

1989

Marxist Feminist Theory: A Review, A Critique, and an Offering

Patricia Ann Wasley Lomire
Minot State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/greatplains Sociologist>



Part of the [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), [Regional Sociology Commons](#), and the [Rural Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Wasley Lomire, Patricia Ann (1989) "Marxist Feminist Theory: A Review, A Critique, and an Offering," *Great Plains Sociologist*. Vol. 2 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/greatplains Sociologist/vol2/iss1/5>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Great Plains Sociologist by an authorized editor of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

**MARXIST FEMINIST THEORY:
A REVIEW, A CRITIQUE, AND AN OFFERING**

Patricia Ann Wasely Lomire
Minot State University

INTRODUCTION

The relationship between gender and stratification is one of the most problematic areas in social science (Crompton and Mann, 1986). A review of stratification theory suggests that, in general, main-stream theories are inadequate since they often ignore the independent positions of females in stratification systems (Acker, 1973, 1980; Lenski, 1966; Tyree and Hodge, 1978). In particular, Marxist feminist theories are limiting since they are unable to explain the origin and persistence of gender domination (Balbus, 1982; Crompton and Mann, 1986; Goldthrope, 1983; Walby, 1986). Although Marxist feminism is "the most prevalent feminist framework" (Jagger and Rothenberg, 1984), it is becoming apparent that Marxism does not allow for an adequate theoretical contribution to the practical uprooting of gender domination (Balbus, 1982). Perhaps it is time to seriously accept the deficiencies of Marxist feminism and redirect our theoretical efforts to an alternative framework.

The purpose of this paper is twofold: (1) to briefly review and critique Marxist feminist theory; and (2) to offer suggestions for applying a Weberian theory of domination and capitalism to gender inequality. Since identification and clarification of concepts is essential in theory construction, this paper will focus on reinterpreting two significant Marxian concepts: patriarchy and capitalism. The significance of this paper is that it ought to stimulate further thought on a simple but powerful thesis; the concepts of patriarchy and capitalism are insufficient in explaining the origin and persistence of gender domination. This paper concludes that gender domination and subordination is a consequence of variation in types of traditional authority (patriarchal and non-patriarchal), types of production systems (capitalistic and non-capitalistic), and types of economic behavior (rational and irrational).

A REVIEW: THE DEVELOPMENT OF MARXIST FEMINISM

The conflict theory of Karl Marx is based on the premise that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles whereby oppressor and oppressed stood in constant opposition to one another (Vanfossen, 1979:34-35). Marxists argue that all historical forms of oppression are reducible to one common denominator -- "the irreconcilable conflict between economic class" (Jagger and Rothenberg, 1984:85). This essential historical fact is "the most important key to understanding the shape of contemporary society and the direction of social change" (Jagger and Rothenberg, 1984:85).

Marx's conflict theory is generally referred to as the economic theory of history. Its basic presupposition is that every society is constructed upon an "infrastructure" -- the "mode of production" of commodities, which supports the "superstructure" -- the complex of "social, political, and spiritual processes of life" (Smelser and Warner, 1976:58).

A review of traditional and contemporary feminist theory indicates that Marxism is the most prevalent feminist framework applied to gender analysis (Jagger and Rothenberg, 1984). Gail Rubin (1975) justifies her Marxist orientation on

the grounds that there is no theory which accounts for the oppression of women with anything like the explanatory power of the Marxist theory of class oppression (Rubin in Jaggar and Rothenberg, 1984:156). Perhaps the two most attractive features of Marxism is that it rejects the liberal's belief that it is possible for people to have genuine equality of opportunity while they remain within a class society -- e.g., the liberalism of John S. Mill, Joyce Trebilcot, and even, the Bill of Rights of the National Organization for Women (Jaggar and Rothenberg, 1984:iii-ix, xvii).

Although there are a variety of Marxist feminist theories -- e.g., traditional, radical, radical liberal, progressive liberal, socialist, and contemporary -- each of these theoretical approaches shares a common belief in Marx's "economic theory of history" (Hartman in Jaggar and Rothenberg, 1984:156). In other words, Marxist feminist theories typically focus on the relationship of women to the economic system. This relationship takes on a twofold character. First, women are responsible for the production of the means of existence -- food, clothing, shelter, and tools for production. Secondly, women are responsible for the production of human beings -- the propagation of the species (Mitchell in Roszak and Roszak, 1969:160).

Divergence in Marxist feminist theories exist primarily between traditional and contemporary theorists. Traditional Marxist feminists are involved in the project of extracting a theory of sex oppression from the study of kinship relations (Hartman, 1981:366-394). Traditional theorists maintain that the root of woman's oppression is within the monogamous family (Mitchell in Roszak and Roszak, 1969:163). Heidi Hartman (1981) suggests that the underlying concept of the family as an active agent with unified interests is erroneous. Rather, the family is the locus of struggle -- it is not a unit shaped by affect or kinship, but the location where production and redistribution take place (Hartman, 1981:366-394). Balbus (1982:71) concurs with Hartman and suggests that the family is "repressive and conservatising institution that reproduces within itself the hierarchical, authoritarian relationships of the capitalistic workplace." Women are completely submerged within the family as "units of capitalistic production." These theoretical views can be traced to the *Grundrisse* (1973) whereby Marx states that the individual within the family carries his power in his pocket -- i.e., power within the family is a function of money rather than sexual identity (Marx in Balbus, 1982:65).

