
Reproduction, Mothering, and the Origins of Patriarchy

AZIZAH AL-HIBRI

Introduction

This essay is an attempt to explain the origins, development, and forms of patriarchal behavior and institutions. The essay accepts as its starting point the general human fear of death and the desire for continuity or immortality. It places this fear and desire in the context of the male's experience of the world, and argues that it is this context which ultimately leads to the emergence of patriarchy.

Three different theses about males are introduced, examined, and used at various stages of the discussion. In asserting each thesis is true of the male, it is not simultaneously denied of the female. However, it is argued that there is an important difference between the male's experience of being in the world, and the female's. If these theses are true of females as well as of males, they are not true of them in the same way or to the same degree.

The discussion is based mainly on data obtained from western culture, since the reader of this essay will be more familiar with such data. But what is presented here is not an account of the western female-male relationship; rather it is a speculative account, cast in western mold, that provides a structural or symbolic framework for understanding the female-male dialectic of opposites.

©1981, 1982 by Azizah al-Hibri. A different version of this essay was published under the title "Capitalism Is an Advanced Stage of Patriarchy: But Marxism Is Not Feminism" in *Women and Revolution*, edited by Lydia Sargent (Boston: South End Press, 1981). Reprinted by permission of the author.

THESIS I: THE MALE DESIRES IMMORTALITY

Aristotle puts it this way: "But we must not follow those who advise us, being men, to think of human things, and being mortal, of mortal things, but must, so far as we can, make ourselves *immortal*."¹

Hannah Arendt argues that

imbedded in a cosmos where everything was immortal, mortality became the hallmark of human existence. . . . by their capacity for the immortal deed, by their ability to leave non-perishable traces behind, men, their individual mortality notwithstanding, attain an immortality of their own and prove themselves to be of a "divine" nature.²

Arendt defines immortality as "endurance in time, deathless life on earth."³ Put in this way it becomes clearer that men generally desire immortality. The promise of an afterlife can also be seen as a way of allaying the anxieties of people about their mortality, which helps to explain the increased religiosity of people as they approach death. During the SALT II talks, the seriously ill leader of the U.S.S.R., Leonid Brezhnev, was heard to say, "*God* will not forgive us if we fail."⁴

THESIS II: THE MALE CONSIDERS REPRODUCTION A PATH TO IMMORTALITY

There is an Arabic saying that "he who reproduces does not die." The importance to the male of having children is well known. But we need to keep in mind that the desire for offspring is directly connected to the desire for *immortality*. Fathers try to live their lives all over again through their sons. In the *Symposium*, Socrates introduces Diotima of Mantinea, a wise and revered woman with whom he has a most interesting dialogue about immortality and love. In that dialogue Diotima argues that

to the mortal creature, generation is a sort of eternity and immortality. [For] the mortal nature is seeking as far as possible to be ever-lasting and immortal: and this is only to be attained in generation, because generation always leaves behind a new existence in place of the old.⁵

When Socrates shows astonishment at her words, she elaborates, adding at one point, "Marvel not then at the love which all men have of their offspring; for that universal love and interest is for the sake of immortality."⁶ Later, Socrates concludes his account of Diotima's views saying that he was persuaded of their truth, "and being persuaded of them, I try to persuade others."⁷

The desire for a son to carry on the family's name is one of the patriarchy's ways of giving immortality to the male ancestor whose name is immortalized through the generations of his male descendents. Women rarely immortalize their own male (or even female) ancestors in patriarchal societies. More often,

they only get the chance to participate in immortalizing the male ancestors of their husbands. For instance, my family can trace its family tree back several centuries, but all the names on that tree are male. It was a shocking experience to me when I realized that I cannot trace my matrilineage back for more than two generations. It appears that women have been characteristically less obsessed with immortality than men.

THESIS III: THE MALE CONSIDERS PRODUCTION A PATH TO IMMORTALITY

Production can be of words, as in poetry; or of deeds, as in society; or more generally of tools, as in technology. But the key requirement is to produce that which reflects a person's individual talent (or essence) and consequently to objectify it in the outer world, giving the producer an illusion of permanence. This mode of immortalization is seen as superior to that obtained through reproduction (perhaps because it can last longer than one's immediate offspring and is not dependent on the wish or ability of others to participate). Even Diotima concurs. According to Socrates, she wonders, "Who, when he thinks of Homer and Hesiod and other great poets, would not rather have their children than ordinary human ones?"⁸ And Arendt, too:

