

---

---

## **Feminism, Imperialism and Orientalism: the challenge of the 'Indian woman'**

**JOANNA LIDDLE & SHIRIN RAI**

*University of Warwick, Coventry, United Kingdom*

**ABSTRACT** This article examines the content and process of imperialist discourse on the 'Indian woman' in the writings of two North American women, one writing at the time of 'first wave' feminism, the other a key exponent of the 'second wave' of the movement. By analysing these writings, it demonstrates how the content of the discourse was reproduced over time with different but parallel effects in the changed political circumstances, in the first case producing the Western imperial powers as superior on the scale of civilisation, and in the second case producing Western women as the leaders of global feminism. It also identifies how the process of creating written images occurred within the context of each author's social relations with the subject, the reader and the other authors, showing how an orientalist discourse can be produced through the author's representation of the human subjects of whom she writes; how this discourse can be reproduced through the author's uncritical use of earlier writers; and how the discourse can be activated in the audience through the author's failure to challenge established cognitive structures in the reader.

### **Introduction**

This article has two main aims. First, it examines how aspects of imperialist discourse on the colonised woman were taken up in Western women's writing at the time of 'first wave' feminism, and reproduced in the 'second wave' of the movement within the context of the changing power relations between the imperial powers and the former colonies. Second, it identifies some of the discursive practices which have produced imperialist images of the colonised woman, and shows how these practices take place within the social relations of authorship in the field of women's studies. In both cases we are looking at the importance of the historical for the contemporary: in the case of imperialist discourse, we show how certain aspects of the *content* were reproduced with different but parallel effects in the changed political circumstances; in the case of discursive practice, we show how the *process*

of creating written images occurred within the context of the author's social relations with the subject, with the reader, and with other authors. Our hope is to promote a genuinely international feminist dialogue by providing some analytical tools for recognising, deconstructing and ultimately undermining both the content and the process of imperialist discourse.

To conduct this analysis, we critically examine the texts of two Western women authors of different generations who have written about Indian women. These are Katherine Mayo writing in the 1920s, and Mary Daly writing from the 1970s to the present. Both are American women with specific political agendas informed by different historical contexts and intellectual paradigms and, interestingly, in different ways reinforcing rather than challenging the dominant discourses. The particular works we focus on do not stand alone, but are connected in that Daly was heavily influenced by Mayo, and Daly's text builds upon Mayo's. The two texts are further linked by the history of the relations between the East and the West, yet both leave the relationship unchallenged: the historical context of imperialism which allowed for the construction of the 'Indian woman' remains unproblematised.

The writers have been chosen for three reasons. First, the historical relationship between the authors enables us to trace some of the variations and some of the continuities of discourse between the earlier and the later writer. Second, each author had an important influence on public ideas at the time of writing, as will be elaborated in the sections on each author. Third, the lasting reputation of each writer has been maintained in three different continents, since Katherine Mayo is still well known in India, whereas Mary Daly is perhaps best known in Britain and the USA. This provides a particular focus of interest for readers from the three different areas of the world, enabling us to follow the movement of discourse across time and place in a way that is relevant to an international audience. While Mayo has been the subject of a recent historiographical critique by Mrinalini Sinha [1], our analysis is distinct in linking the historical to the contemporary, showing how features of Mayo's discourse were subsequently taken up by Daly and reproduced within a set of authorial relations which create Western culture and 'first world' feminism as superior to their Indian counterparts.

Having analysed the content of the discourses and their political impact, we conclude by identifying some of the processes by which the discourses are produced within the social relations of authorship, referring to three sets of authorial relationship: between the author and the human subjects of whom she writes, between the author and the readers for whom she writes, and between the author and the other writers on whom she draws. We aim to show first, how an orientalist discourse can be produced through the author's representation of her human subjects; second, how this discourse can be reproduced through the author's uncritical use of earlier

writers; and third, how the discourse can be activated in the audience through the author's failure to challenge established cognitive structures in the reader.

### **Imperialism and Orientalism**

No analysis of the relationship between East and West can take place without reference to imperialism. Imperialism is important, not only as an economic, political and social context in which cultures and peoples encountered each other, but also to understand the imbalance of power that has defined much of this contact. It is also the context in which knowledges emerged that 'explained' Eastern reality to the West, and in which these countries found a place in the international systems of power. As Robert Young has said: "that history lives on ... its effects are operating now".[2] This can be witnessed in the contemporary agendas for debate on development.

Perhaps one of the most important aspects of any relationship that is defined by a significant imbalance of power is how the narrative of one is given legitimacy over the narrative of the other. The possession of greater power generally invests the knowledges of the more powerful with a greater authority than those of the powerless, and this authority facilitates the creation of universalised images of both the powerful and the powerless. Edward Said's path-breaking book identified such an exercise of power in the context of imperialism as 'orientalism', an approach which enabled the West to come to terms with the East, and at the same time to construct the West's identity in contrast or opposition to that of the East.[3] Said argued that the 'political doctrine' of orientalism [4] has resulted in a powerful consensus and created a universal imagination concerning the Orient that has spanned many generations in the West.[5]

The historical image that the orientalist created for the Orient was a complex one, overlaying the 'lost glory' of ancient cultures with a negative image of decline. This recreated history both explained the fall of oriental cultures and legitimised continued colonial rule.[6] Historians, novelists, artists, linguists, travellers, administrators and others cooperated in the creation of this image of the East, supported by the political and material resources made available to them within the colonial context. The imbalance of power that characterised the image affected and continues to affect the representation of 'the Orient' today.

We should emphasise at this point that we do not equate the 'Orient' of colonial times with the Third World of today. The 'Orient' was and continues to be a historically rooted construction linked primarily to colonialism, and both the structures of imperialism and the forms of orientalist discourse varied over different historical periods and in different geographical locations.[7] Nevertheless, we will argue that certain aspects of

the orientalist discourse on India have retained a hold on the Western imagination as expressed in certain contemporary women's studies writings. The art historian John MacKenzie has pointed out that Said's view of orientalism is overgeneralised and "inadequately rooted in the ... complexity of different forms of imperialism and varieties of economic and political relationship".[8] Thus, the term orientalism needs to be made specific to particular cultural, geographical and historical contexts. Our analysis will examine the contribution of two North American authors and will show how these writings can be understood within their respective political contexts. Antoinette Burton has suggested that the empire did not only happen 'out there' in the colony but at home too, and that the relationship between the empire and the mother country was dialectic not dichotomous.[9] We suggest that the way imperialist relations were conducted between India and Britain was also important for the USA, Britain's major imperial competitor, implying that the empire was not only created in the colony and the mother country but also in the countries of the competing imperial powers. Gayatri Spivak [10] and Robert Young [11] have discussed how Western writings on the Orient tell us more about the authors and the political contexts in which they wrote than about the Orient itself. We will identify what the work of Katherine Mayo and Mary Daly has to say about their own political concerns and the place of Western women in global politics.

