

By the same writer

**Marx's 'CAPITAL':
An Introduction
(in 3 volumes)**

- ◆ This is an English translation of a 5-volume work originally written in Telugu by Ranganayakamma.
- ◆ The 5-volume Telugu work will be brought out, as it is, in a 3-volume English translation that runs about 2,000 pages.
- ◆ The translation work is almost ready and all the three English volumes will come out approximately by October, 1999.
- ◆ For details contact : **Sweet Home Publications**
(Address given on the reverse side of the inner title page)

**HOUSE WORK
AND
OUTSIDE WORK**

Have to look for 'fruits' in the 'trees'!

For 'fish' in the 'waters' !

For 'equality' - in the 'labour relations'!

This is a 'social law' as definite as the 'law of nature'!

RANGANAYAKAMMA

HOUSE WORK AND OUTSIDE WORK

Telugu Original :

RANGANAYAKAMMA

English Translation :

HYMA

SWEET HOME PUBLICATIONS

First Published 1999

ISBN :

Price: Rs.30/-

For Copies :

ARUNA PUBLISHING HOUSE

Eluru Road, Vijayawada - 520 002.

Phone : 0866-431181

&

NAVODAYA BOOK HOUSE

Lane Opp. Arya Samaj Mandir,

Kachiguda Cross Roads,

Hyderabad - 500 027.

Phone : 040- 465 2387

Published by :

Ranganayakamma

SWEET HOME PUBLICATIONS

H. No. 1-95/1 (76, Radhika Vihar Colony),

Near Durgam Cheruvu, Guttala Begampeta,

Jubilee Hills post, Hyderabad - 500 033.

India. Phone : 040-311 7302

Phototypesetting & Printing at :

THE PRINT SHOP

11-5-436/2 & 3,

Red Hills, Lakdi-ka-pool,

Hyderabad - 500 004.

Phone : 040-339 5571

Note :

J.U.B.V. PRASAD, a reader of Ranganayakamma's writings, provided fund for printing this book. **PRASAD** is a Computer Software Engineer by profession.

CONTENTS

A Note on Translation	v
PREFACE	vi
House Work and Outside Work	1
1. Productive labour	3
2. Unproductive labour	10
3. Independent labour	19
4. Family labour	20
5. Women who do labour at Home and Outside as well	41
6. Is House work part of 'Social Labour' or not?	50
7. What is the 'class' of Women?	54
8. The total population in the 'Capitalist' society	61
9. Productive and Unproductive distinction is specific only to the capitalist society	62
10. Accusations of Bourgeois feminists against Marxism	64
11. Man-Women Physical relationships	75

A Note on Translation

I wrote this essay originally in October 1996 and it underwent two editions since then. This translation is a major part of chapter 3 of a M.Phil., dissertation (Title: Translating from Telugu to English: A ‘practical’ translation and its analysis) submitted in May 1997 by J. Hymavathi Devi (HYMA), a student of M.Phil. in Translation Studies at the Centre for Applied Linguistics and Translation Studies, University of Hyderabad. Hyma worked on the dissertation under the research supervision of B.R. Bapuji, Reader in Translation Theory and Evaluation, University of Hyderabad. Bapuji went through the first draft of Hyma’s translation and made substantial modifications. Aditi Mukherjee, Professor of Linguistics, Osmania University and Sonia Gupta, Reader in Spanish, Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages (CIEFL), had gone through the second draft of the translation and suggested useful corrections with reference to some grammatical categories (articles, prepositions, tense etc.,) and vocabulary items (collocational restrictions, idioms, etc.). However, Hyma and Bapuji claim the responsibility for the shortcomings in the translation.

Here, I may inform the readers of this translation that I did not provide any footnotes to the Telugu original. I avoided footnotes due to constraints of space and attention. For example, quoting or restating bourgeois feminist arguments will consume lot of space and results in digressions. Of course, I am aware that a text, after all, will acquire polemical nature in the absence of footnotes. However, it should not be a problem for the English-knowing readers to locate texts concerning bourgeois- feminist critique of Marx.

Ranganayakamma

Hyderabad, March 1999.

PREFACE

This is an attempt at explaining the relationship between ‘House work’ and ‘Outside work’. The relationship between housework and outside work implies the relationship between man and woman.

When we speak of man-woman relationship what appears generally and immediately is the question of physical relationships only. But man-woman relationships do not simply mean physical relationships, but also labour relations! Physical relationships constitute the natural dimension. However, labour relationships constitute the social dimension. Aspects related to the dimensions of nature are also affected by the nature of the social relationship.

It is indispensable that male and female, young and old, children and the like, all, each one, in the society are involved in the labour relations somewhere or the other, in one role or the other.

It is most essential to understand the social relationships in order to understand the man-woman relationships and the problems arising among them at both the dimensions.

It is only through **Marx’s ‘Capital’** that it is possible to understand such categories as labour, value, use-value, money, labour relations etc., that are mentioned in this essay. ‘**Capital**’ itself is the basis for this essay. But, so many details that find place in it (‘Capital’) will not be found in this essay. We have to understand the limitation of this essay.

About 23 years ago, in 1975, I wrote an essay in Telugu on the question of 'House work' under the title: "What sort of 'exploitation' is household drudgery and how it will end?" It was at a common sense level and I did not have clarity with regard to the concept of 'labour relations' because I was not at all acquainted with **Marx's 'Capital'** at that time. It follows that we cannot arrive at a proper understanding of any problem unless we know such concepts as 'labour relations' and 'division of labour' as discussed in '**Capital**'. This fact became evident to me many a time.

HOUSE WORK AND OUTSIDE WORK

The male and the female, children and the like, the young and the old in a society taken together constitute the total population of that society. Whatever work performed, wherever and by whomsoever from among the population, wherever and whoever does the minutest work - if all those tasks are combined, that whole may be divided into 4 types:

- (1) Productive labour
- (2) Unproductive labour
- (3) Independent labour
- (4) Family labour

Wherever the 'work' is performed, it falls under one or the other of these 4 types.

Work performed at certain places appear not to belong to any of these types. For example, the work performed at such religious places as temples, monasteries and the like appear as if it does not belong to any type. But all this work too falls under the sub-divisions of these types.

Here we have to mention the fifth kind, which doesn't come under 'work'. The acts such as talking, eating, sleeping, sitting, standing, do not fall under 'work'. Acts such as these are natural, physical properties. But according to the grammatical principles in language, we consider these acts

also as ‘work’ (verbs). But these do not constitute ‘work’. It is not the physical properties that are to be considered here.

Animals also have physical properties. ‘To do labour’ is a property that is specific only to human beings. Therefore, we have to first understand properly the difference between physical properties and labouring. The whole issue here concerns “performance of labour” (doing work) only.

The point relevant to us here is - “To which category does house work belong?” To begin with, we offer a brief answer: this falls under the category of “family labour”. It follows that housework is neither productive labour, nor unproductive labour, or independent labour! This is none other than the type called “house work” (or ‘family labour’). To understand this we have to proceed with understanding the first three types of labour.

Before looking into these details, we have to assume that the society, which we are going to examine, is a capitalist society. Which means it is neither a slave society, nor a feudal society or a socialist society. Because the “productive-unproductive” distinction among the labours applies simply to the capitalist society alone. It does not apply to other societies, even though those other societies are not of the same type.

A capitalist society is a society, which has ‘capitalist system’ in its production relations. In the capitalist system, we will be able to see clearly the ‘exploitation of labour’ and labour relations through such aspects as capital, wage labour,

and surplus value. Though all these aspects exist also in the exploitative societies of the past, there they would be in different forms that cannot be captured by measurements of money. That is why, details, which are found in the capitalist system, are not found in the past societies. Therefore we have to understand the details of ‘labour’ through the capitalist system and then understand as to how the same could be in other societies.

All the countries in the world are at present with the capitalist system in varying degrees of differences.

According to what we said in the beginning, labour under capitalism will be of those types, which we are going to see now.

1. Productive Labour

Let us suppose that a capitalist is running a ‘hotel’. There the foodstuffs are prepared and sold. That is, all those foodstuffs are commodities. All the means of production that are required for the commodities are those of the capitalist, (means of production and means of labour are one and the same). C is the symbol for means of production. Those who work are workers. They include all men and women, young and old. They work on the basis of wage. Value of labour power is another name for wage. The symbol for wages is V . Let us consider certain amount of foodstuffs as a commodity. The expenses of means of production necessary for the commodities and the expenses of wages together - i.e., $C + V$

- constitute capital. What the capitalist expends for the commodity is only the capital. But what actually is expended for the commodity is not the capital alone. Surplus labour of the workers will also be expended. S is the symbol for 'Surplus labour'. It means that the commodity is produced with three kinds of expenses, C+V+S. This aggregate is the value of the commodity. In this example let us suppose that the value of the commodity is $80 C + 20 V + 20 S = 120$. Out of this $80 C + 20 V$ constitute capital. This is 100. But the commodity value is not simply 100. If the value of a commodity is only the capital invested by the capitalist, it is not at all possible for the capitalist to get profit through that commodity. Therefore the value of the commodity would certainly be more than the capital. The value of commodity in this example is 120. When this commodity is sold, capitalist gets 120 in terms of money. If 100 is taken back out of it, still 20 remains. That is the surplus value of the workers.

If we see this aspect from the workers' side, they did for this commodity, a labour of $20 V + 20 S = 40$ value. Which means, the value of their labour is 40. But they received only 20 out of it. They did not receive the other 20.

The Capitalist received what the workers didn't receive. Owing to this, the capitalist was able to earn 120 with 100 capital. The money that is over and above the capital is 'surplus value'. If we see that in terms of 'production', it is 'surplus production'. This being taken by the capitalist simply amounts to grabbing of certain part of the worker's labour.

Hence this is exploitation of labour. Capitalist lives on this part only.

Outwardly, it appears as if the capitalist is paying wages to the workers from his own pocket. But there is nothing that the capitalist gives. The wage of the worker is only a piece of his labour. This is the only way to earn the wage irrespective of whether it is man or woman. Paying the wage means paying a piece of their respective labour. It does not so happen that the capitalist pays out of his own labour or pays by borrowing from elsewhere. The relationship that exists between the workers and the capitalist is not the one of exchanging each other's labour. It is workers alone who always give to the capitalist. Workers alone maintain the family of the capitalist. This is what happens everyday.

The two things that occur when the capitalist gets the commodities produced by the workers and sells them are (1) Taking the capital back and (2) taking the 'surplus value' of workers as 'value' (as money). Immediately after the commodities are sold, the initially invested capital of 100 comes back as money. Hence, the capitalist can again invest the same money as new capital, and get new commodities produced. When new commodities are sold, capital comes back and again new surplus value is obtained. That 100 money will go on working as capital for any number of times. Everytime it will be getting new surplus value. Thus, the labour which produces commodities, and which facilitates the return of the capital and which yields more money than the capital, is the productive labour to a capitalist.

Productive labour is that labour which produces. What does that labour produce? It is labour that produces commodities. It will be possible for a capitalist to take the worker's surplus labour in the form of money, only when he gets the commodities produced and sold.

Therefore, the labour, which produces commodities, is - productive labour to the capitalist. In other words, productive labour increases the money of the capitalist.

The workers who produce commodities are the productive workers. The capitalist who gets commodities produced is the productive capitalist.

It is not possible for the capitalist who gets the commodities produced to take away for himself the whole of the surplus value obtained through a commodity. The entire surplus value will be distributed in some portions under different names to certain others also. Those parts would be as follows.

- (1) 'Interest' on capital.
- (2) 'Commercial commission' connected with the selling of that Commodity.
- (3) Rent for the land on which the work place stands.
- (4) Taxes to the government.
- (5) 'Unproductive expenses' incurred at the work place.
- (6) 'Productive profit' - that should remain for the capitalist who gets the commodities produced. Surplus value is distributed under these 6 items.

But in the account, which is shown by the capitalist who gets commodities produced, no account is found that tells - "this has been derived from this commodity". Only those portions into which the surplus value is distributed are seen. That is, portions of interest, commercial commission, land rent, taxes, productive profit etc. It means that the surplus value derived from that commodity is a total of all those portions. Thus, the value obtained through the commodity can be calculated very easily. If we briefly see the persons who consume the surplus value, it is the money capitalist, commercial capitalist, landlord and the productive capitalist who consume it collectively.

If any person even among those who consume surplus value does some labour, he should and would get a wage in return for that labour. There would be no problem if that person takes that wage. Also, there will not be a problem if he takes a portion from the surplus value. This would amount to the fact that he got the entire value of his labour. But if that person not only takes this value of his labour but also takes either interest or profit, or land rent, or all, then there is a problem. That will be the part extracted from others' labour without doing labour for himself. Since the capitalist will certainly grab the surplus value through the commodity in addition to the labour that he performed, the question such as 'will a capitalist do labour or not?' is totally irrelevant. What is relevant to the workers is the question of the surplus value grabbed by the capitalist instead of the question of his performing labour.