The task and potential greatness of mortals lie in their ability to *produce* things—works and deeds and words—which would deserve to be and, at least to some degree, are at home in *everlastingness*, so that through them mortal souls find their place in a cosmos where everything is immortal except themselves.⁹

Even Marx, in his discussion of alienated labor in capitalist societies, utilizes terminology more befitting the description of reproduction than production. The product of labor is seen by Marx as the objectification, not only in consciousness, but in the real world, of the specified character of the individual. It is duplication, it is creation, and its alienation is "begetting as emasculating."¹⁰ And why not, since in appropriating the product of the worker's labor, the capitalist is doing to the worker what the patriarchal male has done to the female? Diotima is quite straightforward about it—for her, the product is also a child, but not a mortal one.

A Feminist Theory on the Origins and Development of Patriarchy and (Male) Technology

Early man must surely have perceived the female as the being in nature most similar to him, and yet quite different. The component of identity between male and female contributed to the centrality of this relationship in the lives of humans. The difference complicated that central relationship.

The most obvious difference between the male and female is the genital difference and related phenomena. One such phenomenon is that females can

bleed suddenly and heavily without dying. (Perhaps this is the earliest reason for associating women with magic, since few men would have survived such bleeding.) Another is that the bleeding can stop just as suddenly as it starts. Furthermore, a woman's body can change shape and then produce a miniature human being, which is subsequently nourished by the female body and grows to start another full life. Meanwhile, the male body does not change, it does not reproduce, it has no nourishment for children even after they are brought into the world by females. In terms of life changes, the male body may have seemed barren and boring. The anthropologist Leo Frobenius quotes an Abyssinian woman commenting on the complexity and richness of the female's body relative to that of the male: "His life and body are always the same. . . . He knows nothing."¹¹

Such differences between male and female provide adequate foundations for the male to develop the notion of the female as an Other. Nevertheless, the female Other is not a diffused Other, that is, merely something different from Self. Rather, it is a most focused, specific, and special Other, by virtue of the fact that it is another consciousness with a basic underlying similarity. It is thus understood as a complementary Other; and for this reason it occupies a central position in man's concern with Otherness.

It is reasonable to assume that during early times human knowledge of biological functions was so primitive that the male did not know his role in reproduction. Since intercourse and childbirth (or even visible pregnancy) are separated by such a significant time lag, the development of the notion of causality here could not have been either immediate or simple. Bronislaw Malinowski lends credence to this conclusion. Commenting on the beliefs of the Trobrianders concerning conception, he says,

The primeval woman is always imagined to bear children without the intervention of a husband or of any other male partner; but not without the vagina being opened by some means. In some of the traditions this is mentioned explicitly. Thus on the island of Vakuta there is a myth which describes how an ancestress of one of the sub-clans exposed her body to falling rain, and thus mechanically lost her virginity.¹²

The following dialogue with a male native of the Trobriand Islands is recounted by Malinowski:

"What then, is the cause of pregnancy?" He answered: "Blood on the head makes child. The seminal fluid does not make the child. Spirits bring at night time the infant, put on women's heads—it makes blood. Then, after two or three months, when the blood [that is, menstruous blood] does not come out, they know: 'Oh, I am pregnant!'"¹³

Thus, at the dawn of history the male had ample reason to experience the female Other as a substantial ego threat. In contradistinction to the male, the female exhibited a greater permanence. Not only did she constantly recover

from her bouts with bleeding, but more significantly, she constantly reproduced herself—she had the key to immortality and he did not. The male, then, had cause to experience himself as inferior and mortal, as excluded and cut off from the cycle of ever-regenerating life.

It is understandable that under such a state of affairs, substantial amounts of alienation and frustration are generated in the male that culminate in feelings of inadequacy, jealousy, or hostility toward the female. Philosophical questions of the sort raised by Plato and Aristotle may well have found their primitive roots in this situation. The questions facing a male dissatisfied with his being in the world would be of the following sort: “What is my significance?” “What am I good for?” “What is my role in life, my destiny?” “What kind of being am I?”

The male’s negative experience of his being in the world was also reinforced by the fact that the male has always been dependent in his early childhood on the female for his very existence.

