

Women Trapped Between Paid and Unpaid Labour

Heidi Hartmann

Jean Gardiner

Helena Hirata

Gülnur Acar Savran

Conference on Women's Labour 12th-13th November 2011

The Socialist Feminist Collective

Feminist Politics
Special Issue
Price: 15TL

Owner:
Filiz Yücel

Editor in Chief:
Berrin Hatacıköglü

Address:
Tel Sok. No: 20/3 Beyoğlu, İstanbul.

Phone Number:
0212 243 49 93

Printing House:
Ofset Production - Ofset Screen and Press Printing Industry and Trade Inc.
Şair Sokak 4, 34410 Kağıthane, İstanbul.
Phone Number: 212 295 86 01
Fax: 212 295 64 55

Email:
feministpolitika@gmail.com
Web:
www.sosyalistfeministkolektif.org

Index

Opening Speech

YASEMİN ÖZGÜN 11

Patriarchy and Capitalism

HEIDI HARTMANN 17

Discussion 33

Care Labour

JEAN GARDINER 63

Discussion 79

Flexible Work and Women's Paid Labour

HELENA HIRATA 99

Discussion 109

Feminist Politics Today

Panel 127

Panel Discussions 159

Jean Gardiner

Jean is one of the contributors to the “The Domestic Labour Debate”, which stretched from the late 70s to the 80s and presented an effort to apply the Marxist theory of value to domestic labour. Her earlier studies were focused on the inter-relationships between labour markets, gender and care labour; nowadays Jean Gardiner carries out research on gender, age and occupational inequalities in employment, workplace pensions and benefits, work-life balance over the life course and labour market transitions e.g. redundancy and retirement. She teaches a course on Gender and Equality at Work. Besides her book titled *Gender, Care and Economics*, her articles were published in various books and academic journals. She wrote the entry on Patriarchy, in the *Encyclopaedia of Political Economy*, edited by P. O'Hara. Gardiner works as a senior lecturer at the University of Leeds in England.

Heidi Hartmann

Heidi has made an important contribution to the discussions on patriarchy, which took place in the aftermath of “The Domestic Labour Debate”. Heidi Hartmann is the author of the article “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism” and one of the eminent materialist feminists of the period. After the 90s, like many other socialist feminists, she opted for pursuing a feminist policy approach based on immediate, concrete demands for better employment opportunities with a view to empowering women within the capitalist mode of production. Nowadays she works mainly on issues such as sick leave and the family; social policy reforms; public policies; feminist theory and the political economy of gender; the women's movement and women's organizations. Heidi Hartmann is one of the founding directors of the Institute for Women's Policy Research (IWPR). Some of the IWPR reports to which she has contributed are as follows: Women's and Men's Unemployment and Unemployment in the Great Recession; Still a Man's Labour Market: The Long-Term Earnings Gap; The Impact of Social Security Reform on Women. She works as editorial adviser in many academic journals and is the editor for *Journal of Women, Politics and Policy*; she is also a member of the editorial board of the journal of *Feminist Economics*.

Helena Hirata

Director (emeritus) of research and sociologist in Paris CNRS (The National Center for Scientific Research), Helena Hirata carries out comparative studies on Brazil, France and Japan within the framework of the international sexual division of labour. She is a member of the scientific committee of the NEMGE Center which carries out interdisciplinary studies on women and gender in University of São Paulo, Brazil. She is also a member of the steering committee of The International Labour Market and Gender Group (Network MAGE). She works on the steering committee of the Inter-University and Interdisciplinary National Network for Gender (RING). She participates in the editorial boards and scientific committees of various periodicals focussing on gender, such as *Cahiers du Genre* (Notebooks of Gender) and *Travail, Genre, Sociétés* (Work, Gender, Society). She has published many works on the gendered structure of globalization and its varying impacts on the northern and southern countries. She has co-edited *Dictionnaire critique du féminisme* (Critical Dictionary of Feminism), which was translated into Turkish by Gülnur Acar Savran, with F. Laborie, H. Le Doare, D. Senotier. She is currently preparing a book about theories and practices of care work in a comparative perspective.

Gülnur Acar Savran

Gülnur resigned from her job as research assistant at the University of Istanbul, Faculty of Letters, Department of Philosophy, when the University Bill was passed in 1976. In 1983 she defended her PhD thesis titled "Rousseau, Hegel and the Critique of Civil Society". Between 1987 and 1997 she taught at BİLAR (Center for Scientific Research) in Istanbul. Then she taught for two semesters at Mimar Sinan University and three semesters at Boğaziçi University. Her books are: *Civil Society and Beyond*, and *Body, Labour, History*. She has also co-edited with Nesrin Tura *The Invisible Labour of Women* and translated into Turkish *Dictionnaire critique du féminisme*. Besides her activities in the feminist movement, she worked on the editorial boards of the periodicals *11. Tez* (Thesis 11), *Sosyalist-Feminist Kaktüs* (Socialist feminist Cactus) and *Pazartesi* (Monday). Her articles were published in the journals *Yapıt* (Opus), *Defer* (Notebook), *Praksis* (Praxis) and *Amargi*. As a member of the Socialist Feminist Collective, she writes articles in the periodical of the collective, *Feminist Politika* (Feminist Politics).

PREFACE

This book is a compilation of the presentations submitted to and the discussions held at the conference –“Women Trapped Between Paid and Unpaid Labour”– organized by the Socialist Feminist Collective (SFC) on November the 12th and 13th, 2011. Heidi Hartmann from the US, Jean Gardiner from England and Helena Hirata from France participated as speakers; Gülnur Acar Savran from the SFC was one of the panelists in the last session. The first day, Heidi Hartmann and Jean Gardiner made presentations on “Capitalism and Patriarchy” and “Care Labour” respectively. The second day, the first session was devoted to Helena Hirata’s speech on “Flexibility and Women’s Labour”; the title of the panel in the afternoon was “Feminist Politics Today”.

Why did the SFC feel the need to organize such a conference? During the four years after its foundation, the SFC insistently emphasized the following point on the issue of women’s labour: Within the context of the reciprocal relationship between patriarchy and capitalism, women’s labour has certain structural characteristics; first and foremost among these, is the fact that women are trapped between paid and unpaid labour. The multi-dimensional domestic labour which women spend at home, points to an appropriation in so far as it is unremunerated labour: Men gain power vis-à-vis women thanks to this labour/time they appropriate, and women lose power. When women go out to the paid labour market, for the majority, it is impossible to find the kind of job that would liberate them from their dependent and powerless status in the domestic sphere. And so long as they continue to take up low-paid insecure jobs, they are forced to spend unremunerated domestic labour. This vicious circle is reproduced as long as the conditions remain the same.

This dual or holistic approach to women’s labour, situated the SFC in quite a particular position concerning issues such as policies aiming to increase women’s employment and programmes of reconciliation of work and family life: The SFC argued that

trying to “empower” women with such policies, at best points to a contradictory process and is paved with traps for women at worst. One of the priority targets of the bulletin *Kitchen Witches* which we started to publish in March 2010, was precisely, to reveal these traps and to discuss the real nature of the new regulations and bills which came one after the other under the pretext of increasing women’s employment; and it was crucial to be able to share our views with a larger number of women and without having to wait for the period of our journal *Feminist Politics*. Current developments such as flexible work, subcontracting, job (in)security, the Omnibus Bill (law no. 6111), policies of empowering the family were analyzed in the bulletin, to a large extent, in the light of the duality of paid and unpaid labour.

By May 2010, we had begun to enlarge the framework of our conception of social policy, which we had started developing at the time of the discussions around the Social Security and Health Insurance Bill, which corresponded to the period of the foundation of the SFC. Besides those demands, on the one hand for empowering women and facilitating their liberation from the family, and on the other, for allowing their participation and the perpetuation of their presence in paid labour, we had also started to develop our view of measures to encourage and incite men to take up house and care work. We were perfectly aware that, at the root of the demands aimed at improving the situation of women which we directed to the state and capital, lay men’s refusal to do their part of house and care work: We were raising the demand for nurseries because they didn’t care for their children; we were asking for early retirement, because we carried the burden of the care of their relatives and of themselves... Therefore, while we were asking for these regulations, we were always keeping it in the corner of our minds that men owe us and that they had to pay their due: The measures the state and capital took so that men didn’t have to carry out the house and care work, didn’t cancel men’s debts to us. In 2010 we started to go after that due and we started our campaign “We want our due from men!”

We organized marches and held conferences and panels in Adana, Ankara, Eskişehir, Istanbul and Izmir.

During this campaign, our “distinct” stance, on the issue of increasing women’s employment and flexible work on the one hand, and on the issue of the reconciliation of work and family life on the other, was confirmed. Concerning the first issue, our conviction that, especially under the conditions of this country, “flexible security” is only a deception, was reinforced. As to our stance on the second subject, it was related to our conception of the “critique of the family” which became an ever more burning issue with the government’s policy of empowering the family. From our point of view the potential to empower women of these reconciliation policies is dubious: Because, in essence, they are developed without questioning the family that controls women’s labour and their bodies and minds by threat of violence or direct violence, and they take as given the sexual division of labour in the family. During the campaign, we started to feel the need of sharing the experiences of different countries and of profiting from these experiences, with a view to strengthening and testing our theses. We began to inquire about the possibilities of creating an environment where feminists from Turkey could hold discussions with feminists we would invite from different countries. And we prepared the programme of the conference which would in a sense constitute the climax of our campaign “We want our due back from men!”

The programme had a logic which moved from the more abstract and long-termed to the more concrete and actual. How we conceptualize the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism influences, albeit indirectly, our approach to women’s labour and the relationship between paid and unpaid labour. In very general terms, we think that patriarchy and capitalism are two different systems which have been historically articulated and which thus constitute a concrete social totality (patriarchal capitalism). In other words, they have both their independent, internal dynamics and dynamics which reciprocally shape one another. These two systems may at times be in

a conflictual relationship, but they may also feed and reproduce one another. Precisely because Hartmann was one of the feminists who had shaped our conception, it was important for us to discuss with her this subject.

Hartmann referred, in her speech, to various improvements in the US from the women's point of view. Concerning the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism, which for us was the focal point, she said that 35 years ago she had underestimated the potentiality of capitalism; and that, although capitalism has by no means abolished patriarchy, it has weakened it to an extent she had not at the time foreseen. In the debates, some of our friends drew the attention to the fact that developments which at first sight seem to be to the benefit of women may be ridden with contradictions: For instance in Turkey, the more women work in paid jobs and are relatively liberated and resist men, the more this pays back in the form of male violence. Hartmann for her part, emphasized that, when women earn money, this all the same weakens patriarchy and that rather than a consensus and a reciprocal reproduction of the two systems, we should talk about a tension between the two.

It was very natural for us to move, from the relationship between patriarchy and capitalism to care labour and policies of reconciliation of work and family life as we see unpaid domestic and care labour as the determining factor in the relationship between paid and unpaid labour. Again it was natural to want to discuss this issue with Jean Gardiner. She is one of the feminists who has personally taken part in the domestic labour debate. More importantly, she has later criticized the general framework of this debate for being too locked up in the Marxist problematic and terminology, and for having considered domestic labour in abstraction from its gender, that is from its subject. It was exciting for us to be able to discuss our approach to the policies of reconciliation of work and family life, with a feminist whom we found so close to our views and who nowadays carries out concrete research on social policy.

In her speech, Jean Gardiner emphasized that in England,

positive developments concerning care labour were witnessed in the area of social policy. On the other hand, she underlined the fact that labour on its own was not sufficient to explain patriarchal oppression and stressed the importance of cultural codes and the different masculinities that these codes give rise to, in other words the importance of the difference between hegemonic masculinity and other forms of masculinity. The discussion which followed was quite similar to the discussion carried out after Hartmann's presentation. Finally, Gardiner wound up as follows: In the long term, women had gains which were maybe small, but whose importance cannot be denied. In the short term, that is in the period we are going through, there are setbacks to these gains. However, in order to continue our struggle, rather than being fixed on the present, we have to fight for partial but long term gains. In fact, this approach on the part of Gardiner was in harmony with the shift in her field of study, from theoretical analyses to more concrete research and policies.

There is no doubt that flexible work is the critical link in the transition from care labour to paid labour. We knew Helena Hirata from her work on the gender of globalisation and flexible work. In her work, flexibilization stood out as one of the concrete and most current examples of the collaboration between patriarchy and capitalism against women. We shared to a large extent her views on these subjects: We held the same view that flexibilization, which is the current method of increasing women's employment, is gendered. We invited her to Istanbul to be able to benefit from her critical approach to flexible work and from her comparative research on France, Brazil and Japan.

The debate following Hirata's presentation developed as an elaboration on various forms of flexible work, rather than as a discussion between different views. Among these, the labour of domestic workers and immigrant women, home-based production as a form of flexible work, the pros and cons of part-time work for women and the reasons behind women's preference for part-time work were some of the issues that stood out.

In the last session we held a panel titled “Feminist Politics Today”. In this panel, we intended to share our experiences in Turkey with our guests. One of our members, Gülnur Acar Savran took part on the panel for this purpose. There was a wide spectrum of participants in the discussion session that followed: from domestic workers to home-based workers, young women who shared with us their personal experiences about their fathers and mothers, academicians... Due to financial restrictions, we had not been able to organise the conference in the form of workshops. Consequently, we tried to allow considerable spans of time for the audience to express themselves at length and become active participants. As a matter of fact, during the two days there was quite an exceptional interaction in the hall, both from the point of view of active intervention and variety on the part of the audience.

In addition, there were tea-coffee and lunch breaks and the evenings during these two days. We exchanged ideas and felt the excitement of experiencing the same atmosphere for two long days, and of sharing our thoughts and emotions with our three guests and many women from Turkey, those we knew before and those we had met then. Because our financial resources were limited, the period leading to the conference had been quite labour intensive for us. We received support and solidarity, in many different ways, from the auditorium to accommodation, simultaneous translators and sound equipments. This solidarity caused us to shoulder the event with an almost naive enthusiasm.

We hope that we have been able to transmit this enthusiasm to you in this book, through the presentations and the discussions.

The Socialist Feminist Collective

Acknowledgements

Many women who are not members of the Socialist Feminist Collective helped in the making of this book. Our special thanks to Banu Karaca, Ceren Yartan, Eylem Delikanlı, Özlem İngün, Seyda Koçak, Tuğçe Nomanoglu, Ülku Songül and Zeyno Üstün for their contributions.

**“Women Trapped Between Paid and Unpaid Labour”
Conference on Women’s Labour**

**12th November, 2011
Saturday**

09:30-10:00 Registration
10:00-10:30 Opening Speech
10:30-11:45 First Session:
“Patriarchy and Capitalism”
Heidi Hartmann

11:45-12:00 Coffee Break
12:00-13:00 Discussion
13:00-14:00 Lunch Break
14:00-15:15 Second Session:
“Care Labour”
Jean Gardiner

15:15-15:30 Coffee Break
15:30-16:30 Discussion

**13th November, 2011
Sunday**

11:00-13:00 Third Session:
“Flexible Work and Women’s Paid Labour”
Helena Hirata

13:00-14:00 Lunch Break
14:00-15:00 Closing Session:
“Feminist Politics Today”
Gülnur Acar Savran, Jean Gardiner,
Helena Hirata, Heidi Hartmann

15:00-15:15 Coffee Break
15:15-16:30 Discussion

Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University
Istanbul/Turkey

Opening Speech

YASEMIN ÖZGÜN

Welcome to the Conference on Women’s Labour organized by the Socialist Feminist Collective. Before we begin the conference, I would like to say a few words about why we put this conference on our agenda and how “women’s trapped between paid and unpaid labour” was formulated as the title of this conference. In other words, my task is a kind of warming up, before we begin the sessions. The Socialist Feminist Collective was formed in 2007; in that period, we emphasized that it was crucial for a feminist movement to be independent from men, from capital and from the state, to develop anti-systemic feminist politics and to have our own voice. Those days, we were acting in unison with many women in various campaigns and demonstrations. However, something was lacking. In our opinion, we needed an organization which would help create permanent relationships with other women and transform those relationships to a political unity. We started our journey with this goal.

The first product of this organization was our journal *Feminist*

Politics; most of you are familiar with the journal. After long discussions, we started publishing it, getting excited and worried with every new issue. However we have already published our 12th issue.

From the very first day, women's labour has been on our agenda. But we never separated the issue of women's labour from the politics of women's body, always making a point of approaching all feminist issues as parts of a totality. While many studies were carried out in the 2000's on women's paid labour, male domination in the domestic sphere was overlooked in those analyses. By using the phrase "women trapped between paid and unpaid work" we wished to emphasize the relationship between women's unpaid domestic labour in the household and paid labour in the workforce market, and the need to consider the unity between the two. For this purpose, last year we carried out a campaign with the title "We Want Our Due Back from Men" in which we tried to draw attention to the unpaid labour at home and to the sexist discrimination in paid employment. Particularly, we tried to deal with the issue of flexible work and the policies of reconciliation between work and family life, from a feminist perspective. We reached the following conclusion: Women's unpaid labour within the family causes them to be trapped between paid labour and unpaid domestic labour. Treating housework as women's duty, along with capitalism, on the one hand deepens the sexist division of labour. On the other hand, concerning working conditions, women as a consequence are employed in the least wanted, lowest paid and worst jobs. Even when women are employed in qualified jobs, the wages in those sectors start to fall. In other words, low wages are not caused by the conception of "women's work," but all types of work become low paid when women are employed. Therefore, as long as women's domestic labour remains invisible, women will not be able to work in secure, stable, full-time and qualified jobs, with wages that will help their liberation from the family and which they will be able to spend according to their own choice. From this viewpoint, the unity

between paid and unpaid domestic labour is highly significant for us. It is never sufficient to change the conditions of paid employment without struggling against male domination at home. Also, it is not easy to comprehend many other issues, without coming to terms with the “family” that imprisons women with its control mechanisms, and without revealing the disadvantageous positions women are offered by the policies of reconciliation between work and family life.

With all these concerns, and surely with the contribution of many feminist friends with whom we cooperate closely, we started discussing in the second half of 2009 how to deal with the issue of women’s labour in a more organized way as feminists, who define themselves as materialist feminists. We figured that in our discussions and in the activities we carried out, we should not approach women’s labour as an academic issue or as an area requiring any specialization, but as a problem to be discussed by all women. In our opinion, the language of practice and theory must always be combined. In other words, we have always underlined that the language of the street, of the household and the academy must somehow come together. Approaches which ignore that concrete individual women and men are the actual parties of activism and struggle, and which do not relate to our own lives, will undermine feminist politics, in our opinion. For this purpose, we formed a group within the Socialist Feminist Collective to work solely on the issue of women’s labour; we came together with the need to go out more on the streets and meet with women in active struggle for the emancipation of women’s labour. In March 2010, we started to publish a bulletin titled *Mutfak Cadıları* (Kitchen Witches). This bulletin focused on current issues, on the policies promoted and put to practice by capital and by the government, and attempted to decipher their explicit meaning and implications. All at once, we had dived into an area in which we lacked any specialist formation. Our bulletin *Mutfak Cadıları* mostly explored the subjects of flexible work, subcontracting, women’s employment, job security, the so called “omnibus bill,” and the position of women trapped between paid and unpaid work.

Concurrent with the publication of *Mutfak Cadıları*, this country was going through a period, when the conditions, which allowed for women's low pay, insecure, unskilled labour based on sexism, were being rendered permanent; and the introduction of many new law drafts and new practices related to women's working conditions followed one after the other. For instance, under the pretext of "harmonization with the European Union," the goal of increasing women's employment within a short time span and the goal of legitimizing women's dependence on the family and their unpaid domestic labour went hand in hand. The omnibus bill, on the other hand, was aiming to corroborate the social security system, which ignored women's unpaid domestic labour and which took as its focus not individual women, but the family.

Against all these drawbacks and having thought about and discussed the significance and implications of all these developments, we started our campaign "We Want Our Due Back from Men" in May 2010. After long discussions on whether the campaign should address unpaid domestic labour, paid labour or social policies, it was obvious to us that our politics must have three bases, covering all these aspects: domestic labour, paid labour and social policies. And the title of the campaign is derived from those three bases. In this line, we made demands from the bosses and the state; however, the campaign's biggest emphasis was on "our due" from men, because it was not possible to tackle the other two aspects without focusing on the sexist division of labour in the household. Men have a material interest in women doing the cleaning, the cooking, and taking care of the elderly and most importantly of children. We want our time and labour back from men, we said. And we said many other things: Though we cooked thousand litres of soup, nobody called us chefs; we listened to everybody's problems, nobody called us psychologists. Within the scope of the campaign, we held concurrent demonstrations in Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, Adana and Eskişehir, and struggled to make our voice heard. Gradually, we felt the need to discuss and synthesize what we had accumulated during the campaign with

different international experiences, and to move on from there.

For this conference, we aimed to create a programme that brings together the Socialist Feminist Collective's specific agenda of women's labour and the general feminist struggle in Turkey. In the first part of the conference, we will be discussing capitalism and patriarchy with Heidi Hartman. To introduce Heidi Hartman shortly, she is a feminist friend of ours, who significantly contributed to the discussion around patriarchy, following the domestic labour debate in the late 1970s and early 1980s. After the 1990s, Hartmann who is the author of "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism," adopted a feminist perspective based on concrete employment demands for women that would strengthen them within the capitalist mode of production in the short term. Today, she lives in the US and carries on studies on the family and sickness leave, social policy reforms, health services, public policies, feminist theory and the political economy of gender in women's organizations. She is an administrator in the Institute for Women's Policy Research.

In the second session, the issue of paying women wages or social relief for their care labour will be discussed. Jean Gardiner will be our main speaker in this session. Jean Gardiner is a feminist economist who contributed to the theoretical and political debate referred to as "the domestic labour debate" (in the late 70s and the early 80s), which tried to adapt the Marxist theory of value to domestic labour. In addition to her earlier studies on care labour, Gardiner currently carries out research and studies on paid work, social policies, the reconciliation of work and family life, the relationship between paid and unpaid work, and the impact of laws on race, ethnicity, gender, age and the family. She gives lectures on "Gender and equality in employment"; she has published numerous articles and books including *Gender, Care and Economics*. She teaches at the University of Leeds.

In the third session, we will have Helena Hirata with us to discuss the relationship between flexibility and women's paid work. A sociologist and research director at Paris CNRS, Hirata conducts

comparative researches on the international sexual division of labour in Brazil, France and Japan. She is a member of the board of science in the NEMGE center that carries out interdisciplinary studies on “women and gender” at the University of Sao Paulo in Brazil. She is a member of the steering committee in The European Research Group on the Labour Market and Gender. Hirata has produced widely known studies on the gendered structure of globalization and its different impacts on the Northern and Southern countries.

Following the third session, we will discuss approaches to feminist politics in general. Here Gülnur Acar Savran will join our guest speakers. Having started her academic life in 1976 as a research assistant in the Philosophy Department of Istanbul University, Gülnur resigned from her position when the bill for the establishment of the Board for Higher Education came into force. In 1983, she defended her PhD dissertation titled “Critique of Civil Society in Rousseau and Hegel.” She lectured at Mimar Sinan and Boğaziçi Universities. In her latest book, *Body, Labour, History*, she evaluates the existing literature on materialist feminism and argues that historical materialism offers a convenient method of analysis for feminism. Also, as a member of the SFC, Gülnur is a friend who actively contributes in the production of the politics of the collective.

Now, before starting the conference, we would like to thank all our friends, many feminist friends who worked for this conference voluntarily, helped and contributed with their solidarity and support. We're quite excited. We worked a lot for this conference; for days we had long to-do lists in our e-mail boxes. And finally we are here. Thank you very much everyone for coming and standing by us.

Patriarchy and Capitalism

HEIDI HARTMANN

Good morning, it is a great pleasure to be here. I have not been to Istanbul or Turkey before; the closest I have been is Thessaloniki in Greece. I would like to thank the Socialist Feminist Collective for inviting me. It's definitely an honour to be present at the birth, or at least the infancy, of a socialist feminist organizing project, which I am told, is inspired, at least partly, by an article I wrote when I was in graduate school myself studying economics at Yale University. I am honoured to have the opportunity also to listen to your comments and debates over the next two days and to share the podium with Jean Gardiner and Helena Hirata, as well as with the founders and the activists in the Socialist Feminist Collective. It's really inspiring for me to see a group organizing politically, using the principles and the insights of socialist feminist theory. I am confident, seeing this crowd and all the huge banners, listening to all of the activities and activist campaigns that this small determined group of women has already done, that this group has a bright future. We can expect this group to

influence politics for years to come in Turkey.

I would like to argue three things today. First, I will lay out the basic arguments in the article “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism” with some references to a second article, “Capitalism, Patriarchy and Job Segregation by Sex.” I want to then comment on some of its weaknesses or lacks, what I left out in the early 1970s and what in hindsight would have been good to include or maybe to discuss more. And, third, I would like to end by talking about the situation in the United States, where we are currently in the United States and where we might go next.

Before we start, let me say that it’s a very humbling project to reread something that you wrote 35 years ago and to see the response over the years. The experience has me question whether I have done enough in my life to try to help achieve the changes that would bring us closer to our ideals. In my efforts to bring about change, I founded a think-tank and I have brought with me some materials from my think-tank in Washington, DC: the Institute for Women’s Policy Research. We have been working on issues related to both paid labour and unpaid labour, primarily in the United States but increasingly around the world as well – we are just now finishing a project that looks at the status of women in Lebanon, Morocco, and Yemen. While I am here in Istanbul, the final meeting of that project is taking place in Marrakesh. We hope that our studies at IWPR, which we typically do with activist coalitions, actually help to bring about better public policies that improve women’s lives.

Let me turn to my first task, to the summary of “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism.” What I argue there is that up to that point most Marxist analysis of the women question, that’s what they often called it “the women question,” addresses the wrong question; it addresses the question of the relationship of women and women’s labour to the capitalist system. I thought, and Amy Bridges –who worked on the article with me– thought too, that the proper question is the relationship of women to men and what Marxist methods would have to say about that if they were applied to that

question. The article has had a controversial life. For several years it couldn't find a publisher. There was a very famous new journal in the United States called *Marxist Perspectives*; the editors rejected the article and said that it did not represent my best work. Many of the women on the editorial board resigned to protest the failure of the journal to accept the article. It was actually first published in England, in the journal *Capital and Class*, and sometime after that it was collected with a set of responses and critiques in a volume by an American publisher, South End Press, who cooperated with Tudor Press for an international edition. The article has been translated into more than 12 languages.

I thought that the feminist question is the right question to ask and that's the question that those using the Marxist method should have been trying to answer. And that question is about the oppression of women. Why is a woman oppressed and who benefits? In Marxist work up to that point, I argued, the answer to both questions is capitalism. Capitalism is the reason women are oppressed and capitalism benefits. And I thought that was a very incomplete answer. One of my favourite articles is by Pat Mainardi and it is called "The Politics of Housework"; maybe some of you have seen or read it in the collection *The Sisterhood is Powerful* edited by Robin Morgan. When I started living with my current partner, a man, I told him that he had to read that article and as many other articles in *Sisterhood is Powerful* as he could in order to continue together, and he very quickly did that. He does do at least half the housework, we had two children together and we have been together about 33-34 years, so I can recommend that strategy if you want to achieve positive change in your household's division of labour. That article really talks about how men benefit from the work that women do, mostly around family care and housework. I believe Mainardi wrote that his resistance is the measure of your oppression. She went through all the strategies that men use to get out of housework. "Oh, honey, you do it so well, you know how to do it, I don't know how to do it" and on and on and on... So, for me this is a first look at where women's labour power is being used, how women's labour power is being exercised and for whom: It is benefiting men in

the family who do not have to do that work.

In addition, we women are producing the next generation of workers to go to the offices and factories, and that of course is helpful to capitalism. We can think of economics as the production of things and the production of people, and historically it has tended to be the case that most of the production of people takes place in the family and the home and this was often ignored by thinkers. But it is important to note that the production of both people and of things is necessary for the survival of any economic system, not just capitalism. Of course, the labour that women do in the family is helpful to capitalism, just as it is helpful to socialism or to any other economic system.

But it is interesting to take a look at who has the leisure time and who is benefiting from leisure time, and that is usually men and male children. We recently did a study of girls in the state of Minnesota, where they had some very good survey research findings: We saw that, as early as the age of 9 and 10 girls are having a double day, they are going to school and they are doing their homework, and they are helping take care of their younger siblings. Sometimes they even miss school if the younger children are sick and the parents have to go to work, because they are the ones who stay home and take care of the younger children. What are the boys doing? Boys are playing video games and have more leisure and more free time. They also play outside more, doing more physical activities. So we know that this starts very young, this socialization of what women's roles and responsibilities are.

But the production of people in the family is not the only place where men benefit from women's labour and women's roles. I think men also benefit in the labour market in the capitalist system (and the labour markets of most other economic systems). Capitalism has a very large and growing labour market, and most people, men and women, work in the labour market. Generally, men hold the better places and women hold the less good places in the labour market. Men benefit from having the higher wage jobs, which means that marriage is still a good way for women to survive –to be married to a higher

waged male— and in return for income support she does most of the housework and family care. Men have more power and authority in the work place and enjoy psychological benefits that accrue as well from not having to do some of the most difficult and unpleasant jobs that a society needs.

So I want us to look at who benefits from women's labour and where, and to see that relationship operating in all spheres of life, not just in the family or just in the work place, and to understand those benefits to men in a systematic or systemic way. I labelled that systematic male power patriarchy (I don't mean I was the first person who called it patriarchy, but the way I chose to use that word in the socialist feminist debate was relatively new and original). Thus we see patriarchy as a system of male power and male oppression of women that operates everywhere, both in the home but also in religious organizations, in universities, and in the labour market. This system of patriarchy or male domination is also discussed in a well-known article, "The Traffic in Women," by Gayle Rubin, who labels it a "sex/gender system." There could be other sex/gender systems, she argues, but this is one system for transforming biological sex into a social category called gender.

I argued that patriarchy could be defined as a set of social relations among men, which is a hierarchical relationship among men that enables them to dominate women, and that, despite the hierarchy, they have a common interest in channelling women's labour to be used in some places in some ways and not in others. I further argued that we should study this system of social relations in the home and family and in the labour market just the same way we study the system of capitalist relations (which is studied more in the labour market and the work place and not so much in the family). The fundamental argument is that men are benefitting from women's labour power as much as the capitalist system is.

Many people have translated this in a somewhat simplistic way, "I see patriarchy is in the family, while capitalism works in the work place," but that is really not my argument. My argument is that they

are working together in both places. I called that the “partnership of capitalism and patriarchy,” and I wrote that in the early 20th century in the United States that partnership took the form of the family wage, in which capitalists figured out that if the working class is going to be able to be reproduced, they had to offer high enough wages to allow, in a commodified system, for working people to have enough money to purchase food, shelter, and other necessities. The family wage meant a married man had a high enough wage to support his wife and children at home. That’s pretty much the essential argument in the article, and I think that’s enough of the argument to describe today.

Now I get to the critical part of my lecture, what I think now about what I wrote then. Part two of my lecture today: what I should have said that I didn’t say; how it looks 35 years later. I am relieved to say that the article doesn’t look too bad. I’m impressed that some of the issues covered in the article, like the role of psychology and the subconscious, have only come to the fore recently in US scholarship around discrimination in the workplace: psychologists have identified implicit bias. For example, Mahzarin Banaji talks about how a manager can be unaware, that s/he doesn’t even know that s/he has discriminatory thoughts or behaviours when making hiring and promotion decisions. Professor Banaji argues that by pointing out their biases, by making people conscious of them, they can learn themselves to consciously eliminate them. I believe the Professor is right, but obviously she hasn’t been able to retrain enough people yet because such biases are still rampant.

One topic I don’t think the article mentions at all is violence against women, also called domestic violence. A political movement on this issue was just getting organized in the early 1970s. In every country where violence against women has been raised up as an issue, it is extremely important to support that movement because nothing is more damaging to women. Moreover, that issue is usually extremely galvanizing. Women organize support groups, raise money, set up shelters, all to enable women to leave abusive relationships and help them become independent economically and emotionally.