Commodities might be such articles as foodstuffs, cloth, sugar and oil which are naturally required. Or they might also be articles such as swords, guns, tobacco, and liquor which are not naturally necessary. Or they might be in the form of a “work” such as driving, teaching, medical treatment instead of being articles. Any article or any work that is produced or performed for sale is a commodity. Whatever labour it may be, if it produces a commodity, it is - ‘productive labour’ only!

As there is certain amount of surplus value in a given commodity, so also in every commodity.

Whatever happens in the case of one productive capitalist, the same will happen with every productive capitalist. That is, around every productive capitalist there exist invariably all such people as money capitalist, commercial capitalist and the landlord.

Whatever happens in one productive branch, the same will happen in every production branch.

The government as is done by the private capitalist also does the work of getting commodities produced. That is, government is also like a capitalist.

If all the productive branches in a society are combined, that is, if agricultural sector, industrial sector, transport sector etc., are combined, the mass of commodities that is produced by all those branches is ‘social mass of commodities’ that is, ‘total mass of commodities related to the entire society. [We can see this calculation with regard to one day or even one

year]. The commodities of all branches together constitute ‘total mass of commodities’. The capitals of all branches together constitute - ‘total capital’. The values of commodities of all branches together constitute ‘value of total mass of commodities’.

When the total capital is deducted from the total mass of commodities, what remains will be - ‘total surplus value’. That is the surplus value, which has been derived from the productive workers of all branches. But it doesn’t appear as a single whole at one place. As the surplus value in a given commodity is in the form of separate parts with certain names, the surplus value at every work place will also be with the same names. Therefore, what has been done to find out the value in one commodity, same thing should be done to find out total surplus value. That is, interests, commercial commissions, land rents, taxes, productive profits etc., of all branches constitute social surplus value. Its amount will be clearly known in terms of money.

While all those who live on ‘wages’ are called ‘working class’, all those who consume surplus value (those who consume interests, rents, profits), are the ‘nonworking class’. The class that labours itself and lives in abject poverty, problems and hardships maintains the ‘class that doesn’t work’. This is the whole secret of prosperity and poverty.

The relationship between productive capitalist and his worker is the relationship between ‘capital’ and ‘wage labour’; between owner and worker. That is a relation of labour exploitation.

2. Unproductive Labour

We have seen that productive labour is that labour which produces “commodities” for a capitalist. Therefore it can be easily understood that unproductive labour is that labour which does not produce commodities for a capitalist. Then, what does unproductive labour produce, if not commodities? To understand this point easily, first we need to go to the home of the capitalist. Let us suppose that there is a female cook cooking for the family at the home of the capitalist, who runs a ‘hotel’ outside. She is a worker and this worker too works on the wage basis. Her wage principle will be the same as that of the productive workers who perform the same kind of work. All the means of production required for her to work are those of the master. With those means, she prepares food. However the family would not sell those food stuffs outside. It uses them for its self-consumption. Which means, those food stuffs are not commodities for that family. They remain as ‘use-values’ only.

But irrespective of whether those foodstuffs are sold outside or not, all the expenses required for their preparation will be the same. That is, not only the expenses on the means of production and on the wage of the cook, but also her ‘surplus labour’ adds up for the preparation of the household foodstuffs. Which means, all the three aspects of $C+V+S$ are expended even at home. If we see from the point of view of the cook it means that she does the labour equal to the amount of $V+S$ and, takes only V as wage out of it, and loses S ! There

is ‘surplus labour’ even in this example. Even here, ‘exploitation of labour’ takes place.

But what happens when the family uses the foodstuffs for self-consumption without selling them outside is that none of the expenses incurred upon those foodstuffs would transform into ‘money’. Neither the expenditure on the means of production, nor the expenditure on the cook’s wage ($C+V$) would return as money. Moreover, the master will not get even the ‘surplus labour’ given by the cook, in the form of ‘money’. All the three items $C+V+S$ would be consumed as ‘use value’ only without transforming into ‘value’. It does not mean that $C+V$ won’t function as capital for the master since they don’t come back as money out of those three. If the master’s family requires fresh food stuffs again in the next part of the day, separate money has to be taken out again and expended on the new $C+V$. Here, the return and the re-use of old $C+V$ do not happen. Even though the household cook gives ‘surplus value’, it won’t transform into ‘surplus value’. Due to these reasons, the labour of the household cook is an ‘unproductive labour’ for the master. Which means, it is a labour that does not produce a commodity. It is a labour that does not give ‘surplus value’.

To the same master, the labour of the cook working in the household will be unproductive, while the work of the cook in the hotel is productive labour. The same cook becomes a productive labourer while working in the hotel and an unproductive labourer while working at the house of the master. But, this productive - unproductive distinction with

regard to labour is concerned with the master only, not with the people who perform labour. Productive labourers as well as unproductive labourers lose 'surplus labour'. It is irrelevant to the labourers whether the master gets that surplus labour converted into money or not. What is important to the labourers is that all types of labourers are subjected to the exploitation of labour.

As the productive labourers receive 'money alone as wage', the unproductive labourers too receive money alone as wage. To the unproductive labourers, it appears as if their labour is being transformed into money.

Though the 'productive-unproductive distinction' is not concerned with the labourers, it is most important for all the labourers to understand the distinction. Because this distinction enables an understanding of different relations that exist between people in the society. What relation do the productive labourers have with the master? What relations do the unproductive labourers have with the master? What relations do these two types of labourers have with each other? Between the productive and unproductive labours, 'which is primary and which is secondary'? To understand all these questions it is most essential for the labourers to understand the 'productive-unproductive distinction'.

Let us suppose that productive capitalist daily gets a certain amount of commodities produced, sold and thereby earns 8 money as his productive profit. That profit is a part of the surplus value derived from those commodities. That

(profit) is the income of the capitalist. That income is not something, which has been obtained through his own labour. It has been derived from the labour of the productive labourers. This, the capitalist spends on the maintenance of his family. He purchases all the means of subsistence necessary for the family out of that 8 only. He pays wages to all the household workers. Which means he pays the unproductive labourers out of the money, which he got by exploiting the productive labourers!

The wages of the unproductive labourers are paid out of the surplus value of productive labourers. Therefore, does it mean that the unproductive labourers are also consuming a part of surplus value produced by the productive labourers without doing any labour like their master? - It is not so. The unproductive labourers are not receiving wages without doing any labour. They are receiving wages only in return for their labour (doing surplus labour also). Although the master pays those wages out of the money that he has gained by exploitation, the unproductive labourers are not responsible for that. They take wages simply because they have done the labour. It means that all the unproductive labourers also live on their own labour (while losing their surplus labour).

Though there are many workers at the master's house, let us here consider the question of the cook only. This is a single day's example. Let us suppose that her wage is 2 per day. Let us also suppose that the surplus labour is worth another 2. Let us suppose that after the master has purchased all the articles required for the family and has paid 2 as wages

to the cook, there still remains 3 money with him. Let us suppose that the family actually needs the cooking labour having '4 value'. The cook would do that much labour per day. If the whole of that labor is to be paid, 4 money has to be given to her. Which means, 2 have to be paid to the cook also from 3 money, which still remained with the master. But, the master won't give like that. Therefore, can that money of 2, which has been kept back without giving to the cook i.e., 2 out of 3 which remained with the master, be called surplus-value that has been derived from the cook? Does it mean that the master from the cook has derived money of 2? No. It cannot be so. It would be wrong if we understand like that. Even the money of 3 remaining with the master has been derived from the productive labourers only and there is no money, which has been derived from the household cook.

What happens if 2 out of 3 money remaining with the master is considered to have come from the cook? It appears as if the surplus value, which has been derived from the productive labourers, has decreased. In this example, it appears as 6 only instead of 8. It means that we have to assume that the master obtained 6 money from the productive labourers and 2 money from the household-cook. To assume this way is an absolutely wrong calculation.

If the surplus labour of the cook also has been transformed into '2 money', then it should appear thus: this 2 money should also appear by the side of 3-money (which remained with the master earlier) without any relation to it. That is $3+2 = '5 \text{ money}'$ should be found with the master.

The '8 money' that has been obtained by the master from the productive labourers together with the 2-money that has been obtained from the household cook, that is '10 money in total' should be found. But, it has not happened like that. Whatever be the way in which we calculate, the total money that is with the master will be 8 only and not more than that. Which means that the surplus labour of the cook has not transformed into money for the capitalist.

What the master's family gained from the cook's surplus labour is not 'an increase' in money but, a 'reduction' in the expenses. These two are not the same. Though the cook has performed the labour of a value of $2 V + 2 S = 4$, no part of this has been converted into money. Then, how did the cook receive money as her wage even though her labour had not been converted into money? She received it out of the 'income' that was already there in the hands of the master. The expenditure of the master has decreased because he paid only 2 instead of 4 money while spending his income. Had that saved amount too been spent, only '1 money' would have remained with the master. A money of 3 has remained with the master simply because the required amount has not been spent. That money is simply a remaining part of the money, which has come from the productive labourers, and it cannot be assumed that 2 out of it is the money derived from the cook. If we consider so, we will have to arrive at the conclusion that even the surplus labour of the unproductive labourers would also convert into money. Moreover, the surplus value that has actually been derived from the

productive labourers appears in a reduced state. We have already seen these points. Therefore, it only means that the expenditure of the master has reduced since he paid only 2 instead of 4. And it does not mean that the money has increased because of the cook.

The labour of the productive labourers will convert into 'value' (into money) for the master. It will not be as 'use value' to the master.

The labour of the unproductive labourers will not convert into value for the master. It will be as 'use value'.

The 'productive - unproductive distinction' depends upon whether the money spent by the master is returning with an increase or is consumed without returning back.

The most important thing to be understood from this is that the money (income) which a capitalist receives is something that comes only through the productive labourers, and not even a single paisa out of it comes from the unproductive labourers.

The gardener, driver, and other workers who work for the master's family are all unproductive labourers. All these render 'surplus value'. But none of their labour converts into money. The unproductive labourers receive wages only from the 'productive profit' obtained by the master from the productive labourers.

That is, if the productive labourers render means of subsistence and luxuries to the master's family through their

'surplus value', the unproductive labourers render all the services necessary for the master's family. Thus, the master's family, without doing either outside work or household work, lives on the exploitation of the productive and unproductive labourers.

Unless the capitalist gets the 'surplus value' through the productive labourers, it is not possible for him to employ the unproductive labourers at home. The latter is possible only due to the occurrence of the former. If the first thing ceases, the second one will also cease. Which means, the liberation of the unproductive labourers depends on the liberation of the productive labourers.

Whatever applies to a single capitalist the same will apply to the whole society.

If we consider society as a whole, all the commercial workers who perform the labour of 'buying and selling' are unproductive labourers only (we cannot see the details here).

All the people such as watchmen, security guards etc., who perform the work of 'guarding' at places of production are merely unproductive labourers. [Since their labour is not a natural requirement for the products that are being produced there].

All the people such as police, soldiers and jail employees who work under the government's control are merely unproductive labourers. [Since the government does not sell their labour as commodities, the government itself is their

master. This master spends on these kinds of labour merely out of the income that it gets through taxes].

Similarly, all the employees who work in the schools, and hospitals run free by the government are also unproductive labourers.

The entire unproductive labour in a society does not convert into money for the masters.

If we assume that the value of the total mass of commodities produced on a single day in the whole society to be 'one crore', there won't be a single paisa that has come from the unproductive labour in that amount.

However, if we take a male or female unproductive labourer, he or she will get only money as wage, even if that person's labour is not converted into value in the society. With that money, it becomes possible for that person to live as an independent individual with self-earning like the productive laborers.

The class that subsists on 'wages' by doing labour is the 'class of laborers' (working class). All the productive and unproductive laborers taken together constitute the class of laborers. The center for this class is - productive laborers only.

The class that lives on interests, profits, land rents etc., by 'exploiting the labour' is the 'exploiting class'. The center for this class is - the 'productive capitalists'.

3. Independent Labour

'Independent' means 'without the master'. We call it independent labour if a person or persons themselves produce commodities without a master and without employing laborers. They are independent laborers or independent producers. There would be both men and women among them.

The persons in a family may run a small hotel with their own labour or may weave clothes and sell them, or may stitch clothes. They may do carpentry. Thus they might do several kinds of work.

Even the 'value' of the commodities, which the Independent laborers produce, has to be divided into $C+V+S$. The means of production are their own. The labour, which they perform, would be a total of $V+S$. When the commodities are sold, they alone will receive the entire value of the commodities. When 'C' is deducted from that value, the remaining will be their $V+S$. Of these, 'V' may be assumed as the 'value of their labour power' and 'S' as their surplus value. Receipt of these 2 parts by them alone implies that no part of their labour goes to the master (since there is no master at all).

Since the independent labour also converts into money as the productive labour does, money in society appears to be connected with the productive and independent labour. That is, if we assume that the value of mass of commodities produced in the society as a whole on a single day is one crore rupees, it only means that it is the total sum produced in

productive and independent branches! However, the parts that constitute independent labour would be very small in the capitalist society.

