FEMINISM AS DEVELOPMENT PLANNING THEORY

by

RAMONA MATTIX

B.A. PSYCHOLOGY

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS (PLANNING)

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

SCHOOL OF COMMUNITY AND REGIONAL PLANNING

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October 1989

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Graduate Studies, School of Community and Regional Planning

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date Sept. 22, 1989

DE-6 (2/88)

Feminism As Development Planning Theory

ABSTRACT

This thesis argues that feminism, the political force advocating equity and parity for women vis-a-vis men, provides a much needed critique to developmental planning theory as well as informing planning practice in general. Feminism, in the political arenas of liberalism, socialism, and radical theory, offers alternative views of power relations. These alternative views are submitted as important keys to transformational planning, that is, planning that becomes a force for structural social change.

The concept of discourse is offered in this thesis as a form of social analysis as important to social change as Marxist analysis is to economic change. The voice of women, it is submitted, has been outside public discourse, and this omission has contributed to their social condition.

Within the thesis is an overview of the womens' movement. It also contains an analysis of alternate paths to democracy held by liberal, socialist and radical positions, and discusses the importance of feminist criticism held by women supporting each ideological position.

The liberatory possiblities of mainstream development planning theory "hearing" the voice of women is explored, along with the contention that new institutions which allow

for social transformation can best be met by valueing womens' experience, and by initiating change at the household level.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank my advisor, Professor Peter Boothroyd, for his conviction that feminist thought is both necessary and important to the discipline of planning, as well as Dr. Julia Gardner, for her thoughtful advice and confidence in this work. In addition, I must express my gratitude to "Monday Group" for the enormous motivational and explorational force they played for me during my two years in graduate school. Finally, I would like to acknowledge my husband, Paul Sneed, for his unwavering belief that the values called for in this work are indeed transformational.

FEMINISM AS DEVELOPMENT PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

This thesis will show how the discipline of planning, particularly development planning, through attention to women's voice, can not only become more sensitive to the issue of gender equity, but can become more effective in practice. There is developed a vantage point from which feminist theory can be viewed as a primary contribution to development planning theory. Feminist considerations open a new window through which to see a population or a political ideology.

The thrust of the message from the womens' movement supports transformational development planning, that is, planning which manages social change in a manner which does not perpetuate existing relations of power that are hierarchical and materially based. This thesis throughout will focus on how development planning theory and practice can and should be informed by including women's voice in discourse.

Definitions

Theory, in the hard, scientific sense as the term originated, is a hypothesis, or guess about why and how

certain things occur. Hypotheses can be tested for validity or truth by various experimental procedures. Theory in the social sciences, however, cannot be verified as easily. Thus, theories of planning, for purposes of discussion in this thesis, are considered assumptions about cause and effect relationships which lend themselves to specific choices of action on the part of those in the practice of planning.

Also for the purpose of definition, it can be generally stated that planning is an activity which occurs in a political setting that serves to direct physical and psychological improvements for constituents within specific geographical boundaries (Grabow and Heskin, 1973; Beazley, 1989).

Development planning theory, 'mainstream' development planning in particular, aims to account for the reasons a region or a country is at a less efficient or advanced state than other industrialized areas and to offer solutions for inefficiencies or lack of industrialization. The practice of development planning seeks, fundamentally, to initiate and propel a process of advancement and efficiency in the direction of industrialization and economic development.

Development planning theorists are diverse in their assumptions of the cause of under-development (Frank, 1966;

McClelland, 1961; Rostow, 1960), yet all theorists share a singular characteristic. Each development planning theorist translates policy (the primary connection between theory and practice) through specific assumptions about the nature of power, using particular political and social theories of cause to create social change in the direction they see fit. The paths for development proposed by planning theorists head in three general directions, liberal, socialist and radical, according to their assumptions and visions about power. As will be seen, feminist thinking is situated along the same three directions.

A precise definition of equity is difficult to construct due to the current contextual nature of assumptions about power made by planners, governments, markets and households. Within those decisions, equity is often contextual to the worldview in which it is defined. Equity in liberal terms is equality of opportunity. Equity in socialist terms is equality of condition. Equity in radical terms combines both liberal and socialist notions of equity and adds a third, committment to non-material based value. For the purposes of this thesis, the definition of equity will be considered from a radical theoretical stance, where the political conceptions of equality of opportunity, condition, and commitment to values of a non-material nature

become cumulative.

The importance of context in a comprehensive theoretical view of of planning theory has been noted:

> ...a more nearly adequate epistemology of planning practice would take account of them [theorists] all. It would describe the knowledge implicit in planning practice, including the know-how by which planners frame both the situations of their practice and the roles which mediate their activities in interpersonal, institutional, and political contexts. It would also show how role and context contribute the formation of knowing-in-practice (Schon, 1982:352).

The vision of development theorists and planners is thus bounded by their analysis of current political context. The political alternatives supported by liberal, socialist, and radical ideologies are useful for analysis in the manner in which they are adopted by development planners. Particularly important is the expression of development planning theory and practice as it affects women.

THE POWER OF DISCOURSE OR VOICE

In addition to multiplicity of theory, definition and variation of solution, planning theory has another notable feature, the lack of the voice of women. It is both significant and unsettling that a profession which has historically provided goals for human settlement and expert prescriptions for social, environmental and economic problem

solving shows such an neglect. If there is no recognized participation by women in discourse, there is no forum for women's thoughts and ideas.

John Friedmann's comprehensive 547 page review and analysis of planning theory devotes only two pages to feminist theory in which he describes it as having no unified social critique. What he does say, however, is:

> Households are the central institution in civil society. And if the principal aim of a reconstructive practice is the recovery of political community as an autonomous domain through institutions of self-management, that community being the political expression of civil society, the reconstruction of the household in line with feminist conceptions is an essential step (Friedmann, 1987:269).

What are we to make of the fact that, not only are there no widely recognized women planning theorists, but also that women's roles in production and reproduction, in education, and in political and social community have gone un-acknowledged by many male economic development and planning theorists alike? What changes in planning theory and practice might occur if feminist precepts were integrated in the mandate of the profession and not, as often seems the case, limited to "reconstruction of the household"? What if the voices of women compelled planning to create a forum which heard another set of priorities?

The Concept of Discourse

Historically, the conception of discourse, which was first articulated by Greek thinkers such as Socrates and Plato, allowed only Greek male citizens to have a social and political 'voice'. Much later, Jurgen Habermas developed a communications theory which focused on ideals of equity in participation of social dialogue (Forester, 1989). The importance of such social discourse was also explored at length in the work of historian philosopher Micheal Foucault (1972).

Foucault believed that power is situated in the dominance of various discursive fields. The authority that has the power to name, or to prevent naming, wields a dominant discourse and therefore shapes understanding and knowledge. Foucault contended western civilization created a major discourse about the body at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution as a method of increasing control over a general population who were becoming self-sufficient as a result of increases in material well-being and therefore, were harder to control by government or by market monopoly of resources. Arising from new-found self-sufficiency were control mechanisms of personal and specialist disciplines like medicine, psychology, sociology and criminology. These were useful, according to Foucault, because of what he

termed "a reversal of the political axis of individuation" which occurred in the 17th century. This meant that power had previously been embodied in the person of a ruler or monarch and excercised on anonymous masses; but power in this instance did not have the physical capacity to enforce compliance over every subject at all times. In the modern era, however, it was power that became anonymous and all invasive, and controlled the individual through social and psychological restrictions heretofore uneccessary and unknown.

The importance of Foucault's work for feminist theory and planning theory alike is in his analysis of the control maintained through discourse. If the power to name belongs to men or certain men, say, planners, then all understanding and knowledge related to their discourse is shaped by those men. If development planning in theory legitimates practice by naming certain arenas for change, it also eliminates others by definition (Forester, 1989). Arenas not often named included women and minorities.

Forester argues that planners exercise power by decision making, agenda setting and shaping "felt" needs of those they purport to serve. When planners manage information by framing problems, he says, they define what is comprehended. Planners can also be the agents of false

assurance, which Forester submits is managing trust, as well as agents of illegitimacy (managing consent) and misrepresenation (managing knowledge). Planners' role in discourse is often powerful and mis-used according to Forester. Planners may view themselves, then, as serving the public interest but, in fact, may answer to the dominant 'voice'.

Similarly, there are definitions provided by the dominant discourse which specify the cultural notion of what a Woman is. Everyday life for women is made problematic in this way. In speaking of her experience at graduate school, Canadian feminist Dorthy Shaw states:

> "The forms of thought, the means of expression, that we had available to us to formulate our experience were made or controlled by men. From that center women appeared as objects. In relation to men (of the ruling class) women's consciousness did not, and most probably generally still does not, appear as an autonomous source of knowledge, experience, relevance and imagination. Women's experience did not appear as the source of an authoritiative general expression of the world. Women did not appear to men as men do to one another, as persons who might share in the common construction of a social reality where that is essentially an ideological construction" (Shaw, 1987:51).

In the common construction of reality proposed by Shaw, it is essential that the power to name be acknowledged and shared with women. Development planning theory, which has been male theory, therefore, requires the participation of

the voice of women, and must legitimate women's experience in its practice.

In a work which addresses issues of power for planners in particular, Forester states that:

> The encouragement of 'voice' is important in two related senses - the broadly political and democratic sense of 'the voice of the people', and the more specific experiential sense conveyed by Belenky et al. in their study of women's epistemological and ethical development: "What we had not anticipated was that 'voice' was more than an academic shorthand for a person's point of view ... In describing their lives, women commonly talked about voice and silence: 'speaking up', 'being silenced', 'not being heard' in an endless variety of connotations all having to do with sense of mind, selfworth ... women repeatedly used the metaphor of voice to depict their intellectual and ethical development." ... we have argued that planners can encourage (or obstruct) the development of voices of ... those who may be vulnerable politically for reasons of class, race or gender (1989:231).

THE VALUE OF A FEMINIST CRITIQUE

As stated earlier, existing theories of political change are found in various facets of feminist thought. Despite political differences there are several ideas that feminism in general can be said to promote - a belief that men have oppressed women on both a private (in the sense of interpersonal and household) basis and on a public scale (in the sense of laws created and cultural beliefs fostered

about the inferiority of women), a determination that this oppression must be rectified, and an insistence on the social recognition of the value and integrity of feminine experience vis-a-vis that of men.

The social criticism grounded in feminist theory is primarily a criticism of patriarchy and claims that, basically, women have been outside the dominant modes of male discourse and that knowledge, which is derived and shaped in relationships with men, is male (DeBeauvoir, 1952; Friedan, 1963; Daley, 1978). Feminist inquiry challenges the understanding and assumptions of what is seen as an exclusively male world view.

Feminism holds that patriarchy was a priori to the class struggle, the regnancy of scientific thought, the growth of the capitalist economy and the rise of modern religion (French, 1985). The rise of patriarchy can be traced to a historical time (about five thousand years ago) following the appearance of nomadic invaders and widespread, organized war into territories previously inhabited by agrarian, non-hierarchical communities (Eisler, 1988).

Simply stated, male domination of the female at the personal level was a necessary and sufficient precursor to every dominant discourse affecting and defining human lives today. Manifestations of gender hierarchy which are rooted

in patriarchy of earlier periods and which continue to modern times are:

1. Specific sexual divisions of labor

2. Restriction of women in public life

3. Control of womens' sexuality and reproductive functions

4. Complex ideology for female submissiveness sanctioned by government, religion and social groups

The existence of these four oppressive social conditions contributes to a wide and varied intellectual examination of cause by feminists - principally psychological, archaeological, biological, anthropological and political science research (Eisler, 1988; Diamond and Quinby, 1988; Fisher, 1987; Basow, 1986; Bunch, 1987). These types of research have led to a rejection of an inherant female inferiority, and support political expressions of equity for all women. This is especially important for development planning theory and practice due to the vehicle for equity that "development" implies.

An overall feminist critique of development planning theory includes a political context (whether liberal, socialist or radical), places the foci of change at both the household and the institutional level, and emphasizes the importance of providing liberatory possibilities to women. What must be avoided, according to feminists, is a

situation where the individual is held responsible for his or her own victimization. Feminist theory and feminist critique bring alternative ways in which to conceive of social change that not only includes the sphere of the private, or the household, but the sphere of the public. The means for creating social change is most often referred to by feminists of all persuasions as empowerment.

Empowerment

Empowerment is liberatory; it creates conditions through which individuals can influence the direction of their lives. It is the basis of the feminist paradigm. A major feminist writer, Marilyn French, speaking about the need for a comprehensive feminist theory, states:

> To attempt to create a feminist political theory, an economic theory that includes all of what has been omitted by male theories, to write philosophy from a perspective that includes the body and emotions, despised castes, labor, childbirth and child rearing, that addresses itself to the complex and unclear matter of reproductive rights, responsiblities, and purposes, to love and need, is to tackle problems at their most profound level.

> We do not need a program: a program is a grid that is lowered upon a population and kills those who fall under its bars. It makes uniform, it regulates. it forbids. We need theory and feeling as rough guides on which to build a next step; flexible, responsive emotional theory capable of adjusting to human needs and desires when these create contradictions. No set of values can call itself a human morality unless it begins with the actuality of the human condition; no political system can contribute to felicity unless it begins with a human morality (1985:488).

Feminism, then rests on a foundation of empowerment which broadcasts the voice of women, which responds to male and female personal and social needs and desires, and which enables women to act toward positive social change and equity in both private and public spheres. The spheres of influence of development planning from a feminist perspective, it will be argued, includes promotion of empowerment.