MOTHERING AND THE GROUNDS FOR BREAST JEALOUSY

It is reasonable to assume that before the appearance of the nuclear family, mothering was quite a different experience for the male. Even today, in some non-western societies, traces of that old relationship of mothering continue to exist. In places where extended families or tribes continue a communal style of living, it is not unusual for women other than the mother to pick up a crying child, clean it up, or even nurse it with their own milk if they are new mothers themselves. As a result, it is not unusual for the child to develop attachments to some other women that are stronger than those it has toward its biological mother. I have a friend whose child refused to rejoin the family in the United States because it had become more attached to its grandmother. The mother submitted to the will of the child (not the grandmother), reasoning that when she herself returns to her homeland she will be living again with the grandmother and the child, so that the problem will be resolved.

But such a model seems to invoke an order in which women were already the nurturers. Let me explain how I see this to have come about. First, it is reasonable to assume that the male, feeling cut off from the cycle of life and lacking knowledge of his role in it, would resent not only the childbearing capacity of the female but also its final product—the child. In fact, such resentment can be detected in the male even today when the male’s role in reproduction has been more than adequately asserted. Such feelings of resentment are not conducive to a nurturing attitude. Second, the child itself learns quickly that only a human being with breasts can satisfy its most pressing need for food/milk. Given a choice, the child will elect the arms of a (potential) mother/nurser. This, of course, does not improve the male’s attitude toward the child. Thus, rather than assuming that only a female, because of her

biology, is “naturally” suited for the role of nurturer and thus “condemned” to it, I am saying that the male, who became increasingly alienated from the child, withdrew from the nurturing process.

THE MALE’S RESPONSE TO HIS HUMAN CONDITION:
THE EMERGENCE OF PATRIARCHY AND (MALE) TECHNOLOGY

As a free human being whose essence is defined by his choices, the male had, since early times, the option of setting out to meet this challenge. At least two courses of action were available to him. First, he could appropriate the gifts of the female and her offspring; this action would integrate him into the cycle of life, if only indirectly. Hence the male appropriated the female’s womb and breasts, making them his and divorcing them from their biological functions. As a result, they no longer appeared as valuable potential natural resources for humanity. Instead, they became problems to be dealt with: how can one ensure that the womb grows only the “right” patriarchal child? Even the breast, the property of the husband, must be protected not only from the world (public exposure), but even from the child (nursing causes breasts to sag, so give the baby bottled milk).

Later discoveries concerning the role of the male in conception may have further reinforced this mode of immortalization for him, and prompted the shift of male dominance from the brother and father of the female and child to the mate or husband. For, the appropriation of offspring would have been given for the first time a biological, or objective justification. The male could then see himself for the first time as appropriating what was already his, his immortalization becoming more direct than ever. Furthermore, this could partly explain why the male has gone to great lengths in minimizing the obvious and substantial contributions of the female to reproduction. He has often described the female as a mere container, an incubator, while he held that his sperm supplied the life principle. If this analysis is correct, then it was not private property, not natural law that made the male appropriate reproduction from the female. Rather, it was his unabashed desire and struggle for immortality in a world that seemed determined to deny it to him.

But the male wanted to appropriate from the female not only her powers of reproduction, but also her powers as a provider. Until recently, mothers were the sole providers of the milk that was the fountain of life and without which the cycle of life could not go on. By appropriating the female’s breasts, the male appropriated symbolically her role as a natural provider. Thus in patriarchal society, patriarchy reverses reality, and the natural provider becomes the dependent/provided for while the dependent is declared the provider. This reversal carries through in capitalist societies to the workers and people of Third World countries. These true providers of labor and resources are now cast as those who are to be provided for by the capitalist—the “white man’s burden.”

A second course of action available to the male was that of making himself useful (and later perhaps indispensable). This approach, unlike the first, was not necessarily based on the notion of domination, but could easily be integrated with it. Historically, the most salient male application of this approach may be found in the area of technology, an area which captured specifically the male imagination. Tools that the male produced were useful in simplifying and securing certain processes in life. Thus they were ideal as compensation for a perceived inadequacy. It also gave the male for the first time some feeling of power. As Freud and others were quick to observe "with every tool man is perfecting his own organs."¹⁴ The male was no longer helpless; he was no longer stuck with his human condition. Through technology he discovered that he could improve his condition by artificial means of his own creation. Therefore, this technological endeavor was particularly suited to the feelings of inadequacy or hostility in the male. It supplied both the possibility of liberation from his perceived inferiority to the female, and also the possibility of a better, more effective foundation for her domination. But most important, in production, the male finally gave concrete expression to his urge for having offspring, i.e., for immortality. The product, as Diotima, Marx, and others reveal, became the child. Production became an imitation of reproduction. The male's minimizing the importance of reproduction in favor of production could be interpreted as the male's way of emphasizing his own significance and of forcing himself deeper into the cycle of life.