Contemporary Marxist feminists, primarily those attempting to explain the woman's liberation movement of the 1960s and 1970s, have attempted to demonstrate the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism (Brittan and Maynard, 1984; Eisenstein, 1979; Hartmann, 1979). Patriarchy (a male dominated sexual division of labor) provides indispensable functions for the perpetuation of the capitalistic mode of production, and capitalism functions to provide the "material basis" for patriarchy (Balbus, 1982:72; Kelly, 1984:54).

A CRITIQUE: THE LIMITATIONS OF MARXIST FEMINISM

A review of the contemporary literature suggests that the Marxist feminism has been critically challenged in theory and practice (Balbus, 1982; Beechey, 1979; Cassell, 1977; Delphy, 1977, 1981; Kelly, 1976, 1984; Young 1980, 1981). The following areas attempt to briefly identify and review the primary theoretical debates.

Marxist feminism is subsumed under family analysis.

Marxist feminism is typically subsumed in an analysis of the repressive, monogamous family (Acker, 1973; Balbus, 1982:65; Crompton and Mann, 1986; Mitchell,

1966:11-37). The typical assumption, underlying most feminist and stratification literature in general, is that all females live in families, therefore their status is determined by that of the male to whom they are attached (Acker, 1973:937). This is perhaps the most blatant form of sexism whereby females are ascribed an "invisible" or "non-person" status (Acker, 1973; Carlen, 1976; Freeman, 1976). Traditional family approaches to gender relations reveal little about the status of women as individual autonomous units who can achieve positions independent from fathers or husbands (Acker, 1973:938; Brittan and Maynard, 1984:51. Lenski (1966:402) explains this neglect as a tendency of sociologists "to treat families, rather than individuals, as the basic unit in systems of stratification."

Marxist feminism is restrained by economic determinism.

Marxist feminists are conceptually bound by the restraints of economic determinism -- that is, the "infrastructure" as the foundation of domination (Mitchell in Roszak and Roszak, 1969:164; Smelser and Warner, 1976:58). However, gender inequality may not be reducible to a single common denominator such as social class. As Max Weber suggests, "not every case of domination makes use of economic means; still less does it always have economic objectives" (Weber, 1978:212).

Marxist feminism is restrained by its focus on class analysis.

Marxist feminists typically focus on the association between gender and social class (Brittan and Maynard, 1984). Caste ("caste-like") or estate ("estate-like") types of stratification are generally eliminated from analysis. Given the importance of caste ("caste-like") and estate ("estate-like") racial theories that played a significant role in understanding American racial inequality (Cox, 1948; Miles, 1960; Myrdal, 1964; Scott, 1969), it seems feasible that contemporary feminists could investigate the implications of non-class types of stratification on gender inequality. Runciman (1968:29) argues that "no society has yet been found which does not have a status [estate] system of some rudimentary kind." Bergel (1962:148) contends that vestiges of estatism operated to legally and politically subordinate given social groups in American society. Nevertheless, "the question of an estate or status system in this country [U.S.] is hardly ever examined" (Bergel, 1962:148).

Marxist feminism is restrained by its focus on capitalism.

Contemporary Marxist feminists generally avoid explaining the issue of gender domination and subordination in non-capitalistic countries (Scott, 1974). Marxist feminism has failed to realize that sexism is not a Western, much less a capitalist monopoly (Balbus, 1982). Although the universality of gender domination within both capitalist and non-capitalist production systems has been challenged, Lockwood (1986:19) firmly contends that "the oppression of women by men is a global feature of social life manifesting itself in every institutional sphere." Consequently, contemporary feminists must search for a theoretical framework that contains the explanatory power to investigate the existence of both capitalistic and non-capitalist forms of gender domination.

Marxist feminism is unable to explain the origin and persistence of gender domination.

Patriarchy and capitalism are two concepts that consistently appear in the Marxist feminist literature (Eisenstein, 1979; Elshtain, 1981; Hartman, 1979, 1981; Rowbotham, 1979, 1982). However, Marxist feminists have had considerable difficulty in reaching an agreement on the historical and/or conceptual association between these two concepts (Beechey, 1979; Crompton and Mann, 1986;

Elshstain, 1981; Hamilton, 1978; Sargent, 1981; Young, 1980, 1981). Marx originally described patriarchy as a "pre-capitalistic" relation (Balbus, 1982). However, he failed to explain the way in which patriarchy and capitalism is retained and maintained by the new mode of production; and the way in which this pre-capitalist relation (patriarchy) assumes a specifically capitalist form (Balbus, 1982:66; Mitchell, 1971:113). Mitchell (1971) and Rowbotham (1973, 1974) suggest that capitalism is the root of gender oppression, and they contend that overthrowing capitalism is the means of eliminating gender inequality. They fail to recognize that socialism per se, or as it is presently practiced, is not a woman's paradise.