In the United States we have focused our legal approach on the issue on the physical part of domestic violence, which is a limited approach. A friend of mine, Evan Stark, a sociologist and social work professor, recently wrote a very important book called *Coercive Control*, published by Oxford University Press. The subtitle of the book is “How Men Entrap Women in Daily Life.” He argues that coercive control is a form of psychological control that often begins at first with subtle behaviours like isolating the woman from her family, not letting her have a cell phone, not letting her meet her friends, not letting her have credit cards, not letting her have any money or hold a job. At some point it may escalate to violence, but until it does, we really don’t have laws about this type of behaviour. We only have laws that address the physical impact, the battering or attempted assault, not other forms of coercive control. I think very often domestic violence is the man’s response to the independence of a woman, to her getting a job, for example. It is a typical response to a woman who becomes pregnant, because having a child is going to take away something, perhaps attention, from that man. There are a lot of things that we still have to understand about violence against women, and we need to improve our public policies to better address them. But of course the fact that it is recognized as a public issue now, and not a private matter, is a huge gain for women.

I think another lack or weakness of the article is that I underestimated, in some ways, the incredible power of capitalism. These days I often describe capitalism as a huge, strong, roiling river, rushing through society and overturning everything in its way and washing it all away. Capitalism is a powerful economic force. It’s probably the most productive economic system ever invented. It has the ability to raise standards of living enormously compared to what they were several hundred years ago, and in some ways capitalism has created a more equal society than the societies it replaced. But it is so powerful that it has the ability to amass a huge volume of capital, which it needs to maximize its efficiency, and that concentration of

capital has really made any way of controlling the power and path of capitalism very difficult. The size of capital is a real challenge to representative democracy as we have had, for example, in the United States for several hundred years now. Our democracy is really under great threat right now. We do not know if we can continue that democracy and gain any improved control over capitalism.

For example, I thought at the time of writing this article that we wouldn't see the breakup of the family wage system or the breakup of the marriage system, that marriage seemed pretty well entrenched in the family wage system. I think what we see now in the US is actually the breaking up of that marriage system, not only because the gay and lesbian challenge is strong (as it should be as a challenge to traditional marriage) or because women want freedom from marriage, but also because, simply put, capitalism is pulling everyone into the labour market and breaking down the family wage, perhaps to reduce the costs of reproducing the next generation of workers. By the way, a commonly told joke in the US is that the only people who want to get married or serve in the military are gays and lesbians, everyone else has rejected marriage and the military, but gays and lesbians want to have opportunities in these arenas were they were denied in the past. I didn't mention gay and lesbian relations in the article, but I did mention the force of sexism and heterosexism as a form of control of women's sexuality as one way that we organize the production of children.

To return to the cost of raising children and family care, I believe I underestimated the extent to which the ability to form a family and support a family in decency and take care of children and the elderly is a cost to the capitalist system that capitalists would really prefer not to pay. Capitalism has a drive to pull everything into the profit-making sphere. We see this happening in the US: we have commercialized many activities previously carried out at home – we have brought them into the private sector (rather than the public sector). In fact, my hotel in Istanbul is right near a McDonald's. We gave the world that, that uniform, cheap food, which is also unhealthy and makes

people fat. But it's very cheap, and in our poor neighbourhoods in the US you will see many fast food outlets. Even poor people in the US can afford to buy this food.

Research shows that poor parents, for example, may see fast food as a treat for their children, one of the few they can afford. In the US, this growth of very low wage labour in highly commercialized activities has gone very far (we have not socialized very much of this activity in the public sector, such as, for example, through subsidized public cafeterias with healthy food). I underestimated the extent to which the drive of capitalism toward low wages and the degradation of labour would really undermine the family wage system and the ability of people to form families and to raise children. Right now in the US in the lowest income group there are almost no people getting married; virtually all of the marriages are taking place in the middle and upper classes; people in the lower class cannot afford marriage. Among the low income group, mostly mothers raise children alone.

So what should our response to this be in the United States? What do I think about the current situation in the US? The third part of my lecture today: What can we do about that huge river of capitalist force? We have to learn to control that force. In Europe, a common way that has been done is through regulation, through the social welfare state, through public provision of benefits the private sector doesn't provide very well – health care, child care, elder care, education, and so on. In contrast, in America, we have tried to privatize these services. To allow capitalists to make profits on these services, we have allowed them to establish retail chains of for-profit child care, chains of for-profit nursing homes which take care of older and disabled people, chains similar to the McDonald's fast food chains. In other countries, this type of activity is done more in the public sector, which personally I think is a better way to organize and pay for this work.

Therefore, one way to gain control of capitalism is to try to use democracy to claim the apparatus of the state, of the public sector, to get the state to provide what capitalists can't do well. Of course, we also have to regulate capitalism and try to get some of the

incredible economic progress that a capitalist system makes possible redistributed to working people and also to women still doing the bulk of the unpaid work in families so that they will have help with child care, elder care, and so on.

Alternatively, or in addition, we could control capitalism better through labour unions and consumer unions, consumers and workers working together to control the worst abuses of capitalism. Requiring corporations to have representatives from workers and consumers on their boards of directors would be another positive step. Another alternative is to try to create something different from capitalism, a better, healthier economic system – out somewhere on the rocks or islands where the river can't go. For example, to see if you can make your own worker co-op or consumer co-op to produce goods and services in some other way than the capitalist for-profit model.

Continuing on this point, as I said, I believe I underestimated the power of capitalism to break down patriarchal power, especially in the family. Women are no longer at home devoting all their labour time to their families, they are out in the workplaces, working for wages and bringing in a crucial share of family income. I underestimated just how much that would happen, not only in the US but in many other countries where the participation of women and men in the labour market is almost the same, with their wages also becoming more equal (though they are certainly not equalized yet).

Another factor I underestimated was the role of education, which is a tremendous force for equalization between women and men. In higher education, for example, women are in the majority in many countries, and increasing one's human capital is extremely important as a way to achieve liberation, self-determination, and control over one's environment, control over your life really. Marxists generally underestimated the importance of this factor of production, too. They focused on physical labour and factories. They talked a little bit about capitalist managers, but the whole development of the professional, technical, managerial class and the real power that workers can get from knowing about how to produce, how to develop their ideas

for products and services, these worker abilities, I think, have been underestimated by materialist theory and Marxist theory.

When I look at the last 50 years in the United States, it is impossible not to see that women have also voted with their feet to go into labour market. They didn't have to be dragged into the market by capitalism. They voted to leave the family behind: fertility rates are down, marriage rates are down, and women are spending more of their lifetimes outside marriage. Today the typical woman is spending more time outside marriage and much more time working for wages. In my view, a lot of the motivation for doing that is the same as it is for men. It is not just to support yourself and your family; it is also to make a difference, to make a contribution beyond your home and your family. You want to have an impact on a larger scale, on society. I think all humans share that drive. Once women get that education, you really can't keep them in the family anymore. There was a song in World War I that went something like "once they have seen Paris you can't keep them down on the farm anymore." That song was about male soldiers and what would happen after the war, a war that exposed them to many other cultures and new ideas. Wars, of course, in that way are often very revolutionary, as they expose soldiers and civilians to many new influences. The movement of women into education and the labour force has been almost as revolutionary as a war; some have written that it was the most important revolution of the 20th century.

Another important concern now for the US: How to get that care labour done that women are leaving behind by going into the labour market? Nancy Fraser, a political scientist and philosopher in the US, calls this the crisis of care work that characterizes all developed nations. As families become smaller, populations age, and women enter the labour force, societies must find a way to make sure this care work is done. Countries can be characterized by the price they set on care work. The US approach is to use cheap labour, commercialization, low-priced food through chains like Burger King and McDonalds – that is the commoditized way to get care work done. This method results in a large low-wage labour force with little job security and few

benefits, and these workers in turn often require the public sector to provide a safety net for them.

In contrast, social welfare states, as I mentioned, have used the public sector to get care work done, typically hiring public workers to provide child care and elder care that is low-cost to the consumers but heavily subsidized by taxpayers.

Now, partly as a result of the financial crisis, there are austerity campaigns nearly everywhere, not just in Greece, Spain, and the UK, but in many other countries as well, because care of others is always labour intensive and expensive when the workers who do it are paid decently. The question is who will pay the taxes to support the public welfare programs. It really comes down to a fight over how much of the enormous profits that the capitalist system generates can be captured by ordinary citizens and working people. What can they get back from the profits that their work generates to enable them to survive at a decent level of living to ensure the reproduction of the human race?

Ironically, the public benefits are attacked as being too costly both in the generous welfare states and in the US where public benefits are very stingy.

The struggle today over the size of public budgets and the level of wages is a struggle of how to get a fair share of the value that human beings produce in order to reproduce themselves and the next generation. That's what we are trying to accomplish in the US when we push for higher wages, better benefits, more family friendly working schedules, more subsidized child care and elder care, and paid family leave. We are working to enable workers, men and women workers today, more time to be with their children in whatever family arrangements they choose. That's the struggle all of us are engaged in: how to reproduce human life in the best way possible. The austerity campaigns to reduce the size of the public sector and the prevalence of low wages in US-style capitalism disproportionately negatively affect women. In the US, for example, women are the majority of the low wage workers, the majority of the public sector workers, and the

majority of the users of public services. Thus, attacks on the public sector are attacks to take back some of the gains women have won. In their struggle against male power in the family, women have turned toward the public sector to provide critical care services at the same time they have entered wage labour to strengthen their economic position to enable them to have greater independence from men.

The title of this conference, “Women between Paid and Unpaid Labour,” tells that story and shows how women are still trapped in this phenomenon. Women have sought to move outside the family to achieve economic independence but require that caring labour be provided by others, ideally with subsidies from the public sector. The capitalist system still seems to resist taking the cost of care into account, hoping to get it done on the cheap. In the US it can be said that capitalists have gone much too far in capturing too large a share of profits; not enough profit is shared with the workers, families, children, and older people. Many workers in the US are simply not able to reproduce themselves in decency.

The US has one of the highest rates of poverty among advanced capitalist nations: 20% of children are poor, 16% of the elderly are poor according to a new measure of poverty. We actually have today 50 million individuals –50 million children and adults– in the US who would be hungry at least some of the time if they did not get Food Stamps. (Food Stamps is the name for a federal government program that provides families with a plastic charge card, and using that card they can buy more groceries at the supermarket than they would be able to purchase based on their own earnings alone.) The large size of the Food Stamp program is the result of the massive increase in unemployment that occurred in 2008 and 2009 and because of the large size of our low wage labour market. We have a federal program that helps 50 million people in the US buy food. To me this situation is ridiculous. The economic system should be generating higher-wage jobs so this would not be necessary.

Another ridiculous lack in the US is the lack of paid maternity leave. The US is one of 3 countries in the world that do not provide

paid maternity leave to women workers. The others are New Guinea and Lesotho.

The free market economy in the US has definitely run off the rails, run out of control. The rising inequality has spawned the Occupy Wall Street movement, a decentralized movement that has appeared in many locations, which has definitely helped change the conversation. The arguments of Occupy Wall Street have tremendous popular support. Every public opinion survey that has been done shows this. When the question is asked, “Do you agree with the claims of Occupy Wall Street?” nearly everyone says yes, 65-75% of the American people, survey after survey, respond yes. Whether this movement has specific demands or not, they have put their protests where they belong, on Wall Street at the foot of capitalism. They are saying, “The economic system is not fair, we don’t like it, we don’t have the opportunities we should have, we can’t earn a living, and we can’t have a full life.”

We have arrived at a new point in the United States. Even in just a few months that this movement has existed across the United States it has already changed the terms of debate in Washington, DC. The Occupy Wall Street movement shows the power of direct action, the power to make a difference through organizing. But it may not make enough difference. Many political leaders in the US are focused on the issue of jobs, jobs, jobs – how to get enough jobs. Austerity measures cannot be successful in growing the economy, yet in addition to the call for jobs, which would require more government spending, there is simultaneously an attack on the public sector, specifically on the socialized ways –the collectivized ways– we provide care for each other through the public sector. This sector was expanding, but now teachers in schools have been laid off in large numbers in the last few months in the US. I worry that, in this large economic crisis, policymakers will once again lose sight of the need to provide care for one another and focus exclusively on encouraging commercial products and services rather than making sure care services continue to be provided by the public sector. Indeed, the President and the

Congress already committed to significant future cuts in government spending, which makes little sense when the population is growing older and needs more, not fewer, government services.

It is a critical moment in time in the United States and what we do with that issue of how we deal with care work is, I think, among the most important decisions we will make as a society in the coming years. There is a lot more I could say but I will wait to hear what your reactions are. I'll end with the thought that I still see that the best way to understand the world we live in is to try to see that world by studying both capitalism and patriarchy. I still stand by that organizing principle that provides a way of understanding the world. Organizing to make change is even better than understanding, although I like to think that we have to understand the world in order to organize to make change. Therefore I commend you, the Socialist Feminist Collective, for taking this direction now, for organizing this conference to improve our understanding and for organizing on the issues that are oppressing women today in Turkey. Thank you.

Discussion

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu (moderator): We thank Heidi Hartmann. We will now start the discussion part. As we will not complete this part only with questions and answers, but also welcome comments, we kindly ask you to try to keep your interventions as short as possible. You can address questions to Heidi Hartmann, or you can communicate your comments around the topic.

Gülfer Akkaya: *Hello to all. I think that the presentation put too much emphasis on capitalism. Hartmann preferred to emphasize the role of capitalism in her talk about the domestic realm, and also about the relation between capitalism and patriarchy. It seems to me that patriarchy was not given a due place in this presentation. I would like to ask Hartmann how she perceives the relation between capitalism and patriarchy, especially, in the domestic realm.*

Heidi Hartmann: Can you hear me? I think that's right and I think probably one reason I did that was to focus on the current movement which is affecting my thinking, that is the capitalist system is in a crisis all around us. But I think I did talk about one of the things that surprised me between the 70s, when I wrote the article and today, 2011, that is the extent to which capitalism has been able to break down patriarchal relations more than I might have estimated, more than I might have thought. That doesn't mean this was intended by capitalism and I wrote in my article that a certain kind of housework still remains. This is definitely what we need to focus on and I think you are doing that in your campaign by focusing on past dues. I'd be happy to hear more about how you evaluate the situation in Turkey and the US. I can say this is not a major focus in the US. I think my strategy is one that is also employed by many other feminists: Let's see how much we can get of capitalism. Let's see how much we can get women in the labour market, into important jobs. And how much change we can make for women and men by getting in there, participating in the system of a wider economy outside the home.

Because I've always thought if we had equal wages in the market place that would tend to change the dynamics of power at home. And this has already been done to some extent in the US; you see more married men spending more hours on housework, especially on childcare. There is certain kind of housework they don't do like laundry. But they do take care of children more; they take children to activities. So we are seeing some changes in what men do. And in a survey research we saw that their perception has even changed. It's almost as if many of them has given up the idea that women will continue to provide a lot of private services to them at home. My partner says to me: "You know, women's liberation meant that women can go out and earn as much money as men, and men have to share the housework that women had to do, but we are still taking out the trash." And that's absolutely true. I don't take out the trash. I also do not change light bulbs, you know. He says, "There are certain jobs around the house that only male humans do." And all the other jobs that female humans do, he has to share them and then I share in making the money. So that's the way our family works. I think this is the kind of response that you see in the US and it's not perfect by any means, I mean, it is very, very far from the goal of having the collective of women and men sharing equally in taking care of people and in the labour force. Definitely we are nowhere there, as the example that we don't even have paid maternity leave in the US shows. We haven't done a campaign for instance around housework, around making men doing more housework. We said we demand paid sick leaves. In the US half of the workers don't have a right to even one day of paid sick leave. And we claimed that women and men should have this right and they should be able to use it to care for the members of their family. In this way when children get sick, the man can stay home and look after them just like the women. So we have directed some attack at that but that attack has usually gone through the work place, it has gone through the public sector. And I'd be interested in knowing other ways of organizing and other ways of attacking it more directly within the family.

Ebru Yıldırım: *I think that Hartmann, during her whole speech, described something inside the system. She didn't suggest a feminist strategy for going beyond the system in any of the examples she gave. Rather, she emphasized the importance of education and equality in education. She emphasized equality between men and women. If I understood correctly, she also talked about the example of the privatization of the care for the elderly and children in the United States in an affirmative way. I want to ask her how the liberation of women could be possible as long as there is no system change. She emphasized individual liberation in her examples. She told that it is possible for women to achieve an individual liberation on their own through developing themselves or having a good education. I want to ask if she can define any sort of holistic liberation of women, or liberation of all women through a change in the system.*

Heidi Hartmann: Well I think in the answer to the last question I commented on that. I think we have taken the test in the US of seeing how far we can go within the system that we have. But I certainly think that it's a good question, it's a good comment; I didn't talk too much about feminist projects outside the system; feminist art, feminist music, feminist culture is very present in the US, something that you notice when you are there. So I think it's a good comment, a reflex to what I decided to do with the last 30 years of my life. I chose to work on that system, within the system. I do want to correct one observation. I wasn't saying that the privatized system was good in the US, I was saying, if anything, I preferred the social welfare state approach where child care, even food and elder care are provided by the public sector. So I'm not endorsing the private approach in the US. I think that's one of the really most damaging things about the US right now.

Participant: *I would like to ask if in the recent year there has been an increase in the violence against women in the US. Because this is the case in Turkey and there is a significant increase. And if there is, I would like to ask why you think this is happening and what can we do to fight it. Thank you.*

Heidi Hartmann: Well, I don't know if there has been an increase,

actually it is difficult to measure: most women don't want to report violence, the police, certainly is still ignorant and try not to report as often as they can. Even when they have passed all kinds of laws that require reporting, that require mandatory arrests, very often when the police goes to the scene of domestic disturbance they, you know they coo-coo it and they think these people are just fighting, tomorrow they will be in love again. And they don't do anything about it. So we have a mandatory arrest law in many states in the US and what typically happens is that the man and the woman both get carted off to jail and arrested because there has to be a mandatory arrest, you know far be it from the police to figure out who is wrong, so they just cart both away, send the children off to foster care, temporarily, etc...

These are difficult things to address and it is very difficult to know the scale. Probably the number is very high. I do think that there is a sense that activists have that the violence against women increases when women are changing their lives, when things are changing for women. And when there is more liberation, you know, the media and everybody is talking about it. Then violence is almost an automatic reaction to slow this down, I think you see more violence emerging in that situation. I think that is true and therefore could account for the increase in violence. But I think it is also possible to fight against it. Nobody has really done a survey on it or really tried to measure it, but I am pretty sure that virtually every community now in the United States has a domestic violence shelter, has some kind of a rape crisis center, some kind of project or program against sexual assault and sexual violence. Vice-president Biden, you might have noticed, has done a lot this year and at least for the past two-three years, on violence against women on campuses: there is a law in the United States that requires campuses to report the amount of sexual violence and other forms of violence against all students on campus; and they don't do it. The last thing they want when the parents are coming to the campuses to say should my child come to this school, and should I pay \$ 50.000 a year to have my student come to your school, the last thing the universities want to say is, "oh last year we had thirty two

sexual assaults, and one hundred and fifty incidents, and the police were called to campus thirty nine times...” Nobody wants to report that. So it is difficult to get at. But the very fact that the vice-president is talking about campuses, I think that is interesting, because that has not happened in a very long time in the US, so I think that is a plus.

Nilgün Yurdalan: *Welcome. I have two questions. Firstly, you talked about relative improvement of the position of women, which, indeed, might be the case. But, how can this be guaranteed under the rise of conservatism, and more, under the subsistence of capitalism and patriarchy? Do you believe that it is possible to preserve it? Can you also evaluate on how the uprising conservatism in the United States reacts against this relative betterment? I couldn't catch the whole of your speech, but I think it was towards the end that you were again talking about this betterment. That part of your speech sounded, to my mind, like you were talking more about white Americans. What about the South Asians, Asian-Americans, or African-Americans? Do you think that what you say can also be applied to the domestic life in those homes? Thank you in advance.*

Heidi Hartmann: Well, I think yes, the short answer to that is yes. Those relative improvements are true for all parts of the American society. Asian Americans, you might be interested in knowing, make more money in the United States than white people do; both men and women. And that's partly because they have more education; they have more education; and it is partly because they don't go into teaching. If Asian American women went into teaching as much as white women did they would make as little as we do. So this is interesting, about how we value teaching in America. African Americans have also benefited from increased income, increased range of occupations. When I was a kid, the only thing an African American woman could do in the United States was to be a maid or clean houses or clean hotels. There was a huge advance when African American women could complete high school, go into secretarial work in large numbers, go into teaching, become social workers, work for the public sector... A vast majority of African American

professional women work for the public sector, not for the private sector. And I think, by the way, it is one reason why we are busy now in our austerity campaign attacking the public sector because that is where the minorities work more. And we are attacking exactly the areas where minorities work most. If you looked at the federal agencies where the minorities work most –and it is mostly blacks, Hispanics have not yet gotten their share of public jobs– it is mostly health and human services, it's housing and education. In other words, they work in areas that are most important to their racial and ethnic group. That is how people reproduce themselves. “Oh funny that they should have been interested in going into those areas, oh now we cannot afford that now, so let's get rid of those areas.” I mean, the cutbacks in the public sector are definitely affecting minorities more; they are also affecting women more, because more women, as is also true in England, work more in the public sector than in the private sector. But I think that, there are few countries on earth that have had the complex racial and ethnic situation that the United States has. And I think it was done as a good job. It is not that we have done a great job; I mean, I am usually complaining about it and rallying about it and saying we need to do more; but I think when you look at what we have done, it is pretty remarkable.

Zeynep Bursa: *I want to point out few things and formulate my question with reference to the Occupy Wall Street movement. As we all know, this struggle gains importance in many countries around the world, especially in the member countries of the European Union in the period of the economic crisis. As we also all know, one of the first measures generally taken during the economic crises is to reduce the wages, which are seen as part of the costs. If we take into consideration the gender inequality in the wages, then we easily see that it is again women who are mostly affected by the crises of capitalism. My question to Hartmann is this: Can the periods of crises of capitalism create an opportunity for getting mobilized around women's labour, or rising this mobilization to a massive level, or for a breakthrough of women's movement? Can we turn it into an opportunity? What concrete steps are being taken to this end,*

or what can be done? Would you see Wall Street occupied only by women as a utopia, or as something possible to be realized in the coming future?

Heidi Hartmann: That's a great image, having only women occupying Wall Street. I think, the English, the British, or the UK –I don't know how you prefer to say it– have done some interesting research showing that the financial traders in the UK, who are male, are more willing to take large risks. The idea is that women would be better for capitalism because they will be better financial traders in fact. Men are very emotional really and they get very carried away by competition, trying to prove that they are stronger and better. That would be a possible connection. But, we wouldn't like women to be organized in Wall Street with the argument that they could make Wall Street better. Anyway, but, I don't know if it is the moment of opportunity for the women's movement in the US. I think within ten years from now might be more of a moment for an opportunity. I am not sure that we see in deep economic crises women's organizations coming to the fore, but they get more organized and come to the fore a bit later. I think what happens in the crises period is actually men take the central stage and say, "Oh, what does the real crisis has to do with this" to show everything we deal with as less important. So, that would be interesting if we could reposition this crisis as Nancy Fraser suggested as a crisis of care for advanced capitalist societies. Because it certainly is that, and it would be great if we could. I do spend a lot of time with the women's movement, women's organizations, and sadly I don't really see them getting stronger right now in that sense of the word.

Hikmet Durkanoglu: *The speeches until now were centered on analyses of the capitalist system, and they formulated solutions for women's problems again within the system. I think this is due to the fact that feminist theory today is developed in the academic circles by European and North American women. I see an unquestioned acceptance of capitalism as an unchangeable system. Our attitude towards capitalism is not the same. We see capitalism not as a stable system, but a changeable one. We have questions concerning the future after this change. We also*

have historical experiences of this possible change, we have the socialist experiences, whether we like them or not. Many of the solutions proposed here had been applied in these societies. However, there are not so many analyses, or studies concerning these experiences. What did they bring to women, or did they bring any transformation in the roles of women? What were the concrete policies adopted to bring solutions to the women's issue? These experiences are left outside of feminist studies today. If we see our liberation in socialism and if we want to develop a future perspective, I think we need to investigate these experiences more. We need to concentrate more on our perspective of the future. Thank you.

Heidi Hartmann: I think that it is very useful comment. Maybe there are some people here who have studied revolutionary movements and revolutionary changes, and what happens to women after the revolution. I certainly heard a lot of comments about Egypt, Libya saying that women can be present in the revolution, but not present after the revolution and in the leadership. So, I think those issues are very important and very challenging. I do believe that those of us who live in more hegemonic countries like United States have a hard time imagining a system other than capitalism. And I recently read a book, which is a pretty good book by a guy. It is *Envisioning Real Utopias* by Erik Olin Wright. He is a well-known Marxist sociologist in the United States. His nickname is "Marxist who can count," because he does a lot quantitative analysis about class and class systems. I used a little bit of that in my talk. He sees two ways to imagine something different from capitalism and to achieve a real utopia that wouldn't be capitalist. And one way is through controlling it through the social welfare state, which is, I think, the kind of approach I am trying to take in the United States. I am trying to get the welfare to expand through the regulation of capitalism. The other way is in these interstices of capitalism, a little island or a box that has not been flooded by capitalism, things like a co-ops, like consumers co-ops. So, there are some alternatives to capitalism, for sure. I think it is true that there are all those real life socialist countries we haven't found super inspiring, and I think that is the difficulty. I think

Marxist theorists really have to work on that.

Participant: *Welcome. It is not always easy or possible for women to find jobs even under a welfare state, or even if they had a good education. I see no betterment in the position of women. Can the welfare state's undertaking the care of elderly and of children lead to the liberation of women? We had a big earthquake in Van last year, and although the media did not show this at all, it was once again women who were mostly affected, and rape cases increased. I want to conclude with the question: Is it possible for women to participate in the labour market solely through improving their level of education?*

Heidi Hartmann: Well, again another excellent question that I appreciate. I think it is very hard to know how far we can take these openings. I think one thing that is very prominent in the US is how much women have taken over the universities, how many women are in high places in, or presidents of major multi-million dollars universities. Harvard, for example, is a university that has a woman president. It is interesting to see how far we can take that. But you are absolutely right about dislocation and emergencies like earthquakes, or the hurricanes we had like Katrina. And one of the things that we also found there is this exposure of women to violence, and a very little idea about relocating people. It was done so casually, they stuffed them on planes and sent them to cities. There was no control over which city they went to. Poor people couldn't choose the cities they went to, and only maybe some middle class people could decide to go to cities where they had some friends. But, when these women round up in these other locations out there without any support, without their friendships, without their relationships, they are much more subject to violence; there is no question about that. So, it is a very interesting and important question about the earthquakes and disasters. And the field of disaster studies points to the lack of ability to protect women when there is a disaster.

Ece Kocabiçak: *I will not ask a question, but I want to contribute to the on going debate here. I think the radicalism of feminist politics does not depend on how much anti-capitalist it is, but how much anti-*

patriarchal it is. It is also related to and can only be measured according to which steps it takes in order to destroy, overcome patriarchy. One of the theories that was proposed in the discussions, especially after the article “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism” was that patriarchy moves away from the private sphere into the public sphere, and that it subsists more in the public sphere than the private. It seems that this thesis is generally accepted today. It is generally assumed that, capitalism, in the course of its development has eventually weakened patriarchy, carried it to the public sphere from the private sphere especially in countries like the United States, where capitalism has developed more. Under this supposition, there is a discussion on the criteria about which Heidi was talking. One of these criteria, for instance, is that women started to spend more time outside than the time they spend in the domestic realm, or that they participate more in the labour market. I find these criteria problematic, since I think that they focus more on the quantitative values and miss the qualitative aspect, and therefore fail to analyse the qualitative change of patriarchy. For instance, looking at the hours spent in the domestic field does not say much about the sexist division of labour, which is indeed fundamental to what patriarchy is. 50 years ago, in some African tribes where a man had 4 wives, the women were spending more time in the field than the house. Can we say that patriarchy is weaker in this model? On the other hand, there are other criteria, like the fact that violence against women is enduring, and it increases from time to time, and that the gains are easily taken back in times of crises. You can suppose a big difference between Turkey and United Kingdom, for instance. But I don't see a big difference. Maybe, we can continue to discuss this point further.

Heidi Hartmann: That was a great comment and I hope we can go on to discuss these positions. It is very interesting to point out that there might be a tendency in the discussion to measure the success of the women's movement by how anti-capitalist it is, and that's not really the measure we are interested in. The measure we are interested in is the measure of what we can do for women's liberation, what we can do for women to be free. We are interested in women's liberation and

how much freedom and self-determination that we women can have. And, it is not really clear what system, what economic system we give them will affect it how. But, it is very interesting and I will forward that discussion to everybody.

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu: In the first section, we heard Heidi Hartmann talk about how she wrote “The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism”; and in the second part of her speech she discussed the current situation in the US in terms of the character of the struggle and the relationship between the struggle against capitalism and against patriarchy. After the questions and answers and the comments we received, we reached a point where we started discussing that we need to talk about the character of the feminist struggle against patriarchy in Turkey and how it should be targeting patriarchy’s manifestations both in the public and the private spheres, and in fact more specifically in the private sphere. In this session, we can discuss, with Heidi, how the feminist struggle against patriarchy, based on the example of Turkey, should be organized and on what basis this struggle should be built. We would like this to be an active discussion where we share our ideas, rather than a simple question/answer format. Who would like to go first?

Yıldız Ay: Hello everyone, my name is Yıldız Ay from the women’s union initiative IMECE. I am a domestic worker. We want our invisible labour to become visible, we want it to be seen and that is why we are getting organized. We are, perhaps for the first time, trying to establish a women’s trade union in Turkey. We are not recognized by the law, we are not perceived as workers but we are getting organized so that we can get recognition. We realize that we need to be organized against the system and also against men. The system functions in such a way that the employers, who happen to be women, are perceived as our enemies. However, it is not only the women who live in those houses and who soil the houses. There are other people; these women have children, they have husbands. But we ignore the husband and directly target the woman. The system has imposed a mission on women: Housework is to be carried out

only by women. However, we need to target men as enemies as well because they are also responsible for the mess or the dirt in the house. I went to clean a house last week. The lady said, “Oh, I am so embarrassed, because my house is very dirty.” And I told her “You don’t have to be ashamed or embarrassed, or at least you should not be the only one to be ashamed. You have a husband and children. They are responsible for the dirt as well.” She was shocked; I guess she didn’t understand what I was trying to say. Then I told her that we have an association and we are trying to become organized as domestic workers, we are fighting for our rights. She asked if we did gain our rights and I told her that we need to struggle in order to gain our rights. We are trying to establish a union but I believe that fighting the system is really a hard job. I participated in a few meetings abroad concerning domestic workers. Domestic workers in various other countries are organized, they have certain rights, their working hours are fixed. They are trying to make visible their labour. This is not the case in Turkey, but we have various demands from the state. We want our labour to be visible, we want to have social security, we want to have a right to retirement pension and we demand the rights of our colleagues who fell while cleaning windows and were injured or died. But of course the state is not going to give us these rights easily. We have to be more organized and carry out a stronger struggle against the system and men. I was wondering about the situation in the US We talked with Heidi Hartmann during the break, but I couldn’t understand well, I was wondering if the domestic workers in the US have the right to get organized, if they have associations, what are their rights and situation in the US? Thank you very much.