### **Orientalism and the Indian Woman**

Two images of India that are recognisable to people today in both Britain and the USA are those of poverty and mystery. What 'sells' a country like India to the West, as seen in tourism advertisements for example, is its 'exotic culture' in the context of its economic poverty. In her exoticism and her misery, the 'Indian woman' has embodied the subcontinent itself: attracting and repelling at the same time, she is as absent in the construction of her image as India has been. As Said says: "in discussions of the orient, the orient is all absence, whereas one feels the orientalist and what he [*sic*] says as presence".[12] Said's quote is significant because, as Billie Melman has shown, although he uses examples of the construction of women in literature as descriptive illustrations of orientalist discourses, he does not incorporate an analysis of gender into his conceptual approach.[13] Liddle & Joshi, for example, show how gender formed one of the pillars on which imperialism was built, and that the divisions of gender mediated the structure of imperialism [14]; and Sangari & Vaid demonstrate that both the coloniser and the colonised used the image of Indian women and the notion of Indian tradition in relation to gender to contain political and cultural change in both Britain and India.[15]

Although this orientalist discourse was largely constructed by men, Western women also contributed to it. Sara Mills has argued that their voice

was distinctive, lacking the authority of the male coloniser, and “therefore not straightforwardly orientalist in the way Said has described it”.<sup>[16]</sup> We would suggest, however, that the secluded woman was the one subject in which Western women had a more legitimate knowledge and were accorded greater authority than Western men, because of their ability to penetrate beyond the purdah. Many of the texts produced by Western women writers, such as Flora Shaw <sup>[17]</sup> who wrote for *The Times*, painted a picture of Indian women which was so pathetic, so oppressed and victimised, that they incensed many sections of British society, including not only conservatives and committed imperialists, but also socialists like the Webbs <sup>[18]</sup>, who supported Indian nationalism, and ‘first wave’ feminists like Eleanor Rathbone <sup>[19]</sup>, who was induced to write her own critique of child marriage <sup>[20]</sup> upon reading Katherine Mayo’s *Mother India*.

It is important to recognise that significant differences of approach can be identified between the wide range of Western female authors writing about Indian women, showing, as Chaudhuri & Strobel put it, a “complex dynamic of complicity and resistance” rather than a simple or straightforward form of orientalism.<sup>[21]</sup> Reina Lewis points out that women’s orientalism was not “either simply supportive or simply oppositional”, it was also “partial, fragmented and contradictory”, and often produced less degrading forms of representation of the orientalisised other.<sup>[22]</sup> Antoinette Burton, however, has suggested that feminist writing in particular depicted Indian women as “enslaved, degraded and in need of salvation”.<sup>[23]</sup> Burton shows that feminist journals of the early twentieth century, including *Women’s Suffrage Journal* and *Votes for Women*, maintained a regular diet of articles on Indian women which produced this image in such a formulaic way that a certain Mrs Chapman “feared the public would weary from too frequent repetition of the story”.<sup>[24]</sup> Although there were exceptions, most feminists believed that the empire demonstrated the superiority of the white race.<sup>[25]</sup>

Ramusack identifies the approach of most Western feminists of the time as “maternal imperialists”, including those who supported Indian nationalism but still believed that the colonial government improved the condition of women.<sup>[26]</sup> As Jayawardena <sup>[27]</sup> makes clear, they saw Indian women as their special burden, and saw themselves as the agents of progress and civilisation.<sup>[28]</sup> The subject Indian woman in a decaying colonised society was the model of everything they were struggling against and was thus the measure of Western feminists’ own progress. British feminists saw Britain as the centre of both democracy and feminism, and when they claimed political rights they also claimed the right to participate in the empire, seeing female influence as crucial for the empire’s preservation.<sup>[29]</sup> They sought power for themselves in the imperial project, and used the opportunities and privileges of empire as a means of resisting patriarchal constraints and creating their own independence.<sup>[30]</sup> This was

done by reproducing the formulaic image of the oppressed Indian woman regardless of class, education, region, language, religion or caste, even when Indian women were creating their own social reformist and women's movements.[31] And despite the real strides that Indian women have made since independence, they are still routinely cast in Western scholarship and the media as victims, as objects of state policy, or more generally as simply oppressed.

In examining the process by which a unitary image is produced, Chandra Mohanty [32] argues that orientalist power is exercised in discourse when the homogenised and monolithic representation of the Third World woman is contrasted with Western feminism's self-representation. The impact is to rob Third World women of their historical and political agency, as Western feminists become "the true 'subjects' of this counter-history [while] third world women ... never rise above the debilitating generality of their 'object' status".[33] Mohanty's analysis is valuable for understanding how power is exercised within the authorial relationship between the writer and the subject, and we draw upon her work in our critique of the two writers. Mills [34] and Lewis [35] point out that it is also necessary to consider how the image is received by the audience. We suggest further that in examining the transition of ideas and images over time, it is important to include an examination of the writer's relationship with other authors. We will therefore examine the relationship of the author with her human subjects, with other authors, and with the reader.

We wish to make it clear that the question at issue here is not the oppressiveness of child marriage, suttee, and other patriarchal abuses against women in India, but the political effects of how India, Indian culture and Indian women are represented. We should also emphasise that Western feminism is not a homogeneous discourse, and orientalism is by no means universal. Nor are Indian women writers by definition excluded from the criticism.[36] Following Mohanty, our aim is not to make "a culturalist argument about ethnocentrism" but to "uncover how ethnocentric universalism is produced in certain analyses".[37]

In the following two sections, we examine the writing of Katherine Mayo and Mary Daly. The analysis of the content of each writer's text will take place within these two sections, followed by a final section analysing the process by which the discourse is produced within the social relations of authorship.

### **Katherine Mayo's 'Child Bride'**

In 1927 Katherine Mayo published her book *Mother India* [38] based on a visit towards the end of 1925–early 1926. To set the political context, the book was published in the same year that the British Government appointed the Simon Commission to investigate Indian demands for self-government,

and 3 years before Gandhi launched the civil disobedience campaigns as a response to Britain's refusal to grant dominion status. It was also the year that the All India Women's Conference was set up, the largest and most influential of the Indian women's movement organisations, and 10 years after the Women's Indian Association had been established when Indian women had first demanded the vote. Women in India were not only active in resistance against the British Raj at that time but were also organising campaigns against purdah, dowry, child marriage and the conditions of widowhood, and in favour of women's education and female suffrage. Although women from all sections of Indian society were active in the nationalist movement, those involved in women's movement activities were largely middle class, and the issues they took up were therefore middle-class issues.[39]

Mayo's book needs to be seen in the context of global politics in the early twentieth century. Up to the start of the First World War Britain was the dominant global power [40], but the USA had from the nineteenth century been in the process of becoming an imperial power in its own right.[41] From 1914 to 1945 Britain still maintained the largest empire [42] but her power was in decline. The USA, meanwhile, established first her equality with Britain and then global dominance as the two world wars enriched the US economy and weakened her European competitors.[43] Before 1914 Britain was "the centre of the world economic system", but after 1914 this position was taken by the USA.[44] From the late nineteenth century onwards the USA had been moving into the Pacific [45] and had seized the islands of Hawaii, Wake, Guam and the Philippines to form a naval and refuelling route across the Pacific in a drive to dominate the China market. The forcible opening of Japan by the USA in the nineteenth century was similarly motivated by the desire to use Japan as a coaling station on the route to China.[46] US expansionist activity in the western Pacific increased from 1900 on, while the Monroe Doctrine, claiming for the USA the exclusive right to intervene in the American continent, was increasingly respected by the European powers as the USA gained in power.[47] Thus, the USA looked on the Americas and the Pacific as its spheres of influence.[48] But although the USA was in the ascendant during the inter-war years, several challenges threatened US power in the 1920s, including the rise of communism, especially the 1917 Russian revolution, Japan's attempt to enter the power group, especially in the sphere of the Pacific, and the global economic depression and threat to capitalism of which the USA was the epicentre.[49] These threats encouraged the Western powers to cooperate together to bolster the global system of imperialism.