The contention will be made first, that neglect of gender issues severely limits development planning theory and practice; second, that issues of gender cannot be included in planning theory and practice apart from feminist theory itself; and finally, that political, social and economic intentions and practices used in the attempts to establish gender equity (on the part of both governments, feminists and proponents of social justice like modern planners) have not been effective since their philosophical origins, some of which existed over three hundred years ago.

To summarize:

* When the social role and capacities of women are ignored, implementation efforts in development fail.

* The voice of women must inform development planning theory and practice.

* Regardless of political orientation, development planning theory and practice cannot bring about social justice apart from feminist concerns with equity.

FEMINIST HISTORY AND FEMINIST THOUGHT

This chapter will present a summary of feminist thought and history. A short review of feminist theory, including liberal, socialist and radical models, will be discussed and the importance of the historical basis of the women's movement will be emphasized. Readers unfamiliar with feminist concepts will be afforded an overiew of the scope of feminist ideology and activity.

THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Social change in less pluralistic times than the present occurred as a result of violent revolution, the slow diffusion of social and technological innovation, or political, often monarchist, directive. In modern times the catalyst for social change has often operated in the form of a movement, a type of political involvement of citizens which functions outside the area of government and institutional power, which is the traditional public sector, and outside household and economic influences, the traditional private sector (Bellah, et al., 1985; Nerfin, 1987). Movements begin and flourish out of public opinion or reaction which gains the credence and support of organized, established groups, or the momentum of such movements

creates a social force of its own. The political legacy of the women's movement was created in the processes of democratic reform that characterises much of the 19th century, particularly in Europe. It is in reform that feminist theory and activity are currently and were historically most often expressed.

The women's movement as an organized historical and political activity can be traced to the mid-nineteeth century. While women espousing more rights and freedoms for women were writing privately, in addition to publishing in public venues as early as the 1500's, there was no organized political activity by women on behalf of women until the time of the French Revolution. At that time the French Republic awarded women the right to divorce, equal rights to inherit, rights to share family property and the right to custody of infants and daughters. Significantly, however, women were not encouraged to speak in public forum and French feminist Olympe DeGouges, who dedicated the "Rights of Woman and the Citizen" to the queen in 1792, was beheaded, ostensibly not for her support of the monarchy, but for "having forgotten the virtues which belong to her sex" (Marks and DeCourtviron, 1981:16). Even these limited gains by French women were to last less than ten years as the government of Napolean Bonaparte rescinded these rights

(French, 1985:192).

During the Industrial Revolution in England, women in the workforce became a political issue. Prior to that time women often worked in guilds along side their husbands or sons. But with increased industrial activity and union organization by the guilds and by men in specific industries, curtailment of the work of women to certain occupations and for specific hours was promoted. As a result, entry to particular trades or skills by women was regulated with the effect of excluding women from better paying positions in the workforce (Walby, 1986). Women were further limited from effective participation in the job market by legislation designed, ironically, to protect them from working long hours in English factories and mines. Women, therefore, began to organize on their own behalf in order to be fairly represented in discourse concerning their welfare. In general, then, the women's movement in England is associated with the labor movement.

In the U.S., women's political activity was associated with the abolitionist movement. During and after the American Civil War women organized on the issue of eradicating slavery. Much of this work was done within the confines of religious organizations such as the Quakers, but later women, led by Lucretia Mott, founded their own anti-

slavery group because the American Anti-Slavery Society did not permit women to speak at its meetings. The treatment of women in the abolitionist movement so outraged Mott and another woman abolitionist, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, that in 1848 they organized a Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York which issued eleven resolutions calling for reform to correct women's unequal social condition.

Characterized as the 'First Wave' these early women's movements concentrated on two areas: sufferage, which was viewed as the key to equal treatment of women politically, economically and socially; and, secondly, calls for determinant improvements in the quality of everyday life. The temperance movement, prison and mental institution reform, and establishment of institutions of higher education for women all provide evidence of women's struggles in the direction of securing better living conditions not only for women alone but for other disadvantaged groups.

It is important to note that these reforms were engineered through volunteer and charitable associations as opposed to being the result of government policy change or market demand. And from those small beginnings, the women's movement became a force for social change.

During the same period as the early women's movements,

the 'cult of domesticity' appeared. Essentially, this was the idealization of women in the role of wife and mother. The notion offered by this 'cult' was that women were morally superior to men and that it was women's influence that civilized human activity. Reflected in the popular media of the day and in government legal and institutional limitations on women (such as prohibiting them from practicing law and refusing them entry into medical schools), the 'cult of domesticity' heralded a counter force to the women's movement (Marshall, 1984; French, 1985; Tax, 1980; Baxendall, 1976; Friedan, 1963). The result of distinguishing women as paragons of virtue and self-sacrifice and the home as a haven of respite for husbands from the competitive world of men, was to define the household sphere as the ideal boundary for women's activity and to limit the political expression of women. It was a force that would come back to haunt women after World War II.

In the U.S., women's push for sufferage, which began in 1848 at the Seneca Falls Convention, took seventy-two years to succeed. Women in most western nations were not granted the right to vote until after World War I. The women of Switzerland did not attain sufferage until 1971 and were still barred from voting in certain local elections as late

as 1985 (French, 1985).

The 'Second Wave' of the women's movement occurred in the mid-twentieth century. During World War II there had been an influx of women into the industrial workforce. Occupations formerly closed to women, such as welding or tinsmithing, welcomed them during that period, but when the war ended and industry was scaled down women were expected to return to the household and in doing so hand over their jobs to returning servicemen. The 'cult of domesticity' resurfaced and women were once again defined by their engagement in the social role of mothering and their expertise in providing a home for their husband.

In the 1950s women's political activity in the U.S. was connected with the civil rights movement with which it had historical association. In the 1960s women supported the peace movement directed against the Vietnam War. At this point women were becoming increasingly aware that suffrage alone could not deliver anticipated social, economic and political equality and began to suspect that other, deeper forces dictated the direction of their lives. The first femininst theorists appeared at this time (DeBeauvoir, 1952; Friedan, 1963) and later other theorists surfaced, such as Daly (1978), on language; Millet (1970), on the politics of sex; Firestone (1970), on reproduction; MacKinnon (1983), on

feminist Marxism; Gilligan (1982), on female ethics and Chodorow (1978), on female psychology. These women contributed to feminist examinations which attempted to conceptualize who and what those deeper forces might be.

This comprehensive examination, characteristic of the womens' movement, was noted by economist Hilkka Pietila:

> The most interesting and the most original of these [social] movements is the womens' movement. It is the most comprehensive and the least prejudiced of the movements which have started and developed their activity over recent years. It receives substance and enhancement from widening and diversifying womens's research, which opens up new perspectives for equality between men and women as well as for social transformation altogether. An analytical, cognitive women's movement as such is [the] peace movement. Here it differs decisively from the so-called equal rights movement, which has not questioned the basic structures and values of the present social order, and which pursued equality for women in [the] men's world on mainly male terms (Waring,1988:176).

Feminist Theory

A great deal of research in the 'hard' sciences that has been done within the last twenty years indicates that any biological assumption of inferiority of women to men has no support (Basow, 1986; Tavris, 1984). And cross-cultural studies regarding the structure of the social fabric in communities find considerable variation among roles of women in specific societies (Duley and Edwards, 1986). Women, for

example, are shown to have control over tribal ritual, to determine bride worth, and to engage in diverse activites such as farming, medicine, construction of housing, and owning their own businesses. Yet nowhere on earth are women, as a specific group, known to be in control of the balance of political power or control access to resources essential to the formation of modern industrialization. In the third world, women are lucky if they can read or even work for wages. Worldwide, women constitute about one half of the world's workforce. They exert two-thirds of the world's work hours, yet they receive only 10% of the world's income and own less than one one-hundreth of the world's property (CIDA, 1988).

These conditions of inequality have promoted analysis of the situation in order to seek solutions. The approaches taken by feminist theorist analysis are intricate, complicated and fractured. The previously cited call for a comprehensive theory by French (1985), as well as others, indicates a lack of cohesive social critique (Rich, 1986; Grimshaw, 1986; Elshtain, 1981). The power which perpetuates the oppression of women has been attributed by feminists, as noted earlier, to language, to class, to capitalism, to the composition of the family, to sexuality itself (Dworkin, 1974), to psychological pressures and interpretations, and

to the conventional socialization of children, among other influences. It is submitted that the paucity of agreement among feminist theorists lies not with faulty attribution of cause, but with differing assumptions regarding the "correct" path to democracy - the equal sharing of power.

The solutions supported by feminists to eliminate oppression of women are roughly aligned with existing worldviews about power and the creation of social change, i.e., liberalism, socialism and radicalism. It is the fact of a feminist critique within each of these social change paradigms that imbues feminist theory with importance to development planning theory and practice. In following chapters, I will examine the assumptions inherant in liberalism, socialism and radicalism, look at the connections of each to development planning theory and discuss the feminist critique of each of the three.

THREE CONCEPTIONS OF POWER

This chapter will cover three main aspects of political ideology, that is, three visions of how to create a just and workable society in a world that is fractured geographically, culturally and socioeconomically.

From the time modern political theory originated in the Seventeenth century until the present day, the ideology termed democracy has come to be viewed as the manner in which to structure power relations, from the way we raise our children (Calhoun, 1973) to the manner in which we structure our civic obligation (Krip et al., 1986). The core of democratic belief is that power should be equally shared among all people. The problem, of course, has been that power has never been democratically shared, during written history at least, so mechanisms for governance using democracy as an ideal were created, or in some cases governments were changed, in an attempt to bring about justice or fairness to those governed. The three primary designs for a democratic society are liberalism, socialism and radical theory.

LIBERALISM

Liberal democracy, or liberalism, is based on the

principle that everyone is created equal and has specific rights as individuals. Government is viewed as an agent of control. Liberal government, therefore, is expressly designed to protect individuals from governmental hegemony by the singular manner in which its law-making institutions are structured. This means that there are only certain areas in which the government can operate; these are referred to as the public sphere. It generally includes activities which are seen as promoting the public good such as providing highways, hospitals, sewage systems and enforcing laws. Everything outside the public sphere is termed the private sphere (Andrew and Milroy, 1988). This includes the household and, more importantly, the market. Government is not supposed to control activities in the private sphere, although it tends to interfere when power is concentrated by some persons or businesses in a manner that is viewed as unjust to other elements in society. This governmental interference in the private sphere is often done by the method of reform, and reform is the chief mechanism used in liberalism to produce social change.

Reform has two qualities - it is incremental rather than revolutionary and it maintains existing power relations while enabling the government to respond to unequal social conditions or, in some cases, to protect particular

interests (Heilbroner, 1975). The relations of power considered most visible in a liberal system are in two domains - the government in the public domain and the capitalist economy in the private domain (Bergman,1986).

These domains are the major area of discourse and power in modern life. In our everyday lives we contend directly with governmental laws and enforcers of those laws; we utilize government infrastructure; we pay taxes. We also deal with market choices, income vicissitudes and with the members of our household and human needs and desires on an intimate level. But these areas are not seperate entities which act independently.

The Interaction of the Market and the State Under Liberalism

Governments claim resources in the form of taxes and make purchases in the market which assist them in completing state obligations that benefit both households and the market. This function is so essential historian and economist Heilbroner (1975) claimed that without unacknowledged subsidies, such as highway systems, capitalism could not exist.

On the other hand, the market affects the resources available to governments and households on a global as well as local basis, as the diminishing numbers of family farms

and the oil embargo of 1974 demonstrate.

Households everywhere affect or affirm government by voting, paying taxes and obeying laws. The household is the current unit of consumption and as such affects the market by its choice in that consumption and by the participation of its members in the workforce. This practice of consumption and participation in liberal society strongly affects individuals' voices in discourse. For example, the political movements which occur within a liberal society but outside government and market institutions, and which gain various household and institutional support, are the mechanism by which individuals can make themselves heard.

Development Planning in the Liberal Tradition

Liberalism focuses on individualism, which has far-reaching ramifications for the construction of social life (Bellah et al., 1985). The political endorsement of the rights of the individual is a distinct expression of liberal governance that development planning reflects by supporting zoning variances, for example. This individualism creates a contextual value system where there are no absolute rights and wrongs, only individual expression of values through 'free' choice. Planning protects free choice by restricting the ability of people to impinge choices on one another in

the same manner as liberal government, i.e. by law.

Liberalism also supports equality of opportunity. This is not the same as equality of result, because differences of circumstance are a fact of everyday life. To mitigate discrepancies western nations adopted a 'development' practice which is not often recognized as such: the creation of the welfare programs. The existence of economic instability and inequality of opportunity has led western liberal nations to the use of mediation policies such as government management of the economy, government regulation of production (including subsidies and tax apportionment), government provision of massive infrastructure --- both physical and social, and institutionalized welfare.

Fundamentally, development planning under liberalism is interventionist and historically grounded in reformist practice. Mainstream development planning tends to be bureaucratically top heavy and heirarchical. Small communities, isolated regions and nations who are technologically and economically poor (Third World Countries) have lacked the ability to deal effectively, i.e., make themselves heard, with the institutional structures and large-scale organizations that characterize modern society. Therefore, development decisions, in practice, are not made democratically but by bureaucratic

professionals informing government policy on a top-down basis (Goodell, 1984; Forester, 1989).