Heidi Hartmann: First I want to congratulate you; it’s great that you are organizing the domestic workers in Turkey. There have been attempts in the past in the US among domestic workers but not much has been done. Some of the rights of domestic workers are in fact covered in the minimum wage law and the social security law. I’m not exactly sure what the exact sum is in dollars, but let’s

say you have to pay at least 500 dollars a month, so that they can pay for the social security system and will have pension. And you are supposed to pay them the minimum wage. But there is a whole class of domestic workers who are exempt from that and these are the people who take care of old people and disabled people in their homes. For some reason some congressmen exempted them when that law was being discussed in congress and everybody voted for it. So this group, the National Domestic Workers Alliance, is now trying to get them covered by the Labour Law and trying to organize them. In fact there has been a case which was successful and I think one of the reasons for its success is that they were focusing on immigrant domestic workers who of course have a lot of problems with their immigration status and who are trying to legalize it with temporary work visas. They needed to come together in the state of New York, which is a high-income state and therefore the number of domestic workers are higher. And they did succeed, actually got a state law passed, which at the time was the first state law in the US ever to include any paid days off from work. I think they got 3 days and now they are trying to get 14 days. Of course 3 may sound like a small number, but 3 is a lot more than zero. You can use it for health related purposes, because you may want to celebrate a holiday, you can use it to take a vacation. There are no other workers in the US apart from these domestic workers in New York who actually have the right to a paid day off. We have a minimum wage law, but that's about all. I mean the European Union has, you know, 20 days of vacation, we have nothing like that. However since that law was passed in New York, the state of Connecticut has passed a law, for about half of the workers there, and now I believe they have the right to 5 paid days off a year. But the New York law for domestic workers was passed before this one in Connecticut. So, that is a really remarkable achievement of this small group of organized domestic workers. I think they are allowed to bargain collectively but this is not a legal right. Actually they have not yet formed an official labour union. I don't know how far they will go in that direction. Rather, they seem now to be doing

extensive work to appeal to the public and to lawmakers to improve the situation of domestic workers. What is the possibility of cross-class cooperation among women in Turkey to help support domestic workers?

Ayşe Panuş: Hello, my name is Ayşe, I am also a member of a union. I think that we have a specific problem in Turkey, besides the ones Heidi Hartmann mentioned in her presentation. I believe that we become feminists without questioning certain mechanisms in our own house, union, political party or even on the streets we are walking. I am a member of a trade union in the public education sector. There is a high number of women in this union. It is the trade union for teachers. Not surprisingly, as is the case all over the world, teaching is a women's profession. Our union, Eğitim-Sen (Education Workers' Union) has 50,000 female members, however we can see that, even in this union, we are not being represented either in terms of our labour nor our bodies; the number of women representatives is very low and this is questioned rarely. When we talk about different classes, unfortunately there is no solidarity or cooperation between the women in the private sector and those in the public sector. You need to be a socialist or politically very much engaged in order to forge solidarity or cooperation with women workers. I will never forget, when I was a member of the executive committee, people were phoning me all the time and my grandmother said, "I didn't know that you had so many husbands. I had only one husband but all these men are calling you so you have hundreds of husbands." This happened 20 years ago so I started to think about this. Although Eğitim-Sen is a trade union that is very sensitive with regard to women's issues, we help the perpetuation of patriarchal mechanisms by reproducing them. This is a big problem for us as a labour organization, as far as women are concerned. Secondly, I want to say a few words about care work. As we all know, the system has changed. We now need to be at home taking care of the children, the elderly, the disabled, cooking and also working outside. I think that this is what awaits us in the future in terms of care work. Because in Turkey, a law is about to pass or it has already passed I am not sure, concerning care services for the elderly; it involves the state

paying for the care of the elderly and the disabled. This is already the case for the care of the disabled as far as I know. For instance, I have two students and the state is paying the woman 300 TL a month because she is not working outside and caring for her two disabled children at home. I believe that this is the prospect for us in the coming period as far as care work and housework go: We will have take care of the house, earn money for the men and also help capitalism to continue its existence. Men will only work outside the house as usual. I do believe that there will be a tremendous increase in the number of women workers in the sectors of education, health, domestic service, cleaning etc. Therefore, as feminists, we must stop the patriarchal negotiations at home. Instead of paving the way for the mechanisms of struggle in the labour market, we women sometimes get into patriarchal negotiations with men for our own stability. And I am not saying this to criticize people, but this is what we are going through. It is easy to criticize the position of the unions on the male domination of women's labour and bodies, or to question capitalism, but we must find methods that will dismantle the patriarchal mechanisms in our organizations. I believe that this will pave the way for us in the future. Thank you.

Necla Akgöke: I would like to formulate the issue in a different way. Rather than women's cross-class cooperation, I want to say a few words about class solidarity among women. I am from an oil workers' trade union and working for its women's magazine. This union, Petrol-İş (Petroleum Workers' Union) is one of the biggest chemical, oil and plastics trade unions in Turkey. For the past eight years, we have been carrying out work among women within the union, through the women's magazine that we publish. As our colleague from the education trade union said, trade unions in Turkey, as is the case all around the world, are rather male dominated structures. In our trade union, when we were carrying out activities focusing on women, or to be more precise, when carrying out activities so that women's labour will be more visible inside the trade union, what gave us power and fuel was the feminist movement outside the union. The first instance of solidarity with the feminist movement was, during the strike of women workers in a multinational

company in the free-trade zone in Antalya called Novamed. Women held to their strike for 448 days and our trade union worked with all the trade unions in Turkey, as well as mobilising the international union mechanisms. However, we were faced with an impasse: the 81 women strikers were actually only a minority; the number of women working in the company was much higher. As a result, only a limited number of women inside the company participated in this strike. I do believe that the feminist movement in Turkey is more powerful compared with the feminist movements in the US or in the other Western countries. In fact, thanks to the solidarity of our feminist friends outside the company, the strike, which looked like it was doomed to fail, was eventually successful. Almost 300 people were employed in this factory and the majority were women, and women worked in production, while men as usual were involved with maintenance and technical work. The strike was successful. The feminist movement organized a campaign called “Solidarity with Women Workers in Novamed.” Of course it was the feminists who were leading this campaign, but many groups or institutions from the women’s movement and many others from the unions were also involved. Therefore, rather than making a class analysis of the feminist movement, after listening to my friend Ece, it appears to me that it is more likely that we may form alliances among women when we define our struggle as a struggle against patriarchy, rather than defining it on the basis of capitalism. Therefore, I find it more appropriate to call it class solidarity among women rather than women’s cross-class cooperation. Thank you.

Serpil Karabay: Hello, my name is Serpil, from IMECE. Heidi asked a very interesting question, something that we are also trying to find an answer for. Can solidarity be established between women who are providing paid domestic labour and those who are receiving these services? And can feminist politics be based on this relationship? If we can say “yes” to this question, then things will be very easy for our union, IMECE. Therefore, we must try to find an answer to it. Because women receiving domestic workers’ services also suffer from gender inequalities. Somehow all domestic work is on the shoulders of women or they feel they have to carry this burden. Therefore, this domestic burden is one

way or other transferred to the domestic worker, so that they can go out and participate in production or carry out their profession. However, they have to negotiate the wages, they have problems in regards to social security. We know that women who are workers in the education sector as well as bourgeois women want to have a domestic worker at home, but they don't have equal status. How are we going to forge solidarity here? For all intents and purposes this is a case of negotiation, there is a conflict of interest here. And it can also easily turn into a relation of oppressor and oppressed. We know that domestic workers do not have social security rights, sometimes their lives are threatened, but if it is left to the initiative of those women who buy these services, women employers will not be able to provide them with these rights. At least, lower middle class women who buy these services and who believe that they are the ones responsible for domestic chores can't do much. On the other hand, from the point of view of domestic workers, they cannot go on strike, they cannot engage in collective bargaining, so they have to come up with a common strategy with their employers. They can do it because their employers are also women. If feminist politics works here, if women's solidarity can be established, then we can, one way or another, become a force through women's solidarity against the burden placed on women's shoulders by the collaboration of patriarchy and capitalism. As the women's trade union İMECE, we believe that we have to struggle for the rights of both paid labour and unpaid domestic labour, that this burden should be lifted from women's shoulders and shared with men and that we need to fight against this within the capitalist system. One last remark: We are having to discuss all these problems within the boundaries of the capitalist system, but I know that many friends here are aspiring to a different world, they believe that we have to create a different world. And this other world is beyond capitalism, and further, a new socialist system, a 21st century socialism. In other words, we need to discuss these issues in conjunction with a new model of society. And I want to thank the Socialist Feminist Collective for organizing this event, for bringing us together. Thank you.

Çingir Kocadost: First of all, I also would like to thank the Socialist

Feminist Collective for organizing this panel. Before the break, my friend made a comment and I would like to continue from that observation. Hartmann said in her presentation something to the effect that she had underestimated the power of capitalism, because it was in the end able to dismantle patriarchy. During the break, I tried to figure out how I should interpret this. I was wondering if, from an optimistic point of view, we should read this as follows: That capitalism ensured that women became a section of the wage earners, such that they were able to go out of their houses, and that this dismantled patriarchy, abolished the inequality between men and women. Because if that's what her comment is, then I don't agree with her. There are many reasons why I do not agree with her. As my friend a while ago said, if we look at the issue not in terms of capitalism but in terms of patriarchy, in terms of what women went through, I can't be optimistic, because patriarchy is neither weaker nor dismantled. In an ideal situation, it would have been possible, perhaps, to foresee that the participation of women in the labour force would be translated into equal wages for men and women, and the economic empowerment of women, as well as equal positions in the domestic sphere by sharing housework because women were empowered. And thus a more egalitarian situation... But this is not the case in the real world. But why? First of all, women, when they work in the labour force, they don't get equal wages. They don't get equal pay for equal work. This is more obvious in the private sector, but can be observed in the public sector as well. Moreover, women can only find jobs in those sectors where only women are employed. When wages are paid for domestic work (care of the elderly and the sick, education) either in the public or the private sector, it is still women who do these jobs. Perhaps one might think that women are now paid for the work that they were not paid for before, however, the same women keep on doing the same work for free in their own homes. Therefore, it is not possible to be optimistic. Maybe we can say that only a small minority, I don't know what percentage but let's say some women whose level of economic welfare is high, now have good jobs with good salaries. And it is only this small minority that is no longer doing domestic work and receiving equal wages with men,

but I don't know what percentage of women are in this position, because when it comes to the vast majority of women, we have a very pessimistic picture. What we call double workday causes women to be responsible for all the work imposed upon them by patriarchy and at the same time participate in wage labour. So there is a double oppression. I don't think that this means patriarchy is weaker now.

Heidi Hartmann: I want to respond a little bit to those comments. First, I think it is very interesting to talk about solidarity among women rather than cross-class cooperation. And I agree that to talk about cross-class cooperation is a bit off putting. I think it is great when there are a lot of, you know, good examples of women's solidarity working together to achieve things such as to support that strike in Novamed. The other thing I wanted to comment about is that, I do not think I said that capitalism eliminated patriarchy. I just said that it made more difference than I thought it would, over 35 years. And in the US, now, about 20% of all women who work are earning more per hour than their husbands, and sometimes their annual wages are higher than their husbands. Surely we can't say that all women are married to men who earn less than they do. These figures date from before the recession, especially before the unemployment crisis. What I tried to say was that such a big change, that the change should reach these dimensions, surprises me. And I think we do see a change in the relationships in the home when women are earning more money. There are a number of studies about women in very high level jobs and how they typically have husbands who quit their jobs or retire early or specifically choose lower wage jobs without a lot of responsibility, because they see that their wives have the stronger career and they are making the most money. I'm talking about, you know, women CEOs of the places like Hewlett Packard or IBM. In fact, I think this was a biography: This woman CEO of IBM pointed out that her husband was a house husband, I think this is a stay-home dad. So things are changing more than I would have suspected. Nobody thinks patriarchy is gone, least of all in America. You know it really is not. This problem of job

segregation, of low pay for women's work outside the home for the double day and for what has been called sex-affective labour. Women are often the ones who are smiling, "you can do it sir" secretary says to her boss, and she goes home and she says to her children "I know you will do a good job tomorrow at school, at the school play" and she says the same thing to her husband. And that emotional work is "work." And it is very important work. And that is the area men really do not take their share. My otherwise ideal male partner does not take his share of emotional work. Who is the one who is keeping track of his family, where they are going, when they will be in town, when we will get together? Me. And this is very, very typical. So there are a lot of aspects of the women's work, that is very, very important work and that needs to be done. For example in the office; what humanises an office? Well, having photos and little signs, celebrating each other's birthdays, weddings, these things are very common in the US. All of that, is almost always done by women. Making that workplace a humane place to be in. So obviously there is no claim that patriarchy is gone. I'm just interested as an observer, how much has been eroded in the US In fact, one time when I was in Sweden... Everybody should go to Sweden, it is very illuminating and if you go there for two weeks you can become an expert. But seriously what I noticed was that they definitely have so many more of the rights than we have in the US, like the paid leave. I observed a lot of men pushing baby carriages around and women, when they have a baby carriage on the bus, it is the driver's job to help the women with the baby carriage in and out of the bus. That never happens in America, no bus driver will get out of his seat for the woman with a baby carriage. On the other hand, what I did not observe in Sweden is a certain kind of aggressiveness among women. I thought that there was an acceptance of the role of primarily the dominant one responsible for raising their children; they are working less and they have a longer number of years when they can work fewer hours; there is still a lot of sex segregation, women are in women's jobs and men are in men's jobs. Women mostly work in the public sector, because the private

sector is not so happy to have people working 6 hours a day and taking these long leaves. I did not observe as much conflict among men and women, I did not observe them arguing whose turn it was to do the dishes, who is going to plan the Thanksgiving or family dinner with his relatives or her relatives. I thought women were somehow more accepting of all those female roles. What you observe in the US is a real aggressivity about that. Women do not accept those roles without a fight. They are arguing about them, the terrain is being argued about every day, in every workplace, in every office and in every family. Yes, that's a slight exaggeration. But even though the women's movement is no longer at its peak and we are not that often out there in the street causing a lot of trouble, this internalization of the rights of women, not to do all the service work, not to be catering to the men all the time, is pretty pervasive and pretty aggressive. I probably could not have imagined 30 years ago that it would be as advanced as it is in many families. I was talking during the break with somebody about the high rate of non-married among specifically poor people. But specifically poor African-Americans. Why is there so much non-marriage? It is because, research has been done on this, African-American women who are poor have a more idealized vision of marriage. Marriage to them should mean that you have money, you can buy a house, you can have a nice life. They do not see that the men can give them that. They do not have jobs or they do not have jobs with high enough wages to give that, so they say what is the point of marrying? That in a way is a sign of women's liberation. It is a liberating position to feel "It is too bad that you cannot do a lot for me, but hey I can support myself, I can get along by myself and support my children." And another sign of that liberation is that, again when I was a teenager, it was certain if you were a member of the middle class, and you got pregnant when you should not have in high school, you would be sent away. And your baby would be put up for adoption and then maybe you could come back and finish school or so on. For the poor people it was more likely that the father said "That boy is gonna marry you," and that was called the shotgun

wedding. The father would go to the other family and say “Your son got my daughter pregnant so you are marrying her.” That does not happen anymore. That’s very, very rare in the US. What happens now, I believe, is that the mother is saying, to the father “She is not gonna marry that guy. Bad enough she has got pregnant, bad enough she was messing around and was not using birth control, I am not allowing her to ruin her life by getting married at age 16, she can have the baby, we will help her take care of the baby, she will finish high school.” And this is what the research shows: If the young girl does not get married, she is much more likely to finish high school, and if she finishes high school, she is more likely to go on secondary, post secondary credentials and so on. So, she will have a better life. So, forcing the woman into early marriage, that’s gone too. So a lot of things are gone, and I do not attribute that to capitalism; I attribute that to the erosion of the idea that all pregnant girls must get married. I attribute that to the women’s liberation principle that it is a right for women not to marry, to live independently of men, to do the best they can with that situation. And in many ways that’s not so bad.

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu: We will continue with our discussion. Heidi Hartmann explained once again that capitalism has transformed patriarchal relations in a way that she had not foreseen, but most definitely it did not end patriarchy. She gave examples from Sweden and African-Americans and emphasized the changes in the perception of marriage. We are now continuing our discussion about the current situation in Turkey. We discussed how we can strengthen the solidarity and the struggle against domestic male domination while struggling against patriarchy within class struggle. We continued with the idea that solidarity among women struggling against patriarchy at home will actually strengthen our struggle against male domination within class struggle.

Yasemin Özgün: *Actually, what Heidi mentioned before reminded me of something else. When I combine what Heidi and Ece said, it reminds me of the example of young girls being subjected to the sexual division of labour within the house from very early on. When I was 13 years old, my*

mother was sick, and I have a brother who is two years younger than me, and all of a sudden I was expected to do all the housework like washing the dishes etc. I think that was my first serious rebellion in my life. I asked my father "How is it possible that my younger brother's penis is preventing him from washing the dishes?" I didn't even know what was going on around me but I reacted like that desperately. Because I looked at him, and I looked at myself, the visible and obvious difference was the fact that he had a penis and I didn't. How can it be that a penis could prevent him from washing the dishes? Next day, my father went and bought a dishwasher. This was very striking. Did this change the sexual division of labour within the household? Yes, there were some crucial changes with the advent of technology. Researches show that women are becoming more visible in the public sphere thanks to these technological developments. Although we can observe this, the sexual division of labour is still apparent, it's still there. We have demands from the state, we have demands from capital, as I also briefly mentioned in the opening speech. We want for example, day care centers, nurseries. But are these demands sufficient, are these adequate demands on their own? Will they enable us to be emancipated from patriarchy? Who is going to take the children to the day care center, who is going to organize this? It is not very easy to measure these issues by researches; and transforming them into concrete demands and fighting for them in solidarity is not as easy as uniting for our demands from the state and the private sector. Maybe we should think about the methods more. Because both the development of capitalism, the harmonious collaboration between capitalism and patriarchy and technological transformations appear to be to the advantage of women, and this is deceiving. Perhaps we need to shift the research and the evaluations to these different areas, to see what exactly is taking place. There is another issue that I think is extremely important; it looks like there is a certain hierarchy among our demands. For example a day care center or a nursery can be a much more vital demand and sometimes we say let's not deal with the domestic sexual division of labour, when we don't even have day centers and nurseries. We have to see all the three components which are very much interrelated with each other; if we do

not see the totality we are imprisoned in it, and the strong and resisting patriarchal system continues to exist. Thank you.

Meriç Eyüboğlu: I would also like to thank the Socialist Feminist Collective and all our friends who put in a lot of effort for this conference. I would like to return to a point we made a few moments ago. Maybe it would also help in terms of introducing ourselves to the other women here. There is no doubt that not everybody in this room defines herself as a socialist feminist. But I think it is probable that a bigger majority define themselves as anti-system. In fact, it seems to me that the women who are gathered here accord an importance to the discussion around the issue of being anti-system or not. When I listened to the questions especially in the first section, I realized that there are many traces of this discussion in the systematic of our reasoning, and that is why we are asking these questions to our speakers and to ourselves. Many of us, many of the people who are here, think that women cannot be emancipated within the capitalist system. It seems to me to be possible to summarise it this way. However, as Necla implied, what brings us here today is not our various perspectives on women's emancipation. What brings us here is our perception of patriarchy, which in this country causes feminists to go out and demonstrate on the street every single day. That's why, when we consider the issues in Turkey, it is more important to have this discussion here, within this geography, compared to the US or to other countries. I would believe that similar approaches are prevalent in the hall concerning abstract equality. In this country, the people who rule it, the Prime Minister for example, believe that men and women are not equal in nature or in terms of character. They are created different in their character at birth. And when you have a Prime Minister insisting over and over again that men and women are not equal, we as women, as feminists who live in this country, believe that every improvement and equality of rights gained within this geography, within this system is very important. That's why I wanted to take into brackets the perspective of emancipation. However, in our perception there is room, in fact, for an equality that recognizes the differences between men and women, not abstract equality between men and women. In this country, we

are still trying to wage a feminist struggle for positive discrimination measures that should be effective until we are equal to men at the level of rights, let alone discussing real equality between men and women. We are trying to organize a feminist struggle in a country where positive discrimination measures are not in effect. But I think this geography, at the same time, is very rich in terms of hope, when you consider that we are all in this struggle. I would like to go back to what was said in the first part of the discussion. As far as I can see, Heidi talked about three main points when comparing her position now to that of 25 years ago. One of these issues was violence. She said that reevaluating her article now, she thinks her work did not deal with violence sufficiently. The second point was domestic care, and the last one capitalism. I am not going to talk about the violence and brutality of capitalism, I will leave that aside. Women's labour, and especially care labour forms an important part of the agenda of our feminist struggle at the point we are at present, and will continue to do so. Another issue is what we call male violence. However, we need to discuss female labour and male violence in terms of patriarchy. At least that's what we are trying to do. We made the following assessment working on violence: We realized that women contribute more to the household economy than men. And there is a consensus on this among us. That it is exclusively the woman who does the domestic work empowers the woman but this strikes back as violence towards her. Perhaps a better way of putting it is as follows: Woman murders and violence against women are on the rise, and we are all thinking, talking about, discussing the reasons for this. At the same time, there are various campaigns on this issue in this country. Numerous reasons can be laid out for the increase in murders, but one of the most important outcomes of our evaluation is that, the number of murders, the massacre of women increases when women resist, say "No," or are not submissive. What I want to say is, women work outside, they are being employed outside the house in Turkey, in the US.. (I believe we are going to discuss, what type of employment, in the next session.) But at the same time women, unfortunately, continue fulfilling in the household their patriarchal domestic duties. However, the more they say "No," the

more they want to get divorced or want the custody of the children when they get divorced because they have become economically empowered, or perhaps thanks to the contribution of the feminist movement, the more they are killed. These are the reasons why they are being murdered. Our assessment is that there is a correlation between violence and resistance. I am mentioning this as a positive development, if we set aside the fact that patriarchy is perpetuating violence in order to oppress women, to use the current status of women for its purposes. We need to contemplate on these different aspects of the issue as well.

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu: Dear friends, we have actually exceeded our time limits and for the next two days we will continue to discuss these issues, so I will give the floor to two of my friends who have been asking to speak for quite some time, and then it will be Heidi's turn. We will then have a lunch break. Mürüvvet firstly, and then Berrin, and then Heidi can wrap up.

Mürüvvet Yılmaz: Hartmann talked about how capitalism, or to be more precise, the changes that have taken place, had an impact on women's life and their care labour. But I think, when we take into consideration the changes in the world economy, it seems to me that capitalism has reconciled with the conservative aspects of patriarchy. One other important point that should be mentioned, especially in the case of Turkey, is that domestic care labour is increasing with flexible production. As production becomes more flexible, both the production of life through waged and unwaged labour and the production cycle are actually more and more perpetuated through women's labour. A good example for this can be the carrying out of certain parts of factory work, like needle work, production of small items like pens, or heads of pens at home by women and the ensuing confinement of women to the house. The connections are always established through men, and yet again women work at home with lower wages and do the housework as well. They also continue to do all household tasks. As Ayşe mentioned, for example, although they are paid for the care of the disabled people at home, this means that women are once more tied to the house. Another point is that, even women who are doing intellectual work are also working at

home, for example even in the computing sector women work at home. Therefore, in the current situation women stay at home, and their care labour continues as before. Another issue I would like to raise is the situation of Kurdish women. As a result of the war, many Kurdish women had to migrate to metropolitan cities. They are both continuing to be exploited at home as flexible workers and do all the care work at home as well. Labour has become more Kurdish in metropolitan cities. The exploitation of cheap labour in Turkey continues through Kurdish women and the immigrant foreign women who have come from overseas countries. I would like to ask; what is the situation for immigrant women in the US; what are the implications of this situation for the continuation and corroboration of patriarchy; and what is being done to reverse this situation?

Berrin Hatacikoğlu: I have a short question. Heidi said that she had underestimated capitalism, and that consequently, although patriarchy did not vanish, there were some positive developments. However, I frankly believe that most of those gains were achieved by the feminist struggle in the 1970s in the US, by the struggle of a very powerful feminist movement which she was a part of. For example in Turkey, capitalism is gaining force, more and more women are killed, and if it weren't for feminists who are raising their voice strongly against this, nobody, none of the capitalists would be bothered. I want to ask Heidi what distinction does she make between the two, how much does she attribute to each?

Filiz Kerestecioglu: I would also like to thank the Socialist Feminist Collective and I would like to thank one more person, Yıldız Ay who spoke as a domestic worker. We actually interviewed her years ago and we realized that we do not recognize very basic things that are in front of our very eyes although we are feminists, leftists and so on. After the interview, I realized that certain issues were also invisible to me, even as a feminist, as a socialist, or as a leftist. That interview made me realize that domestic workers should also have a right to social security. After that, I tried to organize my mother and her friends, and I was able to help one woman get social security. Of course it is a very personal issue, a very individualistic effort. As you know social security in this area is

still not legally regulated. Social security rights can be obtained in big cleaning companies. Obviously we are at a conference on women's labour and we naturally concentrate on the concept of labour. However, when you look at it from the outside, that is, if you are not actually involved in organizing with women and you only concentrate on labour, we can clearly see that the issue of "identity" is left out. When we don't deal with the subject as a whole, we come up with no solutions, as it is the case with the Kurdish issue. It is empty talk when we say let's just go and invest in the Kurdish region without realizing the identity problem, the Kurdish identity problem; or without dealing with the right to education in the mother tongue, we are left without a solution. So I think the same applies to the issue of women. We see that, while economic developments alone, to be more precise the developments within capitalism, may lead to improvements, these still cannot solve many of the problems. For example, in a sport stadium, a very famous technical director can yell out to a woman who intervenes "Shut up, bitch." He can say that because there is actually a refusal, a non-recognition of an identity there, the woman's identity. I believe that the increase in violence is also related to this. No matter how much the situation improves in terms of the economic development, it is the case that a woman's identity is not recognized, is not seen as equally worthy. If we are claiming that a non-capitalist world is possible, and we talked about this with my friends during the coffee break, maybe in another gathering, in another conference, we need to invite women from former "socialist" countries and talk about their experiences, their perspectives, their new perspectives, if they have any. We would be more than happy to hear their experiences. Thank you.

Heidi Hartmann: So, I'll try to wrap up because I am now standing in the way of your lunch. And I just want to say thank you. It has been a remarkable opportunity for me. Your questions and comments have been very challenging, and very difficult to respond to and very interesting. I think one thing the responses from the people in this last session indicate is that patriarchy is not just one thing at one time, always the same everywhere. There are a lot of variations. And I think it is certainly not surprising to think that we have made

more progress in the US or in Sweden in combating patriarchy than women have been able to make here in Turkey. I think also that it was an excellent comment to point out that yes, the women's movements' struggle is the reason why capitalism in the US has been as liberating as it has been; which is not to say that it has been completely liberating, or that patriarchy is completely gone; but it gave women some opportunities; the opportunity to make money is an opportunity to challenge the power structure in the family. And I think women have taken great advantage of that opportunity in the US. But I think that the focus on the women's movement's struggle and the role of that is a very important focus. It is not just capitalism and patriarchy that are operating. It is women and men struggling, as they do through the union movement, through the women's movement, through the civil rights movement, through the gay rights movement, through the environmental movement. All these struggles are contributing to the shaping of these forces and have effects on our lives. And in general we are trying to get better lives, and to ameliorate the worst effects of these negative forces' impact on our lives. I think someone said that perhaps I have reconciled with capitalism and I think in a way that's true. I see now my life goal for the amount of years I have left in the US is trying to create a softer, nicer, better capitalism, through having a stronger social welfare state, through having more rights for women and other minorities, and more public policies, a bigger public sector, higher taxes for the wealthy and more control over capitalism, and more sharing of the profits from that very productive system. But I don't really think that capitalism and patriarchy have reconciled in any way. I think that that the tension over the control of women's labour is going to continue. There will always be points of fissure, points where you seize the opportunities where you see the conflict, and you can exacerbate it and take advantage of it through some social movements. So I think that that's always open to us because none of these things are static, they are very dynamic and they are changing all the time and we can get in there and make them change more in

the direction that we would like them to change. So, with that I'll just say thank you. This has been a great opportunity and I look forward to having my colleagues grilled the same way I was. And seriously it will be a lot of fun. I am looking forward to the rest of the congress.

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu: We would like to thank Heidi Hartmann. And we will be continuing to discuss with her and our other guests in the following sessions. Thank you very much.

Care Labour

JEAN GARDINER

Hello sisters. Thank you for my mauve scarf, I already feel at least a junior member of the Socialist Feminist Collective. I'm really delighted to be here today. This is an experience unlike any of those I've ever had. When I was invited here I was very surprised because nobody has asked me to talk about care labour for a very long time. To discover that there are two hundred plus women in Istanbul who actually want to hear what I have to say about care labour is just completely mind-blowing. I hope I don't enormously disappoint you. I think I probably will disappoint you to some extent. And I'm just prepared for that.

I have prepared some power point slides. I must apologize that I didn't actually finish preparing these until yesterday afternoon and that explains why they're not translated for you. I thought it was still probably better to use them although I do appreciate they are of limited use because they are in English. I hope at least for some of you it will help you understand the direction in which I'm going and

what I'm trying to cover in this talk. Just as a piece of background, obviously you all know that I was one of the many socialist Marxist feminists participating in the debate about domestic labour in 1970s - 1980s. Just to give you a little bit of personal history, I was an economist, and I was a Marxist economist. For me the domestic labour debate was very important. I certainly didn't start it but because others had started that debate, it gave me an opportunity to begin to steer those Marxist ideas which had nothing to say about gender in the direction I could. My first work was very much focused on the internal Marxist debates and I was much less engaged with the feminist debates.

One of the evolutions for me over the 1970s - 1980s was obviously to benefit from some other people like Heidi Hartman, who is here, and to recognize that you could actually begin to integrate or relate or link these feminist and Marxist frameworks.

I know that some of you have read an article I got published in 2000. I'm not proposing to talk about that article today, there might be one or two reference points, but I'm very happy if people have questions about that article to raise in the discussion questions later on. I haven't really thought about care labour as a major focus since about 2000 when that article was published. For me that was the point which I thought "Okay, I kind of written what I think I have to say about domestic labour, about care labour and now I need to go on to other things." Since 2000, I have been much more focused on looking at paid labour, looking at the labour market, looking at the way in which paid work is structured and gendered. Therefore for me looking at care labour today is very much from the context of how care labour has an impact on paid labour and how care labour relates to the macro economy, the macro society. I'm going to mostly talk about that.

We are from very different generations and ages in this room. Also I come from England and it's in many ways a very different society. It's got some similarities with the US, which Heidi has been talking about, but also some major differences. I to be honest knew

very little about Turkey, about the gender divisions in Turkey before preparing for this talk. Therefore in this talk I've tried to bring out the fact that we have a great variety of capitalisms, we have a variety of patriarchies, and we have a variety of histories as feminists. If we want to learn from each other we need to understand the different contexts in which all of us are living, working and being politically active.

My plan for the talk is to summarize what is my perception of what you have asked me to talk about. What I'd like to emphasize in the introduction is that I think care labour, although is often performed in a patriarchal set of social relationships, is actually also performed in other kinds of ways. In order for us to really understand the oppressive nature that care labour often takes for women, we have to be able to perceive that there are other ways of organizing it and that social relationships involving care are not always patriarchal. That's one of the points that I'm going to start from. I think this is where the international comparisons and close comparisons also come in. The social relationships of care labour vary within society across classes, across regions, maybe across religions and cultures. They also vary internationally across nation states and regions of the world.

The second thing I'm going to go through fairly quickly is what we know about the gender division of labour internationally. People have already referred to this but I want to just use some fairly up to date statistics which I found quite useful produced by the U.N. However limited time-use data may be, it is useful to have it as one source of information about how the position of males and females in society varies and how things vary across different countries. I then want to spend some time focusing on why is care labour central if you want to understand gender equality - inequality in society. Then I want to say that, across all societies in the world today as far as I'm aware, women do pay what I call "gender penalty" for care labour. There isn't a society in the world where women don't find themselves at a disadvantage. However, the extent of this gender penalty varies greatly across regions of the world and therefore we need to be more

historical and more specific in terms of understanding the different ways in which gender relations are working out in these different regions. Finally I will say something about what I believe to be the probable factors behind the gender penalty associated with care labour.