The early part of the twentieth century also saw the rise of nationalist feelings in the colonies. From 1905 the nationalist movements in India and Egypt had a degree of mass support, and the First World War undermined colonialism to an unprecedented extent. The fall of the Tsarist empire in

1917 was followed in 1921 by Irish independence, the transformation of Egypt from a British protectorate to a semi-independent state in 1922 (though still under British control), and the mass campaign of non-cooperation in India called by Gandhi and the Indian National Congress.[50]

It is in this context of the Western powers' competition for global dominance, the internal and external threats to the world imperialist system inducing cooperation among the Western powers, and the challenges to imperial authority from the colonies of both the United Kingdom and the USA, that we can understand Mayo's decision to write *Isles of Fear: the truth about the Philippines* in 1925 and *Mother India* in 1927, since both books argued that Britain and the USA shared a common responsibility for the 'backward' peoples of the colonies and must resist native demands for independence. As Sinha [51] has outlined, Mayo was a member of the patriotic Society of Mayflower Descendants and was already famous for writing propagandist books in the USA. Her interest in India was sparked by a Senate bill on Indian citizenship rights in the USA, and the British parliamentary debate on the Simon Commission to investigate political reform in India as a response to nationalist agitation. Mayo undertook her trip to India for the specific purpose of writing the book.[52] Her status not only as a woman but as an American gave to *Mother India* a legitimacy and an authority which did not attach to British authors, and therefore heightened the book's influence on the British public and British media. As evidence of this legitimacy, in the second-hand copy of *Mother India* from which this critique is being written, Iain Dunbar, its first owner, has noted: "Written by an American, and therefore a third party, Britain emerges favourably and Swaraj and Co are depicted in their true light". It was this third party status and therefore ostensible neutrality, together with Mayo's attempt to stiffen the backbone of the British and US empires at a time when both were facing serious challenge, which explains the book's popularity even in an outlet like the Fabian *New Statesman and Nation*. *Mother India* provoked a great stir in India and Britain, but of very different kinds. A review of *Mother India* in the *New Statesman* expressed vitriolic sentiments against Indian nationalism, and declared:

The book is a tremendous frontal attack upon the whole social system of India in all its aspects, and by implication one of the most powerful defences of the British Raj that has ever been written. ... All who know anything of India are aware ... of the prime evils of Hinduism, of the horrors of the child marriage system, of the universality of sexual vice in its most extravagant forms ... of the filthy personal habits of even the most highly educated classes – which, like the degradation of Hindu women, are unequalled even amongst the most primitive African or Australian savages. ... Miss Mayo makes the claim for Swaraj [self-rule] seem nonsense, and the will to grant it almost a crime.[53]

It was Mayo's book which focused British outrage at the problem of child marriage, leading to the 1929 Child Marriage Restraint Act, a means of satisfying public opinion in the United Kingdom without seriously tackling the problem of child marriage in India.[54] In contrast to the fervent welcome the book received in Britain, however, in India it produced universal criticism.[55] Amongst Indian women, the subject of a large portion of the book, it created a lasting mental scar which, even today, remains in the consciousness of Indian women exploring the relationship between themselves and the British Empire. For example, in 1989 Gita Mehta published the novel *Raj*, in which Katherine Mayo is referred to by the heroine as "clearly mad, but the British believe every word she writes".[56]

*Mother India* documents the failings of Indian civilisation in order to establish that:

Inertia, helplessness, lack of initiative and originality, lack of staying power and of sustained loyalties, sterility of enthusiasm, weakness of life-vigour itself – all are traits that truly characterise the Indian not only of today, but of long-past history.[57]

and that "The British administration of India, be it good, bad or indifferent, has nothing whatever to do with" [58] these conditions. Mayo's central argument is that India's political subjugation and "slave mentality" is attributable to the biological deterioration of the Indian stock:

The whole pyramid of the Indian's woes, material and spiritual ... rests upon a rock-bottom physical base. This base is, simply, his manner of getting into the world and his sex-life thenceforward.[59]

This is the reason "why they are poor and sick and dying and why their hands are too weak, too fluttering, to seize or to hold the reins of Government".[60] The weakening of the stock was caused, among other factors, by child marriage, premature consummation and pregnancy, destructive methods of midwifery, excessive child-bearing, purdah, child widowhood, prostitution, sexual recklessness and venereal disease, lack of education especially for women [61] and irrational systems of medicine.[62] Educated Indians did nothing about these conditions except to "curse the one power which, however little to their liking, is doing practically all of whatever is done for the comfort of sad old Mother India".[63] Mayo exonerates this "one power" – the British colonial state – from responsibility for the paucity of education in India [64] and refutes Britain's economic exploitation of India on the grounds that Britain's commercial interests in the colony were solely for India's benefit.[65] No statistics, evidence or research is referred to in substantiation of any of her assertions on Indian mothers [66], Indian midwives [67], Indian children [68] or Indian men.[69]

The racism of such writing becomes explicit where Mayo contends that Indian habits and attitudes are a danger, not just to themselves but to the

rest of the world [70], and contrasts the culture of the “Anglo-Saxon”, which leads him into “the full glory of manhood”, with that of the Indian, which produces “broken-nerved, low-spirited, petulant ancients”. [71] The peoples of the East, whether colonised by Britain or the USA, were equally incapable of self-rule: “between the Filipino who had no history, and the Hindu” whose history was too old to be of any use, “there was little to choose” since neither of them was able “to grasp the spirit of democracy” [72]; for the idea of representing a constituency is “too gauzy a figment, too abstract a theory, *too non-oriental a conception*, to figure as an influence in their minds” (emphasis added). [73] On the contrary:

The [Indian] masses have, as a whole, little ambition to raise or to change actual living conditions. ... They are content with their mud huts. Given windows and chimneys, they stop them up. ... Given ample space, they crowd in a closet. Rather than work harder for more food, they prefer their ancient measure of leisure and just enough food for the day. [74]

Mayo criticises, quite rightly, the customs and practices which have made child marriage a religious necessity, and details some of the horrific effects on women and girls, including examples of child sexual abuse. But in doing so she presents Indian women as universally weak, passive victims of the barbaric Indian male, and as too backward and ignorant to find any means to resist their oppression.

