the male body, (men own pattas) and the commodification of sexuality in dowry transactions (women are bodies). This then is but one element of the double burden endured by women.

Observed from another end, women farmers' suicides relate to the structural violence of globalizing economies. Global economics *denies and excludes* women's economic productivity and cultural wisdom from global trade and commerce.

This agrarian crisis forces us to recognize globalization's attack on sustainable women's subsistence farming. Gabriele Dietrich's analysis of globalization (1997) and the *International Monetary Fund and the World Bank (IMF/WB)* delineates the nature of "hegemonic" control financial institutions enforce on "poor nations."<sup>23</sup> The debt-trap, she claims, diverts 30% of all government spending to debt-servicing, which forces nations to return to such institutions in order to spruce up reserves and service debts further. This vicious spiral is further complicated via the *Structural Adjustment Program (SAP)*, much later constituted as an international legal system, namely the *World Trade Organization (WTO)* which developed an anti-farmer regime for the rural sector. The big farmers confront economic disruptions no doubt but their strategies only produce greater exploitation of women farm-workers. Dietrich further argues that the system of privatization/liberalization which curbs public spending under SAP calls "education" "health" and "distribution" as "wasteful expenditure". In the rural sector, Dietrich claims, the impact of such discourse is "disastrous". Subsidies are reduced; food trade, monopolized; and farming handed down to the powerful few<sup>24</sup> who can afford imported seeds, elaborate irrigation



systems and cheap labor.<sup>25</sup> Multinational monopolies, large farming cartels and the market exploit, “natural resources”, including “water” denying the struggling farm-laborer and small farmer her survival. Above all, women’s economic productivity, their skilled labor as farm seed-producers, is displaced by mechanized farming and imported seeds. Dietrich points out:

This (the new regime) is a direct onslaught on women peasants. While women agricultural laborers will face more competition from men losing land, the traditional knowledge systems of women about seeds, live-stock as well as soil-regeneration and water management will be discredited and destroyed. Their methods of seed preservation will be deemed illegal.<sup>26</sup>

Written in 1997, this analysis appears prophetic; it explains the unscrupulous nature of the new economic regime engaged in the protection and production of profit as capital. Women also bear the manipulations in fair-price procurement too. This warning appearing, almost a decade ago, unpacks its intentions as the nation-state proudly enhances its hands-off approach, remaining a mute spectator to this growing crisis. For Dietrich, the protocols of globalism are an ideological framework based on profit for the few and poverty for the many. Further the ecological shifts in climate patterns restrict the natural benefits farmers need.<sup>27</sup>

The programmatic silencing of indigenous farming competencies displaces women’s wisdom to the periphery and inserts imported seeds into the emerging markets. In permitting the sale of goods and services, good, bad or ugly, the nation directly mutes women’s livelihoods and creative energies. In this silence, markets feminize so-called unprofitable productivity and women’s subsistence farming and masculinize profit and wealth. The marketization of agriculture expects women to bear the social costs as self-sacrifice in order to service corporations, all in the name of economic development. Thus the gender-neutral subject of the public sphere is a masculinized subject othering woman as economic producer and censoring her subjectivity. In effect, the market, not the state, control women’s lives and their livelihoods, as it genders global economy and emasculates the social. Gazing immobile, the Indian nation colludes with the global market to assert a masculinist global order to fashion its vulgarized claim, to encouraging unbridled creativity in economic enterprise gazing immobile at the destruction of modes of production, women innovate for the benefit of humane/human societies

## Gender and Globalism

Let me make a rather abrupt switch to urban centers where globalism organizes a different sexual-politics.

In the spectacular arrival of market economics, urban centers in India produce media-images that apparently represent fresh explorations of female desire. Victorian moralism and ritualized purity appear de-legitimized in the social and public sphere. No longer is the body, male or female, the site of shame/purity, but is cast as radical self-expression. This seemingly powerful self-expression is fashioned in the *field of advertising* wherein women are figured as the sign of the modern-self, transacting with the male gaze. This presumably emanates from "the train of western industrialism"<sup>28</sup> with all its implications of "a modern hegemony of vision" producing new forms of regulation and control.<sup>29</sup> But this rather ambiguous space, over-determined by a complex moralism therefore needs to be framed differently. But the history of the visual spectacle, from colonial travel to the glamorization of the male body in fascism, inflects the spectator's gaze, shaping and reshaping a new order of subjectivities. Thus Global visual culture effectively transcribes the spectacularization of the woman's body as voyeurist commodity.