You might broadly define care labour in all sorts of different ways. You might want to include the paid care work which we talked about a little bit in the earlier discussion. A lot of the care economy now in many societies is actually monetized. It's either organized within private care services or within state public services. But I'm going to focus today on the care labour which is performed in households and families which is not based on any kind of market transaction or payment. So the care labour I'm talking about is based on the social relations of the household.

Secondly, this care labour has, as does work in paid economy, in the workforce and in the labour market, a mental element and an emotional element to it. All of these aspects need to be taken into account. Certainly in the more developed parts of the world the physical aspects of care labour are much less for those who could afford dishwashers, microwaves and domestic technology. My mother used to spend the whole day every Monday washing. I grew up seeing my mother spend all that time. Washing now for me really is a very, very small part because I don't have young kids and my partner organizes his own washing. Actually doing the washing with a washing machine is a very simple, much more simple activity physically.

But the reason why I'm using care labour is that I've increasingly focused on the fact that domestic labour isn't just about physical task. It is about sustaining the relationships, managing the emotions, and also taking physical care of those who are not able to care for themselves.

I do want to make a few positive comments too. One of the things coming to talk here today has done for me was to reflect on what has actually happened in the +30 years since we've engaged in the

domestic labour debate around care labour. Once I started thinking about what we've achieved at least in Europe and where the second wave feminist movement was active around the world, I thought that we actually got people to recognize, governments and international bodies, the fact that unpaid care work is part of the economies, it sustains the economy, it has to be accounted for. Maybe you can't measure it very easily, and maybe you don't still count it for all sorts of reasons when you're looking at economic growth, but unpaid work in the home is a vital part of the care economy of the world. I think that is an achievement of the feminist movement. Some of the statistics that I'm going to be talking to you about today are only available because feminists raised the issue of care labour, unpaid work in the home as being part of the economy.

I just want to reemphasize what I said at the beginning. For me care labour consists of different kinds of social relationships. In the article that I referred to here there is a typology that I find quite helpful. That is to say, obviously a lot of care labour performed around the world takes more patriarchal form of personal service provided by the wife or the daughter to the husband or the father, and these are based on patriarchal household relations in which men have power to command women's labour. There are unequal power relations and that is clearly a very dominant form of care labour internationally.

Secondly, if we look at the care labour now performed in many European countries, then a lot of care labour is much more taking a form of care giving for dependents, which may or may not have a patriarchal element to it, but is not essentially a patriarchal relationship. It's a relationship between the person who is looking after, and the person who is being looked after. For all sorts of reasons the child who is very young or the elderly person or the disabled person does not have the capacity to carry out some of those care activities for themselves. So there is a non-patriarchal element in that relationship. Obviously with demographic change, with the ageing population or when you have high birth rates, there will be

different amounts of time that are spent by the care giving work. Care giving work in the UK has certainly expanded relative to personal service work for husbands and fathers.

The third kind of social relationship relates to that we all need care at certain times, we all have crises and we care for each other. I think one of the features of feminist movement is, where they're working well in solidarity, women have a caring relationship for each other. We care for each other on reciprocal basis. I believe care can be reciprocal as well as patriarchal. I've been trying to think about how we can, as feminists, try to create a society in which care becomes more focused on care giving, more focused on reciprocity and less focused on patriarchy.

The final thing I'd like to say is that I think one of the things that we were baffled with as feminists and Marxists is that, we thought that certain kinds of relationships were objectively oppressive but women don't all necessarily perceive these things in that way. I think we also have to listen to what identities women have. All I'm saying is care labour may be patriarchal but it might still be experienced as something voluntary by women engaged in it. It may be because the culture that women live in is such, it may be that women retake, gain their sense of identity as mothers, as wives and therefore see their roles not as patriarchal but as almost natural.

Obviously one of the roles of feminist movements is to get women to think more critically about some of these relationships.

Let's move on to who does the care labour around the world. I mentioned this U.N. study which is a useful thing for you to refer to if you want to have statistics on how women's position varies in different countries. It's absolutely clear from the statistics that across the world, in all more developed and less developed countries, women do still carry out a bulk of unpaid care labour in spite of their increased participation in employment. I do think that there is a source here of solidarity amongst women across the world although these are averages and it doesn't mean to say that all women are necessarily in this position. But in terms of the average position for

all societies women do still carry out the bulk and this won't come as news to any of you. And I just will quote here, showing how the U.N. report does recognize that women who carry out that burden of work for the home obviously end up in the labour market in a highly disadvantaged position. It affects their position in the labour market, it affects the kinds of jobs they get, it affects in many countries their access to educational training, it affects their leisure time and opportunities to care for themselves.

One of the things that people complain about in England today is that they don't have me-time; they don't have time for themselves. Women actually often are so busy thinking about everybody else that it's only when you, we were talking about it last night actually, get into your sixties that you suddenly think, "Well, I'm now supposed to have time for me but what do I do with it?" Because it's not something like we as women have learned to, my generation of women, I don't think we really learned nor had the opportunity to think about for much of our lives.

Just to run through these figures, if we look at the more developed countries like America, like Europe, like Australia, in many of the developed countries men now on average do about half the unpaid care labour that women currently do. But there are some developed countries like Italy and Japan where there's still a much bigger split between the amount of unpaid work done by women and men. In the UK the average now for women is just over five hours a day, this is week days, it doesn't include weekends, and that's a pretty dramatic figure as far as I'm concerned given that many, a vast majority of women also do paid work. The average for men is just under three hours a day doing unpaid work, care labour. However the report also highlighted that especially in Asian countries the gender imbalance in unpaid work time is still very high and hasn't really shifted.

I thought you'd be interested to see the figure for Turkey in this particular report which finds out that woman on average weekdays do about six hours 11 minutes of care labour and men do one hour 28 minutes. That's about a four to one ratio. You can see how obviously

this is varying around the world. We have different degrees of the extent of which we regard this as a battle area although it's still a battle area everywhere. I think what this report also brings out is that we really need to understand the links between unpaid work and paid work if we want to understand the social relations of care labour and how patriarchal they are, and if we want to understand the gender inequality in the labour market. This is why I think this conference is focused on such a good issue because the links between unpaid work and paid work are absolutely critical if we want to understand the material economic gender divisions in society.

We know that labour force participation rates have been rising for women globally in most countries and that in 2010 you see that women's labour force participation is still internationally significantly lower than men's: 52% as compared to 77%. So obviously we would expect men to spend more time in paid work than women, which they do, but because women's unpaid work is greater than men's unpaid work, if you add up the unpaid work and paid work you find that women still have less leisure time. Women have a total workload which is higher than men; this is why we talk about the double burden. Again from this report, in Turkey, if you look at the total work time, women are working for a total of seven hours 19 minutes a day compared to just under seven hours for men. It is longer but once you add the paid work the gap reduced obviously. In the UK again we've got a similar gap. In every country women, if you add unpaid and paid work, work longer hours than men. I think that is a major unifying factor across countries.

This study is really for my benefit more than for yours because you're probably familiar with the figures in Turkey but I was quite struck at the fact that the percentage of women in Turkey in the labour force has declined in the last 20 years which is not the same picture we have in the UK. In the UK there has been a slight increase to 56% whereas in Turkey only 24% of women are participating in the labour force. That's obviously really significant in terms of gender divisions in society and how they operate in slightly different ways. I

put the figures for men as well which have been declining in Turkey as well. There are obviously some issues that are not just about gender but about maybe high unemployment or more people giving up work, older ages, maybe more people participating in education.

Again in the UK you can see that the percentage of the work force which is female is continuing to rise, whereas that isn't the case in Turkey.

I now want to focus on why is care labour so central if you want to understand gender inequality in society. I've tried to pick out a number of issues some of which have already come up today. As Heidi also mentioned this morning, education opportunities have been a very important achievement in the shift towards a gender aware society. Mothers' encouraging their daughters to get education is one of the ways in which feminism has actually worked through in terms of raising the skill levels and confidence levels of younger women. It's quite striking that, if you look at those statistics, in Turkey women still have a lower percentage of participation in tertiary education which is university and above schooling. I don't know whether this is influenced in any way by care labour. In fact, younger women may find themselves in a situation where they don't have the opportunity to take part in education because of their care responsibilities or there may be other factors as well. But the UK statistics is quite striking that education shifted in such a way that women are much more likely to participate in education than men now. I would say that this is one little success of feminism, that it has, both through the school system and through the influences on the parents, rejected some of the hegemonic notions of femininity and masculinity which used to dominate our society. Education used to be a very critical route for women to gain greater equality.

When we look at occupational gender segregation, it is the case in all societies, even those where women may have greater progress in the labour market, that women are crowded into jobs which can more easily be combined with their care responsibilities which is why in the UK and Sweden a lot of women work in the public sector.

I think Heidi also mentioned this in the morning. Women are also looking for part-time work, shorter hours of work, which makes it possible for them to combine with their care responsibilities. We have a pattern now in the UK, although certainly better than how it was 20 years ago, that there is a lot of shift work. There is 24/7 hour of working in society and this is one of the ways in which care is shared between parents. Perhaps the husband works 9-5 and the wife works as a night nurse in the hospital, and while the wife is working on her night shift the husband is actually asleep [laughing in the audience] but he still can care for the children. So there are various ways in which people duck and dive to make these things work but it shapes the kind of jobs that women are able to access.

To the extent that we now have privatized care services, much of the labour for those emerging privatized care services is carried out by women. Women also tend to be concentrated in the jobs that require emotional labour skills. There are secretaries who write the power point presentation for their managers. I come across that a fair bit and that happens in universities, you have men going around giving their talks but the presentations are put together to a great extent by the secretary who doesn't get any credit. The invisibility of women's labour transfers into paid labour as well. A basic problem is that women perform and use these skills like unpaid labour within the home and it is sometimes seen as if women know how to do these by nature; it's not perceived as a skill, it's not perceived as something we've learned, we've had to train for. That's one of the reasons why care work that's paid tends to be underpaid. One of the reasons why emotional labour is undervalued is that it's assumed that women can just do it. I think you all know that we can't just do it; some of us find it really quite hard. Some of us spend years learning how to do it. It's those unpaid years of investment in our human capital, in our emotional skills, which society doesn't recognize.

The link to occupational gender segregation and care labour is the issue of working hours. In the developed regions of the world I think it still is a very common notion that the ideal worker, the ideal paid

worker especially in a managerial or professional kind of occupation, is someone who can work full time. He doesn't have a life outside of work; he can dedicate himself in total to work. Although we have rights for parents and carers to request shorter hours in the UK because of their parental responsibilities, all research demonstrates that anyone who actually wants to progress their career is best advised not to work flexibly because if you work flexibly you are no longer to be the ideal worker and therefore career progression is much harder to achieve. So what we have today is that women are concentrated, women with care responsibilities especially, in part time jobs.

Today in the European countries we are seeing an acceptance that there is not one form of masculinity. That a masculine identity does not have to be patriarchal. I think what we have to do is actually to form alliances with those men who also want to challenge that notion of hegemonic masculinity based around dominating women. I say it because if it's hard for a mother who wants to reduce her working time and keep her career going, if it's hard for a mother to request to work flexibly in the workplace, it's actually even harder for a father to ask for those rights even though legally fathers have the same rights as mothers in the UK. Men, who challenge that notion of hegemonic masculinity, have an even greater likelihood of being deemed to be not one of the "Men's Club" and therefore it is hard for men to carve out spaces for alternative masculine identities. When we have dialogues with men this is one of themes that needs to be discussed.

Poverty and financial dependence over the life course is something that I have been very concerned with in recent years. Probably because of my own demographic position I've got a lot more interested in issues around retirement and what happens with our lives when we're looking forward to longer lives. If we just talk about the relationship between unpaid and paid work, we're assuming that life ends when we retire but actually life goes on and we have hopefully many years of life. And the critical issue for feminists today, which we haven't engaged sufficiently, is the enormous and much greater

inequality in pensions between men and women than is the case for wages. We're all preoccupied by the gender pay gap but actually the gender pension gap is much much greater than the gender pay gap. This is precisely because women are engaged in unpaid labour for large parts of their lives maybe outside the labour force or if they're in the labour force they're working shorter hours. Pensions are based entirely in most countries on the contributions you make through employment.

Traditionally women were living very much to marriage so they got their pensions via their husbands. That still is the case to some extent but the issue of how to fight for women to have financial independence post retirement I think is certainly in my country one of the biggest challenges for feminists today. I'd like you to think about that so that you're prepared at least. I'm sure that most of you are not thinking about retirement yet, that is a long way off but maybe one of the goals of your collective could be the time you get to that point you have some system in place in Turkey. I don't know what the system is like now but I imagine it's not very good in terms of pensions. Another thing that we've achieved as feminists in the UK is that now we are moving towards a state pension, even though it's very low, which doesn't require you to work many years in the labour market in order to claim in it. The number of years you actually have to do paid work to get your state pension is going down.

Also care labour is now recognized as a contribution, another really important feminist achievement. Care labour is recognized as a credit towards your pension as well as your employment record. This might be something that you could consider here.

Okay. I'm probably taking too long, am I okay for time? I'll try to finish in the next five minutes.

Finally, on the issue of care labour and gender inequality: I've already talked about unequal access to leisure time. I think the other thing we haven't really talked about is how actually one of the things that's harder for women because of care labour is being actively involved in politics, actively involved in trade unions, being actively

involved and trying to bring about changes. Therefore I suppose that the other challenge for feminist movements is, and for trade unions as well, how do we organize political action in a way that makes it possible for women, those women with care responsibilities to take part.

There is a gender penalty associated with care labour throughout the world but I think in some regions it is greater than others. I want to just say a little bit more about that now to finish my talk. Basically we've been talking about unpaid and paid work and how they're combined. What I'd like to propose is a very simplified way of comparing different kinds of regimes of care and employment that we can perceive around the world. First, we have the traditional male breadwinner and female full time unpaid carer model where you have usually quite a patriarchal household relationship with very high female economic dependence on marriage and the absence of any state support for care. That male breadwinner model is still in evidence in some parts of the world but it's certainly in decline.

The most common mode we have across the world today is what people refer to as a dual breadwinner model, where the male is the primary breadwinner normally, and the female is the primary unpaid carer. So the female has breadwinning responsibilities but also shoulders the bulk of the unpaid care. Obviously there are more female employment opportunities here but they are often part time, often the wife is working shorter hours earning less than the husband. There are limited female career opportunities because organizations discriminate against all women on the grounds that they're likely to go off and have babies; therefore they don't employ women. There are limited child care services provided by the state, in other words the household is still expected to do the bulk of care labour, but there is sometimes some emergence of some state services or some private care services.

Then you have what some feminists are referring to as the notion of a dual career household. This notion suggests that as adults we are workers. In theory at least in this model the care labour should be

shared between the breadwinners because everyone's doing a similar amount of paid labour. What you are getting there is obviously a greater equalization of female and male labour. Labour force participation of women is much higher with a usually high level of state support for care. I think the description Heidi gave us this morning of the US shows that the US is moving to an adult worker model but without state support to back it up and so it's obviously a much more class divided unequal picture that you see there but there are the Scandinavian countries like Iceland, Sweden and Norway which come closest to this model of more equal sharing of domestic labour. However women, even in the countries that approach most closely to this notion of adult workers, are still doing more unpaid work and men are still doing more paid work.

So, my conclusion. What are the main points I'm trying to put across? There is a gender penalty associated with care labour throughout the world which is why it's really important to have a feminist perspective on it. And there's a lot that we can share in our perceptions; internationally there are some very common patterns although that penalty is much greater in some regions than others. What we see now internationally in the labour market is the dominance of a dual breadwinner arrangement where men continue to be the primary breadwinners and women continue to be the primary carers but women are involved in paid work and breadwinning and men are to some extent involved in care labour. I think the role of the state in supporting care and regulating employment around things like working time is absolutely critical if we want to see more countries shifting from a male breadwinner or a dual breadwinner to a dual career regime. At the moment this isn't looking very hopeful because the state is in retreat. It's cutting back on the services that have made some of these progresses you've seen possible. Also, it's likely that unemployment will rise and it'll be hard for women to access the kind of jobs where they can get greater financial independence.

But I would like to finish on a positive weight. Actually when we look at the last 30 - 40 years, and this is the point we mentioned in

the end of the discussion this morning, a lot of the progress around reducing the gender penalty of care labour has come about because feminists got involved politically, because they got involved through bringing up their own kids to want a different life, especially their daughters. We're probably more successful with daughters than we are about sons. There are quite a few things that have been achieved through feminist action which actually I hope will raise the hopes for you, that you will also be able to achieve similar things in Turkey. I look forward very much to discussing these issues with you.

There are a couple of references if anyone's interested, the full reference to "The World's Women Report" and also if you're interested in this notion of different breadwinning, different care models, the article by Jane Lewis is also quite helpful.

Discussion

Participant: Thanks a lot, it was a great pleasure to listen to your interesting speech. You were talking about this dual career regime or dual breadwinner model. Maybe there is something that is being concealed or hidden there. I am sure this is also the case in the UK, but in Turkey we're witnessing this new regime with the intensification of migrant labour especially in the last decade; but women and men do not share the tasks equally. You mentioned its relation to class, but what is concealed here is that today, thanks to the availability of cheap migrant labour, middle classes can also afford paid domestic labour, just like the upper classes. Therefore, the flow of migrant labour from Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Armenia and many other countries to Turkey renders such equality possible, for middle class women as well; of course keeping in mind the class distinction. So, the picture you described disregards the informal economy to some extent. Most probably for England as well, but in Istanbul especially, the informal economy, especially as far as women's labour is concerned, is an area that cannot be disregarded. How would you comment on these two related points? Thank you again.

Jean Gardiner: Two really good points. I totally agree with what you said, I was sort of rushing a little bit towards the end; one of the points I was actually wanting to make is this notion of comparing dual breadwinner or dual career regimes. Sometimes you can think about it across different countries, but you can also think about it across different classes within a country. And you are absolutely right that, to the extent that there has been progress towards the dual career model in some countries, it tends to be much more likely depending not just on state provision, but also on the expansion of paid domestic work. I completely agree with that point, I think that paying somebody can mask certain things. I know I've been quoting statistics and this might seem contradictory; one of the things you can say about statistics is that they are very inadequate to some extent. Unpaid care labour is very difficult to measure and especially

unpaid care labour, which is of a mental, or emotional kind is much harder to measure by timing studies than physical care labour. So I think one could say that even if you have a society that looks very egalitarian, at least for some classes of women within the society, it's quite likely that there are still invisible forms of care labour underpinning that. I mean obviously employing someone and paying them to look after your children when you go out to work enables you to access the labour market and it means you are not having to do the child care during the day, but somebody, either the mother or the father has to come back at the end of the day and spend intensive time with the family. So if you are a parent, you can't get rid of the relationship you have with your children. So it's about asking what kind of relationship do mothers have with their children, what kind of relationships do fathers have with their children? Is that different, how is that different, how do we want it to change? So those are all very valid points.

On the informal economy, again absolutely... Actually another part of this report that I used has figures about the different employment relations of males and females and one of things that is very clear in Turkey is that about at least 20% of women who are involved in work are unpaid family workers. So you got quite a large economy, which is based on families and women doing productive work but not being paid for it. Obviously the picture I painted is somewhat simplistic.

Participant: *Hello and thank you. My question is somehow related to the previous one, but I will ask a very practical and short question. In Turkey especially maternity leave both for mothers and fathers is a factor affecting the amount of migrant labour and contributing to the expansion of informal economy. I would like to ask you what are the conditions determining maternity leave in the UK? What sort of struggle are the women engaged in for the improvement of the conditions of parental leave? Actually there is another debate going on: When women have longer maternity leaves, they will be more confined to domestic and care work. But as it is, neither fathers nor mothers can spend as much care*

labour as they would like to for their children and then the informal economy keeps growing and growing. So how would you comment on this? And what is being done in the UK about that? Thank you.

Jean Gardiner: Well, I would say that we sort of have a much better maternity leave than we had when I had my first child in 1980 and there were no statutory rights. I was given 6 weeks maternity leave when I had my son in 1981, we now have 52 weeks paid maternity leave and women also have an entitlement to take longer unpaid leaves and return to their jobs. I was looking again to the reports that say 16 weeks maternity leave in Turkey, I'm not sure whether these are up to date. But obviously you're right; this is an issue: If you give women entitlements to maternity leave, this can potentially have negative impacts as well as positive ones. I would say that overall it has to be positive. But I think what you have to ensure is, not just that the leave is paid, but that the law is enforced in a way that women are enabled to return to the work they have prior to the maternity leave, if they choose to do that. In the UK, we have had the regulation on maternity leave now for probably nearly 30 years, and we still find that the biggest source of cases of sex discrimination that women raise in the UK is about being discriminated against on the grounds of pregnancy and taking maternity leave. Because many employers try to downgrade women after they take maternity leave. So we have good laws, but it still is a terrain of struggle. But I think it is another example of how the feminist movement did achieve a very important change. As to the negative side of the maternity leave, I suppose there are two issues really: One is that the more successful we are at fighting for better maternity rights, there are more firms responding to this by saying they don't want to employ women. Because it creates trouble, then they have to find someone to employ while the women are on leave; so you have this battle going on. But personally I don't think that we can say, OK we better go back to not having maternity leave so that women get treated more equally in the labour market. I don't think that solves the problem, because what that just disguises is the fact that having babies is real work, it's very hard work and

you have to have time off in order to do it and if you want to have good relationships with your children, you need to have that period. Obviously one of the main problems is that because men don't take much leave, employers can discriminate against women. So it's an important battle to fight for fathers to have the leave. They have to take that leave, they cannot just say "My wife can do it happily instead of me, I want to carry on working." That's what they've done in Norway and in Sweden and I think they have fathers' days that fathers have to take; and it had a big impact, because men don't tend to take parental leave that can be used either by the man or the woman; but they do tend to take father's leave that only they can take. And it kind of promotes the notion of the father's relationship with the children being as important as the mother's relationships with the children.

I promise I won't speak very long because this is your time to talk; but because I was asked about informal economy I thought somebody might be interested: I was thinking that about 20% of employed women in Turkey are working as unpaid family workers but the number is actually much higher. According to U.N. figures, 38% of women work in informal economy on a family basis and therefore are not paid; so if you like, this is a form of unpaid work which isn't care labour, it's unpaid work contributing to a family business whether it's a small shop or a farm or some other form of family business. You see, in the UK it's a very, very small percentage of women who work in those kinds of employment relations. So for women in the UK, their main paid work employment relation is as an employee and that isn't the case in Turkey.

Gülner Acar Savran: *First of all, I would like to thank Jean for her speech and for coming here. I have a very concrete question in fact. But before I ask my question, I would like to remind you that in many countries, because of neoliberal policies, the retirement age is being pulled upwards and the number of obligatory premium days is also increasing. And in Turkey with the latest social security regulation package, women were deprived of their right to early retirement, and the retirement age for both women and men has been pulled up. So, in our campaign called*

“We Want Our Due Back from Men” we basically raised two demands in order to make sure that care labour will be included in retirement pensions: One is to regain the early retirement right for women and the other demand is the right to retirement pension for full-time housewives at the age of 50 or 55. We raise these demands as the remuneration of the domestic labour they have spent and of course so that women can have a degree of independence within marriage when they reach a certain age. So, Jean said in her speech that in the UK care labour is taken into consideration within the framework of retirement pension mechanisms, I want to ask through what sort of concrete mechanisms?

Jean Gardiner: I think I can answer that quite quickly. Basically, we have a system of child credits that is a payment to the primary carer in the household. It’s an amount of money that usually women, but occasionally men if they are the primary carers, receive for having children up to age twelve. So what happens now is that if you haven’t made social security contributions through employment but you have received child benefit then you automatically get credited for pensions.

Berrin Hatacıköglü (moderator): Ok. I will take three questions and then the answers. One person from the back...

Gülsüm Coşkun: As you said in your presentation, for women who are involved in unpaid domestic labour and care labour activities, their employment in the labour market is closely related to care labour. I would like to raise a point that was not mentioned in the presentation though: How do you approach home-based work? It is estimated that in Turkey about 30% of women work without any security and the figures presented by TUIK (Turkish Statistical Institute) confirm this information and 90% of women carry out home-based paid work. So, they do something at home and generate income, but they are not acknowledged as employees and are barely included in the statistics. If I am not mistaken, the percentage of home-based women employees in the UK is 75%. How do you approach this? Home based-work and domestic labour are very much intertwined. How do you see home-based work within your general approach to domestic labour?

Fatma Gök: Well this is not really a question, but rather a statement. But first of all, thank you very much. I was really very excited and I would like to thank all my friends in the Socialist Feminist Collective for organizing this event. What I would like to mention is another form of care work women carry out extensively. However, in this form of care work, women spend mostly emotional and mental labour. Women's relation to their children's school constitutes a very important sphere in women's relation with the education system. This task, indeed, can get so intensive that it may take a full-time commitment. For instance, a couple of years ago, we shifted to a new programme in Turkey, i.e. to the structuring education model and to an active teaching method, which –seemingly– positions the student at the center. But we see in the newspapers that many women have to go to internet cafes to do the homework of their children. In addition to that, since as a result of neoliberal policies the state's per capita budget for students is decreasing, public schools are going through a tough period. Now that they are not able to survive, they are trying to make sure that women take over. They have invented a task called "classroom mother." The Istanbul Provincial Directorate recently issued a circular saying that classroom motherhood should be encouraged. In other words, everything about the furnishing of the classroom, from buying curtains and furniture to cleaning the classrooms, and even the presents for the teacher, is put upon the shoulders of women. What sort of labour is this? Besides washing the dishes, doing the laundry and all other domestic tasks, women with children have to spend a huge amount of labour on this. I just wanted to mention this and I also would like to thank Jean for her presentation.

Güneş: Well, I also would like to thank you for your presentation and I thank the Collective for organizing this event. Maybe I misunderstood you, but in your presentation you touched upon masculinity and you talked about a certain common masculinity, sharing this profit let's say and forming a consensus. You implied that hegemonic masculinity is broader than patriarchy and that it doesn't necessarily overlap with patriarchal relations. Maybe I misunderstood, but what I would like to ask is this: There are different theories both on patriarchy and on

hegemonic masculinity. People like Brown can be cited in relation to hegemonic masculinity. Hegemonic masculinity is also said to be broader than patriarchy in certain aspects. What do you think about the relation between neoliberal capitalism, hegemonic masculinity and patriarchy? Do you think that patriarchy is no longer valid as a term, as an analytical category and is now substituted by hegemonic masculinity? Secondly, and included in the first question, can we define the state's role in (the building of) hegemonic masculinity through "male associations"? What is the relation between the state's integral and hegemonic relation to hegemonic masculinity? I would like to hear your opinion on these, within the framework of care labour or paid labour as analytical categories? Thank you.

Jean Gardiner: Ok, I think I'll deal with that question first and then I'll try to go back to the others. I used the term hegemonic masculinity and I think it kind of complements the concept of patriarchy, but I think it's more of a cultural concept than a material concept. I think somebody talked about identity this morning; how do we shape the identity we have? What masculinity means to me as a female or to me as a male, how we interpret our roles in society operates at a cultural level, if you like, and complements the material structural relationships in society. I think patriarchy is a structural concept, it focuses on material relationships and I was trying to focus on material relationships in most of what I said. But I think it's important that we are also aware of how culture interacts with material structures. I don't believe that material structures entirely determine how people behave in society. My own belief is that material structures are very important forces, but I think culture is also independently a force, and I also think human agency, human action is a force within society that can bring about change or that can bring about continuity in the structure and culture. So what I wanted to raise, I didn't have time to go into properly, maybe I shouldn't have raised it, but I wanted to actually say that on some occasions we need to think about how men and women interpret their femininity and masculinity.

There is a very useful work done by R. W. Connell in the US

who has written about masculinities and what he is arguing is that there are masculinities and the hegemonic form of masculinity is patriarchal; it's about hegemonic masculinity. I'm not trying to suggest that hegemonic masculinity is the concept that should be used rather than patriarchy; these are complementary concepts. It depends on what questions we are asking; you need to take into account culture as well as structure and material relationships.

Going back to the second question; very interesting observation that you made about how care labour is now going into schools because of cuts in the number of teachers and in the education budget; and the mothers are being expected to work for the schools. I absolutely agree with that comment and I think certain similar things are happening in the UK now. We've got major issues; crisis in our national health service. There are lots of really dreadful stories that are coming out about how elderly people especially in hospitals are not given proper care.

And it's linked to a lot of problems, but a major one is the fact that there are just not enough health workers employed in hospitals to take proper care of the elderly people. So families are now being encouraged to spend time; basically they are being told that if you are worried about your elderly mother in hospital, why don't you come in and make sure she is properly cared for. It's a similar issue really; I think we are operating more at the level of care for the elderly than care for the children in the UK.

Your question, at the back, about home-based domestic labour; obviously it's a very important point and I do accept that in my discussion I was mostly referring to formal employment situations; I didn't really address the issue of home-based employment. I would say however that we have to look at home-based employment. There are probably a lot of different types of home-based employment coexisting. Traditionally, home based employment was very low paid, very exploitative if it was paid at all, and obviously family work that is often done at home wasn't paid. One of the most long lasting organizations that came out of the feminist movement, in first wave

feminism, is an organization that tries to mobilize and organize home workers in the UK and they have had success in trying to provide support for these workers. So I think it's obviously depending on the nature of the home work, which you will know more about than I do in Turkey. It is an area, which provides scope for organization, and obviously the connections with care labour are obvious; because often the reason why home work is carried out is because we have care responsibilities and we cannot leave the home so the two things are connected.

Participant: *Now, after all that has been said, I have started to question paid domestic labour. Is it really a good thing for women? Assume that we have started to calculate and have determined some criteria. How far can it go? Are we going to say, "I gave my child this much love, so I should be paid that much for this"? I feel like we are going through a very alienating process. This may be a philosophical question, but to what extent is it right or humane to calculate the value of this labour and pay for it? I started thinking that we need to question this, not only for women or for domestic labour, but also in normal work life.*

Ayşe Durakbaşa: *I would also like to thank the Socialist Feminist Collective because they gave us this opportunity and we are here to discuss with feminists from the West; this is, I think, very important. We were talking in the coffee break with one of my friends who works at The Women's Library here in Istanbul; we were saying, no matter how informed feminists are, especially in terms of knowledge, we run the risk of not realizing the potential monopoly that exists in terms of feminist information and feminist knowledge; because most of the time there is a Western orientated feminist knowledge and we approach politics from a Western perspective. In this sense, I think it is very important that this conference has been organized here in Turkey. Making this encounter possible and the new discussions and questions that will emerge as a result of this conference are very important. This time knowledge transfer will be from Turkey, a transfer of information through such a channel would be very important.*

How do we characterize Turkey as a country? Turkey is a country

which believes it is somewhere in the center when in fact it is in the periphery, perhaps a country which does not really know its position; or at least definitely a country distinct from the West. After having said all this, I have to say that like my friend who talked a few minutes ago, I was also thinking about my own individual life story. I separated from my husband six years ago and ever since I have been a single parent. I have two sons; one is 21 and the other one is 11 years old. When

I separated from my husband, my younger son was about three years old. I can't say his exact age, because as you all know there is always a period of separation before the official divorce takes place. Anyhow my younger son, I can tell, was quite young. When I think about that whole process, the issue of care labour must really be subject to calculation and feminists must think about it in this way; but it will be meaningful, if and only if, we will formulate policies in the manner that Gülnur explained. Otherwise it will be a great blow to us women. Care is everywhere, care and labour are life itself; and we cannot do away with them in any way. I also personally think that we cannot turn this issue into an issue of constant negotiation or bargain. But then I think of these issues in Turkey and we are so backward in terms of social policies... I was thinking when Jean was talking about how care labour is included in the retirement pension... the situation in Turkey is so ridiculous: There is something called child benefit as you know, which is around 30 TL and it is ridiculous. It is not even clear what it is paid for... I am asking myself "what is my due, and who owes it to me?" Although it is true that I have some ties with the Feminist Collective, I now want to belong more, in terms of creating policies. I believe that the state owes us; the number of single parents is rising in Turkey and maybe we should come up with policies for these women to earn an extra income. These are the issues I wanted to bring to your attention, thank you.