The basic premise of the contemporary Marxist feminist thesis is that the elimination of capitalism is the "pre-condition" for the elimination of patriarchy (Balbus, 1982:73). In other words, they are assuming that capitalism is prior to patriarchy. However, this thesis ignores the chronological order of socio-historical events from patriarchalism to capitalism (Lerner, 1986). Heidi Hartman contends that Marxist feminists are "blind to history" (Hartman in Jagger and Rothenberg, 1984:172). Hartman states that Marxist feminists are unable to answer one basic and fundamental historical question: "If patriarchy (a pre-capitalist structure) existed prior to capitalism, then, 'How can the elimination of capitalism be the 'pre-condition' or the 'material basis' for the elimination of patriarchy?'" Herein lies a major historical and conceptual problem for Marxist feminist theorists. Balbus clearly recognizes this problem in the following statement:

Thus it has fallen on Marxists after Marx to develop, where Marx did not, a theory of the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism that could account for the persistence of the former without undermining the assumption of the primacy of the latter (Balbus, 1982:66).

If Marx did not develop a theory of the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism, then contemporary gender theory is faced with the task of reinterpreting the association between these two concepts.

In order to explain the origin and persistence of gender domination, contemporary gender theorists must address two fundamental questions:

- (1) "Are the concepts of patriarchy and capitalism necessary in explaining the origin and persistence of gender domination?"
- (2) "Are the concepts of patriarchy and capitalism sufficient in explaining the origin and persistence of gender domination?"

A review of Max Weber's theory of domination (derived from Economy and Society) and theory of capitalism (derived from The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism and General Economic History) provides at least a partial answer to the aforementioned questions.

A REVIEW: MAX WEBER'S THEORIES OF DOMINATION AND CAPITALISM

Kate Millett (1970) in Sexual Politics suggests that "...an examination of our system of sexual relationships must point out that the situation between the sexes...is a case of that phenomenon Max Weber defined as herrschaft, a relationship between domination and subordination" (Millett, 1970:24-25).

A Theory of Domination

An examination of Weber's Economy and Society indeed indicates that the core of his analysis is the sociology of domination. For Weber, "domination" was identical with "authoritarian power of command" (Bendix, 1977:291). Weber defines domination as:

The manifested will (command) of the ruler or rulers is meant to influence the conduct of one or more others (the ruled) and actually does influence it in such a way that their conduct to a socially relevant degree occurs as if the ruled had made the content of the command the maxim of their conduct for its very own sake (Bendix, 1977:291).

In order to understand domination, Bendix has separated this statement into its analytical components. For domination to be present there must be:

(1) an individual who rules, or a group of rulers; (2) an individual who is ruled, or a group that is ruled; (3) the will of the rulers to influence the conduct of the ruled and an expression of that will (or a command); (4) evidence of the influence of the rulers in terms of the objective degree of compliance with the command; (5) direct or indirect evidence of compliance with the command; (6) direct or indirect evidence of that influence in terms of the subjective acceptance with which the ruled obey the command (Bendix, 1977:292).

Of additional importance is the meaning that rulers are ruled attach to the relationship of authority. Rulers claim that they have legitimate authority to rule, and they expect their commands to be obeyed. Domination is also required as administrative staff to execute commands. Wherever the group increases beyond a certain size, or the members become differentiated from one another, it becomes too difficult for the administrative functions of domination to be performed. In this way, an administrative structure arises to serve the purposes of the rulers, and all administration means domination (Bendix, 1977:293). In "mass structures," a system of domination includes an administrative staff or organization consisting of persons who:

(1) are accustomed to obey commands; (2) are personally interested in seeing the existing domination continue because they derive benefits therefrom; (3) participate in that domination in the sense that the exercise of functions is divided among them; and (4) hold themselves in readiness for the exercise of these functions (Bendix, 1977:293).

Of central importance in Weber's analysis of domination is the "belief in" the legitimacy of a system of domination. "Belief in" legitimacy can contribute to the stability of an authority relationship, and this belief contributes to the success or failure of the system. Rulers want to see their position as "legitimate" and their advantages as "deserved," and to interpret the subordination of the ruled as the "just fate" of those upon whom it falls. All rulers then develop some myth of their natural superiority, which typically is accepted among the ruled under stable conditions. When this stability appears to be disrupted, then, the ruled may question the established order, and seek change in that order (Bendix, 1977:294).