Modernization Theory

Development theory in liberal terms may be called modernization theory (Garbarino, 1988). Modernization theory is defined as a theory of social evolution which views a population as players in a competition that moves along a scale of increasing complexity and division of labor. A development planner, according to this theory, should encourage efficiency and specialization of production. The rapid rate of economic growth in newly industrialized countries in the Third World as well as the current economic strength of Japan are examples of modernization in practice. It could be generally said that modernization is the process by which the Third world patterns its development on the examples set by industrialized nations; that is, evolving stages of growing technological sophistication which create prosperity (Rostow, 1972; Boulding, 1981).

Modernization tacitly assumes economic growth and technological expansion will improve the quality of life for the residents of a region or country. But James Garbarino contends:

> ...in most modernizing societies the economy services a small but politically powerful group of elites. Household and community food needs receive low priority. Cash crops and capital intensive agriculture displace rural society, and stimulating exports to secure foreign exchange is the name of the game. Stimulating a modern economic elite in the current historical context usually causes collapse of the basic agricultural subsistance economy in the countryside. This produces rising unemployment and a grotesque rush to the big cities, where a few get lucky but for the most life offers little more than survival (1988:158).

Much has been written demonstrating the dangers and pitfalls created by development which uses modernization theory as the basis for social change (Thurow, 1984; Bookchin, 1987; WCED, 1987). The crisis of international debt is a sufficient and powerful example of the problems created through liberal modernization.

The role of the planner within a liberal society as an agent of modernization is often expressed through the role of an advocate. Kravitz (1968) was critical of advocacy planning, which was at that time called 'radical' planning, because he claimed that advocates were really serving the system and not the clients they claimed to represent. The advocate planner of the Davidoff school becomes a conduit who translates the language of the dominant discourses so the words are understandable to those without voice. In development planning the role of the professional who serves the 'public' interest supports this notion (Charoesin-o-

laro, 1985).

Because modern society is so complicated and large, planners become one more represenative for constituents. Yet, once again, there is a missing element, a social conundrum that is not well addressed by reformists offering solutions to problems created by liberal policies that exacerbate the problems of modern life. Simply, the problem is one of hierarchical administration and limited access to appropriate information by those whom decisions affect. This is the point at which the value of liberal feminism to liberal development theory becomes apparent (Bunch, 1987).

The Liberal Feminist Critique

Social oppression and disparity of opportunities, in particular for women but to minorities as well, is seen by liberal feminists to stem from the gender-specific nature of the liberal political system. In simple terms the state supports social and economic forces which exclude women and minorities from political power. The state, according to liberal feminist theory, replaced older forms of patriarchy which operated to promote and maintain male dominance in both the public domain of government and the private domain of the economy. Introduction of the social force of patriarchy as a power mechanism is the most important

contribution of the liberal feminist critique of liberalism.

Support for liberal feminist theory regarding equity comes primarily from historical and anthropological literature that documents the development of patriarchal governance and private property prior to industrialization (Mead, 1949; Goldberg, 1977; Delphy, 1984; Grimshaw, 1986). In other words, oppression of women is not considered a result of modernization, capitalism or other liberal activity by liberal feminists. It should be noted that radical feminists rely on much of the same literature to support their critique of radical theory.

Patriarchal political stance was well described by the grandfather of liberalism, John Locke, about 1690, speaking about his concern that citizens (whom he defined as men) have a right to private property largely because it was men's own labor which was exerted for the wages which were the only means of acquiring property without inheritance (French, 1985). Women, in this view, had little right to property and nothing to say about the products of their own labor. Locke, of course, assumed that all women would marry and have children and thus would not require any particular protection as male heads of households would take care of them. This is a political attitude which carries on to modern times. For example, census takers automatically term

the male as the household head in many countries (Thorberg, 1985).

In the main, liberal feminists support liberal views. They believe in representative democracy, equality of opportunity, and market efficiency. Liberal feminists work for greater participation of women in the workforce, they lobby on behalf of equal pay for equal work, they support efforts of government to enforce justice. The passage of the equal rights amendment in the U.S. and pro-choice legislation regarding reproductive rights are examples of liberal feminist belief in the value of liberal reform. Liberal feminists, like liberal planners, believe the status and quality of life of human beings can be increased on an incremental basis leaving the existing legal and economic structures of society intact. And to eliminate the discrepancy in power between men and women, according to liberal feminists, they must be treated equally before the law, and, in some cases, be protected from exploitation by law (Hewlett, 1968; Bergman, 1986; Friedan, 1963; Gelpi, et al., 1984).

The goal for liberal feminists is to eliminate patriarchal power through reform because they see patriarchy as the major stumbling block to a just society. This goal of liberal feminism is founded on the fact that, politically,

the percentage of high ranking women in national governments remains low regardless of political ideology: about 4% in the USSR (Tavris, 1984) and less than 5% in the U.S., including high ranked women in corporations, cultural organizations, educational institutions and governments (Dye, 1986). It appears that everywhere men have remained the power wielders. Liberal feminists, then, work to eliminate patriarchal power through reform.

SOCIALISM

For the socialist, capitalism, or the profit taking by the owners of the means of production, is the reason that the liberal deification of equality of opportunity fails to provide equality of condition. In essence, under socialism, the role of the state is to foster equality of condition. This is accomplished by eliminating political manipulation (characteristic, for example, of special interest groups) and economic exploitation by means administration so that the state plays a far greater role in the lives of individuals than a liberal system, particularly the liberal market system, would tolerate.

It is impossible to discuss socialism apart from Marxist philosophy. Marx's analysis that disparity and oppression begin with economic class structures created by

capitalism is the lens through which socialist and communist governments focus policies for social change. Democracy, equally shared resources and creation of community, is the Marxist vision of an ideal society. Socialism is connected to Marxist class analysis, but the difference between a socialist and a Marxist lies in the means by which they believe they can achieve generally the same ends. Within socialism it is important to remember there are both Marxist and non-Marxist brands of democratic socialism. These distinctions are not often easy to separate. Marxists are convinced a classless, democratic society can only occur through revolutionary, often violent, means. Social democratic countries, on the other hand, believe reform measures which control market competition and redistribute resources and income will succeed in eliminating economic exploitation of one class by another. That stance could be called mainstream socialism and is characteristic of many socialist and communist countries throughout the world.

An important feature of socialism is that two different spheres of influence than those in liberalism are recognized: state and collective. The state must be the arbitrator in the relations of power between production and people. The state is said to have no power of its own, but instead to be acting on behalf of the collective power of

the people.

Reform under socialism can be either revolutionary (in the sense of sweeping change such as land reform) or incremental (in the sense that economic plans may be spaced over years). Social change within socialism, therefore, is brought about through reform measures which are primarily economic or related to resources, but the administration, or bureaucracy, of socialist government is not greatly changed through reform (Castells, 1983).

Marxism goes further and asserts that social change can only occur from the collective action of oppressed classes to eliminate existing structures of oppression, which are identified as materialist relations. Marxist theory has special implications for developement planning theory. First, it suggests that until equal control of resources and ownership occurs, conflict will be inherent in society, its institutions, and between the working class and those who benefit from exploitation of labor. Secondly, it claims that strategies for dealing with that conflict must be collectively formed to re-order power relations.

Socialist Theories of Development

Characteristic of planning within socialist ideology is the heirarchical, administrative base which becomes a

foundation for planning decisions. Centralized planning underlies a belief in the superiority of scientific rationalism as the method to decision making (Clammer, 1979). Planning theories in socialist ideology consistently restrict the area of discourse to conditions of production and class. Since Marx

> "raised these questions most persistently and systematically, he remains a hidden interlocutor in much of social science discourse." (Wolf, 1982)

The historical account used as a basis for development planning was expanded by Immanual Wallerstein who developed the idea of a global market and a global division of labor which became a type of demographically based world systems theory (Wallerstein, 1974). In a similar fashion, Andre Frank proposed what he termed "The Development of Under-Development" which basically claimed that the capitalist market system used the resources of satellites, or undeveloped countries, to further the capitalist agenda of maintaining dominance over the means of production. Out of Frank's work came dependancy theory, a theory which has been and continues to be the most widely applied development planning theory in modern times (Frank, 1966; WCED, 1987).

During the last half of the twentieth century socialist countries, along with many Third World nations, have chosen the path of industrialization to increase the quality of

life and to enhance their development. The reason for lack of development, as Frank proposed, is not seen as lack of technological evolution, as in liberal development theory but, instead, because of policies created by colonial powers.

Dependency Theory

Dependency theory is linked to colonial domination and contends dependency began through colonial practices which can be eliminated by socialist reform. Dependency theory as a model used in development planning, analyses patterns of intersystemic and international linkages through time to reveal ways in which social change occured or failed to occur. These linkages created dependencies which appear to be a result of structures requiring unequal exchange, such as the colonial power importing raw materials but selling finished goods to the colonized country.

The intervention of either a donor state, or the newly created nation (formerly the colony) for the purposes of industrial growth, employment of residents, and redistributions of resources and income in that nation is a socialist development practice. To date, this socialist reform policy of aid (sometimes termed neo-colonialism) continues and is reflected in the structure and policy of

aid to Third World countries by industrialized donors (CIDA, 1988; WCED, 1988).

Dependancy theory identifies historical, materially based, exploitative relationships as the reason for lack of development (Frank, 1966; Elliot, 1977; Wolf, 1982; Castells, 1983; Hughes, 1985).

The Socialist Feminist Critque

The major contribution of socialist feminist critique to socialism has been largely the theoretical insistence that the economics of the family be recognized as a major contributor to the oppression of women.

While socialist feminists agree with the socialist emphasis on eliminating economic exploitation, most of them do not support the Marxist analysis that oppression is initially structured around class, even though the foundation of socialist feminist theory concurs with Marx's observations of economic structures and practice in the early 1800's. In the case of women, the central proposition of socialist feminism is "that women's special oppression is ultimately based on the family as an economic unit" (Leacock, 1972:57). To socialist feminists a focus on individual change must not supercede the focus for structural change in the household unit. As stated by Weir:

> "...the emphasis on ideology and its subjective operation in the individual has too often meshed in with the emphasis on individual change that was always a strand within women's liberation with the result that personal lifestyles [were thought] more amenable, at least within the middle class, to change than late monopoly capitalism appears to [be to] the main target of feminism. Of course it is important if individual men clean lavatories and change nappies ... but structural change is required as well" (1986:132).

Feminist Jean Bethke Elshtain addresses at length the way in which women have been limited in our time because they have had to use the language of rights expressly as individuals to promote their collective interests. She submits:

> "Their arguments had to be compressed within the linguistic forms of the liberal tradition. This meant that woman's "reason" as a public presence couldn't give voice to the private, social bases of female identity, couldn't allow women's experience to "speak to" the public realm ... She had no vocabulary, in public speech, to describe the nuances and textures of her actual social relations and social location. She lacked terms that might have afforded her a heightened, reflective understanding of herself and her world. The options left open to women were to speak the public language of liberalism and to conceive of their entry into politics on those terms" (1981:127).

While these quotes are intended to be a socialist feminist comment of liberal polices that oppress women, they also indicate an assumption that women themselves are a collective - a view that socialist development planning

theory simply ignores. In other words, even as socialist feminists, women could only "speak" using the words of the dominant discourse of socialist ideology (Sichtermann, 1986; Williams, 1988). Their social concerns and values had no means of expression simply because the concerns and values were different than those used by the dominant discourse. The uneasy alliance between socialism and socialist feminists was expressed when Elshtain posed the question, "Why can't a woman be more like a proletarian?"(Elshtain:256). The analogous socialist identification of all women with working class men, according to socialist feminist critique is an easy way that socialist ideolgy can escape dealing with "the problem of women". In this way, women are effectively silenced. This silence, and what other theorists (feminist and otherwise) have described as the invisibility of women (Boserup, 1970; Benaria, 1982; Smith, 1984; Waring, 1987), is the unseen and unheard oppression that socialist feminism is determined to make known.

Socialist feminists, then, claim that elimination of capitalist activity within the family as well as outside it, is necessary to eliminate class differences, and in so doing eliminate gender inequality. The solution for female exploitation in particular involves eradication of private

property and a redistribution of resources. Feminist socialism mandates changing the family as an economic unit where women's labor will not be considered a 'free' good. This means women should be relieved by the state of much of their familial functions such as childcare and housework (Elshtain, 1981; Millet, 1977; Walby, 1986).

Socialist feminism, like socialism and Marxism, recognizes that society contains contradictions during the process of social change as well as social needs for unity. One unrecognized contradiction within socialism, say socialist feminists, is that women are not viewed as a necessary part of the whole fabric of society, but as adjuncts. When China, after the revolution in the 1930's, sought to end old philosophical and religious sanctions requiring the subordination of women, Mao Tse Tung saw women as:

> ...a vast reserve of labor power. This reserve should be tapped and used in the struggle to build a mighty socialist country (Duley and Edwards, 1986:264).

This statement is precisely the fodder for the socialist feminist critique. Industry, far from wanting women at the hearth, requires their participation. Not only is efficiency and productivity raised by commodifying womens' work and their services, but women in the job market provide a reserve labor pool. Women entering the workforce

during periods of high activity become expendable in low periods, as well as providing a source of always cheaper labor (Anand, 1989; Duley and Edwards, 1986; Elliot, 1977).

Patriarchy as well as class plays an important role in oppression from the vantage point of the socialist feminist. Structures of power, the economy and the collective, are far more powerful forces of social influence than individual relations of men and women, both literally and figuratively, for socialist feminists (Leahy, 1986; Hartsock, 1985; MacIntosh, 1978).