Thus, one may conclude that both male technology and patriarchy are based on the male's feeling of inadequacy and mortality vis-à-vis the female, and his desire to transcend his human condition by forcing himself into the cycle of life from which he *perceived* himself to be cut off through no fault of his own. That this is indeed the case has become even more obvious recently. Not only did the male develop patriarchal technology as a tool for compensation and domination, but as a way for duplicating the very powers of the female he coveted. Thus in recent years, bottled milk and baby foods were developed. Doctors told women that their milk was inadequate nourishment for babies and must be supplemented or eliminated altogether. An advertisement points out that the whole family is happier when mothers use baby food, since now the father can participate in feeding the baby. In Third World countries babies continue to suffer and die as a result of the misuse of bottled milk by mothers who have been convinced by bottled milk companies that it is the best for their babies.¹⁵ But the final straw in the attempt to supercede women's powers and make women superfluous is clonal research.¹⁶

THE GROUNDS FOR REGARDING NATURE AS AN OTHER

There is another dimension associated with the male's feeling of being cut off from the cycle of life. The male has often observed that the female is somehow at one with the rhythms of the universe, of nature. Her bodily rhythm is at-

tuned to it, and nature, like the female, reproduces and nourishes its "children." Nature thus became "Mother Nature" and the connection between the female and nature became exaggerated and magical to the human eye. The belief in the affinity of the female to nature was accepted (though to different degrees and in different ways) by both males and females with interesting results. During the very early stages of technology:

Agriculture was invented by people living within a magical world view and *by virtue of* that world view. Most likely it was . . . an invention of women, who perceived in the fecundity of seed and soil an image of their own sexuality. From that initial poetic insight the technics of cultivation burgeoned into a splendid variety of sexual-spiritual symbols. The new agrarian cultures saw the earth as a mothering womb, the seed and rain as sperm, the crops as a bearing of offspring.¹⁷

But it is perhaps this view of nature as female that finally led to the male's attempt at extending his domination to nature itself. The category of female Other was enlarged to engulf nature as well. For it too had the gifts of immortality, of reproduction, and mothering. On Nature too the male was dependent, and against it his feelings of inadequacy were confirmed. Thus while initially nature like woman was dreaded and respected, it later became, like the female, the target of male domination and hostility through male technology. Tools, which were initially produced for constructive purposes, became agents of subordination and destruction for both women and nature. Man had tasted power and immortality through domination and production. He defied woman and nature; and domination through production seemed to have paid off.

THE FEMALE RESPONSE AND HER GRADUAL EXCLUSION FROM POWER

It is reasonable to believe that the female did not keep up with this technological twist of events for two reasons. First, her experience of the world was substantially different from that of the male. She was planted deeply into the cycle of life and the womb and bosom of nature. Thus she had no reason to feel cut off, frustrated, or shortchanged. If she was anxious about mortality, her anxiety was not exaggerated by those feelings. So she had good reason to relate to the world in a more relaxed fashion. For example, she had no reason to be driven to produce, although she did produce. (Note that later she was driven by patriarchy to reproduce in order to retain her social position, etc., and that came to be interpreted as an expression of her "mother instinct"!)

Nor did her production need to be (initially at least) tainted by hostility and frustration. It was instead oriented primarily toward improving the quality of life (agriculture, for example), and not toward enhancing her

powers of domination. With the male's concentration on the latter orientation, a male power-base was gradually formed with no effective parallel female opposition. Second, the male who understood the extent of power conferred upon him by technology understandably denied woman access to his technology. Thus while patriarchy served male efforts in denying the female access to technology, technology was used by the male to reinforce patriarchy. We may also note that technology provided an answer to the male's original philosophical questions. For he had found a function that characterized his contribution (or function) in life. While women reproduced and mothered, men produced and provided (and that, the male said, was more important). This was a balance of division of labor that the male could live with. It would hardly have been acceptable for him if women reproduced, mothered, produced, and provided, while men only produced and provided. Hence to preserve the fragile male ego it became desirable, among other things, to exclude women from production (housework notwithstanding).

THE ROLE OF RELIGION

It is important at this point to note that man's attempt to gain immortality through production did not go totally unquestioned in the course of history. As Arendt points out,

The fall of the Roman Empire plainly demonstrated that no work of mortal hands can be immortal, and it was accompanied by the rise of the Christian gospel of an everlasting individual life to its position as the exclusive religion of Western mankind.¹⁸

Various historical events served to reveal the inadequacy of the male's attempt to gain immortality through production. Together, they made two facts quite clear: (1) as Arendt observed, the products fabricated by males themselves disintegrated in time; and (2) even when these products temporarily escaped the onslaught of time, they ended up immortalizing either themselves or someone other than the producers. More often than not, the individual identity and life story of the producers were lost.