Domination and Legitimacy

Legitimate domination (authority) is "the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons" (Weber, 1978:53). Weber stresses that what is important in determining whether or not a command is obeyed is "belief in" and "claim to" legitimacy. The validity of claims to legitimacy are based upon three "pure types" of legitimate domination: traditional, charismatic, and legal-rational (Weber, 1978:215). Traditional authority rests on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority under them. Charismatic authority rests on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism, or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him. Legal-rational authority rests on an established belief in the legality of enacted rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (Weber, 1978:215).

Traditional Legitimate Authority

Domination based on traditional legitimate authority is of primary importance to an investigation of the origins of gender domination. Traditional authority rests upon "an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of those exercising authority" (Weber, 1978:215). Traditional authority is manifested by three "ideal types": patriarchy, patrimonialism, and estatism.

1. Patriarchy

Patriarchy is the most elementary type of traditional domination (Weber, 1978:231). Patriarchal domination is rooted in the "master's authority over his household" (Weber, 1978:1006). Within the household, the wife, children and slaves are subordinated to the master because of their "belief in," and the master's "claim to" traditional legitimate authority -- "the normal superiority of the physical and intellectual energies of the male" (Weber, 1978:1007). Patriarchy is a system of relations, which formed the political and economic outlines of feudal and some pre-feudal societies (Balbus, 1982).

2. Patrimonialism

Patrimonialism (which the Marxist feminists fail to recognize) is an additional "pure-type" of authority. Patrimonialism tends to arise whenever traditional authority develops an administration that is the purely personal instrument of the master (Weber, 1978:231). The distinction between the two manifestations of authority reveals an interesting development in the process of domination. Within a patriarchal system, "authority appears as a pre-eminent group right...[that] exists by tradition and not by enactment" (Weber, 1978:213). In other words, the master is still largely dependent upon the willingness of the members to comply with his orders since he has no machinery to enforce them (Weber, 1978:213). Hence the members of the patriarchy (Genossen) are not yet really subjects (Untertanen).

In a patrimonial system, domination turns into a personal right, which is not necessarily based on tradition, but by enactment of an administrative or personal staff -- that is, "force" becomes the "purely personal instrument of the master" (Weber, 1978:213-232). In principle, the master can "exploit his right like any economic asset -- sell it, pledge it as security, or divide it by inheritance" (Weber, 1978:232).

Weber's distinction between patriarchy and patrimony is essential to the investigation of gender domination. First, Weber identifies "force" as the

primary distinction between patriarchy and patrimony. In a patriarchal arrangement, members are not yet really subjects -- i.e., the members willingly comply with the legitimate authority of the master. However, in a patrimonial arrangement, force becomes the purely personal instrument of the master, and the master can exploit subjects to gain compliance. This insight by Weber is important since it is more likely that conflict is a consequence of patrimonial rather than patriarchal conditions. "Patrimonial conditions have had an extraordinary impact as the basis of political structures" (Weber, 1978:1013).

A second distinction between patriarchy and patrimony is that patriarchal authority is relegated to the private realm of the household, but patrimonial authority is relegated to the public realm of an expanded household. Within the patriarchal household, authority is the private prerogative of the master, who has been designated in accordance with definite rules of inheritance. The master has no administrative staff and no machinery to enforce his will but depends on the willingness of the group members to respect his authority, which he exercises on behalf of the group, for their own benefit (Bendix, 1977:330-331). However, problems of organization emerge when the patriarchal master enlarges his property and increases the task of managing it (Bendix, 1977:332). At this point, "offices originate in the household administration of the ruler" and eventually, the management of the household and resources requires an administrative staff -- i.e., "personal servants and personal representatives of the ruler" (Bendix, 1977:3350).

The consequence of patrimonialism is that it can resort to monopolistic satisfaction of personal wants among the master and the administrative staff (Weber, 1978:238). The development of markets is, according to the type of markets involved, more or less seriously limited by irrational factors (Weber, 1978:238). The open market opportunities for profit are in the hands of the ruler and his administrative staff. Capitalism is therefore directly obstructed, or, if the ruler maintains his own administration, it is diverted into political capitalism (Weber, 1978:238).

3. Estatism (Estate-type or Status-type Domination)

Traditional legitimate authority is manifested by patriarchal, patrimonial, and also "estate-type" or "status-type" domination (standische herrschaft). "Estate" is taken from the German term "stand" a most complex, neglected, and troublesome concept in the sociological literature (Bergel, 1962; Cox, 1948; and Murvar, 1985). "Stand" is defined as a social group which occupies a relatively well-defined common status particularly with reference to social stratification. "Stand" alone is usually translated as "status group" or "socially privileged group."

This third pure-type of traditional legitimate authority may be most essential in explaining the emergence of gender domination and subordination. Weber indicates that "all stylization of life either originates in status groups or is at least conserved by them" (Weber, 1978:936). "Estate-type" domination is a form of patrimonial authority that can only develop when an administrative staff has been appointed by a ruler. Eventually, status differentiation, and competition can emerge among members of the staff. The administrative staff in conjunction with the master, then acquires the right to appropriate and expropriate particular powers and corresponding economic assets (Weber, 1978:232).