RADICAL THEORY AND PRACTICE

The analyses set forth by radical thought had a birthplace in both anarchist and utopian theories and practice. The operating principle is change through action based on a critique of state power. Radical thought espouses the inherent freedom of the individual (an anarchist position) and the collective good of all (the utopian vision).

The utopian and anarchist tradition of separatism, what Friedmann calls the "politics of disengagement" (1987:83), is a singular feature of radical philosophy. Many utopian thinkers went on to develop their own communities, most of which failed. Those that survived often had strong religious

foundations, such as the Hutterites (Melnyck, 1985).

Radical theory stands outside the existing worldviews of liberalism and socialism and offers a social critique inspired by an alternative view of how the world might be structured. While this alternative view has taken various forms, such as communes, or communities of interest, the focus appears to be a reforming of power relations on community levels, and a decentralization of decision making on a democratic basis (Kropotkin, 1914; Friedmann, 1985; Ross and Usher, 1986; Illich, 1973; Devall and Sessions, 1985; Bookchin, 1987). The critique attempts to provide solutions for the increased public/private separation, that is, the demarcation and exchange of relations of power which split people from community, business from government, workers from their labor, and households from their environment. These separations are not seen as amenable to reform, of either liberal or socialist nature. Radical theory views power as maintaining itself through instruments of a hierarchical nature and economic hegemony.

Prior to the Seventeenth century, very little separated the social structures of kinship, market trade and production (Heilbroner, 1980). Public and private categories were used to acknowledge the power of the state relative to households. Capitalism, the democratic definition of wealth,

and industrialization created a change in the public/ private split which created, in turn, a new world-view, as suggested by Foucault (1972). The new world view supported a new individualism that fostered new social behaviors:

> What the great social transformation meant for individuals was that they faced challenges and uncertainties for which they were not prepared. Less than ever could they count on relating to others simply on the traditional grounds of kinship, local community, or inherited status. In the new, mobile, middle-class world, one autonomous individual had to deal with other autonomous individuals in situations where one's self esteem and prospects depended on one's ability to impress and negotiate. Social interactions under these conditions were often intense, but also limited and transient (Bellah et. al, 1985:118).

A socialist analysis would insist that the transformation of power from community to isolation which precipitated the change in the public/ private split, was based on material relations ordered by capitalist production. Liberal analysis would simply proffer an acceptance of an evolutionary technological force ordered by the free market where the complexity of tasks required more and more specialization. Radical analysis would reject these explanations and would maintain that state and market spheres of power never had to be structured in a hierarchical manner, that is, adaptive change and communication necessary for modern life could occur in smaller increments based on community interaction and

decision-making which would act as a counter force to heirarchical dominance.

Radical strategies are formed to be territiorial and are political as well as economic. Communities are encouraged toward self-reliance, i.e., to seek and develop their own resources (Melnyck, 1985). Local integration of decision-making is promoted by educating citizens, organizing resources and making a priority of defining and meeting local needs. These tactics lead to development planning that is informed, rational, and self directed activity which is considered to enhance the community or region vis-a-vis other areas.

Radical Development Planning Theory and Practice

Beazley (1989) identifies five characteristics of radical planning theory:

* It is emancipatory.
* Planning decisions are made by citizens themselves.
* It sees particpatory planning as the fundamental agent for social change.
* Rather than being apolitical it is political.
* It is committed to justice and equity.

The major issue that concerns radical development planners is local control to allow people to maximize their potential and protect their environment. In a comprehensive

book, People Centered Development, Russell Ackoff (1984) submits that radical development fosters:

> ...a capacity [that is] defined by what [people] can do with whatever they have to improve their quality of life and that of others (Korten and Klauss, 1984:195).

For radical planners there is no separation of means from ends, or facts from values (Forester, 1978; Schon, 1982). Means are ends and values unavoidably color facts. There is an acknowledgment that context influences decisions more than rational judgements or facts, and that technology is often used in the service of those in control - whether this be under liberal, socialist or facist powers. As opposed to declarations of objective, apolitical ends, there are specific statements of value-driven goals, such as elimination of top-down governance, protection of the environment even at the risk of stopping growth in the economy, and a push for lifestyles that do more with less in the industrialized world:

> ...instrumental judgements are value laden, and problem solving can occur only within evaluative problem settings...[in] the interpersonal context of practice...individuals create behavioral worlds which influence and are influenced by their activities and their ways of knowing (Schon, 1982:352).

Radical planners fundamentally view change in terms of community or regional development (Grabow, et al., 1973). Change is structural only in so far as it affects the

community and its relation to power structures outside the community - radical planning demonstrates an absence of plans for structural household or individual change and no strategy for social change on a national or global basis.

Radical theory in general seeks to focus upon non-monetarized values and activities that add to a communities' welfare, but which have been tradionally marginalized in liberal and socialist ideologies.

Planners who work toward radical change are also planners who could more easily incorporate feminist vision in that change because the justice and equity ideology proffered by both is very similar. Radical feminism, as will be seen, extends radical development planning theory precisely in the direction of household and individual change.

Radical Feminist Critque

Nothing less than a complete paradigm shift is satisfactory to radical feminist theorists (Daly, 1978; Dworkin, 1974; MacKinnon, 1982; Firestone, 1970). It is not enough that male and female achieve equal treatment in law and the marketplace and the household, nor is it satisfactory that heirarchical relations be eliminated. Rather, it is the entire male structuring of worldview that

must be changed and in its place a more 'feminine' worldview must be framed. In this conception, not only is patriarchy one bastion of a liberal stronghold, or a force to be reckoned with that is equal to class, but patriarchy is the over-riding force in the formation of all oppression. Men are viewed as misogynist and determined to command the dominant discourse.

In its most extreme form, radical feminist theory falls back on the old utopian separatist formula by proposing separatist and lesbian communities as an alternative to the pervasive dominance of the male. As expressed by MacKinnon, "sexuality is to feminism what work is to Marxism" (1982:515).

Radical feminism re-valorizes 'feminine' traits and concepts, and sees the historical drive to control nature, and to separate mind from body as the beginning of female oppression. Women have historically been identified with nature (Merchant, 1983; Chernin, 1987; Eisler, 1988; Starhawk, 1982) and control of women, in this view, is parallel to control of nature. Support for radical feminists contention that there is a "rational", male driven oppression of women is based on historical mysogynist facts, such as the burning and torture of witches, the tradition of clitoral mutilation and suttee, and the widespread existence

of acts of rape and beating of women which have had historical sanction, e.g. in war, or through religious and social custom, and even through law. Other support offered for the notion that the treatment of women is analogous to mens' treatment of nature comes generally from philosophical works like Platonism where nature and the earth are referred to as female, and from anthropological work which show womens' biological functions, e.g., menarche, birth and nursing, are often feared and strictly controlled through law, custom and ritual (Merchant, 1980). These same functions are currently controlled in modern life, radical feminist claim, much as nature is controlled at present --- through technology in the hands of men.

The suppression of womens' voice is directly related in radical feminist theory to the pervasive and pernicious dominant discourse of men. Power, privilege and psychological advantage are emphasized as the bases of the seeming superiority of men in a way that reform cannot reach. The major facet and importance of the radical feminist critique for radical theory is that radical feminists hold that individuals and households must also participate in the social changes toward equity and justice which are to occur in the community. This, in the main, means male participation at that level. And radical

feminists are fervent in their belief that power relations must be transformed, not just restructured (French, 1985; Rich, 1986; Starhawk, 1982; Chodorow, 1987; Gilligan, 1982).

CONCEPTIONS OF POWER TRANSLATE REAL LIFE

Thus far, three concepts of how to manage social change under three different perceptions of how power controls human lives and institutions have been reviewed: the liberal concept of the state as the neccessary mediation from which people must be protected; the socialist concept of the capitalist market economy as the agent of control; and the radical concept of technology and alienation of people from their community and environment as the tools of those in power which prevent people from the formation of democratic community.

There was included within each world view a parallel feminist critique of each specific theory in order to demonstrate how feminism goes beyond the causal assumptions of liberalism, socialism and radicalism and fills in critical blanks for each. In fundamental terms, all feminist theory is situated in the fact of the historical tyranny and control of women or sexism. Contrary to Friedmann's contention, feminism can be considered an overall social critque that is internally divided by the attributional

causes of those three major theories which differentiate the arena of power struggles. In an attempt to articulate feminist similarities Marilyn French suggests:

> The major divisions among different groups of feminists today lie in this area: not what we must do, but how. There is general agreement about basic principals, premises, as well as about the vision of a feminist future...(French, 1985:446).

Elshtain, whose major written work discusses feminist internal division, found this in common among feminists:

> ...they would redefine the boundaries of public and the private, the personal and the political, in a manner that opens up certain questions for inquiry. They would "break the silence" of traditional political thought on questions of the historic oppression of women and the absence of women from the realm of public speech (Elshtain, 1981:202).

Nancy Hartsock, a socialist feminist, claims differences may be the cohesive glue with which to form a unified critique:

> For difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our [feminists] creativity can spark like a dialectic ... The outlines ... of an adequate theory of power grounded at the epistemological level of reproduction are now visiable, if only hazily. It is an understanding of power rooted in and defined not simply by women's {sic} experience but by the systematic pulling together and working out of the liberatory possibilites present in that experience (Hartsock, 1985:259).

There are several common goals for political and social change to transform real life that can be found in all feminist theory: the first is equality before law; the

second is the establishment of non-hierarchical relations of power on individual, social and community levels; and the third is recognition of nature and woman as having value previously concealed.

Perhaps the most important aspect of feminism is, at present, as Hartsock claimed, the fact of its social critique. The womens' movement has revealed itself to have widespread support which has already influenced public policy (real life) in many countries (Papanek, 1977; Safillos-Rothschild, 1982; Thorberg, 1985; Cameron, 1987; Douglas, 1977). It is crucial to keep in mind that feminist paradigms, like other theoretical models, are based on ideologies which are powerful interpretations that can obscure alternatives and color perceptions of political, economic and social reality. I have attempted to give a glimpse of how feminism translates and critiques the ideologies of liberalism and socialism. Radical feminism expresses a radical cast by supporting social transformation and by vehement opposition to patriarchy. In so far as feminism can bring attention to gender inequity, relations of power, masculine world-views and provoke analysis which will contribute to fairness, equity, and a 'kinder, gentler' world, it could contribute to development planning.

DEVELOPMENT PLANNING PRACTICE: THE SITUATION OF WOMEN

Development planning is currently captured by the inertia of democratic reform - liberal and socialist - and as theory and action created exclusively to facilitate positive social change, development planning has been able to act effectively only in the service of a power trio: the state, the market and the male (Forester, 1989; Heilbroner, 1985; Friedmann, 1987; Elliot, 1977). The status of women is usually addressed only in terms of their economic participation in a region or nation (Waring, 1988; Tiffany, 1984; Moser and Peake, 1987).

Two ideas inherent in development planning are: first, that development is not primarily individual but includes a group which has access to similar or equal resources; and second, that development is based on the notion of diminishing returns. In other words, a person who is poor and becomes rich has more capacity for "richness" than a person who is already rich to become richer. Put another way, development is an undeveloped region or nations' problem.

A major difficulty for governments and bureaucrats like planners has been that, in spite of the existence of rational planning and constitutions and manifestos that were framed with the intent of strengthening nations and

benefitting all citizens, oppression, poverty and disease continue to increase and the environment continues to erode (WCED, 1987). Reform alone has not solved the question of administering resources with justice to competing users; nor has equity - of opportunity, or of condition - been achieved (Development Studies Centre, 1984; Brown, 1988; Clark, 1984). Perhaps, as radicals have urged, what is needed is not a value-free condition, nor an equal condition, but a consideration of committment to values by governments and citizens.

Committment to values has not been evident in development planning practice. Values are not things that can be mediated and most energies devoted to social change focus on precisely a mediated, incremental type of reform. The political mediation function played by social and political movements is evident from the fact that democratic reform does not alter power relationships. This is not a new argument, others (e.g., Nerfin 1987; Ferguson 1987) see movements outside dominant power structures evolving into a third force of citizenry. As noted in the section on the womens' movement, the alternative to women of working outside traditional boundaries of discourse and power has always been a feminist strategy, and has never been viewed as more necessary than now. As French insists, "Capitalism

has assimilated women, it has not broadened itself; it has swallowed women rather than alter itself. And it has done this in accordance with its traditional structures" (1985:462). Development planning practice has helped maintain traditional structures and has not benefitted the world of women under liberal or socialist auspices (Leahy, 1986).

THE WORLD OF WOMEN

The U.N. dedicated the decade of 1975-85 to the betterment of women throughout the world. Donor countries have attached stipulations affecting women to the aid (e.g., CIDA, 1988) transferred from the industrialized nations to newly developing countries. Women were targeted for mainstream roles in modern nations using such things as affirmative action programs and quotas. Despite a decade dedicated to aid and affirmative action for women, political development strategies remain rhetoric (Keating and Melville, 1985; Siwatibau, 1985; Zak, 1983). Is the problem really that none of the liberal, socialist or radical theories are adequate analyses of disparity and that attempts to compensate and rectify injustices based on these theories will fail? Or is it simply for lack of information about womens' perspective and values that they have failed?

A look at development theory implementation on a cross-cultural basis provides both proof women have remained oppressed and that, as models for positive progress for women, these theories are limited. The three-way stage on which the act of balancing power is played invites women to participate, but does not provide them with the script.