This characterisation of Indian culture and people as uniformly uncivilised and barbarous, and of Indian women as backward and lost in darkness, is based upon the reduction of Indian women to the status of victims. Nowhere in the book is there reference to the Indian women’s movement, and its campaigns against women’s oppression. Mayo discusses the visit of the Secretary of State for India in 1917 to discuss Indian political representation, but she does not mention Sarojini Naidu’s women’s delegation to demand the franchise, nor that the demand was ignored in the Secretary of State’s report, rejected in the subsequent franchise report, and excluded from the 1919 Government of India Act, which only permitted the Provincial Assemblies to drop the exclusion clause if they so wished. [75] In fact, she rewrites history to suggest that Britain’s exclusion of female suffrage from the Act is more democratic than its inclusion, since it will allow the Indian Provincial Assemblies to decide on female suffrage for themselves. [76] This is a spurious argument because all the major political groupings had already testified in support of women’s suffrage [77], as had the representatives of Indian women. The well-known figures in the Indian women’s movement, such as Sarojini Naidu or Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya, predominantly from the middle class, but from all the regions and religions of India, explicitly rejected both oppressive patriarchal social practices and the image of women as helpless victims.

Mayo is able to present a unitary, reductionist view of Indian women by refusing to allow the subjects to represent themselves. Almost two-thirds

of the sources referred to in the book are government or other official reports, and publications by individual Western men and women. One-third are statements from Indian men, either from the Legislative Assembly Debates, or from published writing. Approximately half of the latter are quotations from Gandhi. Gandhi she uses either to support her representation of the backwardness of Indian womanhood when he is arguing for women's freedom, or to demonstrate his own backwardness when he disagrees with her views. She refers to only one source by an Indian woman: Cornelia Sorabji, who wrote *Between the Twilights* in 1908. Sorabji was the first Indian woman bar-at-law, who supported purdah because of the official position she held as legal adviser to the British government.[78] Mayo uses Sorabji to confirm the picture she has presented, but Sorabji's account sits uneasily with Mayo's interpretation since Sorabji's is a sympathetic portrayal bringing out the sources of women's power as well as their powerlessness.[79]

The focus on women's oppression in *Mother India* makes it easy to imagine that Mayo's approach is feminist. This reading of Mayo's work is possible only if patriarchy, cultural, racial and ethnic identities, and nationalist discourses are regarded as discrete systems separable by the force of feminist analysis. Our view is that this book does not aim to campaign against Indian patriarchy, on the grounds first, that Mayo does not examine the causes of women's oppression except to locate it in the singular barbarity of the Indian culture; second, that the Indian women's movement which had been campaigning for 10 years on women's issues is not used as a referent, and there is no attempt to support these campaigns or to inform the reader about them; and third, that Mayo's ignorance of and contempt for Indian women are revealed both in her orientalist representation of 'the Indian woman' as a universally passive victim, and in the reaction that this representation aroused amongst Indian women who were engaged in the struggles for women's liberation and national independence. *Mother India* is a deeply racist book. It constitutes both a reproduction of orientalist discourses and an extension of them, having been given legitimacy by the author's status as a woman, and as an American, who was supposedly impartial in the struggle between Britain and India. Let there be no doubt that *Mother India* is about men's relationship to women only as a means of mediating the West's relationship with the East.

### **Mary Daly's 'Virtuous Woman'**

Our analysis of the work of Katherine Mayo writing in the late colonial period on India and Indian women has indicated the power of the orientalist image. The question for feminists today, however, is, to what extent did Mayo's writing influence later Western feminist views of India, and how far

have 'second wave' feminist discourses been able to free themselves from the influence of orientalism?

Between the time of 'first wave' and 'second wave' feminism, many changes occurred not only in the relations between men and women, but also in the relations between nations. Most of the colonies won their independence from the colonising powers of the West. A relationship of power still existed between the post-colonial countries and the former colonial powers, but of a changed character which did allow some of the former colonies to develop in competition with the West. The women's movements in India, Britain and the USA entered a period of dormancy, having gained the major part of their demands for the vote and reforms in the law.

Mary Daly published *Gyn/Ecology: the metaethics of radical feminism* in 1978 in the USA and 1979 in the United Kingdom, writing at the height of the 'second wave' women's movement. The book's influence on feminist ideas was so great that it was continually reprinted until 1991, when it was republished.[80] In the 1970s a very different set of global conditions prevailed. The USA was the dominant global power, counterbalanced by the Soviet empire, but the 1949 Chinese Communist revolution had destroyed US hopes of controlling the China market. Japan had shown itself capable of challenging the Western powers on their own terms, while Europe's loss of its colonies was counterbalanced by increasing cooperation among the European Community states. The Korean War in 1950-53 and the Vietnam War in 1965-75 were undertaken to prevent the spread of communism, but the standing of the USA was seriously weakened by the defeat in Vietnam in 1975, the wave of revolutions which spread across Africa, Asia and Latin America from 1974 to 1979, the oil shocks created by the Oil Producing and Exporting Countries (OPEC) in 1973 and the Islamic revolution in Iran in 1979.[81]

At the same time as these revolutionary movements threatened the global pre-eminence of the USA, various social movements appeared in North America and Western Europe, including the civil rights movement, radical student movements, anti-war and anti-nuclear movements and the 'second wave' of the women's movement, emerging partly as a result of the huge expansion in education since the end of the Second World War [82], and therefore tied into both the economic success of the West, and the challenge to and breakdown of that success. The American women's movement, and the feminist literature that it produced, must be seen within this dual context, for in challenging the patriarchal organisation of US society, the movement also attempted to reassert American superiority by establishing its own perspective as the dominant form of knowledge over the women activists who were re-emerging all over the globe.

*Gyn/Ecology* is valuable for this article because, first, Daly was one of the earliest 'second wave' Western radical feminists to break out of the

white Western tradition within feminism in an attempt to formulate an international perspective on gender issues. Second, *Gyn/Ecology* is a women's studies book of general interest reaching a wide international readership, which focuses on women's oppression in four continents. This is both a strength in that its influence is far greater than a specialist work, and a weakness in that the author's lack of specialist knowledge sometimes results in one-dimensional representations of the women under scrutiny. Third, the authorial relationship between Katherine Mayo and Mary Daly is explicit, enabling us to trace the influence of the older American on the younger.

The aim of *Gyn/Ecology* is to explore "the journey of women becoming, that is, radical feminism".[83] The book is best described by Adrienne Rich's comment on its cover as "bursting the accustomed bounds even of feminist discourse". It is radical in both content and form. It attempts to break down patriarchal structures of thought and uses new forms of language to uncover lost meanings and create new interpretations. It attacks patriarchal forms of all kinds and proclaims a unity of all women. Its radical feminist discourse is precisely its value, as it struggles to assist the reader to break out of the patriarchal cognitive structures which limit her perception of her own power. Its failure is its inability to assist the reader to escape from the orientalist cognitive structures which inhibit the very unity that the author affirms.

Daly's analysis of Indian suttee (referring to widow-burning, but actually meaning 'virtuous woman') does not attempt to position India as an inferior culture, since she regards all patriarchal civilisations as equally barbaric and deeply damaging to women. She does, however, revert to some of the orientalist characterisations of the Indian woman employed by Katherine Mayo, including universalism, reductionism, and the refusal to allow self-representation.