Patrimonial officials and retainers who obtain an office through a grant from the ruler or through payment of purchase price to him try to protect their right to that benefice for themselves and, if possible, their descendants. Where their efforts succeed, a traditionally stereotyped separation of

powers between the ruler and these officials results. Such a structure tends to frustrate all efforts to introduce more efficient methods of administration, because these will jeopardize the existing opportunities of fiscal exploitation in which the incumbents have a vested interest. When these office-holders become local dignitaries who constitute themselves as a status group of notables, they may be able to prevail over the ruler and his personal dependents (Bendix, 1977:348).

The consequence of "estate-type" domination is that particular powers and corresponding economic assets may be appropriated and expropriated irrationally. Rigid limits may be set in "the acquisitive activity and the development of markets" (Weber, 1978:239). Free economic markets may be restricted by tradition, custom, or inheritance. There may be deliberate attempts of status groups to suppress economic markets in order to protect their monopolization of authority. Consequently, traditionalism (namely "estate-type" domination) "places serious obstacles in the way of formally rational regulations, which can be depended upon to remain stable and hence are calculable in their economic implications and exploitability" (Weber 1978:239).

A Theory of Capitalism

In the Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (1958), Weber identifies capitalistic and non-capitalistic economic action. Capitalistic economic action rests on the expectation of profit by the utilization of opportunities for exchange, that is, on formally peaceful chances of profit; and non-capitalistic economic action is the acquisition of profit by force (Weber, 1958:17; Eldridge, 1971:33).

Weber also makes a distinction between the form of the modern capitalistic enterprise, and the spirit of modern capitalism -- i.e., non-capitalistic/capitalistic types of production; and modern/traditional types of capitalistic spirit (Eldridge, 1971:40). Table 1 illustrates the various cross tabulations emerging from type of spirit by production system.

Table 1: Types of Spirit by Types of Production System

Type of Production System	Type of Spirit	
	Modern Capitalism	Traditionalist
Non-capital	1	2
Capitalist	3	4

Source: J.E.T. Eldridge, Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality. New York: Schocken Books, 1971: p. 40.

Table 1 provides a significant insight into the types of spirit that influence capitalist, as well as non-capitalist production systems. The modern capitalist spirit is motivated by the idea of increasing capital as an end in itself -- i.e., one is motivated to maximize earnings out of a sense of duty or an ethical imperative (Eldridge, 1971:40). The traditional capitalist spirit is motivated by a desire (of both worker and employer) to simply earn sufficient money to enable them to carry on living in a way which, for them, is already established and acceptable (Eldridge, 1971:40-41). An important point to emphasize is that within the traditionalist spirit, there is an emphatic resistance to change -- i.e., change in ways of working, or in the character of market relationships. Change is not only resented, it is resisted. The traditionalist spirit in a non-capital production system (Cell 2) is characterized by the notion of acquisition of profit by force, whereas the traditionalist spirit in a capitalist production system (Cell 4) is characterized by the notion of economic action which rests on the expectation of profit by the utilization of formally peaceful opportunities for exchange (Eldridge, 1971:33).

Weber further differentiates between two types of capitalism -- i.e., political/industrial; and two types of economic behavior -- i.e., irrational/rational. Table 2 illustrates the various cross tabulations.

Table 2: Types of Capitalism by Types of Economic Behavior

Type of Economic Behavior	Types of Capitalism	
	Political	Industrial
Irrational	1	2
Rational	3	4

Source: J.E.T. Eldridge, Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality. New York: Schocken Books, 1971: p. 34.

What is important to Weber is the rational form of capitalistic behavior; "a calculation of capital in terms of money is made, and everything is done in terms of balances" (Eldridge, 1971:340). "So far as the transactions are rational, calculation underlies every single action of the partners" (Eldridge, 1971:34). Political rational capitalism (Cell 3) involves situations where the opportunity exists, and is taken, to obtain profitable exchanges by providing loan support to politicians -- i.e., the capitalist may take advantage of the profit opportunities made available to him by the structure and sanctions of political authority (Eldridge, 1971:33). Industrial rational capitalism (Cell 4) involves situations where continuous productive enterprises seek to exploit a market situation by taking advantage of capital accounting techniques (Eldridge, 1971:33). The most desirable type of capitalism is industrial capitalism motivated by a rational type of economic behavior (Cell 4). The least desirable type of capitalism is political capitalism motivated by an irrational type of economic behavior (Cell 1).

AN OFFERING: A WEBERIAN THEORY OF GENDER DOMINATION?

Max Weber's theory of domination contains the explanatory power to evaluate the relative position of males to females in differential production systems. Weber's method of ideal types is analytically useful in constructing a framework that explains the origin and persistence of gender domination. The following are attempts to identify and clarify the necessary and sufficient concepts for developing a Weberian sociology of gender domination.