As stated earlier, data show that, worldwide, women constitute about half of the work force. They exert two-thirds of the world's work hours, yet they receive only 10% of the world's income and own less than one one-hundreth of the world's property (CIDA, 1988). Between 1929 and 1965 the net national product per capita of the U.S. rose by 90% and leisure time increased by 22%, but women's work hours increased (Williams, 1988; Hewlett, 1985). Women in the U.S. and Canada still make only 64 cents for every dollar made by a male --- a percentage that has varied only slightly over the last 20 years.

The GNP worldwide has increased at a rate of about 2% per year since the Second World War, but the rate of improvement for women proceeds at a snails' pace. For example, although more women are admitted to occupations that were formerly closed to them, such as law and medicine, according to the U.S. government, families with one parent (usually a woman) have less than half the median income of

all families. Women with children constitute 75% of all people in the U.S. living in poverty (Garbarino,1988; Gelp, 1988). In Canada, Armstrong and Armstrong (1986) quote several sociologists, and argue similarly that what the dominant discourses say is not what they really do:

> In Canadian society, as several sociologists have shown, equality of opportunity is taught in theory, but denied in practice. Clement (1975:284) establishes in his extensive examination of the Canadian corporate elite that "It is the class which holds the power bases of society (including the means of communication) which is able, in large part, to influence and direct the ideology of the population." By means of what Pike and Zureik (1975:x) call "manipulative socialization", the dominant groups are able to "foster an internalization of particlar perceptions of social reality". Through their influence over what Porter (1965:460) in his widely acclaimed The Vertical Mosiac, calls "ideological institutions", the dominant groups are able to encourage the acceptance of the existing social order. And the division of labor by sex is part of that order (Armstrong and Armstrong, 1984:197).

Anthropologist Peggy Sanday has forcefully argued that historically, the one main precondition of any increase in female status is prolonged warfare which means male absence or a shortage of labor supply (cited in Duley and Edwards, 1986). Raising the status of women and, therefore, contributing to equity may have another component as well. Another anthropologist, Ursula Sharmin states:

> It is the distribution of property rights (especially rights in land) which we ought to look at first of all if we wish to understand the position of rural women... The poor have little property to protect' the norms governing female roles while permitting them to participate freely in labor, nevertheless, limit the ways in which women can actually use whatever economic power they may derive from their role in production (Duley and Edwards, 1986:197).

In other words, access and control of resources by women may play a critical role in the development of women worldwide. The data presented suggest that world development, as measured by economic growth, is succeeding, at least in part, because of the exploitation of women.

Traditional planning theory has silenced the voice of women by concerning itself with the problems articulated by the dominant discourses. Yet neglect of gender issues by development planning theory and practice often creates more problems with which the profession has to deal. Like an ostrich with its head in the sand, if the social problem cannot be documented as a social problem, i.e.,if women are not heard, there is no need to do anything about it.

One current example of this is the feminization of poverty. Demographic information has long been available in western industrial cultures which indicates that women live longer than men, make about 65% of the money made by men, and that numbers of single parent families, usually headed by women, are increasing (Gelpi et al., 1986; Fuchs, 1986).

Statistics from the U.S. and Canada show that the standard of living for women who divorce is lowered dramatically (averaging about 70% less), and that female headed households are poor (1 in 3) more often than male headed households (1 in 11). Consequently, the majority of poor people are females. This trend is expected to increase. (Gelphi, et. al, 1986:4; Fuchs, 1986; Armstrong and Armstrong, 1985).

Active strategies with which to deal with these demographic facts have not been forthcoming. The social casualties and cost to government from lack of action has been largely ignored. Social programs are among the first to be cut in government budget reductions (Smith, 1986). In spite of these facts, development planning does not address the increasing poverty among women in any meaningful way, whether in the U.S., Canada, or the Third World (Elliot, 1977).

Throughout the world planners continue to support policies such as the design and construction of housing and other social facilities as though nuclear families (which comprise only one fifth of all families (Garbarino, 1988)) with a primary male wage earner were the norm. Development planners do not see that aid in cash and in training which is received by males to help them perform roles they

traditionally do not do (such as cultivation of food crops in sub-Saharan Africa) is wasted. CIDA, which has a specific program for womens' development does not mention equity once in its policy documents (CIDA 1987). Instead the focus is on getting women into the economic system, despite the evidence that women become members of the low-paying "pink ghetto" (Gelpi et al., 1986).

MISCONCEPTIONS IN DATA

Integration of gender as a theoretical and practical consideration in planning (besides the obvious promotion of gender equity) affects the quality of information which is used to generate decisions and plans. Ignoring the fact that 50% of a given population is female in research issues is tantamount to electing to walk in snow with only one shoe. You will have no trouble walking, but there may be unanticipated effects of your choice that become quite handicapping.

A basic assumption of much social research is that male choices or behaviors are the norm. For example, the achievement theory developed by McClelland and his associates (McClelland et al., 1953) was developed from research done with primarily male subjects, and the moral development theory of Kohlberg (Kohlberg, 1969) used male

profiles in describing human moral development. Early studies of dominance in animals looked only at male relationships and elaborate theories of hierarchy were formulated in primate research which emphasized the role of the male. It was only recently that the role of females in kinship and dominance has been studied (Fisher, 1982:139).

Development planning practice, whether it addresses resources, transportation, migration, economics or agriculture, has often made similar assumptions, primarily that women will inevitably follow traditional western patterns of behavior. In creating policies which provide education and training, bank loans, and employment opportunities to males, women are marginalized (Williams, 1988; Wilson and Weir, 1986).

This male bias concentrates major spheres of activity in male hands and patterns development along the lines of modern industrialized nations. As a result, there are large percentages of failure in aid projects (Hughes, 1984; Siwatibau, 1984; Clark, 1986). The stability of Third World governments is often founded on military administrative centrality that rarely includes women in either professional or advisory positions. This occurs in North America as well. Bellah et.al. (1985) criticize this tendency because it produces what he terms "Professionals without content":

> "Their outlook is cosmopolitan, shaped by higher education and linked to others of similar training and skills or to those of similar tastes in networks of friends ... they are closely tied to the priorities of the corporate and governmental worlds. Carefully worked out expert solutions applied in an atmosphere of tolerance bred of easy mobility appear the natural way to make life better for everyone" (Ibid:210).

Neglect of gender and cultural roles hinders the effectiveness, therefore, of the translation of development planning theory to action even without a critique of theory.

Deterioration of family life in western culture is reflected in the rate in which we divorce and remarry, increase in teenage suicides and incidence of physical and sexual abuse. These are all considered to be direct results of the size and pace of modern change (Brown, 1988). Yet development planning with all its economic planning processes, its isolated suburban cul-de-sacs, and accommodation to modern mobility, has no strategy for assisting people with the disruptive and destructive effects of fast-paced change.

There has been no clear recognition, either, of what catastrophes await if the production of labor and reproduction of labor by women continues to be exploited. The double bind created by changes in social and economic demands on women by society, i.e., that women fulfill both household and labor roles, cannot be resolved unless women

participate in solutions. As argued by Elshtain (1981), lack of resolution will create deterioration of the private sphere and prove disastrous for the family and the household.

Changes in womens' roles have been drastic throughout the world. Data is simply not used to support women as they individually attempt to cope with the changes. The largest sector of growth in industrialized nations is the service sector and the employees of that sector are primarily women (Smith, 1986; Armstrong and Armstrong, 1986). The proportion of unemployed has remained relatively stable over the last thirty years. During the same period more and more women have been drawn into the labor force. The expansion of the economy has mainly been in areas previously contributed to by women in the non-cash, informal sector such as meal preparation, nursing, and child care. This, together with the condition of chronic lower wage rates for women, suggests that the unprecedented economic growth in the service sector in the last century has been based on the exploitation of the production and reproduction of labor of women. It would seem, then, that the enormous production of goods and services which characterizes modern societies has been founded on the utility of two "free" goods - the labor of women and the environment, both of which are ignored in

the economy until they have a market use.

TOWARD RADICAL FEMINISM

Relations of hierarchical dominance are so pervasive that they continue to the present day, for example, in modern bureaucracies, businesses, educational institutions and even in families. In fact, hierarchical relations of dominance order most social organizations today except those explicitly mandated as the domain of democratic government. And even in that domain, equity is more mythical than real.

In simple terms this creates a social tension for justice: relationships that are equal cannot also be hierarchical. There is, then, in societies governed by democratic ideology, a continual pressure on those at the bottom of the hierarchy to rise and to gain equity. Feminism, especially radical feminism, attributes the perseverance of hierarchy in the face of democracy to the encompassing and persistent domination of one half of the world's population by the other, historically and on a daily basis --- in other words, to patriarchy.

Because of the triadic power structure of the state, market and male, reform alone will not alter the status of women. The power wielded by the state, the economy and patriarchy acting in concert is so great that nothing short of a major shift in values - political, economic and social - will change the dominant discourse according to radical

feminist thought. Because reform has not created structural change, it would appear the forum for change is radical theory. Only in radical theory and practice can social movement to equity take place because work toward structural change is paramount in radical ideologies.

Even in radical forum, the translation of theory to practice is crucial:

> "no matter how desirable the post industrial ideas may be, they remain pious wishes if not linked to concrete plans of action and organization...I am highly sympathetic to the utopian tradition as a vibrant source of inspiration, a rejection of the pedestrian and the resigned acceptance of irrationality and impoverishment - in the broadest sense - of everyday life...It is therefore necessary to remain within the radical utopian tradition, while at the same time subjecting these same utopian ideas to rigorous scrutiny and evaluation" (Frankel,1987).

A study of the inability for either liberal or socialist policy to eliminate the oppression of women was done by Leahy (1986). She made an extensive comparison of development strategies for women in four countries: Cuba, Mexico, the U.S. and the U.S.S.R.. Her choices of countries reflects four dimensions: undeveloped (Cuba and Mexico), developed (U.S. and U.S.S.R.), and liberal-capitalist (Mexico and U.S.) and Marxist-Socialist (Cuba and U.S.S.R.). The conclusions of this study showed that in all cases:

> * Development and equity do not automatically occur due to legislation.

* Development for women is dependent on their access to resources and control of them.

* The dual role required of women (mother and wage earner) is a problem which must be resolved for equity to occur.

Leahy points to several contradictions related to development policy. First, if effeciency, productivity and profit take priority over other benefits which are social rather than economic, progress for women is limited.

Secondly, women are penalized for taking time off from work in the market place to give birth or raise children, and they are not given adequate support from either the state, the market or their partners which would enable them to either minimize or share these roles. This prohibits women from assuming public as well as private roles equally with men.

Leahy, while operating on the assumption that productivity, modernization and industrialization enlarge the 'economic pie', and stating these have been associated with progress for women, nevertheless submits a contradictory proposal for womens' development. She maintains that:

> Progress (for women)... will be a function of the willingness of society to trade some measure of its economic efficiency for greater social equity...(p. 124)

What comes through clearly in Leahy's work is the

message that too few males are willing or able to take on childcare and housework at a wage the market or government is willing to pay, nor are men willing to share this work out of an ideological ideal. Women of industrialized, non-industrialized, socialist or liberal countries are marginalized because governmental priorities of equity are not well translated into policy and, more importantly, increased household work does not have national male support.

For example, Cuba designed a development plan that specifically targeted women. Cuba was the first nation to legistlate a Family Code specifying that the husband and wife were equally responsible for child care and housework. Sharing domestic labor responsibility has not proved to work well because, according to some analysts, there are not enough resources to provide the support to enforce the law (Duley and Edwards, 1986). Leahy sees it as an unwillingness of on the part of most men to translate a public ideology of equality to the private sphere.

This failure of translation of theory to practice is the cornerstone on which radical theory is founded. Radical theory advocates altering the structure if the results of practice fail.

The propensity of men for patriarchy has been

theoretically detailed in feminist theory described in this thesis in a manner congruent to various streams of political ideology. If there is to be change in the direction of equity, in line with all feminist goals, practical and real strategies identified in radical feminism may very well be required.

Radical feminists, and feminists of other political leanings, despite differences in affinity of remedy and degree of deviation, from women have unique contributions to human life which have historically been de-valued and ignored (Grimshaw, 1984). These contributions, which are characterized as outside the discourse of governments, markets or men, are not traditionally valued contributions. A major part of radical struggle is finding a way to include the value of womens' experience in the decision making which operates within the discourses of power.

EXPERIENCE AS VALUE

Tibor Scitovisky (1978) in a little known book about human satisfaction, did a unique analysis of the market which he bases on the psychology and economics of motivation. Scitovisky submits that the behavior of human beings is heavily influenced by two opposing forces, comfort and pleasure. The psychological material he presents is

well-documented in behaviorist literature. He goes on to present a novel argument:

> Pleasure and comfort have not only turned out to be very different motivating forces; they also seem to stand to each other in a peculiar relation, reminiscent of acceleration and speed, which renders conflict inevitable. To some extent pleasure and comfort are mutually exclusive alternatives confronting the individual with conflict ... (Ibid:59)

Scitovsky claims that the strength of our economy, measured by a collection of indices that are material, e.g., per capita income, per capita comsumption of electric power, number of TV's or refrigerators per household, comes from a choice made fundamentally for comfort. It is worth noting that knowing how many households have or use an item does not give information about who uses the item for what. Information sought on the basis of values, rather than numbers could then elicit different social policies.