Ece Kocabıçak: I would like to say something about the United Kingdom. In the UK, we said, social benefits for women, for mothers have been increased to a certain degree. But on the other hand, women are seriously encouraged to care for their children and the elderly. They are incited by these kinds of benefits; they are incited by the creation of flexible jobs

specific to women in the labour market. Flexible work is regulated by law and the majority of women work in flexible jobs in order to be able to do care work at the same time. The state supports mothers; and in England, currently, there's much less recourse to migrant labour in comparison to the US or Turkey. In the United Kingdom it is usually women themselves who take care of their children, the elderly, the disabled. So, when we look at the situation in the United Kingdom, we see that the burden of care labour is seriously on women's shoulders. And as far as I can see, feminists also supported this policy at the beginning. In debates on care labour, it seems that a kind of mystification was created around care labour like "care labour will best be provided by women, not by the public, nor the private sector"; and it seems that men were not really forced to do anything at all. Especially in cases of child care support, under the title "single parent," we see that women are considered as single, but most of the time they have a partner living in their household although they are not officially married... As far as I can see, due to high unemployment, gradually we are faced with a situation where the man is mostly at home unemployed, takes the child to the park once in a while, works from time to time in flexible jobs, but it is the mother who gets child support, does some kind of flexible work as the sole breadwinner and takes care of the child as well. Then in statistics it looks as if there are many single women, even though they are in fact couples. Of course I will ask for your opinion as well, but from my point of view, even though the state seems to be empowering women, the sexual division of labour seems to be deepening and reproducing itself.

Jean Gardiner: OK, I cannot answer all these points but I'll just try to answer one or two. I think there are always winners and losers. There are uneven processes going on, but overall I think we are probably now at a point where some of the gains in the UK are being reversed. I think that's very clear. I think the UK is very much a dual breadwinner economy; it's not a dual career economy. It's an economy in which –though there might be some women earning more than men– the vast majority of households are households where men earn more than women, men tend to work long hours, women tend

to work short hours, and you are absolutely right, women continue to shoulder the bulk of care in UK society. That could certainly get worse. I think female unemployment is rising more rapidly than male unemployment now; women are most likely to be losing out from the cuts in the public sector, both in terms of jobs and in terms of care services. So at the moment the picture is pretty negative. I suppose what I was trying to do in my talk, was that I was trying to take a longer view, because I think it's important that we don't just talk about the present. I think it's too depressing to just talk about the present, it can go all the way to thinking UK is terrible, Turkey is terrible, let's all give it up. What I was trying to say is that actually there have been some gains. I'll give you another example, which might answer your point as well, and I apologize if I gave the impression that

I'm arguing that care labour should be paid, that was the opposite of what I am arguing. We had campaigns for wages for housework in the UK many years ago and most of us fought against those demands; and I still believe that to campaign for payments for unpaid work, especially if these are payments for mothers rather than parents, a) it's not going to work because as you said it can't be properly measured, b) it reinforces the gender division in society. What I was trying to talk about was how care labour and wage is organized on the basis of gender inequality in society as a whole, both in terms of paid work, in terms of political participation, political power and leisure activities etc etc. I'll just give one example of something that might seem very small, but again it has to do with the overall division of wealth in society. We shouldn't just think of income, I know many people don't have much of wealth, but in the UK the main wealth that most working people have is access to a pension and maybe a house they own. Prior to the feminist women in the UK, women's care labour wasn't counted in the law as entitling women to a share of wealth because all wealth was deemed to be produced by the person who brought money into the family.

One of the gains of feminism is that now when couples divorce, the divorced wife has a right to a share of the household wealth and her

care labour, her role in care labour, bringing up children is counted in the settlement. So if a wife has spent many years doing unpaid care labour, that is, counted, it may still be not counted enough, but it is counted. So those are the kinds of things. I am not saying that care labour should be paid, because I don't think that's the solution; but in the case of pensions, it's not that care labour is paid, but care labour is treated as a contribution to society that is equivalent to being employed and it's a tremendous achievement that we've been able to establish that. And I think we have to see this, still accepting that there is enormous gender inequality and it may be getting worse at the moment and it may continue to get worse for the next ten years. We have a government now that is doing all they can to avoid its responsibilities under the European Union. I don't know if you are familiar with gender mainstreaming in the European Union, but the governments in the EU are supposed to take gender explicitly into account when collecting statistics, when reviewing policy, when developing new policies. That is a requirement of European Union countries. And again it's something that has been fought for by feminists. All I'm trying to say is, if you look historically over a long period of time, then the feminist movement has achieved smallish but significant gains and it's therefore worth carrying on the fight because you can win certain improvements. I suppose, maybe I've become a rather boring social democrat with age and I have lost heart like Heidi because at present there isn't even a socialist party to be talked of in England. The Communist party doesn't exist anymore. And when you live in that sort of a society you somehow have to go on living and struggling for whatever changes you can. I don't know if I have answered your other question. I hope what I've said has met your questions one way or another.

Özgün Akduran: *Hello, my name is Özgün . Before I move onto my question, I would like to make a comment, I hope you don't mind; it will only be 2 or 3 minutes. Actually I have just finished my doctoral thesis so it is like I had a brain concussion so to speak because it has taken so long. And my thesis was about gender inequality and the relationship*

between care labour and gendered budgeting; that is the focal point of my thesis. I am not sure if I have been able to answer this question properly and I am very happy about this conference, which has been organized by the Socialist Feminist Collective. Because all our friends who have contributed to this conference have done it without expecting anything in return; a conference for women with women by women...

So what I am trying to say is, when discussing social policies we always thought that this was an instrument for social control. When social policies were first coming into being in the UK in the Beveridge report or with T. H. Marshall's definition of citizenship, they were actually institutionalizing the family and constructing it as a mechanism of social control for the perpetuation of the capitalist system; and within the family, defining the woman as the carer, mother and wife; they were designed to allow for the most suitable environment for her to execute her duties as a carer, mother and wife. And this was true of social policies on an international scale. Social policies were considered by social democrats or by some socialists, as a way of decommodifying people, by allowing them to have a sustainable life through free education and health care, without having to earn money. This early conception of social policy believed that social policies were successful to the extent that they decommodified people, allowing them to go on living without having to earn money. As far as I can see, now that everything has a price, everything including health and education is commodified, the labour market has shrunk, wages are going up, capitalism is undergoing a crises of expansion and investment, and people are drawn into another massive unemployment and desperation; current social policies seem to be trying to resist all of this by expanding the labour market as much as possible and by pulling wages down, and by mobilizing women's labour to these ends. The higher the number of women entering the labour market as members of the reserve army, the more wages are pulled down; thus, on the one hand women will be working and capitalism will perpetuate itself with lower labour costs; on the other hand for these women to be able to work outside, care work and domestic responsibilities must continue, because labour power must be reproduced as a commodity and hence

cared for. For humanity to continue its existence this care work has to continue too; and this is a problem. Nowadays, it seems that social policies are considered to be successful, not if they can decommodify but on the contrary commodify people. To the extent that a person, man or woman, can become a part of the labour market, whether it is flexible or not, social policies are apparently deemed to be successful. And the question that I have not been able to answer myself - maybe in the future I will be thinking like Heidi, and maybe that is how I am thinking even now.... Although my age and my interrogations in this field have a shorter past than hers, and I am relatively younger, when I started reflecting upon these issues, I criticized social policy from a Marxist and socialist perspective. At the point that I have reached right now, although we keep saying that women cannot be happy until capitalism is abolished as a system and patriarchy disintegrates as a result, it seems to me that in order for women to live an easier life and at least reach the level of illusory freedom that male citizens experience, to taste this illusory feeling of liberty, they have to become workers and be exploited by capitalism as paid workers, not only as unpaid labour. I believe that out of that situation of illusory liberty, at least a demand for real emancipation may be born. At this point, in order to allow women's access to paid work... when capitalism is already undergoing a crisis, it is also undergoing a reproduction crisis and care labour crisis. I think that, perhaps, social policies or policies of reconciliation of work and family life are on the agenda precisely because of this situation. I would like to add one last thing. Jean Gardiner made a very important point: International organizations and financial institutions realized the importance of women's labour because capitalism had to take it into consideration in order to sustain itself; it is very speedily heading towards a wall. There is talk of global public goods in the context of the Millenium Development Targets, they seem to take seriously women's and children's health; but as to how this will be realized, I don't believe anything is produced besides micro credits, and some development plans and projects. Under these circumstances, we have to tell them in their own jargon: If you include these among the Millenium Development Targets,

then there has to be universal access to free care service. Parallel to the direction in which capitalism is evolving at present, that is when it is drawing women into work life, trying to turn women into wage workers, the liberal conservatism in Turkey is trying to pay women within the home. Because of its conservatism, it doesn't push women out of the house, but pays them all the same. What I am trying to say is that, unless we have universal and accessible free child care service, unless we have nurseries in every neighbourhood, at the entrance of every apartment block, it seems to me we will not even reach that point of illusory liberty. Thank you.

Berrin Hatacikoğlu: At 5 o'clock we have to leave the hall. I am sorry there were 2 people who asked for the floor. Let's hear your questions but we really need to be very brief and act very rapidly. You will be able to ask many questions and we are going to have time for discussions tomorrow, because there is a session on what kind of feminist policies we need. I also have to give a few minutes to Jean also, so she can wrap up.

Patriciant: Our friend talked about having a child care center in each district, in each neighbourhood, in each workplace; and a question occurred to me: Who is going to work in those child care centers, in those nurseries? Maybe we need to also think about this. It is true that care work is women's burden and for women to be emancipated they have to free themselves of this burden. Whenever we talk about taking this burden off women's shoulders, we have in our mind a concept of welfare state. We're still viewing things from within the system and expecting state mechanisms to solve the problem. Perhaps in England this is still partially working, but in Turkey we cannot see that welfare state. If we approach the problem from the viewpoint of the care of the sick and elderly, when women don't do this work, it is transferred to hospitals and nurses and nursing is a sector which is 95% women's labour. There too we witness what our domestic worker friend referred to, that is, two women confronting one another: A woman is wasted within the system, so that another woman can have a career and have a better life. As you know, care work is not only emotional or intellectual

labour, it has a physical dimension as well. In Turkey, nurses care for the sick for very long hours and under very bad conditions; and when they go home, they are subjected to what is called “double care” and they provide services for their sick at home and their children. In other words, within this mechanism there are serious physical problems. What are the mechanisms we foresee when thinking about women’s liberation, will women be in those jobs once again?

Fulya: I would also like to thank everyone who contributed to the organization of this event. I would like to thank the interpreters as well. When we talk about the dual character of social production as production and reproduction, we always refer to the distinction between the public sphere and the private sphere. In the feminist theory on women’s labour, especially after the 1970s, the oppression of women and the exploitation of women’s paid and non-paid labour were considered to be based upon the distinction between home and workplace. We also see that here, workplace is specifically a male sphere within the general concept of the public and home is specifically a female sphere, care labour being related to this sphere. However especially when we think of the post-80s, the 90s and even to this day, can’t we say that this conception underwent a transformation? Maybe we can put the question the other way round: Is it because care work takes place within the private sphere that it is a feminist issue? However, women’s participation in a production process in the public sphere is formulated by concepts which we associate with the private sphere. In other words, when women work outside they work in women’s jobs; for example in factories it is women who do the cooking; or again care at home and care at school are intertwined; complex ties are formed between the two spheres. From the 90s onwards, domestic labour has gained a vital importance for capitalism; with the cuts in the social services, there forms a process called housewifeization. On the other side, looking at it from the point of view of the family, due to the poverty caused by neoliberal policies there is a need for the proletarianization of the woman, for the sake of the family budget; this is of course a necessity for capitalism as well. In other words, while being pushed to the private sphere, there is a need for the woman to go out to the public sphere. With

reference to the question posed a while ago, home-based production has become a perfect solution and a perfect formula for capitalism.

Considering all this, I believe that a new feminist theory should be produced in relation to this distinction between the public and the private. Is this distinction still valid? And when theorizing on the period we live in, how should we reconsider this distinction? Thank you.

Berrin Hatacıkoglu: Well, I want to have this as the last question and we will wrap up accordingly. So we have only 5 more minutes left.

Jean Gardiner: Ok well, you made some really, really useful contributions that I can't really do justice to. I just want to say that I think the last points made were more contributions to discussions than questions. I was sort of trying to search for questions, and the questions weren't particularly there. What I'm very pleased about is that this is really good discussion. I'll talk about two or three points to try to bring the discussion together as a summary. I think one of the questions that keep coming up during the discussions is, "why do women care?" And I think I tried to answer that a little bit when I said actually there are a number of different kinds of social relationships within which women care. And some of the people in the latest contributions have been saying we don't actually want to forsake care, women want to be involved in care labour, it's not just an oppressive relationship. I think we just have to accept that we need women to express their voices about the kind of social relationships they want. Do women actually want to have child care centers in which they would get jobs, in which they can find some level of financial independence; or given the fact that they are going to work long hours for very low wages and not spend time with their own children would they actually prefer to care for their children? Just providing socialized care isn't necessarily the answer. I think different countries would find their own answers to that and I think it's a political question; it's about opening up political debate to enable women's voices to be expressed. And for us to accept that we are not necessarily going to agree with each other about the solutions that work for us... What we should be looking for is strategies that would

empower women, that would give women more autonomy to decide on what, how, what kind of choices they do want to make. I think the other thing that this debate brings out is that we've got to challenge the notion that care labour is something that is natural to women. The kinds of relationships we have are constructed in society out of the social relationships operating in the society. Obviously there is a biological element to women bearing the children, but the bulk of care labour isn't biologically determined, it's not based on biological differences between males and females. It's based on how, as I said before, we construct our femininity and masculinity in society, and how we can try to establish space for different kinds of construction of social care labour relationships. I'm sorry if I had no answers to some points but it's the best I can do.

Berrin Hatacikoğlu: Thank you very much. One final remark... Such a conference is always a considerable financial burden; without the individual and institutional contributions we would never be able to realize this conference. So I would like to thank everyone who made a contribution and I would like to thank the interpreters and our male colleagues who helped us with coffee and tea. We would like to thank them all very much for their contributing with their labour. Tomorrow at 11 o'clock we will talk about flexibility and female labour. So we hope to see you tomorrow. Good bye.

Flexible Work and Women's Paid Labour

HELENA HIRATA

Good morning. First, I would like to thank all of you for inviting me to participate in this conference, and especially to thank the organization committee for all the work they did for the success of this conference. I also would like to thank Ece for her kind e-mails although I was not immediately responding. Special thanks to Sezen who picked me up at the airport and welcomed me in French. I shall do my presentation in English. The organization committee asked me to do so. But my English is pretty poor, so I would like to thank the translators in advance for the hard job. Finally, I want to thank Gülnur Acar Savran, who translated my article for the magazine of the Socialist Feminist Collective, *Feminist Politics*. I am very excited to participate in one of the last sessions of the conference this afternoon. A lot of work was done yesterday, in the different discussions of Heidi's and Jean's papers. In these debates, we discussed many issues in depth, including possible different strategies, political strategies for the feminist movement.

My speech will focus on the transformations of professional work because domestic work has not changed so significantly. I shall concentrate my analysis on the transformation of waged work and on the issue of flexibility in women's employment in the current context of globalization. I shall also comment on the sexual division of professional and domestic work, and finish by presenting the French debate on the alternatives to flexible and precarious work; alternatives coming from public policies, alternatives coming from the jurists, from lawyers, lawyers who are specialists in social rights issues, and also alternatives coming from social movements, especially from the feminist movement in France.

Today, the activity rate for French women aged between 25 and 49 years is about 80%. French women constitute the majority of the work force in public administration and the public sector. These jobs are relatively well-protected concerning stability of employment. On the other hand, these women have benefited from the global trend concerning the polarization of women's employment. The share of women in senior professions and manager jobs is now around 30%. However, this access to qualified jobs does not change the general trend towards part-time and precarious employment in Northern countries, and the increase in informal and unprotected work in various countries, as it also seems to be the case here in Turkey. Indeed recent changes in work and production with the renewal of social inequalities have led to a significant change in the social division of labour, particularly in its gender division. Precariousness and informality in Northern countries is increasing in the absence of the protection offered by the welfare state, which is either non-existent, weakened or in crisis with the increasing adoption of neoliberal policies.

It is important to stress that globalization has more than one characteristic. I discussed these different characteristics in the paper you have translated.

Globalization builds itself upon the interdependence of all national markets through the creation of a united world market. However,

globalization does not mean homogenization; it doesn't suppress the existing diversity of work. Quite on the contrary, I believe that the process of the internationalization of capital sharpens the diversity and the heterogeneity of work and employment situations of men and women, and their ways of insertion into economic activities. So, I think that the globalization process has complex and contradictory consequences, which have affected employment in its quality regarding gender during the 1990s and 2000s. In general, male employment has been in regression or at least in stagnation. It was the liberalization of trade and the flexibilization of employment, which have led to these consequences and to increased employment and paid work for women at the world level. The problem with this increase in women's employment, which we all witness and which has been underlined by all the feminist economists, is that this has not been an increase in good employment, stable, well paid and secure employment, but an increase in vulnerable and precarious employment. So, there is definitely an increase in women's employment, however, the quality of this employment is far from being decent. And these kinds of jobs offer almost no possibility of promotion or career and social rights. These are often limited or non-existing. Thus, we can say that all these jobs that have been created do nothing to eliminate or suppress the global informalization and precarization of work. Furthermore, there are dissimilarities in this process, even amongst the European countries.

The North of Europe and the South of Europe have different conditions, different inequalities, i.e. with regard to unemployment or with regard to women's activities. In my paper I presented different data on different kinds of employment.

I would like to speak more about the situation of the poor or single-parent families; however I don't have time to elaborate on each of these in detail. I shall only speak about one phenomenon, that is, about part-time employment and the question of flexibility. Before going into the question of what flexibility is and what it means in different situations, and mostly in the development of part-time jobs

for women, I want to remind you that today's world is marked by a global crisis; financial crisis, social crisis, economic crisis. We will probably discuss the effects of this fact during the debate. I want to briefly mention a few points for the moment. Today's economic crisis is globally changing all the conditions, and this was already stressed yesterday by Heidi and Jean. We cannot talk about the same conditions for the beginning of the 2000s and for today, more precisely for October 1998 and today. Job losses in the industrial sector have now been compensated by the creation of employment in the service sector. This also changed the sexual division of labour. I was in Japan recently for four months to complete my fieldwork about care workers in institutions, in nursing houses and in households. I observed that, at the end of 2008, a lot of men were dismissed from their jobs with the pretext of the collapse of Lehman Brothers. Many enterprises were shut down at that time, and many men became unemployed.

The Japanese government offered them the possibility of having free training in the care sector for taking care of elderly people. Without paying anything, they could gain the skills required for taking care of elderly people in three to four months. Today, in Japan, men constitute 35-40% of the workers in nursing houses. It is a paradox because in the other countries, like France and Brazil, this is less than 10%. In Japan, a large number of male workers now work in a sector, in which the required skills have traditionally taken to be natural female skills.

And these men are in a female sector in one of the most macho countries I have ever seen. Japan is a very male oriented, macho and patriarchal society. It is a very striking paradox.

About flexibility then... I think since the 80s, we talk about flexibility in different senses. The term refers to organization of work when we say, for example, flexible factory. In England, a researcher, Anna Pollert, discussed the question of flexibility and flexible factory. Flexible also refers to the labour market; the flexibility of work and employment. In this sense, it means part-time jobs and reduction of

working time. The term is also ideologically marked. It is taken to be a neutral term or is even considered positively, because it means adaptation, facility of adaptation. However, it indeed indicates a management practice where flexibility is synonymous with precarity. The management would not like to show us this aspect. In all of Europe, and in Japan, flexibility politics characterized the economic policies and the labour laws since the beginning of 80s. In Japan, during the 80s and 90s, a great deal of flexibility was introduced through the contract based employment policies, for the companies.

The flexibility of employment, since around 1975, resulted in atypical forms of employment –atypical in quotation marks, because it is more the typical rather than the atypical employment of today–, like the development of temporary work or the development of limited duration jobs. In France, we can mention CDD (Contrat à Durée Déterminée/Contract of Limited Duration), subcontracting, or assisted contract, a special contract of employment for which the State pays a part of the salary and the company, or the enterprise or the association pays the other part. From 80s up to now, we are witnessing the development of part-time jobs with strong State intervention, with subsidies. For example, in France, while the rate of women in part-time jobs was 18% in 1982, it rose to 30% in 2010. In 30 years we had an increase from 18% to 30% in the rate of French women working in part-time jobs. This is a vast increase, because the employment pattern of French women had always been full-time employment since the end of 19th century. Due to this full-time employment pattern of French workingwomen, France has a tradition of a good deal of crèches or kindergarten, and nurseries.

The French case differs in this regard from the Netherlands for example, or from the United Kingdom or Sweden, where the rate of part-time working women has been higher. In the first trimester of 2011, the rate of working women employed in part-time jobs is 76% in the Netherlands, 43% in the UK, and 40% in Sweden. The data are from Eurostat. I discussed in my paper that the case of Bulgaria is quite different. The rate of women working part-time is

only 2%. Even today, in 2011, the rate of all part-time jobs is 2.6%, and therefore the rate is low for women. In Turkey, it is a bit strange. When we look at the data of the last 3-4 years, the rate of part-time working women amongst working women is 13.5%. I think this is quite high under Turkey's conditions.

It is important to stress that besides temporary work and apprenticeship, women and young people are employed in almost all those jobs without any employment security, like those with CDD. It is mostly young women who are employed in these kinds of jobs, which are very precarious. It is also necessary to state that labour and work precarization cannot be dissociated in the analysis from family precarization, because often, precarious work of a woman also means family precarization. Single-headed families (by women) and poor families are at the same time precarious families. Finally, again it has to be stressed that it is the public policy in France which increases this precarization. In the last years, public policy of employment in France, through the creation of RSA (Revenu de Solidarité Active/Active Solidarity Income), or through the creation of underemployment, short-time employment, part-time employment, reinforces the situation of precariousness. It is not oriented towards creating more stable jobs, and this itself is a problem for women's employment.

We can use various indicators, statistical or social, to describe informal or precarious work. I will mention three of them. The first is the lack of social protection and social rights. Informal work consists of activities realized without social protection, so without social security, without pension after retirement, without holiday pay and so on. Even in developed capitalist countries, rich countries, most people don't have these benefits. So the first indicator is characterized by social rights, by lack of social protection. For example, paid domestic work is done by immigrant women in countries like France, Spain, or the United Kingdom. They do not always have social rights and social protection.

The second characteristic or indicator of precariousness is the

length of the work day: fewer hours than a full-time job offers. Fewer hours imply low wages. Low wages conduce to precarity. A working woman in France may have a part-time job with CDI (Contrat à Durée Indéterminée/Contract of Unlimited Duration), not with a limited duration contract, but a normal contract. She would have a very short working week, like 17 hours per week, and thereby would have a low wage. The result is precariousness, even with a regular employment contract.

The third indicator of informal, precarious work is low-level skills, works carried out without formal skills, and generally with low wages. Low wages conduce to precarity, to underemployment. These three indicators show that there is a strong sexual division of precarious work. Women outnumber men in informal work, in all countries, but especially in Southern countries. This is also the case in part-time jobs.

I will give three examples for flexibility in the organization of work, that is, flexibility in the first sense of the term I mentioned above, or of the flexible factory as we call it. These three examples are from my fieldwork in different French firms operating in Brazil. I will give examples of three different kinds of flexibility in the organization of work corresponding to three different kinds of sexual division of labour. The first example is from a food factory, where flexibility and team work were designed only for male workers, while women working on the packing assembly lines were forced to carry out work and production at very high speed rates. Women were working on a production line, whereas men were without lines, in teamwork, they were in flexible work.

The second example is from a car wind screen manufacturing business. Here we have the inversion of the form of the sexual division of labour. The factory consisted of a feminine ghetto in the form of a white room where manual dexterity skills, precision and hygiene were required. On the other hand, there were male jobs carried out by machines such as placing the windscreens in the furnaces and taking them out, etc. However, when a flexible organization was

introduced, men were the only ones who benefited from an active re-training policy. When the flexible factory was installed, it was only men who could work there, because they were the only ones having had the training for this flexibility.

So, it is generally the case that when there is a technological change, women are dismissed. I observed many times in the companies in France, Brazil and Japan, that when a technological change was introduced, one technician, of course a male technician, and for instance, 20 women who had been working before in the production lines were dismissed. The last example is from a pharmaceutical firm where the impact of the retraining process on women was very negative; by the way they were made to participate in the new organization or innovation.

Women did have access to training, but there was another division that affected them. This was the division between, manual posts and machine operating posts for women and more technical and supervision posts or engineering posts for men. Yesterday, nowhere in the discussions, neither in the morning nor in the afternoon, did we talk about the problem of the glass ceiling. Usually, the positions that require management skills and responsibility are occupied by men, and there is some kind of a glass ceiling that prevents women from moving upwards. This was the case in this pharmaceutical firm. Both the female and male workers had access to training, did gain skills, and could participate in the new technological processes. But the managers, the directors and the supervisors were all men and women were only workers.

I was supposed to talk 30 minutes, but I want to take five minutes more to talk about the alternatives. I have already said that there are alternatives being developed against flexibility and precariousness. One of these alternatives comes from legal scholars specialized in social law and social rights. They propose something like an activity contract, which covers different kinds of unemployment periods, like the training periods or illness periods, rather than a contract for a specific job signed with a certain employer. They say that there

must be different partners working together in offering this kind of special contract. Because not only the employer, but also different organizations are necessary for the organization of retraining, training or other kinds of opportunities that might be assured financially with this new contract. The problem with this alternative is that this becomes possible only if you have a stronger social security; a mechanism of social security which can guarantee that all these different organizations work together to deal with the different kinds of situations in order to create a professional opportunity for a person. Another alternative of the same kind is the cooperation of employers and the state to create what we call flexisécurité in French, a flexible security. There is quite a good literature in the field of sociology of work about the term flexisécurité, and the examples are generally from the North of Europe, especially from Denmark since Denmark has had this experience for a longer period and now it is quite well established.

I want to finish with the alternative of the social movements and in particular the women's mobilization. I think we had a good victory in 2006, when we had a massive mobilization of more than one million of people in the street against CPE (Contrat Première Embauche). It was called the first employment contract and it was introducing precariousness for the young people and young students in their first employment. The law was designed to make it easier for the employers to fire the employees in their first employment. Massive protests were held not only by students but also by the families. You could see the mothers, the fathers, the grandmothers, babies in strollers, all in the street protesting against the precarization of young people in their first employment. The law was already adopted, but in the face of the protests, the government had to withdraw the law. It is not applied. I think other different struggles in which women's movement and many women groups were involved, were the struggles against precarious jobs, like the ones in McDonald's, or in the hotels of Accor group, for example Concorde La Fayette in Paris. Again, for example, there are many small libraries which

have young employees with a short duration contract, and which can easily fire these people. The struggles, the strikes or protests in the last years were mainly against precarization, against part-time jobs and dismissal of workers. Precarity and part-time jobs are not chosen but imposed on employees. You cannot choose to work full-time in a supermarket or in a big department store, because they only offer and therefore impose part-time employment.

There are many organizations and platforms, including trade unions, struggling against precarization. Within these, or struggling with them, are many women and women's groups or organizations, like CNDF (Collective Nationale des Droits des Femmes/ National Collective of the Rights of Women). There are also platforms active around precarization and flexible working conditions at the international level. World Women's March is one of the important components of this movement and is struggling against precarity, poverty and violence against women. Of course, women's organizations are not only part of a movement against precarity and flexibility, but also part of a larger counter- or anti-capitalist movement as it is the case in France.

Thank you very much.

Discussion

Yıldız Ay: Hello, I am Yıldız Ay from İMECE Trade Union Initiative. There is a new development on the domestic workers' front in Turkey. Nowadays, women (employers) hire us to work for half a day. They say, "If you earn 80 liras a day, I'll give you 40 liras for half a day's work." They say half a day but they make you do a full day's work.

Besides this, migrant domestic workers are made to work like slaves. They do not have visas and are employed "illegally," without work permits. Those who are employed as "live-in domestics" live under very bad conditions. They usually sleep in laundry or ironing rooms. How could we create a pressure on the government to make them live and work in Turkey legally under normal conditions? What kinds of rights can the government guarantee?

Also, I am working for an Italian company. I signed a contract with them when I started to work. I've been working for them for 2.5 – 3 years and now they are leaving.

What can I do about it, is there any legal right that I could claim? We don't have any legal employment rights, but at least I have a contract, which shows I have been working for them. I've been working once a week and now they are moving back to Italy. So can I claim any rights? We have many troubles in such cases because we don't have any rights. Thank you very much.

Helena Hirata: Yes, it's very important to speak about the situation of migrant workers. But before that, about domestic workers: I think "half a day" is a very flexible way of having people to work. Because in half a day you can work more intensively and then you're tired and you cannot work another half a day, so you go home with your 40 liras. I think it's very similar to the situation of women in the service sector in various countries. I know that in Canada in the call centers, and in France in the supermarkets, they work during the busiest hours. And then, they must go home. And when the number of clients increases they have to come back to the supermarket, even

if they live far. Living far is their problem, not the problem of the employer. So in the supermarkets, there are a lot of workers during the busy hours, like from 5 pm to 8 pm. In France all the shops are closed from noon to 3 – 4 pm because they have siesta time. People don't go shopping in the supermarkets during these hours; these are the hours when there aren't any clients. So you don't need employees. They have very flexible time schedules; they come early in the morning, then they go home, and some of them come back at the end of afternoon, and others at 8 – 9 o'clock. Because now there is flexibility of duration, you have supermarkets which are open from 8 am to 11 pm in France. Carrefour in Paris is open until 11 pm. So you have a very long working day; you are not obliged to be there from 8 am to 11 pm; but you come and go back home and you come and go back home.

In Canada, the research of the Carnegie Group on the health problems of women workers shows that you see the same phenomenon in the call centers where women have different time schedules for each day. One day is never like another in terms of working hours. So they say that they cannot hire a babysitter, because a babysitter cannot adjust to the diversity of working hours, changing from day to day, and because she must work, or is already working in other houses, or has to study because she is a student. They cannot come at different hours every day. So it is a big problem for the organization of the life of these people.

Concerning the problem of migrant workers, I think the situation of migrant workers without visas or documents is very difficult. In France, we have probably more migrant workers than in Turkey, because France is really a country that was built on the work of migrants who came to work in the secondary sectors: in factories, for example car factories, and also construction work. Now there are a lot of migrants; but the recently arrived migrants do not have and will never have documents, even the old migrants very often do not. We can see in France now the big movement of sans-papiers. Sans-papiers means “without documents.” I think in the US, there

is a similar mobilization of migrants who have no documents. Ruth Milkman, an American researcher, did a lot of research about Latino migrants in San Diego in the western part of the US, and she shows the struggle of migrant workers who do not have documents and ask for documents.

In France it is similar. We have a lot of mobilization and with some success too. They are now supported by trade unions like CGT, General Confederation of the Workers, also CFDT, and SUD, a more leftist union. These trade unions do a lot to support the sans-papiers. Migrant women who work as domestic and care workers also began to struggle to obtain papers. Most of them are from Northern Africa; Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia and also from Black Africa; countries like Congo, Senegal, Mali. We have a lot of sans-papiers from these countries. These women had the support of the legal unions. A certain number did manage to obtain papers and legalise their situation. But they struggled very hard: They occupied some buildings and churches and lived in bad conditions for several days, weeks, until they obtained their documents, papers. But I think in France today, you have continuous mobilization of sans-papiers. In French, papier is a masculine word as le papier. So we say sans-papier, a masculine word. But women say, “We are sans-papières”, they feminize the word. By doing so they have changed the language.