The first problem is that Daly repeats the errors of the past by presenting a universal picture of the Indian woman as victim, failing to reveal the resistance that women offered to the horrifying ritual of suttee, child marriage, or any of the other patriarchal abuses visited on women in the name of the Hindu religion. There is only one instance in the chapter where we encounter a woman actively trying to escape her fate: a widow in 1796 who had escaped from the pyre during the night and was subsequently found and dragged back. Daly quotes Benjamin Walker's 1968 study: "She pleaded to be spared but her own son insisted she throw herself on the pile ... *When she still refused*, the son with the help of some others present bound her hands and feet and hurled her into the blaze" (emphasis added).[84] But Daly chooses not to comment on the woman's heroic attempts to escape the pyre.

Yet Daly's overriding objective is to look for the underlying source of women's power whilst identifying the sources of their powerlessness:

In the process of encountering and naming the Male-Factors ... I point out clues which, as they are recognised, disclose the living process which has been hidden, caricatured, captured, stunted, but never completely killed by phallogocentric Sins. These clues point to a force which is beyond, behind, beneath the patriarchal death march – an *unquenchable gynergy*. (emphasis added)[85]

These “clues” which “disclose the living process” are not identified for Indian women. Yet women’s power and resistance is brought out clearly in the portrayal of European women burned as witches.[86] Daly proposes that it was precisely strong, independent women that the witch-hunts set out to repress:

The witchcraze focused predominantly upon women who had rejected marriage (Spinsters) and women who had survived it (widows) ... women whose physical, intellectual, economic, moral and spiritual independence and activity profoundly threatened the male monopoly in every sphere.[87]

Daly argues that the witch-hunts were different from the atrocities in Asia and Africa because they were directed against women outside the control of the patriarchal family, rather than those who were assimilated into it. But this does not explain why there is no discussion of Indian women’s resistance to patriarchal rites. Daly draws attention to the fact of resistance, the “unquenchable gynergy” of European women, where women committed suicide to escape the witch-hunts [88], but does not do so for the Hindu woman who fought to live.

Is this because she did not resist? Or is it because Daly’s image of the Indian woman fits with the orientalist picture of a passive victim with no history of struggle? Of the male researchers of the witch-hunts, Daly writes: “In all of the male-authored scholarship ... there is something lacking: ... Only reluctantly is the strength and power of the witches, which threatened the fathers, admitted”.[89] What is it that threatens Western feminist authors when they represent European women as strong and powerful despite the terrible tortures to which they are subjected under patriarchy, but represent the Indian woman, similarly subordinated, as weak and helpless?

The second problem lies in the sources Daly uses and the hierarchy of knowledge that this establishes. All the sources used by her in constructing the history of suttee in India, and its justification and acceptance by the Hindu culture, are Western sources; furthermore, all except one are male, plus one husband-wife couple. In discussing the reaction in India to one of these publications, Daly lists 11 books by Indian authors and quotes one Indian male author. But she gives no reference to an Indian woman writer, researcher, politician or activist.[90] The Indian women’s movement is not mentioned. Daly criticises the defence of child marriage made by the Indian

male author, because “He speaks for his sister (who of course is not allowed to speak for herself)”. [91] Why are Indian women not allowed to speak for themselves in Daly’s book?

The use of Western sources appears deliberate, and yet inexplicable. Daly writes:

Closer examination unveils its [suttee’s] connectedness with ‘our’ rituals. Moreover, the very attempt to examine the ritual and its social context through the re-sources of Western scholarship demonstrates this connectedness. For the scholars ... exhibit by their very language their complicity with the same social order. [92]

Is this a reason for using exclusively Western sources? Could ‘connectedness’ not better be demonstrated by using Western *and* Indian sources? Daly explicitly challenges the male version of cultural history on the grounds that it cannot present a woman-centred picture:

The primary sources of this book are women’s experiences, past and present. Its secondary sources are male-authored texts from many ‘fields’. I use the latter ... to expose their limitations, to display and exorcise their deceptions. [93]

Yet she does not expose the limitations, nor exorcise the deceptions of the orientalist representation of gender relations by the Western authors. For example, she quotes Abbe Dubois: “Experience has taught that young Hindu women do not possess sufficient firmness, and sufficient regard for their own honour, to resist the ardent solicitations of a seducer”. [94] What outrages Daly is the blaming of the victim. There is no comment on the author’s racism, only on his sexism.

Daly anticipates the criticism that, in making connections between falsely separated reality, she will be accused of “negativity” and “failure to present the whole picture”. Our criticism is not quite this. It is that some women are presented as victims whilst a more complex picture is presented for others. The “failure to present the whole picture” [95] is selective, coinciding with orientalist stereotypes of the Indian woman. We concur with Daly’s “constant effort to see the inter-connectedness of things”. [96] Our criticism is that she fails to see the interconnectedness of gender and imperialism, of the intimate ways in which imperialism produces the subordination of women.

We referred earlier to the sole female source used by Daly: this source is none other than Katherine Mayo’s *Mother India*. Daly regards Mayo as a true feminist researcher [97], and presents Mayo’s work uncritically. She defends her from the attacks of both Western and Indian critics, and advises feminists to “search out and claim such sisters as Katherine Mayo”. [98] Could it be that we have misjudged Katherine Mayo?

Let us look at whether or not Katherine Mayo’s approach to women fits with Daly’s own view of a feminist approach. One of Daly’s major

criticisms of androcentric authors is their tendency to blame the victim, and to write in such a way that: "From childhood to old age, women are somehow made to appear at fault".[99] Yet Mayo too blames the "the oldest woman" for the misery of the purdah restrictions, ignoring the fact that the old women's power is delegated from the men in the family.[100]

A second criticism which Mary Daly makes of androcentric authors is their tendency to attack and undermine knowledge held by women and to replace it with knowledge produced by men. In the chapters on European witch-burning, Daly points out that the witch-hunts were: "concerned with the process of know-ing, which the professionals wanted to possess and control as their 'body of knowledge'".[101] In the chapter on American gynaecology, she shows how men's struggle to wrest control of midwifery is part of this process. She quotes Adrienne Rich's description of "the stunning reversal ... inflicted upon our minds" in which "filthy midwives" were replaced by "hygienic obstetricians", even though it was the male obstetricians who transmitted a 200-year plague of puerperal fever by failing to wash their hands between treating disease and 'assisting' in childbirth.[102]

Why does Daly not take this critical attitude towards Mayo's representation of the Indian *dhai* (midwife)? Is it not possible that a similar process is being undertaken by the British medical professionals to undermine traditional Indian medicine in general, and the practice of indigenous midwifery in particular? Referring to conditions, not in the seventeenth century, but in 1975, Daly writes the following about Indian midwifery:

the reader should consult Mayo's *Mother India* for a lengthy description of the 'unspeakable' *dhais*, 'midwives' from the 'untouchable' caste to whose filthy, brutal, grotesque, and frequently murderous ministrations the woman in childbirth is subjected.[103]

Daly then quotes an excerpt from Katherine Mayo:

'[The *dhai*] kneads the patient with her fists; stands her against the wall and butts her with her head; props her upright on the bare ground, seizes her hands and shoves against her thighs with gruesome bare feet, until, so the doctors state, the patient's flesh is often torn to ribbons by the *dhai's* long, ragged toe-nails. ... she makes balls of strange substances – any irritant – and thrusts them into the uterus to hasten the event.'[104]

and then continues in her own voice to describe the *dhais* as "the filthiest and most ignorant women".[105]

Daly's uncritical approach to this passage of Katherine Mayo's is astonishing. First, it is clear that even if some of these midwifery practices are true, Mayo cannot know about them at first hand. Daly places great faith in Mayo's "eyewitness account and analysis" which "speaks for itself" [106],

despite Mayo's acknowledgement that the information is derived from the Western doctors to whom she spoke, and who represent the profession which, as Daly herself tells us, acted in bad faith in relation to midwifery in the West. Second, there is the problem of the orientalist attitudes of the doctors to their patients and to traditional Indian medicine, reproduced in Mayo's chapters on tropical diseases ('The world-menace') and on Indian medical practice ('Quacks whom we know').[107] Third, why does Daly collude in Mayo's contempt, not only for traditional midwives, but also for untouchable women? Why does Daly assume that they are "the filthiest"? How can she know that they are "the most ignorant"? Is this not precisely the kind of language which Daly tells us was used to legitimate the takeover of female midwifery knowledge by male gynaecology in the West? Daly herself quotes Adrienne Rich's comment that "The man-midwife ... begins to assert the inferiority of the midwife and to make her name synonymous with dirt, ignorance and superstition" [108], yet this is precisely what Daly (and Mayo) have done to the Indian *dhai*. Daly recognises the importance of language in betraying the real message which feminists need to untangle to expose the deceptions of patriarchy.[109] But she fails to acknowledge that imperialist scholarship is also manifested by its language, and the language which Katherine Mayo uses displays her contempt for both men *and* women of the Indian nation. In reproducing this language, Daly is also reproducing the orientalist image of Indian medicine, Indian society and the Indian woman.

Measured by Daly's self-defined criteria of a feminist approach, that is, refusing to blame women for their own victimisation, and respecting female knowledge in the face of androcentric attack, Katherine Mayo's writing is highly suspect. Measured by the criterion of a non-Western feminist approach, that is, recognising how gender is used to mediate imperialism, it is seriously deficient. Daly's answer to this criticism of her use of Mayo's writing is to pre-empt it:

I have chosen to name these practices for what they are: barbaric rituals/atrocities. Critics from western countries are constantly being intimidated by accusations of 'racism', to the point of misnaming, non-naming, and not seeing these sado-rituals. The accusations of 'racism' may come from ignorance, but they serve only the interests of males, not of women. This kind of accusation and intimidation constitutes an astounding and damaging reversal, for it is clearly in the interests of Black women that feminists of all races should speak out.[110]

Mary Daly implies here that a feminist critique cannot also be imperialist or racist in approach. We dispute this, and argue that while Daly correctly exposes atrocities such as suttee as barbaric patriarchal rituals, she at the same time demeans the women who are subject to these atrocities by representing Indian women in accordance with an orientalist image, a

process which also takes place in the chapter on Chinese women [111]; the chapter on African women has been criticised in similar terms by Audre Lorde.[112] What is emphasised in this portrayal is the strength of resistance among European and American women, and the power of their common history of struggle, compared to the absence of resistance among Indian, Chinese and African women. This image both draws from and feeds into the hierarchical global positioning of these countries, but in a relocated context of radical political opposition, the impact of which is to erase the history of the women's movement in the non-Western world and to elevate American women as the leaders of global feminism.

### **The Social Relations of Authorship in the Production of Orientalist Discourse**

Having examined the political impact of the production and reproduction of the imperialist discourse on the Indian woman by two Western women writers, the final section moves on to identify some of the processes by which this reproduction takes place within the three sets of authorial relationships identified earlier. First, within the social relations of author and subject, our analysis suggests that discursive power takes on the character of orientalism when the discourse forms an explicit or unacknowledged alliance with the structures of imperialism which tie colonised and post-colonial countries into a subordinate position within the international economic system. This is what Mayo does when she examines women's oppression in India, not to attack patriarchal relations, but to reinforce British rule; and what Daly does when she constructs an implicit oppositional alliance between European and American women but neglects the resistance of Indian, Chinese and African women. Another way in which power is exercised is when the author denies the subject the opportunity for self-representation. This is important because allowing the subjects to represent themselves would help to erode the reductive unitary image created by the author and reveal the subject's presence, thus inhibiting the construction of the Western woman author through the erasure of the Indian woman subject. This can be seen to be happening even in the short excerpt from Sorabji quoted by Mayo. Finally, the author exercises power of an orientalist character over the subject of the discourse when either, as with Mayo, she conflates differences in the patriarchal oppression of women, compared to her own culture, with an inferior position in the hierarchy of civilisation, thereby implicitly positioning her own culture, 'race' or nation and the particular patriarchal gender relations operating within it as more advanced on the scale of civilisation; or, as with Daly, she conflates differences in the forms of resistance to patriarchy with an inferior position in the hierarchy of oppositional counter-culture, thereby positioning her own resistance movement as the norm or standard for comparison.

The second set of authorial social relations refers to that between the author and the other writers upon whom she draws. In examining the authorial relationship between Katherine Mayo and Mary Daly, we have shown how the orientalist discourse is reproduced through the power exercised by earlier writers used as sources. However, the important feature of this process is that, although a relationship of power certainly exists between the author and her source, the more significant relationship lies hidden within it. For whilst power in the form of discursive influence is exercised by the source over the author, we would argue that the power of orientalism is not exercised by one author over the other, but is *exchanged* or *transferred* between them, while the subject of the orientalist discourse becomes the *object* of the exchange. We are suggesting, therefore, that the most significant aspect of this relationship is the exchange of orientalist power between the author and her source, in the process of which the Indian woman who forms the subject of the discourse becomes objectified. Within this exchange, a hierarchy of knowledge is constructed as the authors confirm and corroborate each other in the production of a legitimated knowledge, at the same time as eroding the validity of the subject's perspective through the process of objectification; in this way, the two processes of exchange and objectification construct a hierarchy in which Western feminism is elevated to a position of superiority over Indian feminist knowledge.

The strength of the authorial relationship between the two writers whom we have chosen as examples is highlighted rather than undermined by the differences between them. Half a century separates Daly's writing from Mayo's. Although the two authors come from the same national and political culture, they are as far removed in political perspective as in historical time. Living in a post-colonial world and believing that all patriarchal cultures are barbaric, Daly does not use women's oppression to position nations and cultures on a hierarchy of civilisation, as Mayo did. Unlike Mayo, Daly locates herself in the context of the women's movement, and her identification as a feminist is uncontested. Whereas Mayo's analysis of Indian women led her to defend imperialism, Daly attempts to place women at the forefront, and to subvert Western ethnocentrism, by combining an international perspective with radical feminist analysis. Yet it is important to recognise that Mary Daly too writes out of her own time. Daly's discourse on the Indian woman should not be seen as an aberration or as a historical vestige of colonial writing with no contemporary relevance. Daly's intimate identification with Mayo is a reflection of the hierarchy of knowledge which still exists between the West and the East, and the low value ascribed to knowledge produced in the former colonies. Within this context, Daly's neglect of Indian, Chinese and African women's voices means that, despite her very different political motivations, she is as unable as

Katherine Mayo was to formulate a convincing critique or to mount a cross-national challenge to global patriarchal structures.