Although comfort is subjective, standard of living levels, by which we judge equity, are in the form of material goods that provide ease and comfort. This choice, says Scitovsky, creates a condition where we crave arousal, or pleasure, and we attempt to meet that desire primarily through the individual acquisition of novel items or experiences. Our current economy, with mass production, increasingly offers a monotony of products, services and experiences. The emptiness, the lack of spirituality that

surrounds modern life is attributed to a constant search for stimulation as well as development of strong feelings of alienation toward society.

The value of Scitovsky's work for radical argument is his prescription for lifestyle change:

> We get and pay for more comfort than is necessary for the good life, and some of our comforts crowd out some of the enjoyments of life ... we find it hard to accept the idea that one way of making our lifestyle less costly is to make it less austere ... As long as we are leaders ... we can hardly advocate for others a lifestyle different from our own ... (1978:284).

In other words, peoples' lives can be made more rewarding if material items are kept from interfering with pleasures. What is valued here is the subjective experience of pleasure rather than the act of purchasing as a replacement. Scitovsky's argument for choosing pleasure as an alternative to consumption has been echoed by radical feminist Marilyn French, who argues for a valuing of pleasure as a political alternative to valuing power:

> To restore pleasure to centrality requires restoring the body, and therefore nature to value. Although it should be clear that experience of any sort is rooted in the continuum of mind/body, the split made in this continuum is so old and respectable as to stand as truth. Pleasure is disdained because it appears rooted in the body alone and the body is disdained (1985:444).

Certain experience, then, has an intrinsic, pleasurable value in French's scenerio that is outside existing domains

of power. According to French, philosophy from Plato to Descartes has required that we transcend our experience because it has no value of its own, but is valuable only if it provides a means to some better or higher end. Most importantly French goes on to say:

> The restoration of body and nature to value would preclude treatment of both bodies and nature that pervades our world - the torture and deprivation of one, the erosion and pollution of the other ... Lacking transcendent goals, we would have no reason to sacrifice ... pleasure to symbolic superiority (1985:5).

Pleasure, here, is viewed as the mechanism for social change. But social, political and economic restructuring or transformation cannot occur successfully without a context, a vision of what will constitute new structures. Liberal reform has had limited effect and the socialist lack of prescription has often been criticized as an example of too much abstract theorizing (Walby, 1986). Certainly the Soviet move toward glasnost and the new governments of Poland and Hungary demonstrate that when attention is paid to material notions exclusively, government has little credibility. What Scitovsky, French and other radicals, (e.g., Friedmann, 1987; Fox, 1983; Frankel, 1987; Berman, 1981) have in common is a claim that the context of change must be experiential, not abstract, for new structures to be successful.

Feminism offers the experience of women and the

structures which they have utilized as a model for social change. These are, specifically, womens' mediation techniques in the household, their propensity to value relationships over principles, and their fundamental consideration for social needs and connections which are intimate yet shared. An example of feminist attention to intimate human needs comes from a pertinent comment offering an alternative experiential, but concrete example related to the household:

> "A society that offers few other sources of psychic security and little other means of material support is likely to throw people together into little defensive groups and to leave those who do not form such grups isolated and deprived. A male dominated society is likely to produce a form of private life in which men are privileged and powerful. What is needed is not to build up an alternative to the family - new forms of household that would fulfil all the needs that families are supposed to fulfil today - but to make the family less necessary, building up all sorts of other ways of meeting people's needs, ways less volatile and inadequate than those based on the assumption that blood is thicker than water" (Barett and McIntosh, from The Anti-Social Family, quoted in Frankel, 1987, emphasis mine).

Psychic security, pleasure and comfort have been some of the working tools through which women have shaped their knowledge. This experiential knowledge has either been marginalized by theological dismissal of "pleasures of the flesh", commodified in forms such as maid service, therapy, and fast food outlets or women's experience has been

controlled by discourse which has defined the circumstances under which it can be recognized, that is, in the household.

EXPERIENCE AS KNOWLEDGE

The body of thought that promotes the idea that experience is the basis of knowledge was part of the romantic philosophy of Rousseau. The concept was embodied in an idealism which glorified natural (unsullied by 'civilization') impulses and activites, hence the 'nobel savage' image.

Very simply, the idea was that experience is the human foundation for perceiving the world, sometimes termed experiential knowledge. In planning, John Friedmann popularized experiential knowledge terming it social learning, and submitted that "knowledge is derived from experience and validated in practice" (1987:81). Not just radical planners advocate giving importance to experience, or learning by doing. In a critique of church attention to spiritual human needs in parishioners Mathew Fox, radical Catholic theologian, states:

> "... an exaggerated doctrine of original sin, one that is employed as a starting point for spirituality, plays kindly into the hands of empire-builders, slavemasters, and patriarchal society in general. It divides and thereby conquers, pitting one's thoughts against one's feelings, one's body against one's spirit, one's vocation against one's personal needs, people against the earth, animals and nature in general ... the art of savoring is politically suspect; pleasure is too often a route to sharing the pleasure - which is justice making ... pleasure, not will and coercion, is how you most deeply transform people ... I believe that one price the West has paid for ignoring blessing theology is that Christianity has very few tactics for social change" (1983:54).

Like French and Scitovsky, Fox sees potential in the justice making and liberatory possibilites of what he calls "blessing theology" or celebration of pleasurable human experience.

Strategies for radical change, for social transformation have also been put forward by others from experiential references --- Murray Bookchin (1987) in social ecology, Heilbroner, (1975) in economics, Rozak (1983) in business and by others identified primarily with the environmental movement (Schumacher, 1974; Gorz, 1984; Bahro, 1986; Devall and Sessions, 1985). The 'radical' theorists have offered constructions of alternative institutions which are constituted democratically, decentralized, and humanistic. Where they have not been so successful is offering methods of transition to the social change they

support. Calling these radical theorists for social change "post industrial utopians", Boris Frankel offers a pentrating critique:

> "If one desires a society where energy is conserved, where unnecessarily large volumes of raw materials, food and manufactured goods are no longer transported across long distances in millions of environmentally destructive land, sea and air vehicles, where a majority of citizens (rather than private companies and government bureaucracies) determine what, where, and how goods and services are produced, then social planning and open public discourse becomes essential...All those who believe that 'prosuming', simple barter or other forms of socio-economic interaction can replace capitalist markets and state planning - and yet guarantee equity and democracy - are profoundly wrong" (Frankel:253).

Frankel points out that despite the desirability of community level, face-to-face alternatives most radical theorists suggest, equity and democracy will require state institutions.

> "Healthy democratic, post-industrial public spheres require all the corresponding legal, cultural, educational and administrative structures which guarantee adjudication, mediation, representation and checks and balances" (Ibid:263)

Because there is no one umbrella which can cover all radical theory, many times radical positions are considered "special interest", a designation which, while describing the limited focus of a group, effectively prohibits the assumption of wider public support and encourages a

diversity which makes it difficult for groups to coalesce as a force for structural social change. At a household and broader political level, however, feminism, in every form, potentially includes over one half of the world. This makes feminism, where the focus of social change begins at the personal, household level, an ideal vehicle through which to implement structural change.

Personal experience at the household level, according to all feminists (not just material manipulation or actual labor, as Marx would have it) fundamentally reflects what is true, and abstraction serves to protect and enhance dominant discourses.

VALUING FEMININE EXPERIENCE

Feminism, therefore, offers womens' experiential foundation as model on which to base a change of power relations. All associations of female with such separate and particular areas as body, emotion, and nature create an experiential base for women which has been culturally devalued. The Marxist question, "why do women remain in the exploited position of traditional marriage?" has less to do, say radical feminists, with conditions and pay and oppression and much more to do with the intrinsic value of womens' special experiences in their historical and

functional relations with men and children (Chernin, 1987; French, 1985; Hewlett, 1986). Adrienne Rich (1986) argues that the human values women themselves derive from the act and experience of nurturing and negotiating in a family setting is a universal value which for its own sake should be cultivated.

Equal consideration of women in the work of the household and the community would incorporate what has been termed a "female ethic" (Grimshaw, 1986:194) into larger society in a way that tempers the abstraction of modern life and promotes an experiential focus. Grimshaw quotes Agnes Heller's arguement that:

> The very fact that women have been so largely excluded from broader socio-political activity, and restricted to the world of the household or family, has meant that there are more similarities, historically, between the lives of women than between lives of men. Women have tended to live...on a smaller scale, occupied not so much with bold deeds or great causes...but with the dailiness of a life spent in the detailed tasks of managing a small community and meeting daily needs. So, suggests Heller, "Within the framework of their small world, women had to learn how to manage a community. It was a painstaking but peaceful occupation which required enormous tact, a great ability to smooth away conflicts, as well as devotion and sympathy" (Heller, 1980:210)... it is arguable that [women] more than men have tended to have a profound scepticism and ambivalence about the sacrifice of human lives and loves and the fabric of human life to the causes in the name of which men have fought and despoiled and oppressed others (Grimshaw, 1986:195).

The female ethic then, measures the quality of life by

everyday intimacy, in relationships and occurrences, and not in terms of abstract visons or values that diminish human experience.

These positive "intangibles" which rational economists tend to ignore because they have not been able to adequately impute value to them, are valorized in feminist, particularly radical feminist, thought (Daly, 1978; Waring, 1988; Dworkin, 1974). Valuing nature and the body, as well as the mind, for their role in knowledge, comfort and especially in pleasure is part of the social, political and economic change the radical feminism prescribes. For them, the personal is truly the political, and radical feminism has the potential for being the catalyst to transformational planning.

TRANSFORMATIONAL PLANNING

Transformational planning means structural change. This chapter describes various strategies for that kind of change and talks about where transformational change might begin and some of the difficulties encountered in the process.

Friedmann (1985) coined transformational planning "transformative theory" (Ibid:389), which he drew from a social mobilization planning paradigm. In essence, the technique focuses on structural problems, provides critical interpretation, uses a historical perspective, functions democratically and makes choices based on values.

Alternative strategies nearly always call for extensive public participation in decision-making and promote democratic models like co-ops, credit unions, job sharing and local exchange systems. The democratic values articulated in such alternative radical theory and practice are often undermined, however, by contextual assumptions on which they operate and the limited concerns on which interest groups focus. Frankel's view that decentalization and "small is beautiful" may not insure equity and democracy is a pointed critique of lack of relevant development planning for social structural change.

The pluralism created by the participation of alternative groups and institutions appears to act in the

interests of democracy in our hierarchical society because information is thereby increased and decision making can be more participatory. But in general, the participation is reactive rather than proactive. Like a game of smoke and mirrors, democratic decision making is more often delegated and, while this provides opportunities for participation, power is not, in fact, shared, but merely approved by many structures. In the institutions and large scale organizations that characterize modern society, especially governments, current development planning decisions, in practice, are not made democratically but by bureaucratic professionals informing policy (Goodell, 1984; Forester, 1989). This is a myoptic contradiction in modern social and political relationships --- what is deemed to be democratic is hierarchical and relations that are hierarchical are not normally equal.

Futhermore The fractured nature of socio-political movements limits their effectivness as agents for change. This is the reason that transformational change, and planning for that change must occur on a simpler level.

THE HOUSEHOLD AS THE SITE OF TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE

The household, an area traditionally considered the private sphere, is the portion of social life where women

are considered to be properly and normally active, and where the voice of women is socially acknowledged. Decisions about where to live, how to live, where to produce and what to produce begin in this arena. These are decisions which the planning profession, as well as household members, address in everyday life. The intimacy and mutual obligation of the household has been argued as the reason for both the perseverance of household existence and its enormous stability of function in the self-production of daily life over thousands of years and hundreds of variations (Friedmann, 1987; Forester, 1989). All feminists contend that, as the most fundamental human organization, the household in some form must be supported and the re-building of community must begin at the household level (Friedan, 1963; Chodorow, 1978; French, 1985; Rich, 1986; Leahy, 1986).

Some criteria for social change in the household were presented by Brian Fay (1975) in his arguments about political change from the perspective of social construction, and have been encapsulated in Elshtain's discussion of reconstruction of the public and private sphere from a radical viewpoint. She paraphrases Fay:

> ...Fay's bedrock, that there are real human needs, as well as wants, purposes, intentions, and desires; that these needs have motivating force; that they can be distorted and damaged; that they are essential even if distorted; finally, that they serve as the presuppositional basis for any form of social existance and, it follows, for transformative possibilites as well (Elshtain, 1981:314; emphasis mine).

While the importance placed on private human needs is, in many ways, based on the work of psychologist Abraham Maslow (1971) and the communications distortion already discussed by the planner, Forester (1981), the extension that incorporates social change with human needs is critical. In other words, the recognition, expression and meeting of human private and social needs are considered essential to any program of social change or development. And meeting individual needs has been and continues, for the most part, to be the responsibility of the household.

The household, as a mechanism for socializing, civilizing and educating citizens, has become overwhelmed by larger and more complicated institutions upon which it has come to rely for a decent standard of living and for access to technological sophistication; therefore, while the household may be the ideal initial point for articualtion of transformational planning, it does not come without complications.

THE HOUSEHOLD AS PROBLEMATIC

The modern household imitates the larger institutional structures which surround it. In many ways, say feminists, this is how patriarchy is perpetuated and how hierarchy reproduces itself (French, 1985). It is important to remember:

> The hierarchical chain of command is a visible representation of power of the sort we call authority ... people in hierarchies are more likely to attend to those whose ability as well as position they can respect. If, however, the person in authority seems lacking in the particular skill necessary for that position, he must nevertheless be obeyed and attended to, for his authority resides in this position and not in himself. ... This enshrinement of authority and the system it is designed to uphold lead to gross violations of common sense and efficiency as well as of humane interaction ... you must defer to (the boss) him as you do not wish to ruin your own possibilities. Because of this contradiction ... all hierarchies operate by coercion (French, 1985).