Religion provided a timely solution to this crisis. If man behaved in accordance with certain values, he could gain, not immortality, but better yet, an everlasting life in heaven. But again such a solution would not do if women were equally capable of gaining everlasting life. For then again, women would have the possibility for both immortality and everlasting life; while men would have the possibility of the latter only. This problem was solved along lines similar to those used in the realm of production. God was declared male, and man was declared created in his likeness. Eve became the symbol of temptation and sin; and woman was consequently judged a less likely candidate for

salvation and everlasting life in heaven than man. Mary Daly summarizes these and related developments as follows:

The infamous passages of the Old Testament are well known. I need not allude to the misogyny of the church Fathers—for example, Tertullian, who informed women in general: “You are the devil’s gateway,” or Augustine, who opined that women are not made in the image of God. I can omit reference to Thomas Aquinas and his numerous commentators and disciples who defined women as misbegotten males. I can overlook Martin Luther’s remark that God created Adam lord over all living creatures but Eve spoiled it all. I can pass over the fact that John Knox composed a “First Blast of the Trumpet against the Monstrous Regiment of Women.” All of this, after all, is past history.¹⁹

One result of the substitution of the goal of everlasting life for that of immortality is that technological activity slackened considerably during this period and became a secondary concern. St. Augustine, for example, argued that the ideal state of affairs was one where the person attended chiefly to the development of his contemplative knowledge (of eternal things) while at the same time directing his reason to the good use of material things “without which this life cannot go on.”²⁰ Clearly then, during St. Augustine’s days society had become sufficiently dependent on technology and its artifacts as to be unable to do away with them without substantially threatening the quality of life; but they no longer occupied a central position in society.

One problem with religion’s promise of everlasting life was that it could not be substantiated. The promise had to be accepted in faith. Slowly, man started exhibiting restlessness about entrusting such a major concern to the unknown. At the same time, accumulated scientific theories in the West continued to present ever-stronger reasons to doubt the biblical accounts of creation and of man himself. The Copernican revolution, the Newtonian revolution, the Darwinian revolution, and later psychoanalysis, all inflicted deep wounds on the male ego.²¹ They also shook his faith in religion.

The process of secularization allowed the male to overthrow God-the-Father and replace him with the image of *Übermensch*. The major attribute of this *Übermensch* is his ability to be hard against himself by overcoming his passions and human limitations. It is this patriarchal image, presupposing a new “height” in the development of patriarchal ideology, that made possible such events as the Holocaust, the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the Sabra and Shatila massacres in Beirut.

Indeed, as I have argued at length elsewhere,²² the whole history of political oppression (e.g. colonialism, imperialism, etc.) is conceptually tied to shifts and developments in the patriarchal world- (and self-) views. Specifically, racism is simply one offshoot of a particular patriarchal ideology. This fact suggests that feminist world (and self-) views are invaluable for Third World liberation struggles.

Conclusion

This theory is another “just so” story. But to describe it in this fashion is not to minimize its significance or to take it less seriously. All theories are essentially “just so” stories, and yet no discipline can do without them—not even science, that patriarchal paradigm of objectivity. I do not intend to argue that this is exactly and precisely what happened historically between males and females. Instead, I merely wish to present the reader with a story which has at once significant powers of prediction as well as explanation of patriarchal behavior. To the extent that this theory works, one can accept it.

The ramifications of this theory are many, and only some of them have been described here. Readers can reflect on the ramifications in their areas of concern. For example, this theory sheds a new light on the real threat of lesbianism to patriarchal society. It is not that of women loving women; it is women reappropriating their own bodies from men, and hence threatening to cut them from the cycle of life—from one important way in which patriarchal men attempt to immortalize themselves.