Dilek Hattatoğlu: *I'd like to make a contribution. When we talk about “flexibility,” “globalization,” and “changes in working conditions,” the most important thing is the changing organization of work and out-sourcing. That is to say, the production process goes outside factories and is carried out either in small workshops or in homes. Home-based work has become more and more popular throughout the world, whether you name it the North and South, the East and the West, or the First and Third world countries. “Home-based work” has been spread alongside out-sourcing systems. Now women make up almost 90% of home-based workers all around the world. Therefore the term, “home-based work” refers almost exclusively to women. Now, I want to say something about the term itself.*

We can talk about three different types of employment in terms of subcontracted work. The first is the old-style “home work” and it is a type of subcontracted work carried out in homes. The second one is work on order. And the third one is working for oneself, or on one’s own account, but it is different from micro-enterprises. Now the term “home-based work” started to be used widely, after a convention on home work was adopted by ILO in 1996. The idea was to include independent, non home-based subcontracted work as well. So I think we should talk about that as well. I just wanted to say this as a reminder.

Since 1975, there are many organizations of home-based workers throughout the world. Home-based work is characterised by long and irregular working hours as well as irregularities in receiving work and really low wages. So why do women work home-based? Because they take care of children, disabled people or the elderly, and it is expected that those two things, home-based work and caring can go together. Therefore, it is a type of work that people engage in with the expectation that they can earn some money while at the same time fulfilling their usual gendered responsibilities. However, research conducted worldwide shows that this is not true; women cannot at the same time take care of their children and earn money. The ILO has brought together a compilation of these studies. Because when you get a job, you have to finish it on time. You have to dedicate your entire time to it by working day and night. Therefore, when you are on a job, either your daughters fulfill your domestic responsibilities or they remain unfulfilled. Or men do bits and pieces under the name of “help.” At the end of the day, various elements of empowerment and some bargaining power are gained through this. For these women there are no other secure job options with better working conditions anyway. I am not talking only about Turkey, the same goes for many countries around the world. Typically, we see the same patterns everywhere. It is not true that women stay home, take care of their children and of the elderly and make money at the same time, no, this is not the case. This is the first thing that I want to emphasize about home-based work.

Second, there are new types of organizations and the home workers’

organization is one of them. Since the 1970s, regular trade unions do not pay attention to home workers neither in the West nor in the East. They have been more factory-, workplace- and male-oriented. Even though they have been losing their grassroots because of that, they are not very successful in changing their focus. So a different type of organization, called women's unions, developed. For example SEWA in India was established as "Self Employed Women's Association," but they have registered their organization as a trade union through a court decision. There is an embroidery workers' union in Madera, an autonomous region or rather an ex-colony of Portugal. During the Carnation Revolution in Portugal in 1974, women took over the direction of this trade union, which was established in 1938, and then began to organize home workers. And they have also organized themselves around the world as the organization of women home workers and they have sister organizations in different countries. All these organizations that I have mentioned were either established by women or women now operate them. For example in Australia, it was women who organized a regular trade union in the textile-shoe-leather sector. They have women's organizations in Chile, in Bolivia and in Turkey. In 2009, women established a home workers' union in Turkey. In Eastern and Central European countries, there are some organizations even if they are not officially trade unions.

I am talking about all these organizations at some length, because although we talk about female labour, care workers and informal globalization, no one mentions home-based work, the sector that women dominate.

One last word: I emphasize these organizations on purpose. Because home-based workers have a world organization, established in 2006 in Macedonia, and there are national organizations in different forms. In summary, we should not say, "The organization of production has changed and you are exposed to flexible working conditions. Patriarchy is already cornering you and the governments are also pursuing these policies... what a pity for us, what a pity for women." This is not the case; women continue the struggle. Thank you very much.

Firdevs Hoşer: What I understand from your talk is that part-time work

is the new type of employment in the world. While you were doing your fieldwork in different countries, did you ask women whether they prefer to work part-time? Apart from reasons such as child or elderly care, do they prefer working in such conditions for their own convenience?

Helena Hirata: Yes, I have interviewed many women, both those who were working part-time and those who used to work full-time in the past. But in the case of Japan, part-time working is very particular. Because part-time employment in Japan doesn't have a big difference of duration, it's only one hour shorter than full-time employment. The main difference concerns the working conditions. The wages are incomparably lower than in full-time jobs, they are not even half [of what you'd earn full-time]; for example they are much lower than in babysitting. It's very difficult for part-time women workers to find someone to care for their children. So it's very difficult for Japanese women to continue working after marriage and after they have children. The Japanese society wants them in the house to take care of their husbands and children. The part-time wage is very bad, you don't have holidays, and you don't have the possibility of entering a labour union, nor access to a retirement pension, or any other rights as a part-time worker. And still, a lot of women work part-time in Japan, because they cannot work like employers would want them to. I interviewed people who used to work full-time before having a child. After that, they had to work part-time, because they couldn't work from 8 am to 10 pm. To work part-time means you can go home at a descent time. If you're a full-time employee, you are obliged to be at work until you finish what you are doing. So part-time working means to reconcile working time with family life for a woman. Thus they cannot choose full-time work because it is not compatible with family life in the Japanese manner. Men go out very early in the morning and come back very late at night, after drinking with their colleagues and so on. On the other hand, even women who are not married often have to share their mother's domestic work. And care work for other family members is not compatible with a full-time job in Japan. So they work part-time.

Perhaps your question was: “Do women want to have part-time jobs to be at home with their children, or because they want to work fewer hours?” The second option is out of question in Japan. But in France, there are more people who want to have more time with their children and choose part-time working. But choosing to work part time is, I think, only possible in the public sector, for instance in schools and universities, and not in the private sector. In France part-time workers generally don’t work on Wednesdays. In the ancient tradition of France, Wednesday is the day for catechism, for religious education in the church. This is not the case anymore but the tradition of not working on Wednesdays persists. Those people who want to be with their children take Wednesdays off. I have never had Mercredi libre (free Wednesday), I never asked for a part-time job. But we can put the children in a nursery, so my son was also in the nursery. In France you have classes from 8 am to 2.30 pm and then they can stay until 4.30 pm in the nursery, so they eat at school, there is a canteen. It’s not the case in all the European countries. Of course you have the mother living, working or studying somewhere nearby; they pick up their children for lunch. But I never gave my child the possibility to choose between eating at home or in the canteen. The children say the canteen food was not good, and they prefer to eat at home, if you have the possibility.

We can say that in countries like France it is possible to choose part-time work. But generally not in the private sector, only in supermarkets and shops. However in those places you cannot choose, they offer only part time employment. I think the statistical data of the Ministry of Labour shows that 30-40% of people working part-time want to work full-time, but don’t have the possibility to do so. Part-time work in France is not like in Holland. You have the possibility of reversibility in Holland. You can take a part-time job but you can change it into full-time if you want to. In France we don’t have this option. If you want to change from part-time to full-time, you don’t always have the chance to do so.

Necla Akgökçe: Hello, I am Necla Akgökçe from Petrol-İş Women’s

Magazine. I actually wanted to say something about women's working conditions, about the ways in which insecure work manifests itself in the context of globalization; however, the discussions already took too long. I want to ask a question... You said that some women want to have secure and permanent jobs; I think permanent work has to do with how capitalist globalization has differently affected the North and the South. For example here in Turkey, women's work shifts can go up to 36 hours, especially in subcontractor companies. Once, women told me that they had to work for 36 hours continuously in order to finish an order. This is what secure and permanent work might mean for the women in the South. Of course there are some exceptions to that.

Secure part-time work in Turkey does not mean real security in the sense it does in France; it means what I would call a more insecure security. So, I don't know if I will be able to establish the connection, taking into consideration all these facts, but I would like to ask this: Globalization and insecure work have different meanings for women in the North and in the South. What do you think is the impact of patriarchal processes on this difference? With respect to capitalism, this can mean x or y ; but what would you say with respect to the effects of patriarchal processes, or the strength or the weaknesses of patriarchy on this issue?

Özlem Kaya (moderator): Let's take a few questions and contributions first. Then I will give the floor to Helena. Heidi, I think you wanted to say something; would you like to go ahead?

Heidi Hartman: Helena did you say why the number of part-time workers is increasing among women in France? I didn't understand how the changes and the economic structure created so many part-time jobs for women in France. And then I was hoping maybe you can tell us a little bit more about Denmark because it sounds kind of good.

Tuğba Baki: Rather than asking another question, I want to say that I think we have to ponder more on flexibility, and emphasize the relation between patriarchal processes and women being pushed into flexible jobs; because flexible work brings with it insecure work for us women. And it carries another risk; it fixes housework or domestic labour or care

work totally as women's work. We emphasized this issue in our own campaigns. For example last year, in our campaign titled "We Want Our Due Back from Men" our main slogans were: "Men should go home to take care of the children," "Men should go home to cook."

Therefore with flexible work, domestic work is imposed entirely on women. And this is exactly the goal; this is a system where capitalism and patriarchy feed and reinforce one another. Thus women will work in flexible jobs and fulfill domestic duties at the same time. Domestic work is "women's work" anyway. At the same time, women will also carry out tasks that could be performed as paid work, such as taking care of the elderly, the sick and children. But simultaneously, she will earn money in insecure jobs to generate income for the family. You gave an example from your own life, you said that your son had to stay at school until 4.30 pm. Then I have a question; why didn't his father go and pick him at 2 pm so that he could eat at home? Why didn't he cook for him at home if he wanted to have home-made food? So if we continue to analyze the subject from this point of view, without overlooking its relationship to patriarchy, to patriarchal capitalism, I think we will have a chance to analyze the issue in depth with a stronger feminist approach. Thank you.

Ece Öztan: First, I want to thank Hirata for her presentation. She provided us with very valuable empirical data. We were all very excited to see different forms of women's labour in such a clear fashion. Based on everything that has been said so far, I'd like to make a contribution. I think it is very important what Hirata said about individualization that goes hand in hand with flexibilization, in terms of making the connection with patriarchy and understanding different forms of women's labour. Because today, there are different areas where there are constant attempts to individualize or to define labour in general, not just domestic labour on the basis of quantifiable/unquantifiable work. For example in the areas of health and education, there is a tendency to individualize and define different types of labour according to whether they are quantifiable or unquantifiable, on the basis of a particular distinction made with regard to gender. For instance, let's say that you are a nurse at a hospital; your performance is measured by your activities that can be checked by a list.

But at the same time, there is a dimension of emotional labour in your relationship with patients. Or when you work in a school, you engage in a different type of relationship with children. This type of labour is not individualised, on the contrary, it is rather gendered. Therefore we, as feminists, have to go beyond the discussion of domestic labour - paid labour, and we have to identify how invisible labour is being categorized as quantifiable or unquantifiable in the area of paid employment, and how this distinction works through a differentiation on the basis of gender. That's why I'd like to thank you very much for your enlightening presentation.

Hülya Osmanağaoğlu: Hello, now I'd like to say a few words, departing from our own discussions, on how secured flexible work came to our agenda in Turkey, and to ask about the situation in different countries such as France, Brazil and Japan.

There is an issue that we have very often had to take on our agenda, especially after 2008: There have been legal regulations under the guise of "increasing women's employment." Official circulars have been issued, there is constant talk of increasing women's employment, in the name of catching up with EU standards. For instance, it is propagated that insurance premiums should be paid by the state instead of employers. In fact, they are trying to transform women's labour into cheap labour that capitalists would prefer. I don't want to talk at length about the very limited right to nursery opportunities; the participants probably know that nurseries have become completely inaccessible. Secondly, within the framework of "reconciling family and work life," there is talk of women undertaking both domestic work and participating in wage labour. But under the circumstances where conservatism is getting ever stronger this very reconciliation of family and work life serves, in fact, to include women in paid labour by rendering women's unpaid domestic labour a permanent condition. Therefore it rather serves to include them in paid labour while at the same time rendering the patriarchal control of women permanent. There are several forms of work associated with that, such as micro-credits, home-based work models that Dilek mentioned previously, work on call or part-time work etc. They actually want to

take under registration all these forms of work. By doing that they want to tax them, while at the same time getting women to work under the secure flexibility model.

Some of our feminist friends in the women's movement argue, under the name of policies of "empowering women," that we should support policies increasing women's employment, even under these work models, with the precondition of secure flexibility. As for us, we published articles on this issue in our monthly bulletin, *Mutfak Cadıları* (Kitchen Witches), and in our magazine, over and over again; we even went to a meeting organised by TÜSİAD (Turkish Industry & Business Association) and the Minister of State for Women and Family, with our banners saying "We want work, but not flexible work." We believe that, as women we should emphasize what kind of employment we want. When we say, "We want to work but not in a flexible way," we mean that flexible employment is a model developed for unskilled jobs, as Hirata also mentioned. We say that secure flexibility is a model of work which confines women once again to unskilled jobs, and in which there are no opportunities to improve one's labour skills, no retirement benefits even when one is registered in the social security system, and no opportunities of permanent jobs. So is secure flexible work –at least today– a policy to be supported by feminists and the women's movement as a way to empower women? There is no doubt that increasing women's employment or increasing women's participation in wage labour has the potential of empowering women to a certain extent. This was also mentioned yesterday. To start working allows women to stand against men, but beyond this point, supporting such forms of work remains a controversial phenomenon for feminism. As socialist feminists, we defined the situation by saying "We want to work but not in flexible conditions." Are there similar discussions among feminists in Japan, Brazil or France?

Dilan: Hello, I have a question as well. We are talking about flexible working hours but many women are not aware of their rights as women. For example my mother wakes up at 5 am and she works until 10 pm. How am I to explain to my mother that she has the right to wake up at 10 am? We are talking and discussing here right now, but my mother

will wake up at 5 am tomorrow again. My grandmother used to wake up at 5 am too, and her mother used to do the same etc. So, what can we do to break this vicious circle or to solve this problem? Yes, we are about 250 women here talking about our rights, but how are you going to explain their rights to other women who are not here? How are we going to explain to them that they have rights to do certain things, or to object to certain things? Tomorrow everything will go on just the way it used to be. If I weren't here, maybe I would do the same things as my mother. So, I'd like to ask if we have any answers to these questions?

Helena Hirata: I think a lot of people may want to reply to the last question. I will try to answer most of the questions as much as possible but I don't have an answer for all of them. The first question was about working conditions and globalization. I think it is important to stress the element of insecurity. The concept of insecurity is not the same in all countries. Women in various countries who are affected by globalization are indeed not insecure in the same sense, because the process of the globalization affects women in Northern countries and Southern countries differently. And I think the person who posed this question wanted to add the concept of patriarchy, so she asked how patriarchy has different impacts on different countries alongside globalization.

I think, of course, patriarchy and capitalism are not separate from one another and so you can witness the simultaneous consequences of patriarchy and capitalist relations in each of these countries. For example, I remember in Malaysia, women workers in multinational companies had six times higher wages than women in the other companies in Malaysia. So we can say that this is the consequence of the varying economic situation of different countries; because these women were satisfied with their salaries that are relatively high for their home country but not in comparison to the wages in the host countries of multinationals. This is the consequence of the patterns of economic development, and wages are different between these two types of countries. A study was conducted among women working in a multinational corporation in New Delhi, India, which focused

on the cultural dimensions of the issue. The company hosts parties at night, where men and women socialize together, and consume alcohol. But they see that these parties are not part of their cultural habits and that they contradict the country's culture. So on the one hand, these women work, but on the other hand these activities have an aspect that is antagonistic to India's patriarchal structure. Whether this is progress or not is debatable from their perspective. Therefore, the responses that the researcher got from these women were contradictory. The questions that this researcher asked were not straightforward. In the end, the results neither corroborated nor refuted it; we saw in their responses that they were still not really confident about those kinds of anti-patriarchal practices. So we saw a convergence there, both capitalist and patriarchal dimensions of the issue were brought to light in this concrete example.

Heidi asked why part-time employment increased in France. I think the primary reason is the government's struggle against unemployment. Unemployment rates were very high, so part-time employment offered a possibility to increase employment. More people started to work, even though they were working shorter hours. In a similar vein, the government adopted a policy of reducing working hours, so that since individual workers were working less, more people would find employment and unemployment would decrease. This was the government's policy, but reduced working hours did not really trigger an increase in employment rates. The government subsidized the companies and employers to create an incentive. It was thought that this way, the cost of employing workers would be less for the employers, and that they would hire part-time workers. While 18% of women used to work part-time in 1982, now this rate is 30%. Today, 85% of part-time workers are women.

Someone inquired about the case of Denmark. I think it is important to state, from a social policies perspective, that in France and in other countries in Europe, we say that if we have to be unemployed, let's be unemployed in Denmark. There you can enjoy unemployment benefits, subsidies and other social rights.

Therefore my impression is that secure flexibility is more achievable in Denmark in comparison to France or the United Kingdom. Even though some poor conditions, like an increase in the unemployment rate, are also observable in Denmark lately, I think there is a good social panorama with regard to women. In Denmark and Sweden, we see more women in professional positions which require more skills. I am not an expert on Denmark but these countries seem to me to be good examples, women-friendly countries.

In response to Tugba's question, I want to say this: Of course, you might not know me personally. I actually have already said that I am a single mother, so I did not have a husband whom I could ask to pick the child up from school at 2 pm. So I was not able to ask anyone to bring lunch for my kid, but I never wanted to have a husband anyway, really. At the age of sixteen, I said, "I will never get married." Do you know why I did not want to get married? Because I saw those who did and the hardships they encountered while trying to get divorced. That's why I said I would not get married. Probably it was a mistake, because if I had done so, today I would own a house, I would be a rich woman. But I have never wanted to, never intended to do so. By the way, my child's father is not a rich man. But we decided not to live together while I would raise my child. His father decided to have a child with me, he wanted it. I also wanted it; I was 38, I was getting too old to have a child. When a friend of mine came and said let's have a child but not live together, I agreed. We never lived together. He was not a good cook; so I think he would not have been able to pick the child from school and cook him lunch anyway. I arrived in France in 1971, after having been in Japan and Brazil. It's been 40 years, so I have a French mentality. Working French women, women who work in universities full-time do not think that it is a good idea to prepare lunch for children at home, because they prepare dinner anyways. Preparing the dinner is already a burden. So since they prepare dinner, they think cooking lunch is not absolutely necessary. And I thought the same way, and I did not have a husband anyway; maybe I could have asked him "Do you prefer to cook lunch

or dinner?" if I had one. Anyway, I thought preparing the dinner was enough; it was enough to cook in the evenings after a workday and during weekends. But if you asked my child, you probably would not hear the same response from him.

In response to the question about flexibility and individualization, I want to say something about invisible labour. A big portion of the work that women do is domestic work; all kinds of emotional labour are forms of invisible labour anyway. We were talking about this yesterday. Heidi told us that her husband would tell her when to go on a vacation, when to use leave etc. You see, all the management of family life, birthdays, Christmas, gifts and so on, all of these are things that women will have to deal with even if domestic work becomes paid work. Because domestic workers do not deal with these, we do. And this is invisible labour. Even though they are not categorized as women's work or men's work, they are kind of invisible work that women perform. When you say women's invisible labour, we can just go on for three, four hours, so I will not go any further now.

And then there is Hülya's question. It was more a comment than a question, and I think we should think about these comments on how the flexible model is concentrated in unskilled jobs. Indeed, there can be differences across countries with regards to time and place. Flexible work is considered unskilled work, or as skilled work for women. At the same time, Hülya asked whether such feminist meetings were held in Brazil, France, and Japan. In Japan, no. The women's movement in Japan is very weak, almost non-existent. There are individual feminist intellectuals, but there is no movement. There are feminists in trade unions, so unions have a women's movement, but it is nothing like this. In France and Brazil, yes. Yes, there are socialist feminists and you have feminist movements. They have meetings. In France we will have a meeting of this big association, The French Center for the Rights of Women and we have all kinds of associations inside. We will have some activities on December 3 and 4th. In Brazil also, the situation of women is very good, because you

know Brazil is a very big country, and in its different states you have feminist centers, concentrating on different problems; body politics, contraception, abortion and employment. Sao Paulo will now be the base for the World March of Women, a global march that is organized by a feminist Brazilian engineer.

The last question was also more like a comment about her mother who always wakes up very early in the morning. I do not think you will do the same thing, since you are here right now. You will not reproduce this state of affairs.

Hasbiye Günacı: *I'd like to thank the women's labour platform of the Socialist Feminist Collective. You were saying that in France, part-time jobs women have in the public sector are secure work, and that women can choose it because they would like to spend some time with their children. This sounds like a terrible trap to me. Patriarchy is standing here, very strong. French feminists accept the French government telling them, "Work part-time so that we will drive the unemployment rate down, and then go home and serve patriarchy there." I'm sure French feminists are aware of this trap. Also, as for part-time jobs, women get paid less, don't they? Then this is another catastrophe. Be they part-time or full-time workers, everyone should get paid equal wages for comparable jobs. One more thing I would like to say about Japan: There, women stay at home because men want them to do so. We are not surprised to hear that. This is how it is in Turkey and around the world; this is nothing new, unfortunately. But my question about France is, and I think the same goes for Germany or Turkey as well, part-time work only helps to reinforce the gendered division of work so that women do the housework, and it is another name for exploitation, isn't it? I would like to hear your answer to this, if that's possible.*

Well, about gendered division of work, what is the cause of it? Is it because domestic work is unimportant that women do it? Or is it unimportant because women do it? Which way around is it? Divorce is not actually difficult; we are against marriage because this traps women. Marriage is an institution that puts you into a trap. Even if divorce was easy, we still should not marry.

Berrin Hatacikoğlu: *I used to work full-time until 2008, and then worked in flexible jobs for three years. I started to work under flexible conditions because I could not bear the hard conditions of a full-time job anymore. But when my economic conditions worsened, I started to work full-time again. Now I am saving money to get back to part-time or flexible work. This is not a praise for flexible work. During those three years, there were times when I worked for eight hours a day, but when I was working full-time, there were days when I was not even able to take a tea break. You have to work very hard. With part-time jobs, you could expect working in poorer conditions but you have time for yourself. Flexible work needs to be considered alongside the hard conditions of full-time work. In Turkey, going to work and getting back home takes almost 12 hours. And without your mother or a migrant worker helping you out, there is no way that you can make it work. So it seems to me that all full-time jobs should be actually part-time. Thank you.*

Helena Hirata: These two comments lead to the same conclusion: that everybody must have shorter working hours, women and men in all kind of jobs. Of course this is the ideal, and I think it is not possible to say that it is now the case. I know that working full-time is hard; it is very difficult especially when transportation takes long in addition to working hours that are already too long. In France, full-time work is 35 hours a week, in Japan it is 40 and in Brazil it is 44 hours per week. Yes, it is too long in Turkey. So it is a lot of time, and I completely agree that we need equal pay for equal work, and less working time for all. But I think that French feminists are against part-time employment, even in the public sector where the jobs are secure. Why? Because for feminists, part-time jobs mean partial wages and no possibility of promotion. It means no training, because training is offered only to people with full-time jobs. If you want to work part-time, for the employer it means that you haven't got sufficient commitment to work; they suppose that you prefer not to accord all of your time to work, but want to be with your family, with your child and so on. French feminists are against part-

time even in the public sector because women working part-time do not have career options. They cannot ask for more responsibilities and more interesting jobs when they are working part-time.

Feminist Politics Today Panel

Ece Kocabıçak (moderator): As you know, we have been conducting discussions on women's labour for the past two days and our purpose is to contribute to feminist politics. In Turkey and in the world, there have been interesting developments recently. As you remember, a while ago a police officer in Canada said: "As long as women don't pay attention to what they wear, it's normal that they are abused or harassed on the street." You might have also heard that a minister in New Zealand said, "gender division in labour politics depends on the menstruation periods of women." There have been some budget cuts affecting women's employment and 70% of the budget cuts are from financial benefits or subsidies given to women. We think that we are going through a similar process in Turkey. As you know, the prime minister constantly emphasizes that each woman should have at least 3 children. As we wrote in *Mutfak Cadıları*, in Konya families with three children pay less water bills than other families. Through legal regulations such as the "Omnibus Bill" or the recent "Social

Security Law,” women are made more dependent on the family and men, while they are pushed into the labour market under unequal conditions. Flexibility is becoming a form of work recommended for women. Women were already working in flexible and precarious conditions and now these jobs are being registered and thus being legalized. In addition to these issues, increased violence against women has become a pressing problem in Turkey. As we stated in our campaign, every day three women are killed by their spouses, ex-boyfriends, their Şancés and their fathers. It seems that on the one hand there is a serious war waged against women and on the other, women’s resistance is becoming stronger as well. Initiated in Canada, protests under the heading “SlutWalks” spread all around the world in a very short time. Feminists are organizing against budget cuts in the UK and women’s groups against budget cuts are being formed. In Turkey we conducted an important campaign against violence against women and little by little some steps have been taken by the government as a result of this campaign. “We Want Our Due Back from Men” is a campaign the SFC carried out, and the feminist movement in Turkey organized various similar campaigns. So taking into consideration this conjuncture in the world and in Turkey, we would like to think about what kind of feminist organizations and feminist politics we need. This is the topic of our current session. There are serious differences in points of view amongst feminists as to how feminist politics should be done. These different points of view may sometimes intersect, sometimes they may influence each other, but sometimes they may advance different directions as well. I will try to distinguish and summarize them, but then of course we will try to expand on this with your and our speakers’ contributions. Some feminists, emphasizing the differences amongst women, claim that because of these differences, women cannot constitute a collective political subject. As to another group of feminists, they claim that gender is not fixed, is fluid and can be changed and because of its fluid character, it can be distorted by performative acts. Some say that it is no longer necessary to emphasize the differences between men and

women; that it was necessary in the past, but now that women have gained their rights they can struggle hand in hand with men. Some feminists say that feminism is a political movement specific to some Third World countries, African or Muslim countries, where women still live under bad conditions because of underdevelopment, and that it's no longer meaningful for the modern West. Apart from that, some try to define feminism mainly on the basis of oppressed women in the Third World and in developing countries and consider that the middle class or Western women have been emancipated, and that feminism is principally beneficial for domestic workers and poor and immigrant women. And by claiming this, they consider as “the main enemy”, in Delphy's terms, capitalism instead of men. According to another version of this idea, the neoliberal version of capitalism is quite backbreaking for women, but apart from neoliberal capitalism, there are different, more beneficial versions of capitalism. For example, sustainable capitalism, and especially by mainstreaming gender in state policies, more social democratic versions of capitalism may improve the conditions of women.

I tried to summarize the differences roughly. There are many different views amongst the audience as well. So what kind of feminist politics should we conduct and what kind of a model for feminist organization should we propose? And of course what kind of a strategy, enriched by the experiences of our visitors from other countries, do we have to adopt against patriarchy? In this session, we will be talking about feminist strategies without necessarily focusing on women's labour. So, I will give the floor to Gülnur Acar Savran Şrst.

Gülnur Acar Savran: Thank you very much. Welcome to everyone. According to the data by the Ministry of Justice, three women are murdered each day in Turkey. Since the year 2002, murders of women have increased by 1400%. Trying to understand the dramatic increase in the murders of women, as feminists we came up with various answers. There was a general consensus on one of the explanations: Both due to feminism's ideological impacts on society as a result of

25 years of struggle and to the amendments made both in the Civil Code and Penal Code in the last decade, and again because of the increase in the number of women working in income generating jobs (even if these jobs are insecure/flexible/informal/home-based); women started to say “No!” and began to put up a resistance against men, refusing to provide them with sexual or other sorts of personal service; women obey less and they attempt to or get divorced more frequently. Furthermore, male violence is losing its social legitimacy. On the other hand, some of us advanced the following explanation: With a great unemployment ratio, the number of men who lose their self-respect is increasing, because they don’t have their breadwinner status anymore. Men are in depression; masculinity is undergoing a crisis. Following this loss of power, these men use the only power left in their hands, they resort to the use of force on women. Again according to some of us, the Justice and Development Party’s (JDP) discourse against gender equality and their connected practices (for example the changing of the Ministry’s title) are indirectly encouraging men to use force on women. Further, the fact that the media is positioning women as victims and making a pornography out of this, makes killing women a viable option for men. On the other hand, the judicial system is encouraging men by applying sentence reductions on grounds of unjust provocation.

Meanwhile, the killings of women were initially made visible in Kurdish cities, and of course this phenomenon was used by racism as well. At the very beginning of our political activity, women killings were called “honour killings” and were associated exclusively with Kurds, but then thanks to the efforts of feminists, the term “honour killings” evolved into the more comprehensive term “women killings”.

It seems that marriages/unions are collapsing one way or another, or that the family is dissolving. What does this indicate? Does it point to, as some of us defend, the dissolution of “the family order based on the patriarchal bargain”? This would imply a transition from a pre-modern/traditional type of patriarchy (where the man is

the breadwinner and the woman a full-time housewife and mother, and excluded to a great extent from public life) towards a modern/contemporary form of patriarchy. Are patriarchal relations going through a transformation? Are we moving towards a situation where women are much more convinced that it is possible to live without men and are getting divorced at higher rates and starting to live on their own; a situation where a small group of women work at relatively senior level positions in the service sector while a great number of women are employed in flexible, low-wage and insecure jobs; where on the one hand care work is commoditized, and on the other women are trying to reconcile motherhood with their work outside the home (a situation similar to the EU model)?

It seems to me that we can talk about the diversification, the multiplication of patriarchal relations, rather than a transformation. The process we are going through is not a one-way, linear development, but rather, a conflict-ridden, complex process. This process is a precursor of a situation where pre-modern and modern patriarchal orders coexist; orders which exclude women from the public sphere and oppress them by including them in the public sphere: A situation where on the one hand, women are defined within the boundaries of the family with protective laws and social security measures provided through their dependence on their fathers/husbands; and on the other hand, they are pushed more and more towards employment, with flexible forms of work, without security and at low wages, with a view to flexibilizing the whole labor market. The coexistence of different types of patriarchal relations means the diversification, the multiplication of forms and conditions of femininity.

In fact, since the beginning of the 20th century, in Turkey a hybrid/mixed regime of patriarchy has prevailed. On the one hand, as a country located in the Mediterranean basin, Turkey has been hosting elements inherited from the pre-Islamic period, such as an obsession with virginity, head covering, confinement of women, a fetishized concept of honour and honour killings. On the other hand, this is a country where a rapid modernization exists in a

manner similar to that observed in other late capitalized countries. Furthermore, late capitalization has generated a structure in which small family holdings in cities and in the agricultural sector prevailed until recent developments. Add to these the dynamics of Islam and Kemalism, there has emerged a hybrid system in which pre-modern patriarchal relations are mingled with modern patriarchal forms.

I think that in the process we are going through, the hybrid character of patriarchy is being corroborated. It seems to me to be clear that this is mostly due to the neoconservative policies of the JDP and the neoconservative political climate, besides the increase in women's gains and the rise in their resistance. Neo-conservatism is a synthesis of neoliberalism and conservatism (religious or secular). Certainly it has its internal tensions, but nevertheless it is a synthesis. The JDP implements simultaneously policies based on the abstract egalitarianism of neoliberalism under the name of "equal opportunities" (e.g. employment policies, the Social Security and General Health Insurance Law and the so-called "Omnibus Bill") and conservative policies based on the radical difference between women and men (for example, the charity measures of the JDP). This is the typical characteristic of neo-conservatism: Oppression of women both by neoliberal and familialist conservative methods. Women are incited to become breadwinners of the family by micro credits/entrepreneurship programmes, while poverty and familialist discourses push and confine them into more and more domestic and care work. The "solutions" offered by the JDP for the increase in divorces, for homosexuality, for male violence in general and for women killings are precisely those discourses that aim to "reform and redress" the family and situate women in the heterosexual family as wives and mothers. Furthermore, in this period, while familialism comes forward as the dominant ideological discourse, aiming to reinforce the family by reforms (e.g. the discourse of "three children", efforts to involve the directorate of religion, the initiatives to take measures against violence), the aesthetic and plastic surgery sectors that make women hostile to their bodies are on the rise, increasing

constantly their gains... As symbols of this dual process, we can give the examples of the wedding sector which has reached an absurd level and the televised marriage programmes.