McIntosh (1978) suggests that "the state upholds the oppression of women by supporting a form of household in which women provide unpaid domestic services for a male" (Walby, 1986:58). Support for this contention can be seen in the reluctance of states to provide women with equal rights under the law and to enforce those rights with adequate state support. The state's uncertain mediation between patriarchy and the market is exemplified by its policies toward the nuclear family, welfare policies which penalize marriage to a poor partner, divorce laws and refusal to give

women control over reproduction, all of which assist in keeping women subordinate to men. Modern government is state-dominated in spite of democratic foundations and there is ample evidence that the state acts in market and/or patriarchal interests. Perhaps, as Bellah et. al. (1985) feared in their examination of American society, this economic transformation of the household reaches a zenith when therapy becomes the purchase of motherhood and moral impoverishment is necessary to participate in the marketing of the heart. The commodification of womens' traditional roles has become nearly complete in post-industrial society.

To continue on the path of growth and development, the market requires the participation of women and the consumption of the household. Not only is efficiency and profit produced by commodifying womens' services but, as noted earlier, women in the market provide a reserve labor pool by having an unpaid career in the household which has few redeeming features in a post-industrial society. As much as women in the household, paid or unpaid, benefit patriarchy, women in the workforce benefit the market. The resolution of this tension is simple --- women work two jobs; they have a dual role to play which has become increasingly non-volitional. This dual role is currently valorized, much like the cult of domesticity was earlier.

Magazines, TV, books and radio are filled with images of "super women" who do it all. Feminist sociologist Smith relates from personal experience:

> I could see, of course, the merits of being able to be totally absorbed in the relations of ruling. I could see that for men, that is how these matters had been arranged, for of course my practical problems, panics, and pleasures of this double life came from operating in both worlds across a gender divide that was at that time very marked. These were two modes of consciousness that could not coexist with one another. In practice of course, they "existed" in the same person, often in the same places, and certainly they often competed with one another for time. But moving from one to the other was a real shift, involving a different organization of memory, attention, relevances and objectives, and indeed different presences. The strains and anxieties involved in putting and holding together work sites, schedules, and modes of consciousness that were not coordinated marked the separations institutionalized in a gender division of labor... The intellectual world spread out before me appeared, indeed I experienced it , as genderless. But its apparent lack of center was indeed centered. It was structured by its gender subtext. Interests, perspectives, relevances leaked from communities of male experience into the externalized and objectified forms of discourse. Within the discourses embedded in the relations of ruling, women were the Other(Smith, 1987).

The message of this passage is crucial to understanding of the voice of women which comes from a real world of facts, feelings and changes in experience in a household setting that have not been recognized as legitimate by either the state, the market or patriarchy, in so far as acknowledging that part of womens' voice that cannot be

marketed, purchased or induced to support the dominant discourses.

The womens' movement, most active during periods of critical changes in roles and expectations of women (e.g., the introduction of women in the paid workforce during the Industrial Revolution and the cult of domesticity of the 1950's) has articulated a critique of the larger forces of patriarchy, government and the economy. As in other cases, the response has been a modification of the power balance between three already powerful forces --- not greater equity for women. Primarily women were given greater protection (note the patriarchal form the response took) from exploitation of the market, for example, by limiting the hours they worked and the type of employment "suitable" for them, and protection from patriarchal exploitation in the form of welfare payments and property rights, etc. Inherently this means the response of the state has been to support the patriarchal household only "in the instances when it would otherwise fail" (Walby,1986:58).

Transformational planning cannot occur until the household is supported by all civil and market instituions and until equity for women, of opportunity and condition is achieved and a materially based world ethic becomes an ethic based on non-material values.

CONCLUSION

Planning is grounded in issues of social reform and as Forester defines it, "Planning is the guidance of future action" (1989:3). This is a societal responsibility, the importance of which cannot be discounted, for the responsibility of the management of "public interest" held by planners and administrators allows a legitimation, a continuity and an information sharing capacity available to few outside these professions.

Modernization as a development planning practice and theory is actively used on a global level by organizations such as the United Nations and at a local level by agencies like municipal governments. Colonial dependancies are to be eliminated, but female oppression is not seen as an extension of the same dominance. It is interesting to note (and not unexpected) that the participation rate of women in the agencies providing guidance for development is low (Leahy, 1986) and, as in other institutional professionals of influence, women are under-represented and marginalized.

Certain radical and feminist theorists prescribe more involvement of women in public life in order to promote a greater link between scientific and technological knowledge, and the emotional well-being of people and humane action in a manner that would transform society (Friedmann, 1987;

Rostow, 1972; French, 1985; Grimshaw, 1986).

Within the guidlines that follow, it is vital to understand that the transformative goals are yet to be reached, and that equity for women and attention to the importance of the household has no precedence upon which to predict success. But, then, neither did the authors of the U.S. constitution have prescience about the longevity of their creation.

Within the context of development, whether it is planning for change, directing change or managing change, feminist critique provides both theoretical and functional analyses of current political structures and relations of power. And development planning occurs specifically within political and power arenas. To incorporate issues of equity made overt in feminist theory, development planning must address existing mechanisms which effect everyday life. Radical feminism generally calls for:

1 - Parallel re-construction of the community and the household.

2 - Increased gender equity in political, social and economic policies.

3 - Change in the order and nature of power relations among human beings and between them and their environment.

4 - Enhanced quality of life for all community members

As noted earlier, it is common in much of feminist

theory to regard the philosophical foundation of current political structures as primarily patriarchal and hierarchical in nature. Politics did not come before patriarchy, as this statement attributed to a well known actress underscores:

> "I've been married to a fascist and married to a Marxist, and neither one of them took out the garbage" (Tavris, 1984:366).

Development planning theory and practice must learn to "take the garbage out" by acknowledging the intrusiveness of patriarchy, the market and the state in planning efforts to create change toward equity. By incorporating the following objectives, shared by radical planners and feminists, development planning could be the agent for equity it has the promise to be.

Parallel Reconstruction

Reconstruction of the community and household must occur simultaneously. For development planning this means not only using 'top down' avenues for disseminating information but 'bottom up' avenues for the same purpose. More importantly, it requires using other administrative connections that are non-hierarchical and more web-like.

Supplanting rank with networks is viewed as preferable in feminist critique as it reduces the possibility of

exploitation of the many by a few. The parallel reconstruction called for here is one in which the dual role of women as wage-earner and household worker is mitigated by greater inclusion of men into informal economies and household responsibilities at all institutional, community and household levels. This, in effect, smudges the line between public and private spheres. No longer, in a Lockean sense, would there be an insistence that:

> "...it is only in a private sphere of highly charged intimate relationships persisting over time that the possibilities for understanding are the greatest...the abstract relations of the market and liberal citizenship do not and cannot allow for the possibilities of mutual recognition and inter-subjective understanding characteristic of long-term intimate human ties in the private sphere" (Elshtain,1981:119).

In other words, it is not just within the household or the family that people can come to understand and empathize with one another if social structures allow for and value public communications for their own sake.

It is a reconstruction, as suggested by Friedmann (1987:336), that acknowledges the interdependency of human beings and their participation in a political community. He states:

> "We do not yet have a name for the social project that is beginning to take shape. But we do know its general aim, which is to take possession of the terrain of political community, and to transform both state and corporate economy in ways that will place them at the service of human needs at all the relevant levels of public life" (1985:341).

What Friedmann does not say that is vital to this type of reconstruction is that the "service of human needs" has been previously met by women in the private sphere and is primarily met, as measured by numbers, by women in the public sphere (Waring, 1988). By placing women and minorities in the low-paying service sector ghetto, a post-industrial society devalues service and caring abilities of its own members.

Increased Gender Equity

New "patterns of social relations" (Friedmann:341) cannot be developed as long as the economic contribution of men to the household and community is quantitatively and qualitatively recognized as superior to that of women. Alternatively, as some have argued (Hewlett, 1988; Armstrong, 1984) equal inclusion of women into male relations of power only recreates existing political and economic hierarchical relations. Yet, the creation of an androgynous society eliminates the valuation of traditional service and caring activities of women (but which could be

shared with men) that are necessary for the reproduction of society.

One solution here may be establishment of home/work integration in order to allow for multiple social roles by each sex within not only the household, but within the community. These changes to produce equity mean that essentially political life is also private life.

The enormous complexity and fragmentation, as well as sheer numbers of people, in societal organization make it practically impossible to initiate radical value changes and gender equity except at the household level. But changes in the household reflect a public transformation:

> "The first and smallest political community in history [that]...is characterized by strong bonds of affection and continuing mutual obligations of members toward each other - bonds and obligations that both infuse and transcend the households political dimensions" (Friedmann, 1987:344).

Human expression in the public sphere is linked to the actions and attitudes of the household. What must happen, say radical feminists, is that personal bonding and obligations which before had been relegated to emotional situations of unimportance, now be legitimated by modern society as affecting relations of power.

What Friedmann misses is something that others have also been blind to through history; that is the differentiation of political power begins not with caste,

class or race, but in intimate relations of gender which occur mainly outside the hegemony of economics and politics. These relations (which are for the most part patriarchical in nature) directly affect the household, thus the importance of equity in the human community.

Change In Power Relations

It is necessary that the ability of household members to participate equally in their community as well as their household be literal and not just figurative. In real terms this means market and government should value housework, nurturing, protection of the environment and other activities of the household previously unrecognized and institutionally unsupported (such as care of the aged and sick, comforting the grieved, playing with children).

It does not mean return to a family wage, abandonment of child rearing to the state or imputing a dollar value to these activities. What it does mean is the adoption of measures that would empower households to meet their needs and to value their ability to do so in the Third World as well as industrial nations. A change in power relations means giving importance to the household and hearing and recognizing the voice of its members before compressing household concerns into those of the community.

The enormous variation of cultures would indicate that it is important to allow for contextual definitions of empowerment but in general these definitions would include measures that:

* Provide equal education opportunities;

* Have primary concern with quality child care;

* Focus on a form of alternative development that places priority on quality over quantity;

* Create mechanisms which allow the household and the community, including local government and market, to actively communicate;

* Develop a means for accounting for resource use and human production and reproduction that separates destructive or harmful activities from those which lend themselves to the well-being of the community.

These steps would go a long way toward giving the household and the community a voice in the discourse of power, and in turn would enable participation by women as members of those households and communities.

Enhanced Quality of Life

Planning that places more value on non-monetary development --- appreciation of cultural endowments, a cleaner, safer environment, pleasure, and respect and care for the sick and aged, among many other things --- will be planning that enhances the quality of life for people and for the planet on which we live.

The implementation of various development theories, (e.g., modernization or dependency theory) have not worked for women, for more shared resources between have and have-not nations or for the environment (WCED, 1987; Leahy, 1986; Duly and Edwards, 1986). What feminism offers is a less commodified world- view.

Social transformation under feminist criteria occurs in small manageable steps which minimize the trauma change creates for people. The nature of enhanced quality of life, as submitted by French and Scitovsky, is a venture from comfort to pleasure, from quantity to quality.

Friedmann argues that structural change means the household must selectively de-link itself from institutions that do not support the same values of quality. Principally, de-linking means a rejection of the philosophy of individualism and the goal of material collection as wealth. It would include geographic community responsibility by and for household members toward each other and their environment.

In the words of Adrienne Rich, this social transformation:

> "...can only happen hand in hand with, neither before or after, other claims which women and certain men have been denied for centuries: the claim to personhood; the claim to share justly in the products of our labor, not to be used merely as an instrument, a role, a womb, a pair of hands or a back or a set of fingers; to participate fully in the decisions of our workplace, our community; to speak for ourselves, in our own right" (1986:xvii).

Only when this happens can the many feminine voices which have been ignored or silenced be heard in the cacophony of modern life.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackoff, Russell; 1984; "On the Nature of Development and Planning", in People Centered Development; Korten, D. & Klauss, R. eds.; West Hartford, Conneticut; Kumerian Press

Anand, Anita; 1989; "Rethinking Women and Development:The Case for Feminism" CUSO Journal:Women and Development; CUSO

Anderson, Margret; 1988; Thinking About Women: Sociological Perspectives On Sex And Gender; New York; Macmillan Publishing Company

Andrew, C. and Milroy, B. eds.; 1988; Life Spaces; Vancouver; University of British Columbia Press

Armstrong, Pat and Armstrong, Hugh; 1986; The Double Ghetto: Canadian Women And Their Segregated Work; Toronto; McClelland and Steward Ltd.

Bahro, R.; 1986; Building The Green Movement; London; Heretic Books

Barash, David; 1979; The Whisperings Within; New York, Penguin Books

Basow, Susan; 1986; Gender Stereotypes; Belmont, California; Brooks/Cole Publishing Company

Baxendall, Rosalyn, Gordon, Linda, Reverby, Susan, eds.; 1976; America's Working Women: A Documentary History, 1600 to the Present; New York

Bellah, R., Madsen, R., Swidler, A., Tipton, S.; 1985; Habits Of The Heart; New York; Harper and Row, Publishers

Benaria, Lourdes; 1982; Women and Development : The Sexual Division of Labor in Rural Societies; New York; Praeger Publishers

Bergmann, Barbara; 1986; The Economic Emergence of Women; New York; Basic Books, Inc.