If the commodities are produced or a particular work is done for one's own needs and not for the sake of selling outside, then the term 'Independent' will not exist. When the work is performed for one's own needs, the question whether there is a master or not becomes meaningless and hence the word independent would cease to exist and the terms 'producers' or 'labourers' remain. But, as the term labourers denotes the same old meaning of those who work under masters, it will be more meaningful to use the term 'producers' rather than 'labourers' on those occasions when labour is performed for one's own needs.

4. Family Labour

Persons in the family belong to at least three generations. They are wife and husband, their children and parents of wife and husband.

Parents are of the first generation. They will be in their old age. These people having completed the stage of doing 'labour' inside and outside the house will be at the stage of taking rest for the most part.

Wife and husband are the second-generation persons. They will be at the stage of labouring for full time.

Children are persons of third generation. They will be still in their childhood. They will do labour in future.

Articles like rice, clothes etc. required for the subsistence of the family are produced 'outside'. No others do labour 'outside' for these articles than the persons of this family itself. Both the wife and the husband, or only one of them does that labour outside. On the articles which were produced outside and that have been brought to the home, various types of labour are yet to be done at home. These may be divided mainly into 4 types (1) cookery (2) cleanliness of the house: including cleaning of utensils, washing of clothes etc., (3) child care, (4) care of the aged. These duties constitute 'family labour' or 'house work'.

Housework has been the responsibility of women alone since generations in all the countries of the world. Though some women are also doing outside labour like men, they are expected to discharge all the household duties as their responsibility. Which means that these women labour both at home and outside.

Here we cannot discuss the questions as to why the housework had become the responsibility of women in the 'social division of labour'. But, the housework has been the responsibility of only women since historical time. This clearly indicates the 'inequality' between man and woman. Therefore, in order to resolve this 'inequality' we should firstly observe the nature of 'housework'.

Is housework productive labour, unproductive labour or independent labour? Or none of these three kinds? If so, why?

Examining 'family' implies examining 'man-woman relationships'. Man-woman relations are of two types: (1) physical relationships, (2) social relationships.

Social relationships mean 'labour relationships'. It means that there exist labour relationships even between wife and husband.

Though physical relationships exist according to natural properties, they (physical properties) depend upon 'social nature'. That is, whatever nature the society has, it influences the man-woman physical relationships also. Here firstly we shall see the 'labour relationships' between man and woman instead of their physical relationships.

Though certain numbers of women are working at home and outside as well, we will first see the situation of women who are confined to housework.

Let us suppose that the wife in a family is confined to the house and does 'house work'; and the husband is doing some 'job' (some labour) under a master. What is the difference between the conditions of these two persons?

The husband is selling his labour to a master. The master will pay wage for that labour, irrespective of whether it is productive labour or unproductive labour to him. The husband's labour gets money. The husband will be able to buy means of subsistence for the whole family.

The wife will do all the household chores. These too constitute labour. Let us consider cooking work as an example representing all the household chores. Food stuffs are made at home. Whatever factors are necessary for making those stuffs outside, the same will be necessary in order to make them at home also. Which means, 'means of production' and 'labour' have to be spent. Let us consider these items as C+V+S just as we consider them outside. The entire 'C' is husband's labour. V+S constitutes wife's labour. With these items, food stuffs at home are made. But they don't sell these stuffs outside. They use them only for household necessities. These products will be consumed and get expended; thereby the household needs will be satisfied. None of those expenses will return. If new foodstuffs are required the next day, again new C+V+S are needed. That is, the foodstuffs prepared at home are merely use-values to that family and not 'commodities'. The husband is not a capitalist who gets commodities produced and sold. The wife is not a labourer who works on the basis of wage. The foodstuffs prepared by the wife are not sold outside. Hence, they won't convert into money. That is, the labour of the wife will not convert into money. It will not so happen that the wife loses her surplus value or the husband increases his money by extracting surplus value from his wife. Which means, the 'labour relationship' that exists between the wife and the husband is not the one that exists between a capitalist and a productive labourer. Therefore, the labour of the wife does not become even productive labour.

Similarly, the labour of the wife does not become even unproductive labour. Because, she is not a labourer who comes from outside, works on the basis of wage for the master's family and goes away. The relationship, which she and her husband have, is not the one that exists between a master and an unproductive labourer. Therefore her labour does not become even unproductive labour.

The labour of the wife will not even become independent labour because, independent labour by nature produces commodities necessarily for selling them outside. That labour converts into money. But housework does not produce commodities for sale. It doesn't convert into money. Therefore it is not an even independent labour either.

It means that the wife is neither a productive labourer nor an unproductive labourer or an independent labourer.

What then remains is only that labour which is devoid of productive, unproductive and independent characteristics.

Housework is that labour which is done for 'one's own necessities'. It doesn't convert into value. To be a use-value without converting into value is in its very nature. Whoever does that work that is its very nature. Its character will not change even if the husband, instead of the wife, or any one else does it: either a man or a woman.

The expenses connected with the household should be described only in such terms which are appropriate to the present relationship and not as we described in the relationship

between master and labourers. 'C' is the means of production, which the master invests. Let us call the means of production of the household as MP. The labour of the labourers is 'V+S'. Let us call the labour at household as 'L' (labour). Which means, we refer to expenses of the household not by the name 'C+V+S', but as MP+L. Of this, the whole MP is the labour of the husband. The whole L is the labour of the wife. The maintenance of the family continues only by the combination of the labour of both the persons. Everyday new MP and new L would be spent. It means that there is a 'division of labour' between the husband and the wife. It is such a division of labour wherein outside work is meant for the husband and the housework is meant for the wife. Now we have to see 'who is in what state owing to this division of labour'.

The husband through his labour is getting the 'products of subsistence' for himself, for his wife and children. He is responsible for his own maintenance. In his capacity as a father, he is responsible for half of the 'maintenance of the children'. Only these two aspects constitute his responsibility. But the husband is bearing the maintenance of the wife and the half part of which should be borne by the mother with regard to the maintenance of the children as well. It means that out of the products, which he is securing through his labour, the husband is giving one half toward the responsibilities he himself has to fulfil and another half toward the responsibilities, which the wife has to fulfil.

Now if we examine the situation of the wife, she does all the household chores concerning herself, her husband and

children. She is responsible for that part of the work, which is meant for herself. In her capacity as a mother, she is also responsible for that part of the work, which is concerned with the childcare. Only these two aspects constitute her responsibilities. But the wife alone does the work concerned with the husband and also half of the work which the father has to perform with regard to childcare. That is, the wife, out of the household chores, which she performs, does one half toward the responsibilities that she has to fulfil and another half toward the responsibilities that her husband has to fulfil.

(Here we are not mentioning the question of the old people in the family. The old people are the parents of the wife and husband. Since the old people, when they were performing labour had taken care of the children, the children, after they become adults have to take care of the aged people with their labour. It is merely giving back to the parents what they had taken from them. There is nothing that is specially done to the old people. When we speak of the question of wife and husband it means that all the matters concerning the 'family' are included in it.)

The relation, wherein the husband gets the 'products of subsistence', and the wife does the household chores implies that the wife is utilizing the labour of the husband and the husband is utilizing the labour of the wife. Which means that, there exist 'labour relationships' even between the wife and husband. However, those relations are not relations of exploitation of labour.

We have already seen that, in the relations of 'exploitation of labour' the master stands as a person providing 'employment' to the labourers and labourers as those working on the basis of 'wage'. Further, we need to recall another point, which we have seen earlier. In the relations of exploitation of labour, the master always extracts the labour of the labourers. Labourers don't take any labour from the master. But the labour relations of the wife and husband are not like that. Instead of the husband always taking the labour of the wife, both of them take each other's labour. Both of them depend on each other's labour.

If the wife depends on the husband for the 'articles of subsistence', the husband depends on the wife for the household chores.

Thus both depend on each other. But, what is 'primary' and what is 'secondary' in these 'dependencies'? That is, which aspect is dependent on which aspect? Are these two dependencies identical and equal? No. These two are not equal things.

We will be able to understand what is primary and what is secondary only if we understand as to which aspect is dependent on which aspect in these labour relations.

In the first place, only if there are articles of subsistence, then the question of making them ready for use arises. Only if there is a house, the question of cleaning it arises. Only when there is rice, the question of cooking it arises. Only if there are clothes, the question of washing them arises.

Thus, if the wife has to do 'household duties' first there should be the articles of subsistence that the husband gets. These articles of subsistence themselves would constitute the means of production for the performance of labour which the wife does. If these are absent, it is not possible for the wife to do any labour.

If we examine the situation of the husband, the labour, which he does for earning the 'articles of subsistence', is performed at the 'workplace' of the master, [It is either the 'workplace' where commodities are produced or the work at the master's house]. That is, the labour of the husband is performed on the 'means of production' of the master. But not on the 'house hold chores' which the wife does. It means that the household chores done by the wife would not be the 'means of production' for the husband's labour.

This does not mean that the household chores done by the wife are not useful to the husband. As the household duties of the wife are useful to the husband, the articles of subsistence that the husband brings are also useful to the wife. This is the context in which we examine the question as to which of these uses is primary and which is secondary.

If the wife has to do the household duties, there should be, to begin with articles of subsistence which the husband brings.

If the husband has to do labour for those articles of subsistence, there should be before hand the 'means of production' with the master.

(If this husband is supposed to be a productive labourer, the means of production which lie with the capitalist and on which the husband performs his labour in fact are not those of the capitalist. All those means belong to the productive labourers only. They are those that converted into 'C' from the 'surplus value' which the productive labourers had given in the past. We cannot see these details here).

Here, of the relations that exist between the three persons - namely, the wife who is confined only to the housework, the husband who does labour outside and the master of that husband, we are examining only those 'labour relations' that exist between the 'wife and husband'.

In the labour relationship of the wife and husband, the husband's labour is the first point. As that labour converts into money, it is possible to purchase the products of subsistence with that money. Only if that labour is performed, the products of subsistence can be secured. That is, the husband is in such a situation where he is earning his own products of subsistence. The labour of the wife is the second point. The labour of the wife is performed only when there are the articles of subsistence that the husband brings. The wife's labour doesn't convert into money. Therefore, the wife, unlike her husband, has no such condition wherein she earns her own articles of subsistence.

Which aspect of labour is depending on which aspect? It is wife doing labour that is dependent on the husband doing labour. But the husband doing labour is not dependent on the wife doing labour.

Though both dependent on each other, of these dependencies, the main point is that the wife alone is dependent on the husband for her maintenance. The fact that the husband is dependent on the wife for 'household chores' is a secondary point.

These two points are not the same. The second aspect is occurring only due to the first aspect. But it is not so that the first one is occurring due to the second one.

The disparity between the situations of wife and husband is nothing but the disparity between the conditions in which labour converts into money and in which it does not convert so.

If we assume that the value of the mass of the commodities produced on a single day in the society as a whole is '1 core rupees' not even a single paisa of it would be related to the 'household duties'. We have already seen that there won't be any part of the 'unproductive labour' also in that amount. But even though the unproductive labour does not convert into value, the persons doing that labour would get wages in the form of money only. It doesn't so happen in the case of housework.

Therefore, between the husband and wife the condition of the husband doing the 'outside labour' is independent. The condition of wife doing the 'housework' is dependent.

It means, the primary cause of the 'dependency' of woman is that she is confined to 'housework' only. There will

be many secondary causes, which emerge out of this primary cause. That is a different question.

Usually a major mistake is committed while understanding the labour relationships of husband and wife. That mistaken argument will be like this: "It is true that there should be articles of subsistence if the labour of the wife is to be performed. But, if the labour of the husband is to be performed, the wife should perform beforehand all the 'household chores' for the formation of 'labour power' of the husband. The husband will not acquire the labour power without the labour of the wife. Therefore, the labour of the wife alone is primary thing. Labour of the husband is secondary". This is how the argument goes on.

If we argue thus: 'If the husband has to acquire 'labour power' the labour of the wife should be there beforehand', this argument will not stop there itself. Then a question arises thus: 'Are the articles of subsistence brought by the husband not obligatory beforehand for the wife to acquire 'labour power' in order to do whatever work she has to do? Then, this line of argument goes back and forth as follows:

Wife's labour should be there prior to the husband's labour. Husband's labour should be there even prior to the wife's labour.

Wife's labour should be there even more prior to the husband's labour.

In this manner, we have to go back and further back. However back we may go, we cannot locate the beginning. Even if we go to the unmarried stage of the wife and the husband, the situation will not change. It becomes evident that while the wife received all the articles of subsistence before her marriage through her father (through a 'man'), the husband received all the household services before his marriage through his mother (through a 'woman'). Which means, the same situation existed between man and woman even there! If we proceed according to the argument that, "If the man has to acquire labour power, woman's labour should be there beforehand", a question will go on appearing thus: "Should not the labour of man be there beforehand if woman has to acquire labour power to do the labour?" In this kind of an argument, the 'beginning' can never be located. It will never be possible to understand as to which labour is primary and which labour is secondary, and which labour is dependent on which labour. It follows that this argument itself is wrong!

Whether the person doing labour is a man or a woman, whether that labour is housework or outside work, the actual requirements for the performance of labour are merely the means of production and the people who do labour. That's all. The question as to how those labouring people acquired the labour power is not relevant.