"Are the Concepts of Patriarchy and Capitalism Necessary?"

Following a review of Weber's theories of domination and capitalism, this paper strongly suggests that the Marxian concepts of patriarchy and capitalism are necessary components in understanding gender domination. However, in explaining the origin and persistence, contemporary gender theorists must consider the existence of non-patriarchal types of authority and non-capitalistic types of production systems. A beginning point for a Weberian sociology of gender domination is then the identification of relevant concepts: ideal types of traditional authority (patriarchal and non-patriarchal) and ideal types of production systems (capitalist and non-capitalist). Table 3 identifies these basic concepts, and illustrates their interrelationship.

Table 3: "Ideal Types" of Production System by Traditional Legitimate Authority

Type of Production System	Types of Traditional Legitimate Authority	
	Non-Patriarchal	Patriarchal
Non-capital	1	2
Capitalist	3	4

Table 3 immediately directs attention to two opposing structures of gender domination: a non-patriarchal/non-capitalist structure (Cell 1) and a patriarchal/capitalistic structure (Cell 4). On the basis of a review of Weber's theories of domination and capitalism, one might predict that gender domination (male domination/female subordination) would be highest in Cell 1 and lowest in Cell 4. This paper therefore suggests that the origin and persistence of gender domination and subordination can be found in a structure that contains a non-patriarchal type of traditional legitimate authority, and a non-capitalist system of production. Patrimonial authority (a non-patriarchal type of authority) explains the origin of gender domination, and estate-type domination (a non-patriarchal type of authority) operates to legitimately perpetuate and conserve patrimonial conditions.

The ideal typical features of a non-patriarchal/non-capitalist type of gender domination include the characteristics of (1) patrimonial authority--i.e., domination is a personal right based on force whereby a master can exploit his right like any economic asset; and conflict is a more likely consequence of patrimo-

nial rather than patriarchal conditions; (2) estate-type domination--i.e., a master appropriates and expropriates particular powers and corresponding economic assets in such a way as to establish rigid limits in the acquisitive activity and development of markets; and (3) non-capitalistic action--i.e., activity rests upon the acquisition of profit by force.

The ideal typical features of a patriarchal/capitalist type of gender domination include (1) patriarchal authority--i.e., the female has a "belief in" the master's "claim to" traditional legitimate authority; and (2) capitalistic action--i.e., motivated by action that rests on the expectation of profit by the use of opportunities for exchange based on formally peaceful chances of profit.

Given the ideal typical features of Cell 4, one might conclude that a patriarchal/capitalist structure is generally an open opportunity structure whereby acquisition of profit is based on peaceful means; and since Cell 4 is characterized by patriarchal authority, the females "belief in" the legitimate authority of the male does not ascribe females to a subordinate status--i.e., members of a patriarchy (Genossen) are not subjects (Untertanen). Conversely, one might conclude that a non-patriarchal/non-capitalist structure is a closed opportunity structure whereby force characterizes the nature of authority and the development of markets. Hence, non-patriarchal structures consequently "place serious obstacles in the way of formally rational regulations, which can be depended upon to remain stable and hence calculable in their economic implications and exploitability" (Weber, 1978:239). Consequently, non-patriarchal structures limit rationality and encourage exploitability.

"ARE THE CONCEPTS OF PATRIARCHY AND CAPITALISM SUFFICIENT?"

This paper maintains that the concepts of patriarchy and capitalism provide only a partial explanation for the origin and persistence of gender domination. A more adequate explanation would consider the fact that production systems vary by mutually exclusive types of economic behavior. Economic behavior can be rational or irrational (Eldridge, 1971:13). Irrational economic behavior obstructs the stability and calculability of a free open market system, and this behavior encourages oppression. When open market systems are characterized by irrationality, the domination and exploitation of one group (e.g. females) by another group (e.g. males) tends to increase. Irrational economic behavior (1) supports a non-patriarchal form of authority in a non-capitalist production system; (2) explains the origin of gender domination in a patrimonial/non-capitalist system of production; and (3) explains the persistence of gender inequality under estate-type domination in non-capitalist systems of production.

Table 4 illustrates the cross-tabulations between the "ideal types" of traditional legitimate authority and production system by irrational economic behavior--i.e., behavior not based on deliberate planning or calculation (Weber, 1978:634).

Table 4: "Ideal Types" of Production System and Traditional Legitimate Authority by Irrational Economic Behavior

Type of Economic Behavior	Type of Production System	Type of Traditional Legitimate Authority	
		Non-Patriarchal*	Patriarchal
Irrational	Non-Capitalist	1	2
	Capitalist**	3	4

*Non-patriarchal forms of traditional legitimate authority include the patrimonial and estate types.

**Capitalist production systems are imbued with a traditionalist or modern spirit.

Table 5 illustrates the cross-tabulations between the "ideal types" of traditional legitimate authority and production system by rational economic behavior--i.e., behavior based on deliberate planning and calculation (Weber, 1978:63).