Sakuntala Narsimhan's "Profit vs. Ethics"<sup>30</sup> faults a web-company for buying up the "rights" to advertise/paint *pregnant women's stomachs* in order to publicize the product sold. This kind of advertising is popular only in the West now but these ads in web-portals are accessible to all web-users including those few in "India". Women, when interviewed, claimed that they did it "voluntarily" in order to express their freedom of choice. Narsimhan then argues that this raises ethical, not moral questions concerning commodification. Her pivotal question is: "Is that how we want to develop as a modern society?" Such choices should factor in "context" where some things are "not done."<sup>31</sup> Narsimhan only restates the moral police argument here; nevertheless, she foregrounds the commodification issue strongly.

This episode of global advertising brings together the feminist debates over the Beauty Myth, the male gaze and the commodification of the women's bodies in the public sphere. The urban cultural gaze evolved, proposes a choice to sexual exploration, without any shame or debasement of their own bodies. Yet it prepares a new sexual politics of objectification that subtly defines the woman's body as merely pleasurable commodity. In the name of sexual freedom, it retains the male gaze intact. In fact global commodification procedures reduce women to mere sexual objects/bodies constricting their spaces for their subjectivity.

During the anti-beauty pageant campaigns, the moral police appropriated the sexual economy discourse and nationalized its initiatives in terms of the cultural. But nationalism censors sexual freedom, often violating social mixing, re-inventing the male gaze as cultural norm. Today the neo-liberal nation including its moral police revises its cultural codes into cultural contradiction. Valentine Day celebrations are attacked, but parallel media continues to choreograph rape and plunder and market these without any self-regulation.

Apparently women are fore-grounded but commodity-fetishism for profit is submerged: therein lies the hegemony of reverse regulation. Media imagery of liberated women, while reshaping the male gaze refashions the spectacle of desire differently. Such imagery is not only profit but also cultural capital for the multi-national corporates as it inscribes allegories of women's emancipation within the consumption paradigm. This contradictory logic designates consumer identity-politics as the norm of democratization in the social sphere. Only this time all is reversed—the exploitation hidden and the patriarchy, apparently passé. Within the visual field today, modern culture is erected on the site of women's bodies. In the process women's selves are invisibilized in the parade for the male gaze; and individualities so promised are but regulated within the paradigm of compulsive consumption. Thus women's self-representation is predicated on male consumerism, implicated in capitalist profit.

## Conclusion: Globalism, Gender and the Nation-State

The first serious fault-line is *material*. The arrangement of capitalist material conditions brings together the ideology of gender and the repressive apparatus of the bourgeois state. It represents an absence as in Narsamma's case where the postcolonial state abrogates its ameliorative<sup>32</sup> function that Ambedkar visualized for the emerging "Indian" nation. Thus we have a failed nation-state that fosters masculinity at the cost of femaleness; a nation that denies that women are capable of productive economic activity. Gendering is re-defined in the cultural as the superstructure that restores unequal sexual hierarchies in base-structure of material conditions.

The state's inaction deprives underprivileged women farmers, pre-dominantly dalit, and enhances gendering processes premised on the caste/class axis. The deliberately weak nation-state with a parallel global economy owned by global industrial houses that are anti-people and pro-profit constricts the productive innovativeness of women and their craft. These processes write the silencing of women, their wisdom and their presence, in the social sphere.

Contradictorily, the commodification of the woman's body in global consumerism displaces silences over sexuality issues underlying commodity-fetishism. The forces of majoritarian nationalism restore sexual objectification of women as cultural censor but fetishize the female body as a moral norm of the cultural interior while preventing social-mixing in the public sphere. Gendering as economic processes that hides capital-formation is never investigated. By contrast women as trophies/fetishes of caste and community are reified, though their self-emancipation and self-representation are severely regulated. Gendering for profit however continues unabated. Thus modernity and tradition overlap to mystify sexual regulation and

violence on women's bodies. Women's absences/silences are inverted in this form of gendering constituting private humanist subjectivities as commonsense. Global capital and formulaic tradition underwrite this patriarchy.

I may be called 'statist' for critiquing the absent state for its subtle masculinity but postcolonial nations like "India" hold a differing responsibility—from western democracies—where the state birthed on anti-colonial resistance and a democratic system of free citizenship requires to function as discerning arbiter of social and economic discontents. There is unlike elsewhere a discerning optic of relations here between state and community, civil and political society here—which needs to reject globalism as *simple theft that genders/violates women's sexuality in the public sphere*.

Above all else, globalism and the absent state build a *transnational sexual economy* premised on the woman's body, re-inscribing the gendered subaltern in a narrative of self-representation, projecting private choice as the social optic of self-assertion. The sexual exploitation and the gendered violence of differing cultural nationalities are silenced in the prolixity of universal consumption based on transnational profit. What globalism choreographs is the contradictory logic of capital, staging a sexual economy, reminiscent of colonial desire.