If the labour of the wife is to be performed at home, the articles of subsistence that the husband gets should already be there. If the labour of the husband is to be performed

outside, it has nothing to do with the labour of the wife. The 'means' which the master provides outside should be ready.

When we consider husband and wife alone, the labour of the husband is the primary aspect within their labour relationships. As the husband gets the articles of subsistence, the husband acquires the power as the 'householder'. The wife would be in a subservient position in relation to that power.

But the relationship, which results due to this 'question of maintenance', is not the relation of exploitation of labour. Neither the wife constitutes a class performing labour, nor the husband a class, which exploits that labour. Thus, the husband and wife are not the master and the servant who stand in the relationships of 'exploitation of labour'.

But, though the relationship of husband and wife is not directly the relationship of exploitation of labour, this relation is also a relationship of the master and the servant that prevails in the family domain.

The labour relationship of husband and wife is the relationship between the housework and outside work necessary for the family. That family is a family with an 'unequal division of labour'. That division of labour is one that has been formed on the basis of the exploitative relations of production. Thus, the exploitation of labour that prevails in the society stands as the prime cause for the unequal situations of man and woman.

Since 'man' in the 'unequal division of labour' is himself the householder, man himself is the master of the family (though that masterhood is not the one which extracts 'surplus value') and the woman is a servant who is subservient to that master (though that servanthood is not the one which loses the surplus value). Thus, the husband and the wife would become 'master and servant in the family domain due to the unequal division of labour'.

Then, what is the solution to this? For this, the capitalist intellectuals have already discovered some ways out. They are: As the labour of the husband is converting into money so also the labour of the wife should convert into money. The way out for this is paying 'wage' to the wife either by the husband or by the government itself! Let us now see how proper these solutions are.

Husband paying wage to the wife: Husband has no need to pay the wage like this. It is because, the husband is not taking the 'household chores' from the wife free. He is giving the articles of subsistence to her in return for it. Therefore, the husband has no responsibility of paying the wage to the wife.

In case, for the sake of example, the husband is obliged to pay 'money' to the wife for the 'household chores' which he takes from her, then the wife too is obliged to pay 'money' to the husband for the 'articles of subsistence' which she takes from him. It means that the husband and wife should be like buyers and sellers to each other.

The husband has to sell half of the articles of subsistence to the wife and purchase half of the household chores from her. Similarly, the wife too has to sell half the 'household chores', which she does to the husband, and purchase half the articles of subsistence which the husband secures. Okay, let us continue this line of argument.

If the wife has to begin her work, it is simply not possible even to begin the work unless she purchases half of the articles of subsistence from the husband. It means that the wife alone has to pay money first. But, where is the money for her? Whatever she has to purchase from the husband, she has to purchase on 'credit' basis. Which means, to begin with, the wife has to take a loan, and only then has to begin the work. When one day is completed, the husband has to pay money to the wife for half the portion of the 'household chores'. But by that time, the wife owes to the husband. It follows that both the husband and wife have to settle the accounts in the pleasant night. When the debit account and credit account are compared each will cancel the other. There is no scope for the wife to get 'real money' into her hands. She will not have the chance of even setting her eyes on the money due to her.

Thus, everyday the wife will be first borrowing the loan and then clearing that debt. Everyday the wife invariably will be in this situation. The husband would never be in such a situation. He will always stand only as a lender and not as a borrower in relation to his wife.

Will the problem of the wife be solved by this accounting? It won't. Even now the old conditions stand unperturbed. Even now, the outside work is meant for the husband and housework for the wife! Which means, they will be in the same situation even now as they were at the time when they didn't do any accounting. But now it appears in the account as though the wife is getting money. Yet, the husband will still be in a dominating position. The reason for this is obvious. It is because the husband gets money for his labour from outside without any connection with the wife. Thus the condition will not change even if the sales, purchases and money calculations enter into the relationship of husband and wife.

In a sense, this relationship now sinks into a more degraded state than earlier. If we see the situation of the wife, she becomes a cook and a servant who works for money and a prostitute who sells her body for money. Though the husband is also similar to the wife in another sense, he stands in a dominant position in every 'bargain'! When both have become buyers and sellers to each other, it would not be a cohabitation (living together) and familial relationship.

Now let us see another way out, namely, the government itself should pay the wage to housewives.

Why does anybody get something called 'wage'? How will it come? When one approaches a master and does some work, then one would get a portion of that labour itself as wage. If we say that government itself should pay the wage to

the housewife, is she giving her labour to the government? How can the government pay a housewife who doesn't work in any of the governmental institutions? Why should it pay at all?

If the government has to pay the wage to the housewife, for the sake of example, where should the government get it? Where should it collect? It should be collected from her husband. Which means, the government should take it from the husband and has to pay the same to his wife! This means, husband himself pays the wage to the wife. Why will the husband agree to this? Why will he entrust his money to the government? Let us keep these questions aside.

To make our example easier, let us consider the husband as a person who too performs manual labour outside, since all the household chores constitute manual labour only. Which means, in this example, both the husband and the wife belong to the category of manual labourers. Let us suppose that the wage of the husband is 10 per day and the wage of the wife too is 10 per day. As we should not assume the wage of the wife as something less than the wage of the husband, we have assumed the wages of the two are equal. But if the husband pays 10 out of his wage 10 to the government toward the wage of the wife, how would he take the articles of subsistence to the house? None of the intellectuals, who say that wage should be paid to the wife, has explained as to how the husband has to perform this circus feat.

Or, if the working hours of wife at home are more than the working hours of the husband outside, the wage of the wife should be higher than the wage of the husband. Then, even circus feats will not be of any use.

Or should we assume that the value of the entire household duties done by the wife is very low; that the husband can easily pay it out of his wage, that there remains a large amount of the wage with the husband even after paying to the wife; and that he could easily buy all the articles of subsistence with whatever remains in his wage? Unless we assume the wife's wage as very low, how can the husband pay that wage out of his wage? Or, if both their 'wages' are equal how should the husband pay the wage of the wife?

If the husband has to pay the wage to the wife, it is somewhat possible in one way. This is how it is possible: both the husband and the wife should equally spend on all the articles of subsistence required for the house. Further, the husband should also do half of the household duties, isn't it? Not doing so what he would say is this: "I have to do half of the household duties, isn't it? But I won't do, I will pay wage for that. You alone do my portion of the work also!" This is how the husband will be able to pay that money to the wife: As he spends on only half of the articles of subsistence, the money will thus remain with him. With that money, he would be able to pay his wife. But, the wife has to pay back that money towards the half portion of the articles of subsistence. That is, the essence is, it will be possible for the wife to receive some 'money as wages' from the husband only in such a way

whereby both of them bear the expenditure of the articles of subsistence equally and the husband remains without doing any housework.

Whether it is the husband or the government, which pays wage to the housewife, it basically means asking the housewife to remain as housewife only! It is just saying "Housewife! You confine yourself to the household duties only! Well, any way women have nothing to do with the outside world and the men will look after all those things"! That is, housework is always for women and outside work is always for men! Which means this great argument of "wage for housework" keeps the old division of labour as ever and preserves male domination unshaken as ever.

Women who are denied conditions that make them equal to men and who are restricted exclusively to household duties may have to be called 'domestic slaves' or 'domestic servants'.

Then, what is the correct solution to this problem? Establishment of conditions of equality between husband and wife. It means that the question of 'maintenance of the wife' and the question of 'household duties of the husband' as well should change. Which means, the existing division of labour should change.

The wife ought to do outside labour also in the same manner as the husband is doing outside labour. Then the labour of the wife will convert into money, as the labour of the husband does. Due to that, there arises a condition of

independence whereby the woman too, like man will 'earn her own products of maintenance'. The condition of dependence wherein the wife depends on the husband for maintenance will vanish. The wife's money will also be spent on the maintenance of the family.

Next, regarding the 'household duties', the husband also should do the household duties in the same manner as the wife is doing. Then the dependency of the husband on the wife for household duties will disappear. The husband's work will also be for the family only.

Both will do outside work.

Both will do housework.

The labour of both the people will convert into value due to the outside work.

The labour of both the people will not convert into value due to the housework.

Both of them, in their capacity as parents, will maintain the children with equal responsibility. They will also do the work connected with the children with equal responsibility.

Then, the dependency of the wife on the husband for 'maintenance' or dependence of the husband on the wife for 'household duties' would not be there. Neither of them would depend on the other.

But, both would 'cohabit' (live together) as husband and wife and as parents to the children. It is the unity of man and woman who are free.

Thus, both become equals only through the 'equalization' of their conditions of labour.

If we want to see this in the form of MP+L, both people would provide MP required for the family. Both would do L. Both enter into the 'equal division of labour'.

Then, dependencies on each other will not be there. Therefore, there will not be any scope for differences such as 'which is primary and which is secondary' regarding any matter. There won't be any scope for that question itself.

5. Women who do labour at Home and outside as well

Now let us see another situation among women. What is the position of the women who also do the entire housework while doing the outside work?

Among sections which perform 'manual labour', not only men but women too will be doing the outside productive and unproductive labours.

Even among the sections which perform 'mental labour', some women do outside labour (jobs).

If women perform outside labour, whatever applies to men concerning outside labour would also exactly apply to women.

The women doing outside labour is a labourer of the master (either as a productive labourer or as an unproductive

labourer). In return for that labour, she gets ‘money’ (wage). With that ‘money’ she would be able to purchase her own ‘articles of subsistence’. She would be able to fulfil her responsibility with regard to the maintenance of children. The relationship between this labourer and the master who provided her work is not one that of ‘familial relationship’. It is the relation of the ‘exploitation of labour’.

Even if the woman does not work for a master outside, but if she is producing ‘commodities’ as an independent labourer, that labour converts into ‘money’. Therefore, it amounts to the fact that she is doing ‘outside labour’.

The woman doing the outside labour too will have the responsibility of doing half of the ‘household duties’. Then the second half of the work will be the responsibility of the husband. But, neither the husband nor the wife has the right to evade housework wholly, on the ground that they are doing outside work.

The performance of outside labour by women belonging to the section of ‘manual labours’ has been there since the past times also. But, the major portion of that outside labour was concerned with the families of the masters.

The entry of women belonging to the sections of ‘mental labour’ into outside labour has started gradually under capitalism alone.

Even today, we do not find men doing household chores in any family whereas women are doing outside labour. The

fact that women are doing entire household chores as their own responsibility in addition to the outside labour implies that such women are doing two types of labour fully and also double the labour than what their husbands do. Though these women are suffering from the hardship of ‘doing double labour’, their performance of outside labour implies that these women have begun the journey along the path of emancipation from domestic confinement. This represents a very progressive aspect of the life of these women. The authority of the husband over the woman who has the opportunity of securing herself the maintenance of herself and her children would necessarily get reduced to some level or the other (even if it is only to a certain extent).

However, the authority of the husband would also be continuing at certain level even over that woman. The reason for the authority not disappearing is that a change, namely, entry of the husband into the housework, has not yet taken place. That is, though the change in the ‘old division of labour’ has begun, yet it is not in a proper manner.

The proper manner means both should do outside work to secure MP and similarly both should do L necessary at home. Because of this, half the burden of the housework decreases and the wife would be able to spend time for outside work. Those two kinds of duties together constitute a full-time work for the wife. Similarly half the burden of the outside work decreases and thereby the husband too would be able to spend time for the housework. These two kinds of duties together constitute a full-time work for the husband also. If

changes take place in this manner, the old division of labour would change without an increase in the labour time for anybody.

When the wife alone goes for the outside work without any change occurring on the husband's side, the work time of the wife will become double. Though she gets the benefit of getting a wage due to the outside work, the authority of the husband over her would still continue at some level since the entire housework still continues to be her own responsibility.

When we speak of changing the division of labour, that change should occur not simply from the side of the wife but also from the side of the husband.

It means that if the division of labour in the house is to change, the division of labour outside should also change! That is, there is a necessary connection between the two!

In society, the same process that can bring about equality in the 'outside - labour relationships' can alone bring about equality between man and woman in the families too. When we speak of 'equality in the outside labour relationships', the foremost change that should occur is the elimination of the distinction called 'masters and labourers'. The way for such elimination is simply that the class of masters who are consuming the surplus value of the labourers without doing labour should get down to the labour. If everybody enters into the labour, the distinction of masters and labourers will begin to fade-out.

When we speak of "all people doing labour" many details are to be understood. In the case of household chores, there will not be any distinctions such as manual labour and mental labour. All kinds of household chores are manual labour. However, there are such distinctions as skilled labour and unskilled labour among them.

But, when we speak of outside labour, all of it is not manual labour. There would also be mental labour. In both these types there would be such distinctions as skilled and unskilled.

If one manual labour and one mental labour are taken in the same proportion, the value of the mental labour is higher than the value of the manual labour, according to the 'law of value'. (For example: the value of mental labour of one hour is higher than the value of manual labour of one 'hour'). Similarly, the value of skilled labour is higher than the value of unskilled labour.