Table 5: "Ideal Types" of Production System and Traditional Legitimate Authority by Rational Economic Behavior.

Type of Economic Behavior	Type of Production System	Type of Traditional Legitimate Authority	
		Non-Patriarchal*	Patriarchal
Rational	Non-Capitalist	1	2
	Capitalist**	3	4

*Non-patriarchal forms of traditional legitimate authority include the patrimonial and estate types.

**Capitalist production systems are imbued with a traditionalist or modern spirit.

Tables 4 and 5 immediately suggest that rational or irrational behavior can influence authority and production. Herein lies a clue to the Marxist feminist problem of explaining the persistence of gender domination. All economies are not rational. Patrimonial authority limits the rational development of markets within a given structure--i.e., the development of markets is, according to the type of markets involved, more or less seriously limited by irrational factors (Weber, 1978:238). Capitalism is then obstructed or diverted into political capitalism--i.e., profits are utilized to provide loan supports to politicians. The consequence is that the economy provides the polity with the necessary financial support to legitimate traditional authority structures. Political capitalism is imbued with an irrational and traditional spirit that emphatically

resists change. The domination and subordination existing within this structure tends to persist as long as irrational economic behavior characterizes capitalist activity.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Following a review of Weber's theories of domination and capitalism, this paper suggests that the Marxian concepts of patriarchy and capitalism are insufficient in explaining gender domination and subordination. Consequently, this paper recommends that future gender theorists must transcend Marxist feminist categories, and redirect their attention to an alternative framework. Table 6 illustrates a Weberian approach to gender domination and subordination.

Table 6: Gender Domination and Subordination by Type of Economic Behavior, Type of Traditional Legitimate Authority and Type of Production System

Type of Economic Behavior	Type of Traditional Legitimate Authority	Type Production System	Gender Domination and Subordination
Irrational	Non-Patriarchal a. Patrimonial b. Estate	Non-Capitalist	High
Rational	Patriarchal	Capitalist a. Traditionalist b. Modern	Low

*Male domination/female subordination.

Future gender theorists may find it useful to consider the advantages of applying a Weberian theory of domination and capitalism to gender inequality. Advantages include: (1) the Marxist feminist categories of capitalism and patriarchy are expanded by including the non-capitalist and non-patriarchal categories; (2) the concept of patriarchy is clarified by defining patriarchy as a "type" of traditional legitimate authority; (3) the concept of capitalism is clarified by defining capitalism as a "type" of production system; (4) non-patriarchal types of authority are differentiated on the basis of patrimonial and estate types; (5) patrimonial authority (by definition) provides a clue for the origin of gender inequality; (6) estate type domination (by definition) provides a clue for the persistence of gender inequality; (7) irrational and rational economic behavior is identified as a form of action that conditions the direction of traditional legitimate authority and the development of a particular form of production system; (8) capitalism is identified as being imbued with a traditionalist and modern spirit which implies that gender inequality can persist to some degree in capitalist production systems conditioned by traditionalism; (9) the ideal typical approach provides a method for the identification of specific features associated with high and low degrees of gender domination and subordination, and (10) the ideal typical schema is useful for the comparative analysis of females in different societies across time.

Max Weber's dynamic contribution to sociology contains the embryo of a future theory of gender domination and subordination. This paper suggests that the "ideal type" approach is a starting point for the identification of relevant concepts in the analysis of historical gender relations. The future task of gender theorists is to go beyond Weber's classical work on "Class," "Status," and "Party" and to extrapolate from his total work a comprehensive theory of gender domination and subordination.