Indeed, this is the 'Lie of the land'—a lie that violates and destroys, while appearing liberal and progressive

## Notes and References:

1. The term has come to stand for an understanding of not just an economic practice but for a systematic discourse that breeds a new ideology of economic and social power. For further details see, Steger, Manfred (2004) *Globalization: The New Market Ideology*, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
2. I have used ideas from Foucault's interviews and writings on Truth and Knowledge to explain how consent is won both by subtle force and subtle argument. For further details see, Foucault, Michel *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977* New York: Pantheon 1980.
3. I'm using here Derrida's rather sustained notion of an alternative standard of "calculation" which he claims will put pressure on repressive regimes to democratize. Derrida was responding to the Campaigns against Apartheid in both Africa and the United States in the 1980's when anti-racism was deployed as a call for democratization of a racialized polity. I have extended the proposition of discrimination to implicate questions of sexual hierarchies. For Further details See, Derrida Jacques (1985) "Racism's Last Word" trans Kamuf, Peggy *Critical Inquiry* Autumn 1985, Vol.12, No.1.
4. I refer here to Partha Chatterjee's deployment of civil society spaces as being "the sphere of social production"(228). Also I refer to what he claims to be "the rise of the public sphere"

- (235) in Europe as being constituted by how culture and the state are united in the process of the production of the public sphere. For further details see Chatterjee, Partha (1993/2001) "Communities and the Nation" *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
5. The West's faulting the Asian communities particularly for not espousing the ethics of modernity, namely rationality and democracy is what I read as the restoration of an enlightenment ethic which I call a 'moralism.' I use here Bilgrami's recent analysis in *EPW*. See, Bilgrami, Akeel (2006) "Occidentalism, the Very Idea: An Essay on the Enlightenment and Enchantment" *Economic and Political Weekly* Aug 19-25, Vol.XLI No:33.
  6. I refer here to Aijaz Ahmad's analysis of redistributing "income upwards" while denying the already poor and disadvantaged social entitlements such as food, health and education. See Ahmad, Aijaz (2002) *Communalism and Globalization: Offensives of the Far Right* New Delhi: Three Essays Press.
  7. Baxi, Upendra (2002) "The Second Gujarat Catastrophe" *Economic and Political Weekly* 24-03-02.
  8. For a fuller analysis, See Strauss, Claude Levi (1966) *The Savage Mind* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
  9. Eagleton, Terry (2000) "Base and Superstructure Revisited" *New Literary History* 31 University of Exeter 231-240.
  10. Ngugi, Wa Thiongo (1986) *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature* London: James Curry/Heinmann.
  11. Marx, Karl ([1947] 1971) "The German Ideology" In Adams (ed) *Critical Theory Since Plato* New York: Random House.
  12. I gesture here Lacanain theories of primal repression used ever so often as terrains of exploration of feminization. For details See Moi, Toril (1985) *Sexual Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory* London/New York; Methuen &Co. Ltd. p.99-101.
  13. Williams, Raymond (1976) "Culture" *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* London: Fontana Press.
  14. I have used the distinctions between Louis Dumont over the issues of caste here. For further details, See Srinivas MN (2002) "A Note On Sanskritization and Westernization" *Collected Essays* New Delhi: OUP. Also See, Dumont, Loius (1970) *Homo Hierarchius* (Trans) Mark Sainsbury London: Paladin.
  15. Sangari, Kumkum and Vaid, Sudesh (1989) *Recasting Women: Essays in Colonial History* New Delhi: Kali For Women.
  16. *Ibid.*
  17. Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty (1999) *A Critique Of Postcolonial Reason: Towards a History of the Vanishing Present* Calcutta: Seagull Books.
  18. Sainath, P A, "How The Better Half Dies" *The Hindu*, July 31 2005.
  19. *Ibid.*
  20. *Ibid.*

21. *Ibid.*
22. Dietrich, Gabriele, "Effects Of IMF/WB Policies On Women In India" In Muricken, Ajit (ed) *Globalization And SAP Trends and Impact: An Overview* Mumbai: Vikas Adyayan Kendra, 1997.
23. *Ibid.*
24. *Ibid.*
25. *Ibid.*
26. *Ibid.*
27. Narashiman, Sakuntala "Proifit Vs Ethics" *Deccan Herald* April 28 2006.
28. *Ibid.*
29. *Ibid.*
30. *Ibid.*
31. *Ibid.*
32. See further references in Rao, Anupama (ed) Sunder Rajan, Rajeswari (Ed.Series) *Issues in Contemporary Indian Feminism: Gender and Caste* New Delhi: Kali For Women/ Women Unlimited 2003/2006.