If we assume that there are a total of 100 types of labour in society, the values of all types of labour will not be similar. But those values would not be different in 100 ways. Though the values of 100 kinds of labour do not differ in 100 ways, there would definitely be at least some differences. That is, let us assume that the values of 100 kinds of labour would be 4 or 5 groups (grades). If we assume 20 types of manual labour as one group, any labour falling under that group will have the same value. Similarly, if we assume 30 types of mental labour as one group, any labour in that group will have the

same value. Thus, the total values of various kinds of labour in a society would be in certain groups at certain levels.

The existence of the values of various kinds of labour at higher or lower levels is an inevitable phenomenon. It is not possible to eliminate those distinctions. If distinctions between the levels of values is an invariable phenomenon and if one person is always doing one type of mental labour and another person is always doing one type of manual labour, the incomes which they get due to that labours would invariably be different. If the incomes were different, all the living conditions of these individuals would be different. The living conditions would necessarily be 'unequal', whether we view them from the value perspective or from the 'use value' perspective. That is, though every person is doing 'some labour or the other in accordance with the principle that 'everybody should labour', the living conditions of the people would invariably be unequal! Therefore, it is not sufficient that all people enter into labour and simply do some labour. It still won't solve the problem of inequality completely. Which means, we have to change the inequality, which remains.

Take any two persons. If their living conditions are to be equal, their incomes should be equal. For their incomes to be equal, the labour that they do should be equal.

What is meant by 'labour' being 'equal'? If the distinction between manual labour and mental labour is

invariable, how is it possible for the kinds of labour, done by any two persons to be equal?

If you ask how, we will here come to the solution by changing the old division of labour into a new division of labour. 'Old division of labour' means, one person always doing only one labour. It might be either mental labour or manual labour. But the 'new division of labour' means, one person doing both manual labour and mental labour interchangeably instead of doing only one type of labour.

If there are 100 types of labour in society, it is not possible for every person to do all the 100 types of labour. But, let us assume that those 100 types of labour fall in 4 groups. It is possible for every person to do 4 types of labour from 4 groups at the rate of one type of labour from each group. It means that every person does certain manual labour and also certain mental labour! Then if we see the 'total labour' that any two individuals might do, it would be 'equal'. This equality is with regard to both 'value' as well as 'use value'. Thus, the 'new division of labour' will establish 'equal labour relationships' among all the people.

The foremost change, which should take place, is that all those living on exploitation without doing any labour (all men and women of exploiting families) should do some labour or the other. And then, a beginning should be made whereby all those who have always been doing mental labour would do manual labour also; and all those who have always been doing manual labour would do mental labour also. This is

the second change. If these changes take place the 'old division of labour' will completely vanish.

These changes also apply to the 'labour relationships' of man and woman. The first change that should occur is: outside work too for the women who are confined only to housework; and similarly, 'housework' too for the men who are limited to the outside work.

When we speak of outside work for women, it does not mean that again certain kinds of work are assigned there to women alone. For example: Let us suppose that we should run a 'canteen - like' dining hall in a factory. It is not the housework of a family. That is "outside work" only. It only means that some portion of the 'cooking work' that is done in several houses has been shifted outside the house. People would get wages for doing that work. Which means, that work converts into 'value' (into money). Let us, however, suppose that only women do all the duties in such outside dining halls. Let us also suppose that there will be no men in those duties. What does it mean? It means that the work 'cookery', whether it takes place at house or outside, is still, the job of women! Until such distinction as 'women's work or men's work' is eliminated, it amounts to the fact that the character of the old division of labour has not changed.

Similarly, let us suppose that women alone do all the work in the children's nurseries outside and that men won't do. Though a certain portion of 'child care' has been shifted outside from the houses, that work is again like the female

work even out side! Therefore, changing of the old division of labour between man and woman does not simply mean shifting of certain portions of the household chores outside and paying wages for them. Both man and woman should equally do all those duties, which have been shifted outside.

Both man and woman should do any type of work that takes place outside.

Even after certain portions of the household duties have been shifted outside, there still remain certain portions at home. It will never be possible to shift the entire housework outside. Which means, some portion of the 'housework' will always remain in the house. All such work that remains in the house must be done not only by women but also by men.

That is, changes such as the following should occur: Not only women but men too should perform that work which was hitherto considered as 'female tasks' in the society. Similarly, not only men but also women should perform those tasks, which were hitherto considered as 'male tasks'. Such distinctions as 'male tasks' and 'female tasks' should vanish.

Men and women should have equal responsibilities and equal rights. Only if it so happens, it would amount to the fact that the division of labour has changed and acquired new character. Thenceforth it will not be a 'division of labour between men and women'. It becomes a division of labour concerning all human beings!

If we see the question of division of labour between man and woman in isolation, we will find all the changes in it are linked with the social division of labour as a whole. That is, the 'inequality between men and women is a problem that arises out of the inequality in the 'labour relationships' between men and women. That inequality in the 'labour relationships' is a problem that emerges due to the inequality in the labour relationships concerning the whole society. Which means, it is a problem that arises out of the 'exploitation of labour'. Therefore, to understand or resolve any inequality between man and woman, we should be concerned with the question of 'labour relations'. The investigation should touch upon that problem.

Unless the fact, that there exist labour relationships even between men and women is understood, we will not find a solution to any inequality between men and women. Superficial changes and tips will shake no inequality.

6. House Work

Is housework a part of 'social labour' or not? If we understand by social labour that labour which is required for the society, then housework will also be a part of social labour. Or, if we interpret social labour as that labour which converts into value, then housework will not become a part of social labour.

Such forms of work as cookery, house cleaning, childcare are natural labours which the society always needs. The

society can never dispense with these labours. What should happen is that simply a part of this labour has to be shifted outside from the houses. That is, if a certain part of the total 'cooking work' is done at homes, certain portion may be carried on at common kitchens and in canteens at work places. This only means dividing the place where cooking is done but not dispensing with the work itself. The total cooking work that is necessary for the whole society would be done somewhere or the other in the whole society.

It is the same with regard to other labour concerning the family. Those kinds of labour too will be divided but will never be dispensed with.

If we take either one day or one year and see the total labour performed during this period, all kinds of labour performed at the houses will add to that total. But, if we see what is the total value produced during this period, then no labour done at the houses would add to that total.

Does it, however, mean that all the labour that does not convert into 'value' is going waste? No. It means that it is being spent as 'use value'. That is, if we see from the perspective of the 'use value', all the household chores are also, part of social labour. If we see from the perspective of 'value', none of those chores is part of social labour.

Under capitalism, only that labour which converts into value is social labour. That is, 'productive labour' alone is 'social labour'.

The unproductive labour does not produce any value. But as it also converts into money, to an ordinary viewer who sees things superficially, unproductive labour also appears as labour that produces 'value' (as if it is also productive labour), that is, it appears as if there is no difference between the kinds of labour in producing value.

Amidst this confusion, it becomes more difficult to understand 'family labour'.

Hence, the distinctions between the productive, unproductive, Independent and family labour should be understood properly.

Productive Labour : It produces 'value'. It converts into 'money'. A portion of that 'money' goes to the person who performed the labour and the remaining portion to the master.

Unproductive Labour : It does not produce 'value'. It would not convert into 'money'. But the person who performed that labour gets his 'wage' in the form of money only.

Independent Labour : It produces 'value'. It converts into 'money'. The person who performs that labour alone receives that money. Here, the productive and unproductive distinction does not apply.

Family Labour : It doesn't produce 'value'. It doesn't convert into 'money'. The person doing this labour would not get money. This labour gives only 'use value'.

We can understand the relationship between human beings only if we see the relationship in which the labour exists and not by seeing 'labour' in isolation.

It means that all men and women who work outside are doing 'social labour' and could earn the articles of maintenance on their own.

It means that the women confined exclusively to the 'family labour' are not doing 'social labour' and could not earn the articles of subsistence on their own. If we understand these things properly, we can understand such questions as to what is the role of 'family labour' in society and what is the situation of women who are confined exclusively to that labour alone. When the existing problem is understood properly, a correct way to resolve it will also be found.

The only solution for equality of men and women is that the men and women should do labour in the house as well as outside with equal rights and responsibilities.

However, this change depends upon the change in the exploitative relations of production concerning the whole society; and the 'change in the exploitative division of labour' that exists in those production relations. The same struggle, which takes place for equality in the production relations, will lead to the struggle for equality in the familial relationships and to the struggle on many such other issues.

7. What is the Class of Women?

What will be the answer to the question “which class do men belong to”? We should know whether those men are doing ‘labour’ or not. If they do labour they are the class of labourers. If they are not doing labour they are exploiting class. The class is determined only by the ‘labour’. Which means, all men do not constitute the same class.

The same is the case with women also. If some one asks ‘which class do women belong to’, we cannot answer it. We should know whether those women are doing labour or not. All the women do not constitute the same class. The class is determined by the relation to labour. But not according to whether they are men or women.

Every aspect that applies to men ‘who do labour’ also applies to women who do labour. Similarly, all the aspects that apply to men who don’t do labour also apply to women who don’t do labour.

Women who do ‘labour’, either in governmental institutions or private institutions or at the houses of government officials or at the houses of the private capitalists or any other place and earn ‘wage’ will, like men of the same type, become either ‘productive labourers’ or ‘unproductive labourers’. That means, they would belong to the ‘class of labourers’ only.

Women who produce and sell the products independently will become ‘independent producers’.

Women who don’t do any labour like men of the same type would belong to the ‘exploiting class’. Most of these women don’t even do ‘family labour’. The unproductive labourers alone will do all kinds of labours for them.

Some of the women belonging to the ‘exploiting class’ also do outside jobs. Those jobs are invariably connected with ‘mental labour’.

Women who don’t do outside labour and who are confined only to ‘household labour’ belong to the classes of those individuals from whom they receive the articles of subsistence.

If the husband of a woman who is confined only to ‘household labour’ is a labourer, that woman also belongs to the “Class of labourers”. Or, if the husband of that woman is an exploiter who earns interests or profits, then that woman also belongs to the ‘exploiting class’.

The answer to the question, Which class and which section of the class does a person belong to depends on such things as these: whether the person - man or woman - is doing ‘outside labour’ or not? In case that person is not doing outside labour, what sort of income is it by means of which he or she subsists?

Regarding the children, the class of parents itself is the class of the children.

In the class of labourers children belonging to the sections of ‘manual labour’ start doing labour right from their

childhood. These children belong to the 'class of labourers' not only through their parents but also through their own labour.

The children belonging to the sections of the 'mental labour; don't do any labour during their childhood.

Children, in the exploiting class don't do any labourers not only in childhood but also in the adulthood. These today's children are tomorrow's exploiters.

We have to know in a somewhat detailed manner about the women of the 'exploiting class'. In this class, women belonging to families with relatively less income perform some household chores. They get certain chores done by servants. Women in families with high income get all the household chores - including childcare done by domestic servants.

As all the families in this class don't stand at the same level, the women of those families too will not be in the same position. If we see the exploiting class in general disregarding their internal distinctions, the question of women doing jobs will not arise where even men don't do jobs. But, some of the women of this class act as 'directors' of the enterprises of their husbands (husbands place them like that) where properties belong to the husbands. Wives are also directors in those enterprises along with their husbands! The female directors 'work' as "hard" as the male directors do!

Just as men of this class do, the women of this class too whileaway time with pomp and luxuries. Embellishing

themselves with costly dresses and jewelry, indulging in feasts, fun and frolic constitute their daily routine.

While the labouring women are exhausted with several hours of labour everyday in the enterprises run by the fathers and husbands of these women without having any leisure and liberty even to breast-feed the children, these capitalist women entrust all the responsibilities of child care to the servants, 'toil' for hours and hours sitting in front of the dressing-table for dressing their hair, colouring their lips, trimming the eyebrows, selecting the clothing and for wearing them. At times when they can't withstand even that strain, they visit the beauty centres by cars, and get their hair combed, eyebrows trimmed and get ornated by paying very high charges. The car drivers have to linger out somewhere till all these decorations are completed! Later, if they go to the clubs the car drivers again have to linger out there! What the car drivers do is not simply driving the car but they also do the job of satisfying the egotism of the masters.

These capitalist women are 'equals' of the men in all sorts of luxuries such as card-playing, movies, smoking, boozing, horse races etc.

Women who hold capitalist ideas, who lead the capitalist life style and who live on the income of capitalist exploitation are the capitalist or bourgeois women. When these bourgeois women get bored of all common jollity, they resort to 'social service' for a little 'change' just as their men resort to the "service to art". That too, more specifically, into the 'service of the destitute women'! While the fathers and the husbands

of these women constantly create destitutes in the entire society, these women get their 'makeup' done at beauty centres, entering into the service of the 'destitutes', advise all women to become knowledgeable first. Later they advise women to make their children knowledgeable. Destitute women who were unable to understand what they were expected to become and what they were asked to do, turn blank faces as if listening to a speech in an alien language. After that scene is completed, they start narrating their hardships. A poor woman tells that she has no work, that she has no hut to take shelter, that all the children are ailing with diseases and have no medicines, that her husband who used to earn little died as his legs were cut off in the mill, that the owner of the mill did not pay them anything, that the owner of the hut drove them out as the rent wasn't paid; that children are starving and starving, that they should be generous in showing some way out - thus says various things crying and saluting. All the remaining people narrate her own story. All the narrations are of the same pattern. Men would die, or they would linger on with their mutilated limbs. The creditors would foray upon the huts. They take away whatever they find : small goblets and water pots. Children fall sick. There will be no food, no clothing and no shelter. They lack something or the other. Except the word 'no' and 'no' and 'no', there won't be any other word.