The theory outlined in this article provides a solid basis for formulating strategic as well as tactical feminist policies for dissipating male control. Essential to that dissipation is the elimination of obsessive desires for immortality. This is not an easy task. It is a painfully slow one. Nonetheless, since I am arguing that the root of the problem lies in patriarchal ideology, triggered by an obsessive desire for immortality, it becomes essential to strike at the heart of the problem and eliminate it once and for all. This goal is educational and can be achieved in a variety of ways in the home, schools, and mass media. It demands healthier attitudes toward death and dying, as well as the coming to terms with one's own being. Feminist educators, psychologists, etc., should concern themselves with devising the best possible ways for achieving this goal. Feminists should recognize, much more than they do today, the crucial role of mass media (especially television) and pour their energies into using these powerful tools in the service of liberation. This approach is meant to liberate primarily female victims of patriarchal ideology who have contracted the same obsessive desire for immortality, and have adopted the patriarchal view of children as future extensions of one's self. This “need” for children has traditionally chained women to the monogamous family and contributed significantly to their oppression. Thus, to liberate women from unrealistic patriarchal desires for immortality is to give them the freedom of really choosing the style of life they prefer.

Clearly, coupled with such efforts, we must attempt to alter society's view of children as extensions of their parents. This means that part of our task is to struggle for children's liberation. For, so long as children are seen as tools for immortality, they shall continue to be used along with their mothers.

Another major task facing women in the next few decades is, in a temporal sense, the most urgent one. It involves reproductive research conducted by

men and threatening to make women's reproductive powers obsolete. This research is much more advanced than is generally believed (see note 16). If my theory of "womb/breast jealousy" is correct, then women may very well be devalued with the success of the research, and technology will replace the womb as the "civilized" way to reproduce. With the existing power structure, and the male's historic jealousy toward the female, this may result in total separation. At that point total separation will keep women from reproducing, while men clone themselves. In short, women may become extinct.

Thus, the male's attempt to seize (in a new technological way) the power of reproduction from woman must be faced today before it is too late. This means that women should organize and claim supervision and control of such research projects. They should also be developing adequate technological sophistication to run their own reproductive research that could protect them from future catastrophies. (For example, under what conditions can one egg fertilize another? It doesn't look possible now, but neither did cloning before substantial research was devoted to it.)

Finally, feminists should study the history of Third World struggles as a way of understanding how vicious the enemy can get when he thinks his victims are dispensable. Such a study should then inform both feminist theory and practice, opening up to a more dynamic and seasoned approach. To this day, many Third World women have not closed ranks with the American feminist movement because it is seen as white. Its whiteness stems partly from the middle-class issues the movement has traditionally been identified with. But that whiteness also stems from the understandable complacency of many white women who never had to run for their lives. Most Third World women do. Thus it is imperative that the American feminist movement work hard at attracting American women of color, and at integrating their perspective into the heart of feminist ideology. Only then will women of all colors be prepared for the coming onslaught.

Notes

1. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1177b 31; in *The Works of Aristotle*, volume 9, edited and translated by W. D. Ross (London: Oxford University Press, 1944) (emphasis mine).
2. Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1969), pp. 18, 19.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 18.
4. *Time*, 25 June 1979, p. 15 (emphasis mine).
5. Plato, *Dialogues*, translated by B. Jowett, edited by J. D. Kaplan (New York: Pocket Books, 1951), pp. 212, 213.
6. *Ibid.*, p. 213.
7. *Ibid.*, p. 219.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
9. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, p. 19 (emphasis mine).

10. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, *Collected works*, vol. 3 (New York: International Publishers, 1975), p. 275.

11. Quoted in Adrienne Rich, *Of Woman Born* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1976), p. 126.

12. Bronislaw Malinowski, *The Sexual Life of Savages* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1929), p. 182.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 188.

14. Sigmund Freud, *Civilization and Its Discontents*, edited and translated by James Strachey (New York: W. W. Norton, 1961), p. 37.

15. For more on this, see *Technology and Human Affairs*, edited by Larry Hickman and Azizah al-Hibri (St. Louis: C. V. Mosby, 1981) pp. 575-80.

16. For more on this, see my paper "Reproductive Technology and the Future of Women," forthcoming.

17. Theodore Roszak, *Where the Wasteland Ends* (New York: Doubleday, 1972), pp. 373-74.

18. Arendt, *The Human Condition*, p. 21.

19. Mary Daly, *Beyond God the Father* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1973), p. 3.

20. Frederick Copleston, S. J., *History of Philosophy*, vol. 2 (New York: Image Books, 1962), Part 1, p. 73.

21. See similar remarks made by Sigmund Freud, *Collected Papers*, vol. 4, edited by J. Riviere and J. Strachey (New York: The International Psycho-Analytical Press, 1924-50), pp. 351-55.

22. See my "Capitalism Is an Advanced Stage of Patriarchy," a longer and older version of this paper, in *Women and Revolution*, edited by Lydia Sargent (Boston: South End Press, 1981).