This is a process which increases the diversity in women's positions and deepens the differences between them. In Turkey, women's unpaid domestic labour continues to be the main factor influencing women's participation or non-participation in paid labour. Still, for example the number of women working at senior level positions in the service sector, who try to reconcile work life with motherhood by buying care labour is greater than in the past. Neo-conservative policies make room for different segments of women: Women working outside the house/full time housewives; women working in flexible, insecure and low wage jobs/women working in more secure/full time jobs (a minority); divorced, single women/conservative, chaste women who do not work outside and represent the family honor. In brief, these two dynamics coexist and work together in the basic patriarchal structures such as unpaid domestic labor, the patriarchal relations in paid labor, sexuality, male violence, the patriarchal relations in politics and culture. The interesting point is that, both of these two dynamics were reinforced simultaneously ... In addition, the resistance of women is rising as well.

So then, in the context of the multiplication of women's positions, the diversification of forms of patriarchal relations, what kind of feminist politics can we forge against these neo-conservative policies? The feminist policies that we will try to forge should aim to increase and corroborate this resistance, this will to refuse obedience. The way thereof is to produce policies that would empower women in the context of different patriarchal relations (the policies that would allow women not to obey men/not to get killed when they don't obey). In short, it is necessary to create a wide range of social policies which aim to empower divorced and/or single women; women without children; married/full-time housewives with children; married wage workers with children; women working in the home/insecure and/or informal jobs; lesbian/bisexual/trans women. These policies should

not be limited to confronting the differentialist conservative assault, nor to opposing the neoliberal abstract egalitarian policies. This wide range of policies should target those dynamics which do not seem, at first sight, to be simultaneous; that is, both the differentialist dynamics of a certain (e.g. traditional) patriarchal order and the abstract egalitarian dynamics of contemporary patriarchy (which is fed by neoliberalism and feeds the latter in turn). In order to be able to put forth demands contemporaneously for the different categories of women whose social positions vary so much and whose interests seem to be conflicting on occasion, we need to work out the links between these different social positions and associate each and every one of them with the totality of patriarchy.

What I have said so far implies the following: While we are developing our social policies, we should enlarge our horizon such that we can reach far beyond “married women with children, working outside the home, albeit in a flexible mode”, this latter category being the target group of reconciliation policies between family and work (today’s leading social policy). First of all, we need policies that are mainly geared towards empowering full time housewives (in a way which makes it possible for them not to obey). Let me enumerate some of them: The right to individual pensions and health insurance that are not related to husbands or fathers; the formulation of the right to pension so as to include the option of extramarital unions; the right to pension independent of the condition of marriage and being divorced, but based on age (for example, 50). The generalization, without any conditions, of alimony for divorced and poor women under a certain income level, which in the current situation is based on the condition of not being found at fault in the divorce process. Subsistence and housing securities for women in case of divorce. Women should benefit from the unemployment insurance fund once they start looking for a job.

In the second place are measures facilitating women’s participation in paid labour: These measures include generalized free or low cost care centers for children and old people; prolonged service hours in

these centers; care service for old people provided at home as public service by social workers. Following these, come the transformations that have to be made in the labour market: Positive discrimination in employment; equal pay for work of equal worth; quota for women in technical skill courses; the shortening of work day for all employees without wage loss etc. In the recent past, regarding nursery obligation and menstruation leave, we have witnessed the threat of employers not to employ women should this be the case. We need to respond to these threats by claiming “Employment quota for women”; we should not retreat to a defensive position.

Thirdly, we should think about measures encouraging/forcing men to assume the care work at home and outside the home: non-transferable paid parental leaves for fathers; employment of men in public care centers. Furthermore, fathers who benefit from public care services should be held responsible for parental tasks. In these institutions, service receivers and/or their relatives should participate in decision-making and management.

I would like to finish my talk by emphasizing one point: In the neo-conservative political climate where different types of patriarchal relations coexist, we should not hesitate to defend social policies (protective and egalitarian) that seem to take their source from two different theoretical/political frameworks, for fear of being criticized for incoherence.

Jean Gardiner: I feel that perhaps the most useful thing that I could talk about is just some very practical thoughts about how can feminists bring about change, drawing on my experience in the UK. So what I really want to do is just to talk about four or five different ideas of the ways in which I think feminist movements have brought about change. Because I think it is not up to me to talk about what the demands are that we should be focusing on but, I think, how we could help each other is to share our experiences of the actions that we take, what is effective, how can these really really difficult issues begin to be addressed or how can we make progress on some of these issues that we have already began to address. So I just want to...

brainstorm really... about the ideas that I want to talk about.

This is not in an order of importance really, but I think the first thing I would suggest is something I think the feminist movements have been very good at doing, which is a kind of cultural politics. And what I mean by that is interventions, which actually change how women see their own identity, and hopefully also how men see their own identity. And I'm just going to give you one example, just so that you can maybe connect with the history of what was done in the UK about forty years ago. It's just one little example that came to my mind. It used to be –well, it still is I think– the Miss World competition. Is it in Turkey still, I don't know, but it used to be a very big business event in the 1950s and 1960s. It was one of the big television events of the year in the UK; there was a lot of money raised around that, a lot of profits made out of it. And in 1970, the second wave feminists said, "We cannot bear seeing this event on our television screens," and so a full group of feminists managed to get into the event and disrupted it. And obviously this got an enormous amount of publicity and it was the start of the total decline of that event...

So basically, what the feminists were saying was "We want people not to see women as evaluated on the grounds of how they looked in the swimming costume; that is not the way that we want to be judged." It was a terribly controversial thing of the time and feminists were, you know, lots of people thought they did a terrible thing. But when you look back you realize that there was a result of that feminist action even if the competition is still continuing. I'm not saying that we got rid of the problem of sexualization and women being judged on their physical appearances by any means but it's an example of how feminists can engage in a kind of cultural politics which is about challenging hegemonic masculinities, hegemonic femininities that I mentioned in my talk yesterday. And I do think that it is one of the things which we should not discount because even if we don't think that culture is the most important thing, I think we can all agree that it is a cement that holds patriarchy in place. I'm sure there are already

examples of things that you have done in this area.

Another thing that feminists got really involved in was attacking the nature of advertising; the images of women, the images of men in advertising. And I mean now if there is an advert on television, for a washing agent or for some kind of domestic cleaning agent, it's usually a man who is in the advert. And that's quite interesting I think because historically it was always the mother advertising the washing, cleaning agents. Now it's always a man and the line is always: "Even an idiot like him can have a decently clean kitchen because of this fantastic product." And that is all about the feminist intervention in the culture. I think you got ten times bigger cultural challenges now than we have in the UK in this area and it's one thing that I would encourage you to think about how to intervene. And it's about getting your message out, which you have been doing already anyway, to change the way other people think about it. That's my first point.

My second point is political education. I think I had a lot of political education through being a feminist. And I think it could be the best that it was because we don't actually always succeed in achieving what we do. It is so difficult to bring about change; you have to educate each other in the opportunities and mechanisms available for influencing policy, changing policy, get a new policy. Whatever policy you decide you want to intervene in, you need to know how to do it. I don't know how the system works in Turkey but in the UK now petitions are quite big because the government has agreed to this new policy that if a petition gets more than a certain number of signatures on the internet, they have to discuss the issue in the parliament. So now there's a lot of organizing of petitions. You can write a piece and the internet makes it much more easy to coordinate collective letter writing to the members of the parliament. There are now websites set up in the UK; you just go to the website, you find out who your MP is. Feminist organizations could coordinate that.

It's interesting in the UK, that trade unions are now probably putting as much energy into campaign around policy as they are into

industrial action because industrial action is very hard and is getting harder very often with this high unemployment. But one of the ways trade unions follow in the UK is to e-memo their members and say, "When you write your MP about this issue, it's going to be debated in the parliament." Feminist movements have that mechanism as well available to them. If it can be organized, you are a tremendous force for coordinating action to influence policy but only if you know how. You have to educate each other because not everyone knows their rights and so political education is really important. I mean, there are also other aspects to political education. What I'm talking about is knowing how to do it practically. And I think that it's what these movements need to sustain themselves.

My third point is gender mainstreaming, I mentioned it yesterday. It's now accepted at least in the EU, and I think maybe you can begin trying to get in the political agenda in Turkey the notion that all policy should be considered from a gender perspective. What is the impact on women, what is the impact on men, what is the differential impact on women? Not least because a lot of these invisible issues that we've been talking about never get onto the agenda. Obviously you are a long way away from the point to get the government to recognize gender mainstreaming. But what feminist organizations need is those groups within them who are doing the gender analysis, the gender auditing which is, say, pointing things out. You've got to have the facts and figures and the research evidence that you will need in order to try to impact the policy because you can be so easily dismissed. I mean, you can be easily dismissed even if you have lots of evidence but... One of the things I've been intending to get involved in is that we have a Women's Budget Group in the UK, which is a group of mostly London-based feminists who precisely analyze government policy from a gender perspective. Especially economic policy, taxation, welfare policy, those areas. And it would be great if you could begin to do the same, because I think that is very valuable, you don't know how long it will take them to use the information but collecting them is important.

So I think those are the main points that I wanted to make. And my final point is the media. I'm very impressed at how good your links are with the media, you have access to all alternative media. But also think about how you can use the mainstream or conservative media as well. Just a positive example: Recently in England, as I mentioned yesterday, there was a campaign about the fact that women who were about to get retired would be required to work two more years. There was a big campaign about it. This campaign, in the end, was virtually made by the Daily Mail, which is one of the most conservative daily newspapers in the UK. Because it found out that there was this tremendous injustice being done to women and it knows it has a lot of women readers, the newspaper was persuaded that it should support this campaign. And it is because Daily Mail intervened in supporting the campaign that so many women found out about that, and so many women protested the government and as a result eventually it was successful. So I hope there might be something useful there.

Helena Hirata: It is important that as new issues arise in the context of globalization such as the expansion of international migration, particularly of females, or the internationalization of the sex market, the feminist movement and feminist theory are transformed to accommodate these changes. Prostitution and trafficking have now become very important and difficult problems. Feminist movements in many European countries are taking these questions seriously since East European women are being trafficked into countries like France or Spain.

In France, we have a big split within the feminist movement and feminist theory regarding issues like prostitution. Some feminists are of the opinion that prostitution is work like any other and therefore it must be regulated. These women are the regulationists. Then, there are other women, who I think constitute the majority, because socialist feminists constitute the majority of feminists in France, who say that prostitution cannot be categorized as work. It is violence and therefore it must be abolished. They are abolitionists. These

two camps of the feminist movement in France do not communicate with each other because the tension and antagonism between them is very, very deep.

The other question that is at the center of the division in the French feminist movement today is the veil. Differently from other European countries such as the UK, French public policy is concerned with the question of the veil. Due to government regulations, the veil is prohibited in some public hospitals. As a result, you will be dismissed if you are an employee wearing the veil in a public hospital. You cannot wear the veil in public schools either. Your only option is to go to a private school if you are wearing the veil since you will not be allowed to enter classes in public schools. There is a very intense discussion within the feminist movement about the veil, which creates an antagonism like the one concerning the issue of prostitution. That is to say, these women do not speak to each other. The people who oppose the bill for the banning of the veil and who protect veiled women, as in the case of Christine Delphy, are in a big conflict with the other sections of the feminist movement who support the prohibition of the veil. I am happy to see that an antagonism such as the one we have in the French feminist movement presently does not exist here. But perhaps you also have different views about this issue and this is the last occasion for us to know about your differences.

I want to emphasize that feminist struggles today have a North - South dimension. There also exists a globalization of the struggles, along with the globalization of economy, finance, and of the cultural and the social. In my talk yesterday, I mentioned one of the women's organizations that conducts campaigns in the international scale. I think that European and international movements converge in other aspects too.

I think one of the important convergences is the polarization of female employment in all countries, both in the North and in the South. In both geographies, there are professional women who go to universities and have skilled jobs that are valued and relatively

well-paid. This kind of employment comprises 10% of working women. The remaining 90% have another type of work in the traditional sectors for women, such as health-care, education, public sector, the service sector, personal services and so on. I think that this polarization is the consequence of the current education trends in the world. Even in southern countries and in Japan women now hold diplomas that are required for occupations requiring skills. The problem here is that despite having good education and diplomas, they do not have good opportunities to find work. But still, from the point of view of education, there is a very big progress. And I think that it is this progress that causes the polarization in female employment.

I think that the question of immigrants is very important today because women immigrants are being considered as goods for export, everywhere in the world. The president of the Philippines says that the women of the Philippines are very suitable for care work because they have a lot of tenderness and affection. When she visited Japan, she stated that Philippina women are more affectionate than the cold Japanese women. She speaks of the female work force in the Philippines as if they are export goods like any other goods. In her point of view, for the Philippines, women are export goods as care laborers: for domestic work and for the care of the elderly, children, etc. They are the Philippines' most valued power. These women are well educated and have university diplomas. If you visit a rich neighborhood in Paris like the 16th arrondissement, there you will see a lot of Philippina women working as domestic workers or as nannies.

I think it is important to consider that the people of Southern countries who go to Northern countries for work are in a difficult situation, not only because of their working conditions, but also because this work requires them to leave their countries of origin and live with foreign families and children. Whether she is Philippina, Sri Lankan, Ecuadorian or Columbian, the situation is the same for all the women who leave their countries to go work in France or Spain.

Their situation is difficult from a larger point of view. As they are taking care of the children of their employers, they lose the possibility to live with their own children and to educate them. In Japan, I talked with a Philippina domestic worker and asked her why she does not visit her country more than once a year, since the Philippines is very close to Japan. It is not a long distance trip like going from Los Angeles to the Philippines or from Greece to Sri Lanka. She said that making a trip to the Philippines is expensive and that travel expenses diminish your income. She also said she would not be paid for the period she is gone. Since she needs a regular salary, she is unable to frequently visit her children. The emotional difficulties of the children of these domestic workers is a very difficult problem from a subjective point of view. These women are separated from their children who can have emotional problems, school problems etc., even though they are raised by fathers, aunts, sisters.

There are several women researchers like Arlie Hochschild and Rhacel Salazar Parrenas who wrote about the children of immigrants. In France we have researchers like Liane Mozère who wrote about the agency of Philippina domestic laborers: She says that for the first time these women have the freedom, money and the possibility of not caring for their husbands and children all the time. She says that they have the money to live freely in Paris. I think it is the methodological bias in her research that makes her conclude this way. In her research she only interviews the Philippina workers in Paris but not the children of these women who have stayed behind.

One important question arising from this situation is, what can we do about these domestic laborers and also about the differences among women? Is it possible to overcome antagonisms and form solidarity among us?

Naturally if the woman employing a domestic laborer is a bourgeois woman and there exists a class antagonism between the employer and the employee, there is no possibility of solidarity between them. But in countries like Turkey, Brazil or other Latin American countries, a lot of middle class, petty bourgeois and proletarian women employ

domestic laborers because they must go to work even though they earn low wages. There is an antagonism of interests but no class antagonism here. We must think how and what kind of solidarity can be formed in this situation. In France, there is a psychologist named Pascale Molinier, who interviews employers of domestic workers to understand their relationship with their employees. It is important to think about how the primary rights of domestic laborers, such as their right to organize, will be established. In July 2011, the United Nations announced a convention that established the rights of domestic workers and opened it for the signature of individual countries. This is important but of course what is more important is the establishment of an egalitarian division of labor between a man and a woman living together (or between a woman and woman if those living together are two women).

The campaign which you organized as the Socialist Feminist Collective about the division of domestic labor and men's participation, targets a problem which is very different from the division of labor between domestic workers and their employers. As was said by the sociologist Danièle Kergoat, the equal division of domestic labor within a couple diminishes tension. She observes there is less tension between a man and a woman when domestic labor is shared. Then, it is no longer one person doing the work and instructing the other what to do. This provokes struggle in the house. For me, it is important to have this kind of campaign about the division of labor within the couple, and perhaps it is possible to combine this campaign with a campaign for public policy to have more kindergartens and more crèches. In France, 80.2% of women with a child younger than three years work. A lot of women work. In the case of Japan, the rate of working women with children less than three years of age is only 28%. These kids are raised at home because there aren't enough crèches and kindergartens. Now the Japanese government is campaigning to draw women into the work force. In Japan, women on average have 1.3 children. The birth rate is very low. They cannot continue this way. But women who work do not

want to have children or get married. Because they say, “If I have a child, I cannot continue working. I prefer to work because I have an interesting job and it gives me freedom. Therefore, I do not want to have a child.” Women who do not want to leave their jobs end up having less and less children. So I think it is important to have the possibility of a better division of domestic labor between women and men.

I will finish up by saying the struggle against violence is, of course, central. Now in France, Dominique Strauss-Khan did terrible things; but more terrible than that is that people in political circles in France argued that Dominique Strass-Khan’s behavior is not so terrible because it is normal for a person in his standing to behave this way towards women. Last year, the demonstration on November 25th against violence against women was a big one, with the participation of women like Tristane Banon, who is a young woman sexually harassed by Dominique Strauss-Khan seven or eight years ago. She joined the demonstration and of course many newspapers wanted to interview her. In France, once every three days a woman is killed by her husband or by her partner. This kind of data mobilizes different groups in the feminist movement.

Heidi Hartmann: Good afternoon, it is great to see so many people still here on the afternoon of the second day. This is a very committed group and all of us on the panel are very impressed by your commitment.

I will pick up the conversation where Jean left off, and begin by making some observations about the importance of the women’s budget project approach. In the US, we don’t have anything quite like a women’s budget project. Many other countries do. The British Commonwealth seems to be supporting women’s budget activities around the world in former colonies like South Africa. A women’s budget might show what the national budget would look like if women’s needs and preferences were fully reflected in the budget, perhaps more subsidized child care and housing and less expensive weapons systems or more efficient defense strategies, for example.

In addition to a budget that shows what women want, typically a critique of the government's budget is also produced. A critique shows where women are left out of the budget and where women aren't getting resources that they should have. This type of analysis can be very helpful to advocates, helping them determine priorities and action plans. It would be a great thing to do systematically in the US.

What we do in the US now is a little bit more haphazard. Different women's groups specializing in different topic areas might study the parts of the national budget relative to their issues. One group might be doing a lot on women's education, another group might be doing job training, and several groups might be looking specifically at the parts of the budget most related to women's health. For example, where is the money in the budget for contraception and abortion (not that we have a lot of federal monies going to abortion, but poor women receiving their health care through Medicaid –our means-tested health care program for the poor– can use Medicaid funds to get an abortion if their health is in danger or the pregnancy is the result of rape or incest)? Some organizations in the US also study and critique state budgets using a gendered lens, but again, typically looking closely at only a few areas of the budget, since each organization typically works on only a few topics.

In my work I focus on economic issues, on how economic growth, or its lack, is affecting women, on how women are contributing to economic growth, on the differences in the economic roles of women and men, and on the economic sources of men's power. As an economist, I readily admit that it is more difficult to attract a lot of attention to how women affect, and are affected by, economic issues.

When I look at the state of the contemporary women's movement in the US, I observe that women usually get most excited about women's "biological" issues, such issues as access to abortion, rape and sexual assault, domestic violence, and also the issue of breast cancer and assuring enough funding for finding a cure and treating it. While abortion is legal in the United States and the right to

abortion has been confirmed by the US Supreme Court, the court has also ruled that it is legal for states to restrict that right in various ways. There are 50 states and each state passes laws or adopts new regulations designed to restrict women's access to abortion. The women's movement spends a lot of resources and energy on trying to maintain women's right to abortion. I believe women are most passionate about what I call these "biological" issues because women feel them very viscerally, very emotionally. These issues go directly to how women differ from men biologically and the vulnerability women feel in a patriarchal (or male-dominated) society because of these differences. In contrast, it is rarer in my experience for an economic issue, unequal pay for women, for example, to strike women as strongly and motivate them to action as much.

While abortion remains controversial in the US, largely due to a well-organized, fundamentalist Christian minority, the women's movement does occasionally win victories. For example, Mississippi, a very conservative state in the South, is one of many states that allow voters to place substantive issues directly on the ballot if they collect enough signatures from those eligible to vote. In that state, a conservative group got a question placed on the ballot about whether the state constitution should be amended to say that life begins at conception (which would make abortion equal to murder). Remarkably, this initiative lost, even in a very conservative state, because women know there are many circumstances where such a definition of life would restrict women's reproductive choices significantly. For example, some women who have no children use in-vitro fertilization (IVF) followed by the insertion of fertilized eggs into the women's uterus – such procedures would be illegal under the "life begins at conception" rule. Only about one third of people voted for this definition (and against abortion and IVF), so the proposed amendment lost: only 35 percent of voters supported the restrictive definition. It was a big victory for the women's movement.

But, even contraception, a right that women thought they had won decades ago, has become controversial in the last few years.

Many types of services for women have a lot of institutional support in the US. Nonprofit organizations that provide these services receive a substantial amount of money from the federal, state, and local governments every year. Many basic health services, such as mammograms, especially for low-income women, are provided by Planned Parenthood using funds it receives from the federal government. Federal funding can be used for contraception but not for abortion, and only a small part of Planned Parenthood's budget, using their non-government funds, is devoted to abortion. This past year conservative politicians in the US Congress and in several State Houses attacked Planned Parenthood and tried to eliminate all its government funding. So far they have been unsuccessful and Planned Parenthood has emerged stronger from the attacks. But this discussion shows that abortion and contraception are not areas where there is much bipartisan agreement.

Other "biological" issues do sometimes garner bipartisan support, for example, domestic violence, trafficking in women, rape and assault, as well as health research funding. In a highly polarized political environment, as now characterizes the US, these are typically the only issues that attract bipartisan support. Services to women in these areas also receive substantial government funding, and thus we see in the United States a lot of infrastructure that meets women's needs: nearly every city, including small cities, has a battered women's shelter or rape crisis center. These centers not only provide counseling and services to women, they also work with police and the court system to change the way these cases are handled through training of these officials and also through legal reforms (for example requiring mandatory arrest in a domestic violence case). What were once considered private matters between a wife and husband or a woman and man in a relationship are now crimes that are prosecuted. There is a 24-hour telephone hotline for domestic violence victims funded by the federal government, which is available throughout the United States so that women in places where there is no center or who are not aware of a center can also get help.

Another issue increasingly being recognized and gaining more resources is harassment of women in public places, such as streets, buses, and subways, and sexual harassment, as well as rape and assault, on college and university campuses. The Obama administration has appointed a high level advisor on violence against women in the White House and Vice President Biden has visited many campuses to raise awareness of harassment of and assaults against women.

That we have federal funding directed to these issues and a lot of visibility of them among policymakers, and media attention too, is surely a sign of progress for women.

The part of the women's movement that I have worked in for many years consists of those organizations that tend to focus on economic issues, issues such as equal pay, work-family accommodations including paid leave and subsidized child care, and the disproportionate share of poverty born by women in the US. These issues are among those that do not often mobilize women to mass activity. We have not had street demonstrations about equal pay or child care for quite some time, this despite the fact that the US lags many other nations in the degree of pay equality and the availability of subsidized child care. That is why your presence here is very important; you have come together to work on some of these difficult economic issues.

The US is one of only three countries in the world that does not have nationally mandated paid maternity leave to provide women with income when they cannot work because of childbirth. Many countries now have paid paternity leave as well, but this is very rare in the US since neither it nor paid maternity leave are required by law: it is left up to the employer whether to provide any pay and most choose not to. In fact, it is only at the larger firms that women are even guaranteed their job back (through the 1993 Family and Medical Leave Act) when they have had to leave work for childbirth. Getting paid parental leave in the US would be an important win for women and it would improve their economic security and standard of living; in fact like many universal policies it would help poor

women the most.

Another way family needs can be better accommodated at work is through flexibility: if women and men with children who need care can work fewer hours or arrange hours that are most convenient for them, that would ease some of the burdens parents face in trying to do two jobs well, working and raising children. Sweden, for example, requires that reduced working hours be made available to parents, but it is mostly women who take advantage of the availability of part-time work and they mainly work in the public sector, because the private sector appears to be less open to part-time work. The private sector is dominated by men who do not often work part-time. Policies and patterns such as these can lead to discrimination against women, if employers think women will be less likely to work the long hours success requires.

I believe the whole idea that some jobs must require long hours is one way that male domination is occurring and being reproduced; women are excluded from such jobs because someone must take care of the family and that someone is usually a woman. It is quite possible that most such jobs could be restructured to be done by two people working fewer hours (two people each working 30 - 35 hours per week, rather than one working 60 hours) who share information and coordinate to make sure all the needed work is done. The way work is done can be reorganized in many ways with new technologies. These progressive ideas seem far in the future in the US, as we are struggling now with working conditions that are getting worse instead of better.

A major problem in the US is that working conditions of all types have been deteriorating for several decades. Real wages, that is controlling for inflation, for men have not increased much since the mid-1970s, forms of temporary work (where workers have few if any benefits such as health insurance or retirement pensions) have grown, and the gains of economic growth are not being equitably shared. Income inequality has increased substantially as most of the gains of the last several decades of economic growth have gone to the

top 1%. The severe recession of December 2007 - June 2009 has, of course, increased unemployment and decreased family incomes and these losses have not yet been made up. On average, workers and families today are financially behind where they were in 2007.

One reason for the decline in “shared prosperity” is that labor unions have become weaker in the US. Now only about 7-8% of private sector workers belong to labor unions that can bargain collectively to raise wages and improve working conditions. The rate of unionization is higher in the public sector, where jobs are more stable and fringe benefits are generally more available (such benefits as paid sick days, subsidized health insurance, and retirement pensions that provide a set share of worker earnings in retirement). Historically, labor unions did not always seek to include women and often focused on male workers. Across the years, however, more women have joined unions, and now women are the majority of newer union members. Labor unions can be a strong force for improving conditions for all workers. Unions now work to reduce the gender pay gap and improve work-family benefits. In fact, research shows that labor unions raise wages more for women and minority men than they do for white men, so unions especially help disadvantaged workers. Unions have also contributed to many legislative campaigns that benefit all workers, not just their own members: the 8-hour day, the minimum wage, and the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (which provides job guaranteed, but unpaid, leave to about half of the US workforce in the event of their own illness or their families’ needs). Unfortunately unions have been under attack in the US by the business community, and business has largely succeeded in reducing their presence and power.

Amidst all this, women have seen real wage increases since the 1970s, unlike men, and therefore their wages have gone up relative to men’s. The gender wage gap has narrowed substantially but it still remains significant. The struggle for equal pay has a long history in the US. While progress has been made, it has been slow and in fact the rate of change is slowing down, so that much less progress was made

in the 1990s than the 1980s and less in the 2000s than in the 1990s. I recall that in the 1960s when NOW was founded, women wore buttons saying 57 cents, to indicate that on average a woman earned only 57 cents for every dollar a man earned. That ratio increased to 59 cents after a year or so, and most people remember the buttons that said 59 cents. Now that ratio of women's to men's pay is 75 cents on the dollar so we have made a lot of progress, but a 25% pay gap is still much too large.

What accounts for women's progress? Well, certainly women advocated for laws to make unequal pay and employment discrimination illegal and the government has established several enforcement mechanisms. Women have the right to sue employers for discrimination in court, and sometimes they win back pay and damages because of discrimination in pay or promotion or sexual harassment on the job. Women have also increased their education, more are going to college and graduating, so that counting all degrees beyond secondary school in the US, women receive about half of all the degrees granted. Women have also been working more, working more over their lifetimes and working more hours every year, so that both their education and their work experience (time on the job) has increased substantially and increased relative to men (men have not increased their education as much as women have and they also have not increased their work years or working hours as much as women have because they were already working most of the time). Thus, women have increased their "human capital" as economists would say, and, accordingly, their real wages have increased, as have their wages relative to men's.

Besides work and family issues and the wage gap, I also want to touch upon poverty. The US has a very high rate of poverty compared with other countries of similar per capita wealth. We simply have a less robust welfare state than other wealthy nations. Even with the recently passed health care reform, we still lack universal health care, and we lack sufficient public housing (or publicly subsidized housing) to accommodate all the low-income families. And because

we do not have equal pay yet, because we have many low wage jobs (because our minimum wage is set rather low and labor unions are relatively weak in the US), because we do not have paid maternity leave, and because we do not have subsidized child care and other public benefits, women, especially women who raise children alone –without a male earner contributing to the family income– are disproportionately at risk of poverty.

As Helena pointed out, raising children outside marriage is common, especially among poor women, because they do not see marriage as a valuable relationship unless the husband can contribute financially to the household. These women lack higher education, but they want to have a baby and they aspire to a decent standard of living. Low-income women, especially those who work, get some help from the US government through an income transfer program we call the Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC). This supplements what they can earn from low wage jobs (for example, a woman working full-time at the minimum wage would earn about \$15,000 per year and if she had two children, she would receive about \$4,000 from the EITC). She would also receive Food Stamps (Food Stamps, recently renamed SNAP, are essentially vouchers that can only be used to purchase food). Quite possibly, this mother would be eligible for publicly funded health care, called Medicaid. All together, her earnings plus public benefits would likely place her just above the official poverty line. Therefore, she can survive as a single mother. The various forms of assistance and financial aid enable women to raise their children alone, that is, without men, though their standard of living is generally not very high when they do so.

Many women see the ability of women to raise children outside marriage as a success of the women's movement. Of course, most women's leaders would like to see more income transfers to raise the standard of living of low-income families, but the freedom from potential abuse by men is a clear gain when women have an alternative way to support themselves than depending on a violent man. Of course, there is a serious reaction from the right wing, and

under Republican presidents the federal government developed a number of programs to encourage marriage. Even under Obama, some of these programs continue. For example, abstinence is taught to teenagers as a form of contraception. Just say “No.” Don’t have sex with anyone and you can’t get pregnant. Millions of dollars are spent on these programs and on evaluating them, even though most evaluations already show that they do not work to reduce pregnancy and childbearing outside marriage.

Policy makers also hope to encourage marriage by providing marriage and relationship counseling to low income people who could not otherwise afford it. Those who developed this program believe that even if only a small percentage (say 1 to 3%) of couples get this counseling and decide to marry or decide to stay married, this expenditure will have been worth it in generating future economic benefits (such as fewer poor children who will need public assistance). At the height of this campaign, one talented cartoonist redrew the federal buildings surrounding the mall in Washington, DC, and relabeled them with such names as “Bureau of Wedding Rings,” “Bureau of Engagement,” “Department of Lifelong Marriage,” and “Department to Eradicate Divorce.”

This has been the rightwing response to the women’s movement’s idea that it is okay, a basic right really, for women to be able to form families of their own choosing, including having children, living without men, or living with other women. Most progressives know that marriage between a poor man and a poor woman will not eradicate poverty, and most people believe that marriage should be a choice and should not and cannot be controlled via legislation and government programs. So while this movement to encourage marriage has its conservative supporters, most Americans seem to view this campaign with a huge dollop of skepticism.

The irony is that in the US, the conservative reaction seems motivated by fear of the power of women if they are independent and not under the control of men. They seem to ask: “What will happen if we let women loose, not married, not in their father’s

home, or not in a husband's home?" Yet in our foreign policy, our government –through the State Department– promulgates, under both conservative and liberal presidents, a doctrine abroad that emphasizes women's rights and supports programs that help women gain autonomy, arguing that they have the right to determine the nature and the structure of their own lives, to stay in school, not to be forced into early marriage and so on.

Now, in the face of many strong attacks from the right wing, we are beginning to realize that perhaps within the United States we can use the moral authority of the International Declaration of Human Rights, or the Beijing conference platform, to bolster the rights of women that are under attack here. Ever since the 1995 UN conference on women held in Beijing, many American women have become very interested in international work. We are now educating ourselves to try to use these international rights in the US. (Amazingly the US signed the Declaration of Human Rights, probably only because it was so long ago, when it could have been viewed as a reasonable response to the threat of communism; currently we have not ratified CEDAW, we have not signed on to the declaration against child labor. The US has become fairly retrograde in a number of areas.)