These bourgeois women would not have expected to hear 'all this rubbish' at the time of their entry into this 'game of serving the destitutes!' Something happens to their 'delicate'

hearts after listening to those lamentations and wails for sometime. They knavishly try to brush aside all those things by saying thus: "Okay dames! That's all right! You may represent all those things to the government. The government would surely do something or the other for you."

"We don't know where that government is. Can't you represent all this to the government on our behalf?... Take us to the government, we ourselves will request the government"

"No! We have not come for that. We came to teach you. Human being should be first a knowledgeable person. Only when woman becomes knowledgeable, the children would become knowledgeable. Now we will be giving you slates and books. Daily a teacher will come and..."

"Why do we need them? Give that money, we will buy jowar".

The enlighteners don't pay heed to that word. They get the piles of slates out of the cars quickly, distribute to all and go away saying, 'We will be back tomorrow'! All those slates convert into jowar and the destitute families maintain themselves for that day.

Next day, by the time the social servants arrive by cars, there are no signs of the destitutes becoming knowledgeable. The fruits of that service should appear by the same evening or next evening to the social servants who entered into this amusement after becoming bored of all other amusements! At the most they can wait for three days. But this service to

the destitutes will become an interminable matter that does not come to an end point, even after a week. Even after ten days those destitute women would not announce that “Madam! It is just because of you we all became knowledgeable! You have rescued us from the murk of ignorance. We would have remained in ignorance throughout our lives if you hadn’t come. From today, we will serve the country!”

The jollity of bourgeois women shifts very quickly. After a couple of weeks those women get fed up with the nuisance of these services and elude without going to those surroundings saying thus: ‘no use, we can’t change these stupid’ or saying that ‘the doctor has advised rest’. All the social services of the bourgeois women would thus conclude.

Actually who is a ‘destitute’? The real destitute in society is that person who does not have any ‘labour power’ to maintain herself. Viewed in this sense, the capitalist men and women are the real destitutes! All those women, whom the rich women consider destitutes, possess the ability and the capacity to do some work or the other. The rich women who lack any labour power don’t understand that they are more destitute. They don’t have an equal role on par with men even in the work of exploitation. Plunged in the intoxication of riches that their fathers and husbands plunder, they lead slothful and luxuriant lives, sans self-respect; and in this aspect they are in no way inferior to their men.

Therefore, all women are not of the same class.

All interests of women are not of the same type.

8. Total Population in the ‘Capitalist Society’

If we assume that there is a total population of 1 crore in the society, what are the conditions and places in which the population is found? [To make the example simpler, we don’t consider the Independent producers]. That population would be as follows:

- (1) At the productive work places, belonging to the government and the private.
- (2) At unproductive work places.
- (3) At places belonging to both the classes.
- (4) At institutions like courts and prisons (courts are productive so long as they earn the stamp fees. Prisons are productive as long as they get products produced by the prisoners, and sold. Yet these may be considered as unproductive institutions only).
- (5) At Orphanages [These are unproductive institutions only]
- (6) At such religious institutions as churches, temples, and monasteries.

In this total population all the products of subsistence of the sections of productive labour constitute ‘V’ of those sections. All those elements such as C+V required for the performance of unproductive labour; the products of

subsistence and luxury used by the exploitative sections; all the elements such as C+V etc., required for the capitalists to increase 'capital' - are out of 'S' of productive labourers.

We need to understand the labour relationships concerning the whole population in order to understand labour relationships in any kind of situation in a society.

9. 'Productive - Unproductive' distinction is specific only to the 'Capitalist Society'

After the 'productive-unproductive' distinction between various kinds of labour in the 'capitalist society' has been observed, if we observe the same thing in the 'slave society' and 'feudal society', it will become evident that the 'productive - unproductive distinction' does not apply over there.

Let us suppose that there are a few slaves under the control of a slave master. [There will be women also among them]. If a few of those slaves do agricultural work in the lands of the master, few others will do household duties for the family of the master. The products spent on the maintenance of all the slaves would constitute the 'value of their labour power'. It is a wage without the name of a 'wage'. The slaves who do labour both at the house and outside do 'surplus labour'. 'Surplus labour' gives 'surplus products'.

The surplus labour of the slaves is the only basis for the master's family to be able to survive without doing any labour.

Can we, however, classify that, of the labour, which the slaves perform, all the agricultural labour performed outside in the fields as productive labour and all the labour performed at the house of the master as 'unproductive labour'? It is not possible. Because, in the capitalist system, the entire production produced by the capitalist enters into sale and converts into 'money'. The capitalist derives surplus value from that money. Therefore, that entire 'outside labour' would be 'productive labour' for the capitalist. But this aspect would be quite different under slavery.

If we consider the agricultural labour performed in the fields of the slave master, the entire grains produced through that labour would not convert into commodity. That is, only a portion of it goes for sale. The remaining portion will be required for the maintenance of the slave families and for the maintenance of the family of the master. It won't enter into sale. Only that grain which has gone into sale will convert into money. The remaining portion would not convert into money. Then, would a certain portion of the agricultural labour become productive labour and certain other portion of it become unproductive labour? Would the slaves who perform agricultural labour become productive labourers on the one hand and unproductive labourers on the other? This is a meaningless thing. 'Surplus labour' exists in the 'slave society'. It gives 'surplus production'. But it does not convert into money. Hence, the productive and unproductive

distinction does not apply to the slave society just as it applies to the capitalist society.

Similarly, this distinction doesn't apply even to the feudal society. Even in this society all the products produced outside would not enter into sale.

If we consider the socialist society, and if we assume that everybody would do labour; that everybody would receive their own 'surplus value' and that there won't be such distinction as 'masters and labourers', the productive and unproductive distinction will not apply even in such labour relationships. This is, however, not a context to examine adequately all these aspects in detail. We cannot see all other aspects since the question at hand is only to understand the condition of the women who are confined exclusively to 'housework'.

10. The accusations of the Bourgeois Feminists against Marxism

Marxism insists that the class of lazy fellows which does not do labour but lives on exploitation by extracting interests, profits and rents, must be dragged into the labour force. This theory argues that no problem in society will be resolved unless the property rights and the ways and means of exploitation are abolished. That is why the class, which is insatiably accustomed to exploitation, is hostile to Marxism! That class explores various ways to carry on false propaganda

against Marxism. That class spends across the world one piece of the 'surplus value' that it extracts from the labourers through 3 shifts day in and day out for anti-Marxist campaign.

Bourgeois feminism as it exists today in any country is not at all innocent, who knows little or nothing, as in the past. Today's bourgeois feminism is surely one that has entered into the arena with a clear-cut goal called 'Anti-Marxism'. Bourgeois feminists receive 'funds' from bourgeois institutions for their office management, for the activities connected with meetings, for the printing of glittering books and for other luxuries, and for everything. The whole thing is remuneration for the service, which these feminists do for the exploiting class. Those who are insatiably accustomed to the flesh and blood of the class of labours and intoxicated by the 'surplus value' make the anti-Marxist propaganda itself their routine activity.

The major accusations, which the bourgeois feminists make against Marxism, are:

- (1) Marxism entrusts the responsibility of the maintenance of woman to man.
- (2) Marxism speaks only about the labour of the men but not about the labour of the women.
- (3) Marxism simply speaks about the 'production relations' but not about 'patriarchy' which oppresses women. All accusations are of this nature.

The essence of all these accusations is one and the same. Yet let us examine them one by one.

Bourgeois feminists accuse that Marxism has entrusted the responsibility of the maintenance of women to the men. As an example for this, they show the following aspect of Marxism. While explaining the question “what is meant by the ‘value of the labour power’”, Marx takes the male labourer as an example and says that the expenses to maintain the family (also expenditure of maintenance of the wife) would be part of the value of the ‘labour power’ of the man. Hence, they point out that aspect. They interpret that “to include the expenses of the maintenance of the wife in the value of the labour power of the husband amounts to saying that the husband alone has to maintain the wife and that ‘self maintenance’ for her is not needed”.

Is Marx explaining the existing situation in the society, or is he arguing that the society should remain in status quo forever? The bourgeois feminists attack Marxism without understanding at all the labour relationships prevailing in the society and the aspects related to ‘value’.

As there existed a situation wherein the husband secured the articles of subsistence of the wife during the time even prior to ‘Modern Industry’, Marx described the situation of that time. Marx also elucidated as to how the advent of women and children into the outside labour has occurred gradually since the outset of the ‘Industrial system’. When women enter into outside labour, they themselves could earn their own

subsistence. Therefore there is no dispute with regard to that age. However, the only point to be discussed is that: whether the subsistence of women in the proletarian families took place through man alone before the advent of modern Industry. Whether the women of the proletarian families were confined exclusively to the housework without doing any outside labour during that time?

It is a matter of fact that in any country the truth is that the number of female workers is not equal to the number of male workers. If we consider the same situation during the period of manufacture it would not be contrary to the fact that the number of female workers is very little compared to the number of male workers.

It means that the woman is fulfilling her own responsibility in the maintenance of the family only, if she is able to secure the expenses of her own maintenance and half the expenses of the maintenance of the children.

Did the situation, which does not exist even today, exist on that day? Will it not be a fact if it is assumed that the number of female workers was much less than the number of male workers? Or will it be contrary to the fact if it is assumed that the earnings of the female worker were much lower than earnings of the male worker during the whole year, though the women too performed certain kinds of labour?

Due to this fact, Marx had taken ‘male worker’ as a general example. This is not a decision, which Marx made out of his own likes and dislikes. Marx is not deciding that

“the maintenance of woman should be carried out by man alone”. He is stating a fact concerning the maintenance of the family in the society. He is not arguing that the said fact should remain as it is. He is not justifying that fact.

If both the husband and wife do labour for the master and take wages from him, even then, each wage would be the value of the ‘labour power’. Each wage would render ‘surplus value’ to the master. The proletarian family, which gets 2 wages, could consume some more products than the family, which gets a single wage.

Have all the women of the proletarian families been performing the outside labour and taking responsibility for half of the portion of the ‘maintenance of the family’ since the period prior to the ‘large-scale industry’? If that is true, why such arguments as “women are being confined only to housework”?

The actual fact is that even today, in any country, certain numbers of women in the families where men do mental labour or manual labour, are not performing the outside labour. While the situation is so even today, will it be contrary to the fact that the maintenance of the family was done by man? If the maintenance of the family has to be carried on by only man, will the maintenance of the wife too become a part of the value of the labour power (the wage) of the husband?

The bourgeois feminists who complain that ‘Marxism talked about the labour of men alone and not talked about the labour of women do not pay any attention to the ‘labour

relationships’ which Marxism talked about. Will the observations taking male worker as an example not apply to the female worker also?

If women also do outside labour like men, they too will become either productive labourers or unproductive labourers.

Or the labour of that woman will be consumed as ‘use value’ for the family if she doesn’t do outside labour. Then the man will do himself her maintenance himself.

Or, if the husband and wife in a family produce a ‘commodity’ they will become independent producers. However, in the labour performed in the family for the commodity, the labour of the wife will necessarily be less than the labour of the husband, since the wife has a main labour called ‘housework’. Even in the families of the Independent producers, i.e., in the families where women also do labour for the commodities, man himself is the master over the family due to the fundamental fact that the husband is the master of the family throughout the society. In such a relationship, the wife remains submissive to the authority of the husband, even while doing the labour for the commodities. Marxism has talked of all these issues. Then what is the meaning of the argument that Marxism did not talk about the labour of women?

When it is argued that “the labour relations and exploitative division of labour - which constitute the basis for all the inequalities in the society - must be changed”, will that change not apply to all the labour relations in the society?

Will it not apply to the labour relations between man and woman?

Marxism is a theory, which demonstrates equal labour relationships in the place of exploitative labour relationships. It is a theory that preaches equality of human beings. If women too are human beings like men, equality of human beings is also the equality between man and woman.

Marx had nowhere justified the enslavement of women and children in the family.

“... In private property of every type the slavery of the members of the family at least is always implicit since they are made use of and exploited by the head of the family”. Marx - (Capital-1, Penguin Edition, pp. 1083).

“However terrible and disgusting the dissolution of the old family ties within the capitalist system may appear, large-scale industry, by assigning an important part in socially organized processes of production, outside the sphere of the domestic economy to women, young persons and children of both sexes, does nevertheless create a new economic foundation for a higher form of the family and of relations between the sexes ...It is also obvious that the fact that the collective working group is composed of individuals of both sexes and all ages must under the appropriate conditions turn into a source of humane development, although in its spontaneously developed, brutal, capitalist form, the system works in the opposite direction, and becomes a pestiferous source

of corruption and slavery, since here the worker exists for the process of production, and not the process of production for the worker”. - Marx (Capital-1, Penguin Edition, pp. 620-21).