Daly not only reflects but helps to create the global hierarchy of knowledge and power by elevating, not American civilisation, but American feminist opposition to US civilisation. The power of the orientalist imagination can only be sustained by the continuous production and reproduction of practices and discourses of the kind identified in this article. This power is both underpinned by, and helps to maintain, the structural inequality between the 'advanced' nations of the West and the 'developing' post-colonial states. When this alliance between discourse and structure takes place within the framework of contemporary Western feminism, as is the case with Mary Daly, the orientalist imagination becomes hegemonic, not only because of its historical strength, but because of its contemporary relevance and the ratification and reinforcement it receives from the complicity of sections of Western feminism in validating the discourse.

The third set of authorial social relations is that between the author and the reader. Mary Daly, whilst drawing no link between women's social position and the hierarchy of civilisation, does reproduce Mayo's universalistic and reductive account of the 'Indian woman'. But the fact that Daly regards all patriarchal cultures as equally barbaric does not mean that *readers* of Daly's unitary image of Indian women do not themselves make the link with the hierarchy of civilisation. The question is, what is the image which arises in the minds of Western readers when they read of Indian, Chinese or African atrocities against women? The experience of teaching material on gender and imperialism to Western women of all ages, backgrounds and educational levels indicates that often the first response to emerge from the Western mind is of the universal barbarism of the Asian and African 'races', not the universal barbarism of the male. Even if the author states explicitly, as Mary Daly does, that similar atrocities against women are committed by men regardless of 'race' or culture, the cognitive construction of the Western mind immediately calls forth the image of the barbarian native. This image is as much racist as sexist, for it conjures up the oppressive, irrational oriental male, in contrast to the democratic, objective Western male, and the backward, passive oriental female in opposition to the liberated, active Western woman. The image derives from a long history of orientalist representations of Eastern peoples from colonial times to the present.

This is a conversation one of us had with a white woman student after a class on Women in India.

Student: Indian women have a much worse time of it than us, don't they?

Tutor: Yes, they've got all of the problems caused by imperialism to cope with too.

Student: No I didn't mean that, I meant suttee and things like that, we've never had to deal with anything as awful as that.

Tutor: What about the witch-burnings?

Student: Oh yes, but that was a long time ago.

Tutor: So was suttee.

Student: Yes but the witch-hunts were a much *longer* time ago than suttee weren't they?

In this exchange the student attempts to position European atrocities against women at a more remote period in history than Indian patriarchal abuses, suggesting that European men became 'civilised' earlier than Indian men. This helps to maintain the belief that Indian culture is more oppressive to women than British culture, to blame not men as a sex, but Indian culture and the Indian people as a national or 'racial' group, and to distinguish British people and British culture from any comparable barbarity. To prevent this from happening, it is not enough for an author to point out that she is generalising about patriarchy across cultures; it is also necessary to counter the process by which orientalist discourses are *activated* by statements about women's oppression in Eastern cultures. What is happening here is precisely what Mary Daly, for example, claims to be fighting *against*, namely the erasure of male responsibility for patriarchal atrocities. By blaming the 'race', men as a group are exonerated. Responsibility for the oppression of Indian women is attached to both Indian men through their barbaric practices, and Indian women through their passivity and acceptance. Above all, women's oppression in India becomes defined as a problem of Indianness, as part of the pathology of Indian culture, and represented as if it can somehow be detached from the problem of masculinity which is also pertinent in Western cultures. The political impact of this is to close down consideration of patriarchal relations and to open up the question of national, 'racial' and cultural hierarchy, thus promoting the orientalist discourse and actively preventing a truly comparative feminist approach to the question of gender.

### Notes

- [1] Mrinalini Sinha (1994) Reading Mother India: empire, nation and the female voice, *Journal of Women's History*, 6, pp. 6-44.
- [2] Robert Young (1990) *White Mythologies: writing history and the West*, p.175 (London: Routledge).
- [3] Edward Said (1976) *Orientalism* (Harmondsworth: Penguin).
- [4] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

- [5] *Ibid.*, p. 202.
- [6] Kumkum Sangari & Sudesh Vaid (Eds) (1989) *Recasting Women: essays in colonial history*, pp. 1-26 (New Delhi: Kali for Women Press).
- [7] Aijaz Ahmad (1992) *In Theory, Classes, Nations, Literatures* (New York: Verso).
- [8] John MacKenzie (1995) *Orientalism: history, theory and the arts*, p. xv (Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- [9] Antoinette Burton (1994) Rules of thumb: British history and 'imperial culture' in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Britain, *Women's History Review*, 3, pp. 483-486.
- [10] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1988) *In Other Worlds: essays in cultural politics* (London: Routledge).
- [11] Young, *White Mythologies*.
- [12] Said, *Orientalism*, p. 208.
- [13] Billie Melman (1992) *Women's Orients: English women and the Middle East, 1718-1918, sexuality, religion and work* (Basingstoke: Macmillan).
- [14] Joanna Liddle & Rama Joshi (1986) *Daughters of Independence: gender, caste and class in India*, pp. 30-32 (London: Zed Books).
- [15] See, for example, Lata Mani (1989) Contentious traditions: the debate on *sati* in colonial India, and Uma Chakravarti (1989) Whatever happened to the Vedic *Dasī*? Orientalism, nationalism and a script for the past, in Sangari & Vaid, *Recasting Women*.
- [16] Sara Mills (1991) *Discourses of Difference: an analysis of women's travel writing and colonialism*, p. 62 (London: Routledge).
- [17] Helen Callaway & Dorothy Helly (1992) Crusaders for empire: Flora Shaw/ Lady Lugard, in Nupur Chaudhuri & Margaret Strobel (Eds) *Western Women and Imperialism: complicity and resistance*, pp. 79-97 (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).
- [18] *Ibid.*
- [19] See Barbara Ramusack's discussion of Rathbone (1990) in Cultural missionaries, maternal imperialists, feminist allies: British women activists in India, 1865-1945, *Women's Studies International Forum*, 13, pp. 315-316; and Joanna Liddle & Shirin Rai (1993) Between feminism and orientalism, in Mary Kennedy, Cathy Lubelska & Val Walsh (Eds) *Making Connections: women's studies, women's movements, women's lives*, pp. 15-16 (London: Taylor & Francis).
- [20] Eleanor Rathbone (1934) *Child Marriage: the Indian minotaur* (London: George Allen & Unwin).
- [21] Chaudhuri & Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism*, p. 7; see, for example, the articles by Clancy-Smith, Sinha, Ramusack, Burton and Paxton, in *ibid.*
- [22] Reina Lewis (1996) *Gendering Orientalism: race, femininity and representation*, p. 237 (London: Routledge).
- [23] Antoinette Burton (1992) 'The white woman's burden', in Chaudhuri & Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism*, p. 145.