Let me end with a few comments on how the US women's movement is organized and how it mobilizes women (or not). The contemporary women's movement in the US is incredibly large and diverse. It consists of thousands of discrete organizations, many of which provide services to women such as health care or counseling, others provide services to members who support a cause such as increasing education for girls and women, and a few of which employ professional lobbyists to advocate in Congress and in State Houses across the country to get pro-women legislation passed. Some operate on the local, state, or regional level, some on the national and/or international arena. As large as it is and as many resources as it has, the heyday of the women's movement, when women marched in the streets every day and went to meetings every night, organizing from the moment that they woke up to the moment they fell asleep

at night, is over. That period is over and the women's movement is now more institutionalized, with many staff members working for pay to provide services to women and to work for change for women.

There is a lot of activity by women's organizations on many issues, but that activity is generally not being conducted via mass protests. Many of the activities are not targeted at political interventions at all. While a few groups do focus on electing more women, gaining more political power for women, winning more government resources for women, or getting equal pay, many organizations do not work on issues such as these. The groups have different levels of commitment to political action, and they are not united around a small set of unifying goals that are endorsed by all, a strategy that could lead to more and better outcomes for women.

One might ask, then, is there still a feminist movement in the United States? One of the fascinating things about the US is that from the first moment of the women's movement the media has declared it dead. On the one hand, the media loves anything new and anything exciting, and they covered the women's movement well at the outset. On the other hand, by the 1970s, *Time Magazine*, which is a large-circulation weekly magazine, had on its cover "Is Feminism Dead?" So now, whenever somebody says "feminism is dead," we all just laugh, because it's been dead since the 1970s as far as the mainstream media is concerned. So, yes the women's movement is still active, but it is probably true that it is less politically effective than it could be if it were better organized and better coordinated.

I wonder if women could organize their own political party, to run candidates for elective office and promote a pro-woman public policy agenda in the US. I wonder if that could be a possibility for Turkey, given how your electoral system is organized. It could be a positive development to have a women's political party. An independent women's political party might be the best way to get the other political parties to take women voters and issues of special importance to women more seriously.

An analogy from how women's studies developed in the US

illustrates how this might work. Feminist scholars started doing research on issues in their fields that were especially important to women; they often began by studying women writers who had been ignored, women leaders of past periods who were being ignored by contemporary historians, and so on. Literature was taught as if there were no women writers; history was taught as if there were no women in history; the 70-year struggle by women for the right to vote was ignored in US history. Male scholars were puzzled, “Why are you studying this woman?”, “Why are you studying that topic from a women’s perspective?”, “What do we need that for?”, they asked. Women faculty began to form women’s studies programs and departments and many students signed up to take the classes offered; new courses, especially interdisciplinary courses, were continually developed. The leaders of the traditional departments were shocked and realized they would lose a lot of students if they did not start offering courses on women. So, they started offering classes on the history of women, women in literature, women in economics, women in geography, because they wanted those students to come back into their departments. Then some of the traditional departments began to attack women’s studies and argue that, “We don’t need women studies, because we have it now in our departments.” And feminist scholars replied, “That’s fine you can have courses on women in your departments, too, we welcome that, but we need to maintain our own independent intellectual base, and we do not want to give it up. The way we got you to take on this new type of scholarship was to compete with you. You would never have changed if we had not first established our own independent base.”

By analogy, and thinking politically, if you can develop a women’s party in Turkey that might make it possible to affect the other parties and encourage them to develop pro-women programs.

I am very impressed by the Socialist Feminist Collective’s campaigns, especially around the claim that men should participate equally in housework and family care. It is difficult to win campaigns that affect people’s so-called private lives, what they do off the job

and in their own homes. But it is not impossible. Taking the example of Dominique Strauss-Kahn, former president of the IMF, had that incident happened a number of years ago, the maid who said he attacked her would not have been listened to. She would have been dismissed, and that would have been the end of it, because a powerful man could not have been challenged on his sexual behavior, unless it was extremely egregious and maybe not even then. Within marriage, husbands' affairs with other women were tolerated by wives, but wives had to be monogamous, had to have no outside relationships. We called that the "double standard," sexual freedom for one but not the other. Today, we observe that attitudes have changed in this area in the United States, not so much towards sexual freedom for both genders but more towards expecting monogamy from both partners. Yet change has been slower to come in other areas. For example, when a father leaves work early to go to his son's football match, people say "John is a wonderful dad because he went to watch his son play!" In contrast, when a mother leaves work to do something for her children, or to have another child, people say, "She did it again, she already has enough children."

There is still a huge difference in how people think about a woman's parenthood and a father's parenthood. Here a doubled standard remains. I think a massive public education campaign to encourage men to spend more time with their children is needed to help change this double standard, and, by the way, to make the need for days off work for family care as common among men as it is among women. The type of cultural push that Jean talked about could make a difference in this area. There are many other areas of women's activism we could discuss, but I will stop here. Thank you.

Panel Discussions

Ece Kocabıçak: Dear friends, this is our last session. We have 45 minutes. We will now give the şoor to you. We will give Şve minutes to each speaker to sum up their statements. Because we have limited time, if we could try and round up our comments in 5 minutes, then we could give the şoor to as many people as possible. Brieşy, Gülnur talked about the distinctive dynamics of the patriarchal system in Turkey and she recommended that we produce policies against it at three levels. She said that we should clarify our policies on women's employment; and produce policies to encourage and push men to take part in all domestic responsibilities and care labour. Thirdly, she said that given the immensity of violence against women in the current period, we should take precautions so that women can be liberated from male violence. Jean talked about the feminist movement in the UK. She especially emphasized the importance and power of feminist politics to change and enhance women's conditions in daily life. She recommended that we have a feminist policy which aims to challenge the cultural identities of woman and man, and also the hegemonic cultural reşections of these identities. She also talked about gender budgeting, social policies and taxation. Heidi gave us quite detailed information about the feminist movement and women's situation in the US. She stated that economic policies are important; but also that, especially body politics –such as the right to have an abortion, violence against woman– are no less crucial. Finally, she raised the question of whether it would be possible to have a women's political party. Helena talked about the dilemmas in the feminist movement in France and the divisive issues in the movement, such as headscarves, prostitution, sex workers etc. She mentioned that, especially Eastern European women have been migrating in large numbers to France and taking over domestic work and care labour. She stated that as far as care workers are concerned, even though the employer is a woman, women's solidarity is possible in certain cases. She mentioned that as

a result of their education, some women are freer now in the labour market and that this causes polarization among women. Now, I would like to give the şoor to you. Please raise your hands insistently, because sometimes it's not possible for us to see everybody. I will try to make a list of speakers.

Ferhunde Özbay: *It really is a great meeting. I would like to specially thank the organizers. I have only one problem. During these two days, we have met wonderful moderators. They have summarized everything so well, but we don't know who they are and what their names are. I would like to have more information about them and I would like to congratulate the moderators, especially Ece in this session.*

Ece Kocabıçak: Ok, the şrst session was moderated by Hülüya. Hülüya is from the Socialist Feminist Collective. She is at the same time a member of the women's labour group within the collective. The second session was moderated by Berrin. She is also from the women's labour group. The third session was moderated by Özlem. Yasemin made the opening speech yesterday. My name is Ece. Ok friends, who would like to speak? Gülnur and Yıldız.

Gülnur Elçik: *As you know, şrst Marx and later many others, among them also feminists, criticized the trend of economism which produced the dualities of liberalism, as a result of the priority it accorded to productive forces over social relations of production. That is to say, dualities such as civil society-state, economy-politics etc... The last session can be regarded as an exception, but I think sometimes we can't overcome this handicap, neither in academic research, nor in determining our paths of struggle in social movements. I mean that, as far as class studies and women's studies go, in addition to the material character of class, there is also a sociological character causing it to reproduce itself socially. Besides parameters such as family, education, institutions, traditions etc. there is also the political dimension based on class tendencies such as voting behaviour. I think that generally we lack a holistic approach. Why do I think this is important? Because when this is the case, what we call class analysis or class studies, or again women's studies, becomes a list of subjects, rubrics, and as a result becomes marginalized. In other*

words, when we talk about, for example, making a class analysis of women's issues, we tend to prioritize women's labour and its material aspects. We analyze class, not as a mediating factor of variables such as gender, race, religion, but as one of the elements in this series. Therefore, I wish that in the previous presentations we had heard some comments on these relationships that mediate women's labour in various ways; a more holistic approach.

When we are structuring our politics, the issue of beauty –since this was mentioned in the last intervention-, what it means to spend care labour in a consumerist society, should be touched upon. As you know the issue of consumerism is important: In the last crisis, the cosmetic sector was the only one which went on expanding while all the others shrunk. Women spent all their labour in trying to make themselves more beautiful. This prevented them from accumulating property. Therefore we will start talking more on this. I would like to say something, very briefly, based on my personal experience about this issue: I grew up in a family where sharing, solidarity, mutual help were propagated. Besides that, I think there was also an implicit class hatred, as for example in the sentence “A rich man is a bad man.” I started university with this sort of an understanding. And in my university years, I shared my income and labour with anarchist men who didn't work, I call them that because they called themselves anarchists. After my second year at the university, I started to work. One of my boyfriends said to me: “You didn't love me, you just had mercy on me.” I wasn't a feminist at the time, but I had a feminist perspective in all other regards. For example, I made them do the housework; I also felt free in my sexual life etc. After becoming a feminist, I set aside this material issue as well. By the look of it I was a feminist. But internally, I mean looking inwards, I realize now that there were certain areas where I wasn't emotionally free. In my opinion, we are entering a new era in which we need to think more about emotions. For example, the feeling of guilt which has its roots in motherhood and child care is becoming very much a female feeling. Self-confidence is becoming an emotion that you can only experience so long as you can control your body signs. As someone who believes that she adopts, as

far as possible, a feminist approach in other spheres of life, I realize that, more often than not, I can't avoid this feeling of guilt, this lack of self-confidence. Why did I say this? As far as I am concerned, feminism should continue to produce theory on the public sphere; but we should, in no way, give up our discussions where we probe the personal and the private, develop together a political consciousness and construct our politics on the basis of our own personal experiences. What we do under which circumstances, how we cope... I believe we should make a point of sharing these practices. Thank you very much.

Ece Kocabıçak: My friends, every time you take more than three minutes, it means that another woman will lose her right to speak. Please, take it into consideration.

Yıldız Ay: Hello. I would also like to say something about women's solidarity. I am a domestic worker; I suppose I am the only one here. We are discussing women's labour, but how could I forge solidarity with my boss? If my employer constantly oppresses me, how can I be in solidarity with that woman? We watched a documentary a while ago, Gülnur was also there. I actually invited my employer too, and when the question-answer session began, my employer ran away from the hall. Later she told me she wanted to write about my life; so she asked for other documentaries where I took part; but she didn't call me again. She lives in Kaş in Antalya. She thinks that domestic workers are very ignorant and uneducated women, oppressed in their houses, beaten up by their husbands, and with whom they, the bosses, sympathize and whom they pamper and then send back home. Now academicians are talking about labour here. They discussed my labour, too. But I wish there were also domestic workers and women working in home-based production at this conference, and they had told their stories about the feelings, contradictions we experience. How can we forge solidarity with these women, in accordance with feminist politics? This is my question. Thank you very much.

Ece Kocabıçak: Anybody else who would like to say something, make a comment? There is someone here.

Gülsüm Coşkun: I'm extremely happy too, to be in a conference where

women's labour is discussed. But I will go back home quite unhappy. Because, so much is said about women's labour, there are feminists from four different countries in this conference and yet nobody even mentioned home-based production. How come home-based work isn't even alluded to in a conference where women's labour, care labour is discussed? Why is it so invisible? Or is it intentionally made invisible? Women being secluded at home... I guess you are anxious about even mentioning home-based work, because you think that you will be supporting the seclusion of women in their homes. I wish that you could share your ideas and do away with your worries, by discussing this issue with us. I am a home-based worker and I'm a founder member of Home-based Workers' Union. There is an organization here, and there are such organizations around the world, for example in Brazil. We are not secluded in our homes. When we talk about *şexible* work, it doesn't mean that we are secluded at home. This is not the problem. But we are worried about *şexible* work, because if you work *şexible*, you don't have pension rights according to the legal regulations in Turkey. As a union, our priority demands are occupational health and safety, job security and the right to retirement pension. That's our main problem about *şexible* work. If you are secluded at home, you can't work home-based any way, you can't show people what you have produced. It's not like working in a factory. It is not as if you go to work each morning and then come out in the evenings and the next day you receive your salary. As a matter of fact, we must go out more. Sometimes I have to go out at nights at two or three o'clock, to get new material to work on, or to do the *Ştting* for dresses. My friends in the union have the same experiences. It is not a matter of "poor home-based workers, they can't go out." If you are discussing home-based work the workers should be here too. What you are doing is covering up the matter; but you can't remove it from the agenda by covering it up; because it is a form of work which is getting more and more widespread throughout the world. Be it that 90% of TUIK *Şgures* are wrong... The state ofŞcials come and do different surveys on us. When I say "I work in the house," they ask me "Are you a housewife?" and I have to explain in detail: "No, I'm not a housewife. I sew, I cut noodle..." This time they ask: "Are you a tailor?"

“Tailor” is the best thing they come up with. Under these conditions, home-based work becomes invisible. I have been working to build up this organization for 10 years. I have been doing mapping. I mean I have been in each neighbourhood, each city. We have argued this with women from different countries too. How you formulate a question is very important. Although I have mapped home-based production, in official documents you come across “small family enterprises,” “agricultural workers” etc. It’s a great gap that home-based work is not discussed in a conference where unpaid domestic labour and domestic workers are discussed. I am directing this question to all the four of you: How come home-based work is so invisible in this conference? Do you expressly ignore this issue as a result of your political positions?

Aysel Kayaoglu: I guess everybody has come here with certain expectations. Our friend said that home-based work is invisible. My expectation was to hear more holistic analyses. Of course, I would like to thank all of you very much for your contributions. On the other hand, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that when discussing women’s labour under the rubrics sexible work, neoliberal politics, and care labour, it seems to me, as somebody who is not very familiar with the issue of women’s labour, that we should analyze these in their relation to patriarchy; I believe this would be more meaningful. What changes cause which transformations in the patriarchal system, or what policies would empower women? Because I think, feminist politics goes hand in hand with these analyses. Gülnur touched upon it in her last speech. I think this gap is the result of the dominant trend in social sciences. You may call the system patriarchy or not; as you know, there are many people who prefer not to do so any more. But, having said this, we don’t come across many analyses which consider patriarchy in its historical transformation, not in feminist theory either. This is true for Turkey and the West. How has it changed? If yes, in what direction? And what does feminist politics correspond to in all this? I think pondering upon it expands the horizon of feminist politics. In the political arena in general in Turkey, I don’t mean this specifically for the SFC, but many women’s organizations, when they are organizing against violence against women

for example, make the statement that male domination and patriarchy are the cause of this violence. And that's it, it is taken for granted. However, both in our own society and in the world in general, I believe that, in the context of globalization, we need more reŒned analyses of patriarchy. As far as I am concerned, I can't Œnd this sort of analyses in feminist theory. Thank you.

Dilek Hattatođlu: I would Œrst like to say something about the format of the meeting. Of course, I would like to thank all my friends who have put in a lot of effort, and it was good that we had this conference. But instead of this method, where four people sit on the platform, not directly facing the audience, nor one another, and discussing in a question-answer format within a limited span of time, a method based on workshops, perhaps also with a few plenary sessions, would be more productive. I recommend this for your future gatherings. Besides this, I would like to say a few words on strategies. To begin with, the issue of women's class belongings is important as Glsm and Yldz have also mentioned. When we make various analyses on behalf of the feminist movement, even though we may be inside it, it is important where we position ourselves. When, all of a sudden, we start speaking, and rightly so, as women who have been in it for years, we are talking about the totality of the movement. But there are differences among women and differences within the feminist movement as well. Perhaps we can too easily talk with authority about groups of women we have academically studied, made analyses about, or even worked with; I know this is not a very kind expression, but I am using it for lack of a better one. We advise them... tell them what to do... These women are oppressed, domestic workers are oppressed, they are heavily exploited, they work for low wages, and so are home-based workers... of course we know they are... In fact, if we were asked, "Do you really think so?" actually we don't, but the way we behave, our manner of approaching them, brings us to this point: As if they are not intelligent enough, as if they need to be told, "You are being exploited, you don't know that you are exploited..." However, we must keep in mind that there is such a thing as strategy; women of all groups, all classes, the most illiterate, the worst paid, the most exploited

use certain strategies. They resort to these strategies against their bosses, against those who are closest to them, or together with them... But they do employ strategies. I would like to say one more thing before I finish off: In general, what disturbed me most in these presentations, what I need clarification for, is our constant quest for "what is to be done?" There is constant talk of something we are subjected to. I realize that a certain analytical distance is essential when we make analyses about the world, but don't women have any role in the formation of such a world? Something has happened, it has happened before us, there's a time lapse in between, and we react to it... We have slightly touched upon this in relation to the media. Alternative networks of information... We need to question what kind of counter-information we can mobilize, and whether counter information production is possible or not. And how can we do this, keeping in mind the relations of power and class differences among women, and without talking about other groups of women? We need to consider this seriously.

Helena Hirata: The discussions, especially the last one, have been really interesting; new ideas have been put forth; and these ideas can shape the format of possible forthcoming meetings. For example, smaller groups can work intensely and then a plenary meeting can be arranged. But sometimes organizers don't prefer workshops; and as a consequence everybody in the conference can't take the show. Of course, it is difficult to decide on the format of the meeting. On the other hand, even with this method, it is possible to reflect on issues, develop ideas. But, of course, making three speeches in two hours and then discussing them in a limited time span is hard. In France, in general, presentations are longer than discussions. That is very different from the method adopted in this meeting. I think today's meeting was much more useful, in terms of further discussions, diverse suggestions and interpretations, and this made me very happy. I want to respond to some of these questions and comments. Of course, we know that domestic and care workers are, in general, women and migrants. They are exposed to racism and are regarded as a political class. These three parameters make it essential to organize

on this issue. Also I want to say something about home-based work. In this meeting, this issue is not one of the main topics but this does not mean that we don't accord any importance to it. It is necessary to limit the main topic when we're organizing a meeting. Academic studies on home-based work are not in the scope of our main issue. A domestic worker shared her personal experiences and stated that there had to be solidarity among women in this area. Although, the starting point of feminist policymaking must be personal experience, solidarity should not mean consensus between two women. In Brazil for example we have a union of domestic workers; but employers are not allowed even to enter the building of the union. Because they are not seen as friends of domestic workers. We can develop our perspective by focusing on different strategies.

Serpil Çakır: *When we heard about this conference –I'm not from the Socialist Feminist Collective, I'm an academician and an activist in the women's movement– when we were invited, I was happy I was going to see in person those very women whose books (or about whom) we had read so much. I am really happy to see you here, you, whose articles I have read and assigned to my students. At the same time I am in a strange mood: I was almost desperate, but now I'm becoming much more hopeful. I don't know how many women there are in this hall. But at least there are a hundred women here and we are speaking the same language, and understanding each other. Because I had come to think nobody understands us, that we were talking to a void. You helped me overcome my pessimism, you made me feel hope again. I am thankful that you are here, that this meeting was organized. Of course, we cannot put an end to an age-long oppression in two days. Of course we would have liked to have workshops, more seminars, but everything has a cost. It is a great opportunity to listen to each other, share views and learn from one another. Thank you.*

Ece Kocabıçak: Due to budget problems, we couldn't have simultaneous interpretation in French. Helena expressed herself in English, although she's not very comfortable in English. Thanks Helena. Banu Paker, Serpil and Halime... Please raise your hand in

order to take the şoor.

Banu Pakar: *Dear friends, spending these two days with us and under the conference title suggested by us, was really precious for me. As our friend Dilek has said, we have some deŞciencies, that's for sure. This is not the way we organize meetings generally, as feminists; however we have already had difŞculties with the simultaneous translation and I hope that maybe we can Şnd ways of holding a meeting with non-Turkish speaking women in a workshop format. Actually this conference was not organized exclusively by the SFC. To say so would really be unfair; you know us, we are actually a very small group with big ideas. We don't receive funds and generally our magazine is published by the fees we pay. Thanks to your support and solidarity, and the support from Petrol-İş of course, we were able to manage this conference. I'm sure that we will Şnd new ways, formats that will please all of us in the coming years. We will organize them together, so we are expecting your support. We have a registration table at the entrance and there we can see that many of our friends would like to be added to the SFC announcement list and that is really exciting for us. We showed some incompetence perhaps, but it was our Şrst time and we are asking you to excuse any shortcomings. I'd like to mention another point; our home-based worker friends have complained –with good reason– about the limited time they were given. Actually, looking over the speeches of the two days, though their problems have not been taken up directly, home-based work was assumed implicitly under the rubric of şexibility and it constitutes an important part of şexible work. You all know that şexible work is practiced not only by women at their homes but also by multi-national companies internationally for the last 10 years. While a part of a computer is produced in South Korea, these parts are assembled on ships and put up for sale in Germany or somewhere else in the world. In other words, we are talking about an unequal, combined and fragmented production. We are not trying to speak in the name of women working in home-based production or working part-time, but what we are actually trying to stress is the need to formulate the problems and seek a solution together. What we target in general is, women being trapped between*

paid and unpaid labour, whether home-based or not; we would like to ease this trap that divides women, that splits them both materially and morally, and together find a way for liberating their spirits and taking them out of their houses.

Serpil Kemalbay: Many things have been said here for the past two days and they were all very important. Especially there were some practical suggestions which were also very significant. However there is one point I would like to emphasize: After all that's been said, we can see that we are badly battered both by capitalism and by men. That's what we have actually been talking about for the past two days. There is no doubt that capitalism oppressed workers and women before the 70s; but especially with the onset of neoliberal policies, with the fragmentation of the production process, by renovating and restructuring itself, capital has made a leap into a multi-faceted, multi-dimensional exploitation system. However, when we consider how women position themselves vis-à-vis this oppression and exploitation, the collaboration between patriarchy and capitalism and the policies developed against all this, we see that we haven't gone a long way. Many valuable gains, like gender budgeting were mentioned here, and these are all important. However when we look at the whole picture and try to see how far we have gone, we can see that we are in quite a miserable situation and that we need big changes. If we can prevent violence against even a single person, a single woman in this capitalist system, this is very important. However, I still believe we need a big transformation. Serpil talked about hope, I think we do need hope and we need to gather our hopes together. We need a holistic perspective against men and against capitalism. Otherwise, what I can see for the future is gender mainstreaming and flexible security in state and government programmes... On the one hand, flexible security causes individualization, it facilitates exploitation by causing disorganization and atomization within the class; on the other hand gender mainstreaming also leads to disorganization... In other words, neoliberal policies are perpetuated. Sorry for taking so long. Thank you.

Halime Güner: I took the floor in order to say something similar to Serpil Çakır's intervention. I want to continue from where she left:

I want to remind you of the women's conference before 1990 which changed so many things and opened so many new paths in our minds and the synergy it gave us; then the feminist weekend; following that, CEDAW and the gathering together of 453 women for three days... In other words, I intervened to talk about the feeling of togetherness and the morale this meeting provides, besides its specific topic. I came from Ankara and I am very glad that I came. I really thank you. In the period ahead of us, we can perhaps hold meetings on the direction that women's associations should take, because if it's true that we can change life only by establishing real contact with it, then that will happen not here but by doing fieldwork. Therefore, we can organize a meeting to discuss where we should be carrying out fieldwork of women's organizations with a feminist perspective. Thank you all.

Zeynep Bursa: First of all, I'm also very happy for having been here for the past two days. Just as Serpil Çakır said, I also came to see Heidi Hartmann in person. I am very glad to have met Helena Hirata and Jean Gardiner. Gülnur Acar Savran has, it seems, made sure without my knowledge that I maintained a feminist stance all the while I was amongst socialists, and I'm also very happy to see her again. I'm not sure whether there will be time to answer this question, but I want to say a few words on the issue of sex workers mentioned by Helena Hirata. "Sex workers" was translated here as prostitutes or street walkers. There are some contradictions in my mind on this subject. After all, it is the commodification or forceful commodification of women's bodies that we are talking about. On the other hand, there are feminists who defend the use of this term in the name of occupational or economical freedom. Rather than making a political or ideological judgement here, I would like to find out what your thoughts on this issue are. However, something I read in an article has stuck to my mind. As you all know, one of the things that neoliberal capitalism has commodified is hair, human hair, especially women's hair. India is one of the countries that exports most hair. The income gained from Indian women's hair reaches up to 300 million dollars per year. Considering the commodification of women's hair, women's bodies and their transformation into commodities which

are sold and purchased; do you think that this has an aspect of economical freedom or is it rather a coercion caused by the conditions we are in? Or is it an inhuman situation as Hirata stated in the last instance? Thank you.

Melek Özman: First of all thank you for the wonderful job you did. I'd like to begin with a suggestion: We should definitely make this a tradition, I mean, it should happen next year and the year after. Because it is really a huge subject that we're talking about. Whether domestic, flexible, home-based or not, understanding women's labour and being organized on that basis is a really difficult thing. There are many women's organizations in Turkey. And there are maybe 40-50 women's cooperatives, all organized on the basis of what they produce. Apart from these, I know that the women workers in home-based production are also organized and they have cooperatives. There are different women's cooperatives. However I would like to make one point: There are new theories relating to wage labour which cannot be explained merely by neoliberal policies, such as glass ceiling or glass abyss. There are glass ceilings in the media. And men are on the ceilings, in the decision-making mechanisms. These are solid layers. Women work in the fluid layers in the middle and in those sectors which function as kitchens in the preparation of the job. These are very complicated matters, even more complicated than the issue of equal wages. There is nowhere to breathe or to go. There is a great need for comprehending these matters and also for a conversation about organizational experiences, if we carry on these conferences. That's why I thanked you for the wonderful job you did. Good thing you started it. However, on the subject of organizing, I've always believed in feminist organizations. The idea of having huge feminist organizations or a political party really scares me. I believe in having small intervention groups, small change and action groups. However, I need to discuss and understand the organizational models in the area of women's work. I'd like to draw your attention to the areas in which we can organize ourselves on the basis of women's labour, for the next conference. I thank you all.

Gaye: Some allusions were made, both to the existing policy of

isolation and to the deconstruction of identities. I would like to query one thing, if you could please enlighten me in the closing speech: The feminist movement has its own inner distinctions, but at least as far as anarcho-feminism or socialist feminism are concerned we have an academic language. We can hold a meeting where we can share our ideas and discuss both the “ideal” and the “actual.” However when we walk out of here, there are lots of people, women, who believe in power, that is, women who haven’t given any thought to feminism. I think that there is a need for explaining what feminism is. It is much easier to talk about everything theoretically, however, I’d be very pleased if you could inform us on what we can do in practice. I mean, I can share my thoughts with my father who is in power at home and who earns the money; but my mother is so reserved and oppressive that I sometimes think that my father is actually my mother and my mother is my father in terms of gender. Thank you.

Gülner Acar Savran: We have very little time left, so I will not be able to answer all the questions. First I’d like to express my own idea about a women’s party. Feminist politics must of course be carried out in organizational forms which allow us to politicize the personal and the private. However I think that, in the occurrence of a rise in the women’s movement, the establishment of, not a women’s, but a feminist party isn’t impossible. Because we all know about women’s platforms in mixed political parties. In Turkey we are not at all short of experience in this regard. I don’t want to dwell upon this at length here. Secondly, about the issue of home-based work: I have it in my notes, cross my heart, when I said şexibility and referred to the expansion of the informal sector, home-based work was among the examples; I must have skipped it. Thirdly, yesterday Yıldız herself gave a very good hint about how women’s solidarity could be possible in paid domestic work. Still, she is right of course: It’s really hard for her to forge solidarity with her boss at home. But there was an important hint there: We should always bear in mind that, what positions the boss at home and the domestic worker against one another is patriarchy, that behind the scene there

is a man, and that it is his dirt that is being cleaned. Beyond this, I can't say much either on solidarity. Concerning prostitution: I think that the polarization between prostitution as profession and prostitution as mere violence is dangerous. Because when we say that prostitution is violence, full stop, we risk ignoring the social rights of prostitutes. And until prostitution is abolished we have to defend the social rights of sex workers. And lastly, perhaps it will be much too theoretical, but I want to respond to Dilek's words on not considering women as passive victims who have been subjected to various form of oppression: I believe in trying to form a dialectical synthesis between an analysis which explains the social on the basis of social actors and a structural analysis. Thanks.

Jean Gardiner: Okay. Can I just say that one of the side effects of having a speaker for two quite long days is that by the end of the two days, it is actually quite hard to have anything sensible to say in response to what has been a very, very interesting discussion. And I cannot do justice to the points that have been raised. I just want to pick out one or two things. Just to make a link between some of those points that have been made. I think there is this tension in the debate: What we are referring to as a holistic theory, something where we can understand all the links, all the connections at the global level, is the desirable goal. This session is about feminist politics and politics operates at different levels. It operates at a local level at the Şeld: Somebody talked about a personal experience which was experienced in her family, the other person talked about the thing which is personal, somebody out there talked about the politics of the personal. All feminist politics has to relate with all these levels and actually politics at the global and international level is much harder for us to engage with. So it is not either the local, family level or the international level. And I think it is a mistake to pose these things as alternatives. We all have to work where we work; we have to do what we are trying to do but not to criticize others for wanting to work at a different level. Just a quick comment about fathers and mothers: I think it is an interesting issue really. There are other examples where

fathers have played an important role in supporting the liberation of daughters. I will just give you an example: Some research is done on why women go to engineering or science or technical occupations. In the UK it is found that a very high percentage of these women have fathers who work in science, engineering or technical occupations. And I think fathers can be allies, they are not always patriarchs. My general message is that we have to understand the specifics of the political arena in which we are operating.

Heidi Hartmann: It is really difficult to find anything intelligent to say at this moment, but let me start by saying that we had a wonderful time, we learned a lot, but we will not possibly remember your names but we will try. And we hope we will stay in touch in the years to come. We have worked with small consciousness raising groups in which I also participated, consciousness raising in order to figure out where our motivation arises and to understand how we were socialized to be in certain a way. So I want to encourage you to do that if you have not been doing that here. There are two comments which are related to being domestic workers and workers in home-based production which I remembered... I can comment about this in terms of developing standards of behaviour and standards of treatment. And this sometimes works. You can get strong enough to demand paid vacations, for example, and participation in the social insurance system. We do have that now in the US for domestic workers; they are covered by social security. So I think the solution to both is to improve those standards. I know people are saying about home-based work that the government makes it possible to exploit women who are making these products but it does not have to be that; we can work with that union and enforce the regulations. I know that you feel that your movement is in a radical path and you do not want to hear about this boring stuff, like working with government agencies and trying to make things better, which I do every day and I know it is really boring. But you do not have to do it in a boring way. You can just be out there in the street, protesting and complaining. And bureaucrats will have to figure out how to

improve the regulations. Keep protesting. You do not have to make a consensus if you really do not want to. For example, the Occupy Wall Street movement in the US had no agenda. It does not matter and they are making a very forceful point. And they are changing the debate all over the country and the world without a detailed political agenda, so we do not have to get into the details. You just have to say, this is not good, this is exploiting women, we do not like it, stop it, and they will try to figure out how they can get it done. But I want to emphasize two points: One is the issue of the women's political party. Looking at the US, we have all of the resources and strengths as women's organizations, but we do not have the political attractiveness that we should have. And I think one reason is that we have not been able to successfully penetrate the political parties. What happened is, the Republican Party completely abandoned the women's agenda. They basically drew feminists out of their party. So all the women vote for the Democratic Party and they took all the women in the National Democratic Congress. But there was a great number of republicans in the congress. We have no way right now to be effective on the national scene. I think now that when I was first active in the women's liberation movement in the 1970s, I would have never bothered with anything so bourgeois. But I have come to realize that this process which controls the resources for our movement, and we have a lot of federal resources in the US for our movement, led us away from political representation. And we do not, I do not feel that we have the political power that we should, and this is the reason for my suggestion about women's parties. I'll conclude my speech with a comment about fathers and daughters. One of the things our members of congress try is to get fathers and daughters to vote for us on women's issues and we always find that men who have daughters are much more likely to vote for our issues; and you know this is such an interesting issue because they want for their daughters that they never wanted for their wives.