REFERENCES

- Acker, Joan
1973 "Women and Social Stratification: A Case of Intellectual Sexism." American Journal of Sociology. 78:936-45.
- 1980 "Women and Stratification: A Review of Recent Literature." Contemporary Sociology. 9:25-39.
- Balbus, Isaac D.
1982 Marxism and Domination. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Beechey, Veronica
1979 "On Patriarchy." Feminist Review. 3:18-26.
- Bendix, Reinhard
1977 Max Weber: An Intellectual Portrait. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bergel, Egon Ernest
1962 Social Stratification. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Brittan, Arthur and Mary Maynard
1984 Sexism, Racism and Oppression. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Carlen, Pat
1976 The Sociology of Law. Staffordshire: University of Keele.
- Cassell, Joan
1977 A Group Called Women. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Crompton, Rosemary and Michael Mann
1986 Gender and Stratification. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Cox, Oliver
1948 Caste, Class & Race. New York: Doubleday & Company.
- Delphy, Christine
1977 The Main Enemy. London: Women's Research and Resources Centre Publications.
- 1981 "Women in Stratification Studies. In Helen Roberts (ed.), Doing Feminist Research. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Eisenstein, Zillah R.
1979 "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism." In Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.), Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Elshtain, Jean Bethke
1981 Public Man, Private Woman. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Eldridge, J.E.T.
1971 Max Weber: The Interpretation of Social Reality. New York: Schocken Books.
- Freeman, Bonnie Cook
1976 "Power, Patriarchy, and Political Primitives." In Joan Roberts Beyond Intellectual Sexism: A New Woman, A New Reality. New York: David McKay.
- Goldberg, Stephen
1977 The Inevitability of Patriarchy. London: The Temple Press.
- Goldthorpe, J.H.
1983 "Women and Class Analysis: In Defense of the Conventional View." Sociology. 17(4):466-474.
- Hamilton, Roberta
1978 The Liberation of Women: A Study of Patriarchy and Capitalism. London: George Allen and Unwin.
- Hartman, Heidi
1979 "Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex." In Z. Eisenstein, Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism. New York: Monthly Review Press.
1981 "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Toward a More Progressive Union." In L. Sargent (ed.), Women and Revolution. London: Pluto Press.
- Jagger, Allison J. and Paula S. Rothenberg
1984 Feminist Frameworks. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kelly, Joan
1976 "The Social Relations of the Sexes: Methodological Implications of Women's History." Signs 1:809-23.
1984 Women, History and Theory. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lenski, Gerhard
1986 Power and Privilege. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lerner, Gerda
1970 "The Feminists: A Second Look," Columbia Forum 13 (Fall 1970):24-30.
1986 The Creation of Patriarchy. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lockwood, David
1986 "Class, Status and Gender." In Rosemary Crompton and Michael Mann (eds), Gender and Stratification. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Marx, Karl
1973 Grundrisse: Foundations of the Critique of Political Economy. New York: Vintage Books.

- Miles, Robert
1980 "Class, Race and Ethnicity: A Critique of Cox's Theory." Ethnic and Racial Studies, 3(2).
- Millet, Kate
1970 Sexual Politics. New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Mitchell, Juliet
1966 "The Longest Revolution." In Betty Roszak and Theodore Roszak (eds.), Masculine/Feminine: Readings in Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women. New York, Harper & Row, (1969):160-173.
1971 Women's Estate. New York: Vintage Books.
- Murvar, Vatro
1985 Theory of Liberty, Legitimacy and Power: New Directions in the Intellectual and Scientific Legacy of Max Weber. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Myrdal, Gunnar
1964 An American Dilemma. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Newby, H.
1982 The State of Research into Social Stratification. London: Social Science Research Council.
- Rozsak, Betty and Theodore Roszak
1969 Masculine/Feminine: Readings in Sexual Mythology and the Liberation of Women. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.
- Roth, Guenther and Wolfgang Schluchter
1979 Max Weber's Vision of History: Ethics & Methods. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Rowbotham, Sheila
1973 Woman's Consciousness, Man's World. Baltimore: Penguin.
1974 Hidden from History: 300 Years of Women's Oppression and the Fight Against It. London: Pluto Press.
1979 "The Problem with 'Patriarchy'." New Statesman, (21-28 December). Reprinted in Dreams and Dilemmas. London: Virago.
1982 "The Trouble with 'Patriarchy'." In H. Evans (ed.), The Woman Question. London: Fontana.
- Rubin, Gayle
1975 "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex." In Jagger and Rothenberg (eds.) Feminist Frameworks. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Runciman, W.G.
1968 "Class, Status and Power?" In J.A. Jackson. Social Stratification. Cambridge: University Press.

- Sargent, Lydia
1981 Women and Revolution. Boston: South End Press.
- Scott, Hilda
1974 Does Socialism Liberate Women? Experiences from Eastern Europe. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Scott, Joseph
1969 "The Black Revolt and the Politics of Status." Law and Poverty. 3(3).
- Smelser, Neil J. and R. Stephan Warner
1976 Sociological Theory: Historical and Formal. New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Tyree, Andrea and Robert W. Hodge
1978 "Editorial Foreword: Five Empirical Landmarks." Social Forces. 56(3):761-69.
- Vanfossen, Beth E.
1979 The Structure of Social Inequality. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.
- Walby, Sylvia
1986 "Gender, Class and Stratification: Towards a New Approach." In Crompton and Mann (eds.), Gender and Stratification. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Weber, Max
1958 The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. New York: Charles Scribner.
1961 General Economic History. Translated by Frank H. Knight. New York: Collier-Macmillan. Original from 1919-20 lectures.
1978 Economy and Society. Ed. Guenther Roth and Claus Wittich. Berkeley: University of California Press; 2 Vol.
- West J.
1978 "Women, Sex and Class." In A. Kuhn and A.M. Wolpe (eds.), Feminism and Materialism. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Young, Iris
1980 "Socialist Feminism and the Limits of Dual Systems Theory." Socialist Review. 50(1):169-88.
1981 "Beyond the Unhappy Marriage: A Critique of Dual Systems Theory." In L. Sargent (ed.), Women and Revolution. London: Pluto Press.