In this manner, Marxism explains, how the servility of women is embedded either in some kind of private property or in the property of Independent producers. Owing to an important role assigned to women, who hitherto did not play important role in the process of production outside the family, there evolves a new economic base which leads to the higher form of ‘man-woman relationships’ i.e., to the equal form. Marxism also explains how the old family transforms into a higher form of family and man-woman relationships into higher form of relationships, when capitalist economic base is transformed into appropriate conditions. Does all this mean disregarding the slavery of women and labour of women? Does it mean considering the labour of men alone?

Another point of criticism, which the bourgeois feminists make against Marxism, is: ‘Marxism argues that the women would be liberated if they participate in social labour. And all the proletarian women are now engaged in social labour, aren’t they? Yet, they have not at all been liberated from the ‘male domination’, have they? Then, it means that what Marxism suggests with regard to women’s emancipation is not a right solution, isn’t it?’ The answer to this question is the following: Marxism doesn’t simply suggest a single aspect of the problem, namely, that ‘woman should participate in the social labour’. It also suggests another aspect, namely,

that ‘men should participate in housework’. Marxism argues that the family division of labour which creates the inequality on the ‘foundations of exploitation’ in society and which continues even today, will have to transform into a ‘new division of labour’ that permits ‘equality’.

The transformation of the division of labour does not simply mean the participation of women in outside work. It also means the participation of men in housework. As the second transformation is not taking place even in those families where the first transformation has occurred, the male domination continues to exist.

The second transformation is not taking place even in those families where the first transformation has occurred because even the first transformation is not occurring at a proper level throughout the society.

We have already seen how the transformation of the division of labour in the family is linked with the transformation of the exploitative production relationships. While all the exploitative production relationships continue to exist as ever in the society, it is not possible for the nature of the family to change simply because women do outside labour.

Marxism does not argue that the ‘liberation of an individual’ takes place without any relation to the ‘liberation of the class’. The two are mutually related processes.

If some one understands the point that “women will be liberated only if they participate in social labour” in a purely mechanical manner and ask us “why women performing social labour are not being liberated”, it simply demonstrates his or her opposition to Marxism.

Another point of criticism is that “Marxism talks exclusively about production relationships and not about ‘patriarchy’ which oppresses women!”

‘Patriarchy’ is nothing but ‘male domination’. Wherever ‘domination’ exists, we should search for its basis in the labour relationships (i.e., production relationships). Those labour relationships are related not to just somebody. They are related to those individuals who exercise ‘domination’ and who are in the state of ‘subservience’. The mystery comes into light, when we find the basis for the domination of the husband and the subservience of the wife in the labour relationships that exist between the wife and the husband. The labour relations that exist in the entire society outside constitute the basis for the labour relationships that exist in the family.

‘Domination’ could be not only of a woman by man but also of a woman by another woman, if those two women are ‘master’ and the ‘servants’.

Wherever male domination exists, we should search for its basis. Similarly, to locate ‘male domination’, we have to seek it first in the ‘division of labour’ between man and woman in the family and then in the division of labour that exists in

the whole of the society. On the whole, we should seek it only in the production relationships. We have already done this job. We have already seen why male domination is still exercised over the family.

It is fully appropriate for the bourgeois feminists to assume that they can fight against male domination by ignoring the labour relations, because, they cannot do anything except to view any problem merely superficially.

While reading any 'work', although misunderstandings crop up temporarily either due to lack of adequate clarifications or due to an unclear understanding of the contents, we will certainly get out of the misunderstandings as we gradually proceed further and understand the nature of the work. If the path suggested by that work is appropriate at all for the resolution of the contradictions, we might also apply that path for other contradictions too in an appropriate manner. No science would give all the details. It only offers general principles, which enable grasping the details. It is not impossible to understand the diverse social problems through Marxism, which discusses social labour relationships as the main factor.

But the bourgeois intellectuals, who are hostile to Marxism, employ their capabilities and tactics not for understanding Marxism, but only to misconstrue it. Same is the case with the bourgeois feminists! They enthuse to understand the physical relationships of man and woman as much erroneously as possible, as they enthuse to understand

erroneously the 'social relationships of man and woman'. In these relations, they discover many mean ways, which a normal brain does not imagine. Let us see those things also a little.

11. Man-Woman Physical Relationships

Physical relationships are natural relationships. But, physical relations could prevail as wholly independent natural relationships only until the category 'labour' had begun in the human society. Since the time when 'labour' and 'labour relationships' began and human relationships acquired a particular character, no natural phenomenon associated with the human life could exist as a wholly independent phenomenon, unconnected with the social nature. Every natural phenomenon would certainly transform in accordance with the social nature. Same is the case with the question of physical relationships. They will also be necessarily influenced in accordance with the social nature though they are also natural relationships.

What is the social nature that exists between man and woman in the 'family'? The male domination and female subservience that cropped up due to the unequal division of labour. It is this social character that influences each and every aspect of physical relationship of man and woman. Each of the aspects such as the experiences pertaining to physical relationships and begetting children will be influenced by and exist in accordance with 'male domination'!

Restrictions on physical relations in any society have been there only in the case of women and not men, since the beginning of male domination till today. In any country there is the classification of family-women and prostitutes among women. The family-women should have relation only with their husbands. The prostitutes do not have husbands at all. They should be available to any man.

There is no such classification like this among men. It means that among men there is no such classification as family men and non-family men. A man can be with his wife and can also be with prostitutes. The restrictions that apply to women apply to men. A section of women should exist as prostitutes if the men are to lead a way of life that does not have any restrictions.

The terms 'husband-wife', 'prostitute-customer' are not the terms which simply denote natural properties. Those are the terms that denote social relationships also.

The relationship between husband and wife or the relationship between man and a prostitute are not simply natural relationships. They are relationships blended with a social element.

All such matters as love, cohabitation (living together), children, that exist between man and woman are those which are blended with the social element.

What is the solution for the problem of physical relationships, which have been formed in accordance with the

social nature, called male domination and female subservience? Equality is the right solution for any problem. Does equality here mean evolving the same situation of men for women too? Or, does it mean evolving the same situation of women for men too? Or does it mean that the situation of both the parties change into a different manner. What does it mean if we say "in a different manner"?

Between the two kinds of relationships, let us suppose the labour relations constitute the primary aspect and physical relationships the secondary aspect. It amounts to a proper understanding of the problem only if we understand its totality viz., that a given aspect in any problem is primary, that another given aspect is secondary and that the two have a specific relationship. It does not mean that the struggle against the problem would not begin until the problem is correctly understood. The struggle would continue in some way or the other depending upon how it is understood. The struggle could be either right or wrong.

For example: Veeresalingam (a late 19th century social reformer from Andhra) fought for 'child-widow remarriage'. This question falls under the category of questions related to physical relationships of man and woman. [There won't be any change in the life of a woman with regard to labour relations, either before or after she becomes a widow after the remarriage. It is only through man that a woman who is confined to housework receives the articles of subsistence. The change that occurs due to the remarriage is the creation of the condition of becoming a wife once again, and becoming

a mother once again. That is why we consider the widow remarriage a matter of 'physical relationships' instead of a matter of labour relationships.] It means that this is a secondary problem. This reformer is unaware of the man-woman 'labour relationships' and their basis, viz., the 'class exploitation'. Yet, he struggled against an issue, which he perceived as an injustice in the society. It is a struggle, which demands that the woman should have the right to remarry when her husband dies just as the man has the right to remarry when his wife dies; and the child-widows should be remarried. It is a struggle, which facilitates to provide women with a right, which was absent hitherto, and equality of man and woman in that specific problem. Hence it bestowed good results.

What would be the result, if that struggle had trodden faultily? Let us suppose that a reformer says to the widow and preaches thus: "Don't you need physical pleasures? You enjoy with men as you wish. Never mind if you establish even secret relationships. Never mind even if you act as a concubine. You seek your own ways". This path will not at all resolve the question of widows. It will not render any rights afresh to them. More over it will create many new problems, which were not there in the past in the lives of those women. That is, rather than resolving the old problem, it will make their conditions still more unbearable and maximize the problems. Hence, it is a wrong path.

It follows that the struggle, let it be against any problem and let it be even against secondary problems, should be in a

proper way which facilitates the resolution of the problem. This is the first thing. The second thing is: however rightly they may proceed, there is no use of such struggles if they are waged only against secondary issues and if they never understand the primary issue. It is because, the struggle in fact should be able to furnish such circumstances where the struggle itself is not required after sometime or the other. The forms of the struggle should shift on to the primary issue and resolve in order to create conditions where struggle itself will not exist. But if the primary question were never perceived, there would not be a struggle against it at all. That primary problem will go on creating secondary problems. There will be neither an end nor a limit to the struggles if they are exclusively waged against secondary problems without touching upon the primary problem, even if they continue along a right path. The secondary issues would be appearing again and again metamorphosing into newer and newer forms. The stage where there will be no problems would never be reached.

Veerasingam against 'child marriage' and 'women's Illiteracy', Raja Ram Mohan Roy (a 19th century reformer from Bengal) against 'sati sacrifice' (burning of wife on the pyre of the husband), others against prostitution and another against 'Purdah system' (hiding women under a veil) - in this way they had carried out struggles in a right direction only. They secured good results too. But these secondary questions will never cease if the struggles, in this manner, are always confined exclusively to this type of superficial issues and do

not understand the issue of the 'division of labour' which is the basis of 'male domination', and 'class exploitation' which is the basis of the 'division of labour'. Only their forms will be changing. Because of that, it appears as if problems always and necessarily persist between man and woman and such persistence is a social law. Therefore, if the struggles against secondary issues do not turn their attention to the fundamental issue, they will not solve anything even if they are conducted along a right path. We should examine our present problem only with this understanding.

The present question is a question of inequality existing in physical relationships of man and woman. How should it change? Should the condition of men be created also for women? Or should the condition of women be created also for men? Or, instead of these two kinds, should a third kind of condition be created? - This alone is the present issue.

Now let us examine briefly these three kinds of changes. Let us assume that women too, like men, do not have any restrictions with regard to the physical relationships. If it so happens, will men and women become 'equals'? No, it won't be so. Then a situation arises whereby the identity of the child's father will not be known. It will violate the rights of the man. Moreover, a situation arises whereby the husband need not discharge responsibilities toward the children. It means, that the man will not have rights as well as responsibilities with regard to the children. The mother alone would possess all the rights and responsibilities which both the mother and father should possess. This will not contribute

to 'equality'. Let us leave this aspect aside. If all the circumstances transform in this manner, will the labour relationships between man and woman also transform equally? No such thing will happen. That condition will remain as it is since the struggle against the problem of labour relationships has not yet been waged.

Now let us see the second example: Will men and women become 'equal' if men too are classified as family men and non-family men just as women are classified as family-women and prostitutes? Even that will not resolve the problem. There would be no equality among women due to the classification of women. There would be no equality among men due to the classification of men. There won't be equality even between men and women. Even then there won't be any question of change in the labour relationships of men and women.

What remains is the last path, namely, the path that the present conditions should change on both the sides. Those changes should be such that they contribute to 'equality'. Then, how should those changes take place?

The change that has to take place in the case of women:
The classification of women into family-women and prostitutes should vanish. The profession of prostitution should vanish. All the women should be in the same state of being family women only.

The change that has to take place in the case of men:
Instead of a system which has no restrictions, a situation should arise whereby men too stand as family men.

It will be able to contribute to equality in the physical relationships of men and women only if the changes take place in this manner on both the sides. But will a change in the labour relationships also take place? It will not take place like that. If the struggle against it does not take place, that aspect will not change even then.

The point to be grasped here is until the struggle is waged against the 'fundamental' issue, changes, which we expect to take place for the equality in the physical relationships, will not at all take place. Only if the old division of labour between man and woman changes in a proper way, a proper path with regard to the problem of 'physical relationships' will also begin.

To make our example simpler, if we examine separately the issue of 'physical relationships' the solution without contradictions in this question includes such elements as establishment of cohabitation only through 'love' and establishment of that relationship as 'one man and one woman relationship'; voluntary acceptance of this change by men as well; the disappearance of the profession of prostitution among women.

Monogamy is the relation of 'one man and one woman'. This has been in practice till today only in the case of women but not in the case of men. Therefore, monogamy would acquire a completely 'new character' if the 'man-woman relationships' transform in such a way that it (monogamy) becomes a fact even in the case of men. Real monogamy

between men and women begins when they enter into 'cohabitation' based on 'relationship of love' after the disappearance of the prostitution by women on the one hand and the role of man as a 'customer of the prostitute' on the other hand.

Such a man and woman would stand as 'life partners', as parents of the children and as independent individuals possessing equal rights and equal responsibilities.

Even then there would exist what is called 'family'. But it would arise not with the old characteristics of male domination and female slavery, but with such higher characteristic called 'equality'.

If proper changes in the man-woman physical relationships are to take place in this manner, then it depends upon the proper changes that take place in the 'labour relationships'. It is impossible for the physical relationships to transform into a state of 'equality', while the 'labour relationships' are in a state of 'inequality'.