- [24] Ibid., p. 147.
- [25] Burton, 'The white woman's burden', p. 138. See also Joyce Zonana (1993) *The sultan and the slave: feminist orientalism and the structure of Jane Eyre*, *Signs*, 18(3), pp. 592-617.
- [26] Ramusack, 'Cultural missionaries'.
- [27] Kumari Jayawardena (1995) *The White Woman's Other Burden* (London: Routledge). See especially pp. 95-100 for a discussion of Mayo and Daly.
- [28] Burton, 'The white woman's burden', p. 139.
- [29] Ibid., pp. 145-152.
- [30] Ibid., p. 142; see also articles by Birkett and Flemming in Chaudhuri & Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism*; and Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism*.
- [31] Burton, 'The white woman's burden'.
- [32] Chandra Mohanty (1988) *Under Western eyes: feminist scholarship and colonial discourse*, *Feminist Review*, 30, pp. 63-64.
- [33] Ibid., p. 79.
- [34] Mills, *Discourses of Difference*, p. 12.
- [35] Lewis, *Gendering Orientalism*, pp. 3-4.
- [36] Said, *Orientalism*, p. 322.
- [37] Mohanty, 'Under Western eyes', p. 64.
- [38] Katherine Mayo (1927) *Mother India* (London: Jonathan Cape).
- [39] Veena Mazumdar (1976) *The social reform movement in India*, in B. R. Nanda (Ed.) *Indian Women: from purdah to modernity* (New Delhi: Vikas).
- [40] Jon Halliday (1975) *A Political History of Japanese Capitalism*, p. 87 (London: Monthly Review Press).
- [41] W. G. Beasley (1990) *The Rise of Modern Japan*, p. 27 (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson).
- [42] Eric Hobsbawm (1994) *Age of Extremes: the short twentieth century, 1914-1991*, p. 40 (London: Michael Joseph).
- [43] Ibid., pp. 40, 97.
- [44] Ibid., p. 99.
- [45] Beasley, *The Rise of Modern Japan*, p. 27.
- [46] Halliday, *A Political History*, p. 88.
- [47] Eric Hobsbawm (1987) *The Age of Empire 1875-1914*, pp. 58-59 (London: Abacus).
- [48] Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, p. 41.
- [49] Ibid., p. 86.
- [50] Ibid., p. 210.
- [51] Sinha, 'Reading Mother India', p. 9.
- [52] Ibid.

- [53] *New Statesman & Nation* (1927) India as it is, 16 July.
- [54] Mrinalini Sinha (1987) Gender and imperialism: colonial policy and the ideology of moral imperialism in late nineteenth century Bengal, in Michael Kimmel (Ed.) *Changing Men* (London: Sage).
- [55] See, for example, Mahatma Gandhi (1927) A drain inspector's report, *Young India*, 15, September; J. J. Cornelius (n.d.) What is wrong with 'Mother India', in *What India Thinks of 'Mother India'* (New York: Publisher unknown); C. S. Ranga Iyer (1928) *Father India: a reply to Mother India* (New York: Louis Carrier & Co).
- [56] Gita Mehta (1989) *Raj*, p.197 (London: Jonathan Cape).
- [57] Mayo, *Mother India*, p. 24.
- [58] Ibid.
- [59] Ibid., p. 29.
- [60] Ibid., p. 38.
- [61] Ibid., parts 1 and 2.
- [62] Ibid., chs 26, 27, 28.
- [63] Ibid., p. 28.
- [64] Ibid., ch. 14.
- [65] Ibid., ch. 29, appendix III.
- [66] Ibid., p. 96.
- [67] Ibid., p. 91.
- [68] Ibid., p. 30.
- [69] Ibid., p. 34.
- [70] Ibid., p. 23.
- [71] Ibid., p. 38.
- [72] Ibid., p. 181.
- [73] Ibid., p. 269.
- [74] Ibid., p. 361.
- [75] Jana Matson Everett (1981) *Women and Social Change in India*, pp. 102-106 (New Delhi: Heritage).
- [76] Mayo, *Mother India*, p. 367.
- [77] Everett, *Women and Social Change*, p. 106.
- [78] Kamaladevi Chattopadhyay (1983) *Indian Women's Battle for Freedom*, p. 51 (New Delhi: Abhinav Publications).
- [79] Mayo, *Mother India*, pp. 77, 81.
- [80] Mary Daly (1979 and 1991) *Gyn/Ecology: the metaethics of radical feminism* (London: The Women's Press).
- [81] Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, pp. 237-248, 450-453.
- [82] Ibid., pp. 297-301.

- [83] Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 1.
- [84] *Ibid.*, p. 117.
- [85] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
- [86] *Ibid.*, p. 211.
- [87] *Ibid.*, p. 184.
- [88] *Ibid.*, p. 211
- [89] *Ibid.*, p. 216.
- [90] She could, for example, have referred to Vijaya Lakshmi Pandit's response to Mayo's book, recorded in her biography by Robert Hardy Andrews (1967) *A Lamp for India: the story of Madame Pandit* (London: Arthur Barker).
- [91] Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 128.
- [92] *Ibid.*, pp. 114-115.
- [93] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
- [94] *Ibid.*, p. 122.
- [95] *Ibid.*, p. XIV.
- [96] *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.
- [97] *Ibid.*, p. 119.
- [98] *Ibid.*, p. 129.
- [99] *Ibid.*, p. 123.
- [100] Mayo, *Mother India*, p. 112.
- [101] Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 194.
- [102] *Ibid.*, p. 236.
- [103] *Ibid.*, p. 438.
- [104] *Ibid.*, p. 439.
- [105] *Ibid.*
- [106] *Ibid.*, p. 128.
- [107] Mayo, *Mother India*, chs 27, 28.
- [108] Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, p. 268.
- [109] *Ibid.*, p. 112.
- [110] *Ibid.*, p. 154.
- [111] *Ibid.*, ch. 4.
- [112] Audre Lorde (1981) An open letter to Mary Daly, in Cherrie Moraga & Gloria Anzaldua (Eds) *This Bridge Called My Back: writings by radical women of color* (New York: Women of Color Press).

---

**JOANNA LIDDLE** is a lecturer in Women's Studies at the Centre for the Study of Women and Gender, University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom, where she teaches courses in Interdisciplinary Women's

Studies and Gender and International Development. She has published various articles on women's work in India, women and nationalism, and women and orientalism, and is co-author, with Rama Joshi, of *Daughters of Independence: gender, caste and class in India* (Zed Books, 1986). She is currently writing a book on women's work in Japan, and is involved with a collaborative international study in 28 countries of women, men and public power.

**SHIRIN RAI** is a senior lecturer in Politics in the Department of Politics and International Studies at the University of Warwick, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom, where she also teaches at the Centre for the Study of Women and Gender. Her publications include: *Women and the State: international perspectives* (co-editor, Taylor & Francis, 1997), *Civil Society: democratic perspectives* (co-editor, Frank Cass, 1997) and *Women in the Face of Change, Eastern Europe, Soviet Union and China* (Routledge, 1992). Currently she is working on two projects: *Gender and Development* (with Caroline Wright, to be published by Polity Press) and *Gender and Democratisation: international perspectives* (editor).