The bourgeois feminists ignore all this. They shout at the top of their voice thus: "struggle against patriarchy"! "Equality"! But, as they have suggested either the solution of 'wages' or another irrational solution for the problem of housework, they also suggest similar type of hideous solutions even for this 'physical relationships'. According to them, the system whereby men do not follow any rules need not change at all. If women too begin to follow the same system, they become equal with men and the problem will be solved! Which

means, women need not demand familial relationships and cohabitation. They should consider it a great 'progress' to abandon them! But women must have physical relationships with men! There is, however, no objection to enjoy 'voluptuous relationships' with those men with whom living together is objectionable!

It is needless to say specially what the 'temporary physical relations sans cohabitation' mean. The whole secret embedded in this is nothing but deriving sex without having familial relationships. It means that man-woman relationships are those relations which, instead of concerning with various aspects of life, are concerned with only one specific aspect on temporary basis.

Or, it means that the woman, while staying amidst the familial relations, follows the same policy just as a man leads an adulterous life while remaining in familial relations. Which means, family and the wife-husband relationships remain as legal relationships to acquire property if there is any as a hereditary right.

In the bourgeois perspective, 'love between man and woman', marriage, sex, children and all things are found isolated from each other. According to that perspective, coherence between all the aspects and existence of all the things between the same pairs of men and women constitute an uncivilized state of affairs. Just as the types of commodities and fashions change, the relationships of women with men and relationships of men with women should constantly

change. They must be evergreen.

In the bourgeois perspective 'human relationships' do not specially exist. The human relations too are like animal relations.

Let us compare the animal relationships and the human relationships according to the bourgeois feminists:

<i>Animal relationships</i>	<i>Human relationships according to the bourgeois perspective.</i>
There is no cohabitation among animals. There is no family.	Co-habitation is not necessary even for human beings. Family is not necessary. Familial relationships are not necessary.
There is no 'love' among animals. Any female animal can conceive through any male animal.	Ephemeral relationships that last for only few days are enough; relationships of love are not necessary even for humans.
Pregnancy could be induced through even artificial insemination among animals.	Children might be begotten in a similar way. That is why 'sperm bank' is like a 'blood bank' in the bourgeois perspective. There is no difference between the two. Both are worth existing in the society.
The father animal has no responsibility of the children. Even the mother-animal would	Even mother doesn't know the father of the child on many occasions. Even on those occasions where it is known, the father will have no responsibility of childcare.

not have the responsibility of childcare for a long time.

The mother also forsakes certain natural responsibilities concerning the child. For example, she believes that beauty sustains if not breast-feeding the child. There are many such other things.

If a female animal begets five children in her lifetime, no two children might have the same father. There might be five fathers to the five children.

If a woman begets five children in her lifetime, there might be no single father to any two children. There might be five fathers to the five children. It is only through the mother and not through the father that those children become sisters and brothers.

If we go on examining these issues in this manner, the vileness that is not possible in the animal relationships appears in the man-woman relationships of human beings.

If a man is selling his sperm (or, if he contributes it to the 'sperm bank' free), it means that he has no objection wherever 'his' children are born. This is just creating fatherless children on the one hand and parents who needn't fulfil the responsibilities of the children, on the other hand. This will make men freer than in the past by entrusting the entire responsibility of children to women. This points to a "new path" to men whereby they will spend time with women in ephemeral, voluptuous relationships.

There is yet another meaner and more brutal aspect discovered from a bourgeois perspective. That is, women can also sell any organ related to pregnancy just as men sell sperm. They can even beget a child and sell it. Which means they give birth to children only for the purpose of 'selling'! Settling the money bargain with the prospective buyer of the child, taking some amount as an advance, conceiving by means of science through the relationship with the person who pays money, flinging the fee at the doctor, leaving the child immediately after the delivery, collecting the balance amount of money, investing that money in a finance company which offers high rate of interest or buying shares or doing something or the other! Law permits all this!

In the bourgeois perception, there will be only one thing with regard to any aspect: 'whether it is permitted by law or not?' There won't be any values such as "Is it just or unjust? Is it good or bad?" It is enough if it is as per the 'law'.

They make various heinous laws which uphold various brutalities for the sake of earning money and commit those brutalities under the shelter of those laws and say thus: "We are conducting ourselves as per law. What we are doing is not against the law."

If we say "you are doing as per law only. But, your law itself is heinous! Brutal! Both you and your law are the culprits", they don't agree, since they need that heinous law only for their earning.

According to the bourgeois perspective, the qualities such as naturalness and unnaturalness; goodness and badness; morality and immorality; justice and injustice meted out to the children in the procreation of children; natural rights of the children do not exist either in the man-woman relationships or in the mother-child relationships or in the father-children relationship or in any other relationships. What it wants is money and luxuries! Any meanness will be lawful for the sake of those things!

Bourgeois solutions and bourgeois practices regarding women's problems degrade the 'man-woman relationships' completely to the level of beasts. They remove the minimal 'humane element' of the past, in the human relationships in the name of 'science' and 'development'.

If the laws are not yet adequate to uphold the loathsome and vulgar practices in the physical relationships, the bourgeois fighters agitate for new laws as well.

For example, they fight to legalize 'relationships between women and women', and 'relationships between men and men'. These deformities might have begun long back in the past societies. But they have never been natural ones. Therefore, they are neither 'socially acceptable nor legally acceptable' till today. But, by making every deformity as legal, bourgeois perception tries to make it socially acceptable. Thus, upholding each deformity regarding 'physical relationships', the bourgeois feminists glorify it as 'progress'.

One of the aspects of the struggles of bourgeois feminists is to understand the category 'labour' in a vulgar manner. They treat such natural processes as menstruation, conception, giving birth to children as 'labour'. That is why as soon as they speak of "women's problems", they mention 'sexuality', 'reproduction' and treat them as 'labour activities' and make them primary. The distinction between labour and natural properties gets blurred in their view. When we grasp the kind of 'social element' by which those natural properties are influenced, what we have to question is only the 'social element' and not the 'physical properties'. But it is natural to view both the things identically where the distinction of "what is social element and what is natural property" is absent, i.e. where both are understood wrongly. It is also natural to view 'sexual freedom' as 'social freedom'. It is the sexual freedom, which is the centre for entire freedom according to that perspective. The entire struggle is only for its sake.

In any question, the understanding of bourgeois women is identical to that of bourgeois men. Bourgeois feminism does not wish true equality between man and woman. It is because, it does not wish equality in any exploitative relationships.

Whatever is the solution between two men, the same will be the solution between two women also. This kind of solution is invisible to the bourgeois view because equality between two men also is invisible to this view.

That is why Marxism is useless for bourgeois feminists. Turning a deaf ear to all the solutions, which Marxism

proposes, they carry out the slanderous propaganda that Marxism did not say anything for the sake of women.

What is useful where Marxism is of no use? That which is opposed to Marxism! That is, exploitation only. That is what the bourgeois want [whether they are men or women]. But they don't say it directly. They declare as if there is some thing 'wrong' in Marxism, that they had discovered it, and hence they discarded it and that they adopted something 'greater' than that. That 'great' thing is nothing other than the theory of sexual freedom, which they desire. Thus they fall into their own groove!

Opposition to 'Marxism is the birth right of those intellectual groups which view the issues superficially. Marxism itself would become erroneous if they don't exhibit that opposition.

Just as the bourgeois feminists see all the solutions in 'sexual freedom', so also some others see in the environmental purification. A third person in 'Dalitism' and a fourth person in the fourth one! On the whole, none of the intellectuals glance at the foundation called "labour relations". They don't turn their face towards that foundation which constantly splashes many problems hither and thither, indiscriminately on to the society. They demonstrate their superficial exploratory abilities on the problem of their concern and that is the path they pursue.

It becomes obligatory for an intellectual to take up the activity of 'capital purification', discarding the

'environmental purification' if he is able to perceive that the environmental pollution is but the result of the profit oriented view of the capitalist industries. But this Intellectual who has immense fear and reverence for 'capital', unable to suspect the sanctity of the capital even in imagination, will be engrossed breathlessly in environmental purification. As the environmental pollution is an ever flowing stream when 'capital' is untouched, there is the guarantee of indepletable fame of social service to our intellectual for any number of generations to come!

Even the innocent Dalit Intellectual, like a fox that foolishly imitates the tiger and burns its body for the sake of tiger-like marks on its body, loses his way and falls into bewilderment, where he cannot perceive what is safe and what is harmful to him. He looks with doubt and dissent at such struggle called the class struggle, which serves him as a protective shield and which is the permanent path of liberation for him. The reason is nothing but the Dalit intellectual's inability to understand the dalit problem. The Dalit populace is unaware that the Dalit problem is directly a problem of 'class exploitation', that it is a problem of 'division of labour', that the Dalits constitute the bottom most sections of the manual labour. According to the 'law of value', the 'value' of manual labour is naturally low. The incomes of the Dalits are extremely low. Their problems are enormous! What is the solution? What is the way, which can create equality both in the dimension of value and in the dimension of the 'use value'? The way out is to drag the class of lazy fellows which is

intoxicated with comforts and splendors, never knowing what labour is, into labour, down to the level of bottom most manual labour. Then what happens? The past disappears. Manual labour and mental labour become united. Human beings transform into new forms with new powers whereby they are capable of performing the bottom most manual labour on the one hand and higher mental labour on the other hand! That is the only way which will liberate human beings from contradictions.

How could either Dalits or any other victim safe guard their labour through any program without touching the 'means of production', and without being concerned with the production relations and without being prepared for 'class struggle'? What will they locate except vacuum, if they look for the solution not in labour relationships, but outside them?

Have to look for 'fruits' in the 'trees'!

For 'fish' in the 'waters' !

For 'equality' - in the 'labour relations'!

This is a 'social law' as definite as the 'law of nature'!

Now, let us again go to the problems of women. Those feminists who demand proper equality between man and woman should base themselves on rational logic. They have to understand the cause due to which a problem arises. They should fight not for animal level solutions, but for rational solutions appropriate to human relationships.

Those solutions should be able to confer independent personality and self respect to women.

They should be such that they assign equal responsibilities and equal rights both at home and outside in the sphere of social relations.

If women who work at the house as well as outside also fail to understand the necessity of men participating in household chores and the equality based on that, they will remain subservient to men in the families, doing both the types of labour as long as they remain like that. Until then, men will remain as masters over the women.

We have to examine each and every characteristic of man-woman relationship determined by the exploitative society and retain whatever is right. We have to alter improper characteristics. For example, one of the aspects of equal rights of man and woman is the equal right in the matter of identifying the children. The identification of a person is done through the name consisting of 2 aspects called 'given name' and the 'surname'. The children in the exploitative societies inherit the surname through the father only. Which means, identification of the child is done through the father only! The mother will have no place in this respect. Since both the mother as well as the father are responsible for the birth of the child, the identities of both of them should be included in the names of the children in such a way that both the parents would have place. For this, we have to adopt whatever method is right. Thus, we have to subject to logical analysis, all the characteristics, which have been established by the exploitative society with regard to man-woman relationships.

Woman too like man would acquire the capacity for 'self-maintenance', if there were equal opportunities for both men and women since childhood in education and in acquiring the labour powers.

Such a cohabitation will not be similar to the cohabitation of the old time when both man and woman acquire the capacity for self-maintenance and the capacity to maintain children. It is cohabitation based on equal labour relationships. That is a cohabitation of man and woman who are independent and equal. It will change the old character of the 'institution of family'. Which means, while the family remains stable even in the new society, it will acquire a noble character.

Along with that, the entire terminology related to the old life style of man and woman will also change.

In this evolutionary phase, however, when we speak of man-woman equality, man cooperates only to a certain extent. The working 'male', who demands his equality with the master, will be disinclined to give up his masterhood in the family. He refuses stridently to renounce his male domination completely for equality with the wife.

The men who have soon understood the characteristics of the new society will open their eyes quickly. They will step down from the 'throne' of domination. But those who cannot quit those 'thrones' still hold the edges of those 'thrones' and remain dangling.

As much struggle is necessary for dragging the non-labouring class into labour, as much struggle is necessary for dragging the class of mental labourers into the manual labour; similar and as much struggle is necessary to drag men into the 'work of women' and to get rid of male domination.

Women will be completely liberated from their slavery for men only when they acquire self-respect to fight against male domination wherever and whenever it appears.

AND OUTSIDE WORK

Have to look for 'fruits' in the 'trees'!

For 'fish' in the 'waters' !

For 'equality' - in the 'labour relations'!

This is a 'social law' as definite as the 'law of nature'!

RANGANAYAKAMMA

An Introduction to Marx's 'CAPITAL'

(in 3 volumes)

- ◆ This is an English translation of a 5-volume work originally written in Telugu by Ranganayakamma.
- ◆ The 5-volume Telugu work will be brought out, as it is, in a 3-volume English translation that runs about 2,000 pages.
- ◆ The translation work is almost ready and the three English volumes will come out approximately by August, 1999.
- ◆ For details contact :
Sweet Home Publications
H. No. 1-95/1 (76, Radhika Vihar Colony),
Near Durgam Cheruvu, Guttala Begampeta,
Jubilee Hills post, Hyderabad - 500 033.
Phone : 040-311 7302