Berman, Morris; 1981; The Reenchantment of the World; Ithica, N.Y.; Cornell University Press

Bloom, Allen; 1987; The Closing Of The American Mind; New York; Simon and Schuster

Bookchin, Murray; 1982; The Ecology of Freedom; Palo Alto. CA; Cheshire Books

Bookchin, Murray; 1987; The Modern Crisis; Montreal; Black Rose Books

Boserup, Ester; 1970; Women's Role in Economic Development; New York; St. Martin's Press

Brown, Lester; 1988; The State of the World; New York; W.W. Norton & Company

Bunch, Charlotte; 1987; Passionate Politics; New York; St. Martin's Press

Calhoun, Daniel; 1973; The Intelligence of a People; Princeton, New Jersey; Princeton University Press

Cameron, John; 1987; "The Quality of Life for Women Using Active Life Profile Analysis"; Journal of Pacific Studies; Vol. 13:81-89

Castells, Manuel; 1983; The City and the Grass Roots; London; Edward Arnold

Charoensin-o-larn, Chairat; 1985 Ph.D Dissertation excerpt; Understanding Postwar Reformism in Thailand; Bangkok; Editions Duangkamol

Chernin, Kim; 1987; Reinventing Eve; New York; Harper and Row Publishers

Chilcott, Jennifer and Lucas, David; 1985; "The Socio-economic Status of Women in the South Pacific: A Statistical Overview"; in Women in Development in the South Pacific: Barriers and Opportunities; Canberra; Australian National University

Chodorow, Nancy; 1978; The Reproduction of Mothering; Berkley; University of California Press

CIDA; 1986 Women in Development:CIDA Action Plan; Hull,

Quebec; Public Affairs Branch, Canadian International Development Agency

CIDA; 1988; Report on the Women in Development Exploratory Mission to the South Pacific; Internal Version, CIDA; Management for Change Program

Clammer, John; 1979; Anthropology and Political Economy; New York; MacMillan

Clark, Mari; 1984; "Women Headed Households and Poverty: Insights from Kenya"; in Women and Poverty; Gelpi et. al. eds.; Chicago; University of Chicago Press

Daly, Mary; 1978; Gyn/Ecology : The Metaethics of Radical Feminism; Boston; Beacon Press

Davis, Elizabeth Gould; 1971; The First Sex; New York; Putnam

Deaus, K. and Lewis, L.; 1984; "Structure of Gender Stereotypes" ; in Journal of Personality and Social Psychology; Vol. 46:991-1004

De Beauvoir, Simone; 1953; The Second Sex; New York; Alfred A. Knopf Inc.

Delphy, Christine; 1984; Close To Home: A Materialist Analysis Of Women's Oppression; London; Hutchinson

Devall, B. and Sessions, G.; 1985; Deep Ecology; Salt Lake City; Peregrine Books

Development Studies Centre; 1984; Women In Development In The South Pacific: Barriers and Opportunities; Canberra Australia; The Australian National University

Diamond, I. and Quinby, L. eds.; 1988; Feminism and Foucault; Boston; Northeastern University Press

Douglas, Ann; 1977; The Feminization Of The American Culture; New York; Anchor Press

Duley, Margret and Edwards, Mary eds.; 1986; THe Cross-Cultural Study Of Women; New York; The Feminist Press

Dworkin, Andrea; 1974; Women Hating; New York, E.P. Dutton

Dye, Thomas; 1986; Who's Running America?; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice Hall, Inc.

Ehrenreich, Barbara; 1983; The Hearts Of Men; Garden City, New York; Anchor Books

Eisenstein, Hester; 1983; Contemporary Feminist Thought; Boston; G.K. Hall and Co.

Eisler, Riane; 1988; The Chalice And The Blade; San Francisco; Harper and Row Publishers

Elliot, Carolyn; 1977; "Theories of Development"; in Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society; Vol. 3, No.1, Autumn

Elshtain, Jean Bethke; 1981; Public Man, Private Women; Princeton, New Jersey; Princeton University Press

Engels, Frederick; 1972; The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State; Leackock, Eleanor ed.; New York; International Publishers

Faludi, Andreas; 1973; Planning Theory; Toronto; Pergamon Press

Fay,Brian; 1975; Social Theory and Political Practice; London; George Allen & Unwin

Ferguson, Marilyn; 1987; The Aquarian Conspiracy; New York; St. Martins Press

Firestone, Shulamith; 1970; The Dialectic of Sex; New York; Bantam Books

Fisher, Helen; 1983; The Sex Contact; New York; William Morrow Company, Inc.

Forester, John; 1989; Planning In The Face Of Power; Berkley, California; University of California Press

Fouchee, H.C., Helmrick, R.L., and Spence, J.T.; 1979; "Implicit Theories of Masculinity and Feminity"; Psychology of Women Quarterly; Vol. 3:259 - 269

Fox, Mathew; 1983; Original Blessing; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Bear and Company

Frank, Andre Gunder; 1966, September; The Development of Underdevelopment; Boston; New England Free Press

Frankel, Boris; 1987; The Post-Industrial Utopians; Madison, WI; University of Wisconsin Press

Freeman, Jo, ed.; 1984; Women:A Feminist Perspective; Palo Alto, California; Mayfield Publishing Company

French, Marilyn; 1985; Beyond Power; New York; Ballentine Books

Friedmann, John; 1987; Planning In The Public Domain: From Knowledge To Action; Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton University Press

Fuch, Victor; 1986, May; "The Feminization of Poverty"; Stanford; Stanford University, Department of Economics

Garbarino, James; 1988; The Future As If It Really Mattered; Longmont, Colorado; Bookmakers Guild Inc.

Gelpi, B., Hartsock, N., Novak, C., and Strober, S. eds.; 1984; Women In Poverty; Chicago; University of Chicago Press

Gilligan, Carol; 1982; In A Different Voice; Cambridge, Massachusets; Harvard University Press

Goldberg, Steven; 1977; The Inevitability of Patriarchy; London; Temple Smith Ltd.

Gortz, A.; 1985; Paths to Paradise on the Liberation from Work; London; Pluto Press

Goodell, Grace; 1984; "Political Development and Social Welfare: A Conservative Perspective" in People Centered Development; Korten, D. and Klauss, R. eds.; Hartford, Conneticut; Kumarian Press

Grabow, Stephen and Heskin, Allan; 1973, March; "Foundations for a Radical Concept of Planning"; in American Institute of Planning Journal

Grimshaw, Jean; 1986; Feminist Philosophers: Women's Perspectives On Philosophical Traditions; Brighton, England; Wheatsheaf Books

Hartsock, Nancy; 1985; Money, Sex And Power: Toward A Feminist Historical Materialism; Boston; Northeastern University Press

Heilbroner, Robert; 1975; An Inquiry Into The Human Prospect; New York; W.W. Norton and Company

Heilbroner, Robert; 1980; The Worldly Philosophers; New York; Simon and Schuster

Helmrich, R.L., Spence, J.T. and Gibson, R.H.; 1982; "Sex-role Attitudes"; in Journal of Personality and Social Psychology; Vol. 8:656-663

Hewlett, Sylvia; 1986; A Lesser Life: The Myth of Women's Liberation In America; New York; Warner Books, Inc.

Hirschman, A.O. and Lindblom, C.E.; 1962; "Economic Development, Research and Development and Policy Making: Some Converging Views"; in Behavioral Science; Vol. 7, No. 2, April:211-222

Hughes, Helen; 1985; "Women in the Development of the South Pacific"; in Women in Development in the South Pacific: Barriers and Opportunities; Canberra; Australia National University

Illich, I.; 1973; Tools for Conviviality; London; Fontana Books

Korten, D.C. and Klauss eds., R.; 1984; People Centered Development; West Hartford, Conneticut; Kumarian Press

Krip, David, Yudof, Mark, and Franks, Marlene; 1986; Gender Justice; Chicago; University of Chicago Press

Kropotkin, P.; 1914; Mutual Aid; Boston; Porter Sargent Books

Keating,Maree and Melville, Lyn; 1985; "Aid and Development Issues in the Pacifc"; Development in the Pacific: What Women Say; Development Dossier NO. 18; Canberra; Australian Council for Overseas Aid

Kohlberg, L. and Ullian, D.Z.; 1974; "Stages in the Development of Psychosexual Concepts and Attitudes"; in Sex Differences in Behavior; Friedman, R.C., Richart, R.M., and Vande Wiele,, R.L., eds.; New York; Wiley

Leahy, Margret; 1986; Development Strategies and the Status of Women; Boulder, Colorado; Lynne Reinner Publishers, Inc.

MacKinnon, Catherine; 1983 Summer; "Feminism, Marxism, Method and the State'; in Signs; Vol.8, No.4:635-658

Marks, E. and de Courtivron, I. eds.; 1981; New French Feminisms; New York; Schoken Books

Maslow, Abraham; 1971; The Farther Reaches of Human Nature; New York; Penguin

Masser, Ian; 1972; Analytical Models for Urban and Regional Planning; Devon, England; David & Charles Publishers

McClelland, D.C., Atkinson, J.W., Clark, R.A., and Lowell, E.G.; 1953; The Achievement Motive; New York; Appleton-Century-Crofts

McGregor, Douglas; 1960; The Human Side of Enterprise; New York; McGraw-Hill

McIntosh, Mary; 1978; "The State and the Oppression of Women" in Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production; Kuhn, A. and Wolpe, A. eds.; London; Routledge and Kegan Paul

Mead, Margret; 1949; Male and Female; New York; William Morrow & Co.

Mellaart, James; 1967; Catal Huyuk; A Neolithic Town in Anatolia; New York; McGraw-HIll

Melnyck,G.; 1985; The Search for Community; Montreal; Black Rose Books

Melville, Lyn; 1983; Women, Aid And Development: Proceedings Of A Workshop; Published by The Women and Development Network of Australia

Merchant, Carolyn; 1980; The Death of Nature; London; Wildwood House

Millet, Kate; 1977; Sexual Politics; London; Virago

Moser, Caroline and Peake, Linda eds.; 1987; Women, Human Settlements, And Housing; London; Tavistock Publications

Nerfin, Marc; 1987; "Neither Prince nor Merchant: Citizen" in Development Dialog; (1) 170-195

Papanek, Hannah; 1977; "Development Planning For Women"; in Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society; Vol. 3, No. 1, Autumn

Recommendations of the Fourth Regional Women's Conference; 1988, September 17-23; Suva Fiji

Rich, Adrienne; 1986; Of Woman Born; New York; W.W. Norton and Company

Rosaldo, Michelle Zimbalist, and Lamphere, Louise, eds.; 1974; Woman, Culture and Society; Stanford; Stanford University Press

Ross and Usher; 1986; From the Roots Up; Toronto; Lorimer and Co.

Rostow, William; 1972; The Stages of Economic Growth; Cambridge; Cambridge University Press

Rozak, Theodore; 1973; Where the Wasteland Ends; Garden City, N.Y.; Anchor Books

Safilios-Rothschild, Constantina; 1982; "Female Power, Autonomy and Demgraphic Change in the Third World"; in Women's Roles and Population Trends in the Third World; Anker,R., Buvinic,M., Youseff,N., eds.; London; Croom Helm Ltd.

Shumacher, E.F.; 1974; Small Is Beautiful; London; Abacus Press

Scitovsky,Tibor; 1978; The Joyless Economy; Oxford; Oxford University Press

Schoen, D.; 1982; "Planning Within Social Learning"; Journal of the American Planing Association; Vol.28; No.4

Sichtermann, Barbara; 1986; Femininity: The Politics Of The Personal; Minneapolis, Minnesota; University of Minnesota Press

Smith, Dorthy; 1987; The Everyday World As Problematic; Toronto; University of Toronto Press

Smith, Joan; 1984; "The Paradox of Women's Poverty: Wage Earning Women and Economic Transformation"; in Women and Poverty; Gelpi et. a. eds.; Chicago; University of Chicago Press

Starhawk; 1982; Dreaming The Dark; Boston; Beacon Press

Siwatibau, Suliana; 1985; "Women's Access to Aid Sponsered Training in the South Pacific"; in Women in Development in the South Pacific: Barriers and Opportunities; Canberra; Australian National University

Tavris, Carol and Wade, Carole; 1984; The Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective; Toronto; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers

Thorborg, Marina; 1985; Identification Of Priority Research Issues On Women In Asia And The Pacific; Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with Developing Countries (SAREC) Publishing

Tiffany, Sharon; 1984; "Introduction: Feminist Perspectives in Anthropology"; in Rethinking Women's Roles; Berkley; University of California Press

Tiffany, Sharon; 1981; "Women in Cross-Cultural Perspective: A Bibliographic Guide"; Whitewater, Wisconsin; University of Wisconsin-Whitewater

United Nations Development Program; 1984; Strengthening the Planning and Implementation of National Women's Programmes in the Pacific; UNDP/SPC Project RAS/81/WO6; Final Report; Noumea, New Caledonia; South Pacific Commission

Walby, Sylvia; 1986; Patriarchy At Work; Mineapolis, Minnesota; University of Minnesota Press

Waring, Marilyn; 1988; If Women Counted; San Francisco; Harper and Row Publishers

Wolf, Eric; 1982; Europe and the People Without a History; Berkley; University of California Press

World Commission on Environment and Development; 1987; Our Common Future; Oxford; Oxford University Press

Williams, Marjorie; 1988, July; "The Global Economic Crisis, Structural Adjustment and the Fate of Women", draft paper; Women's Alternative Economic Summit; Queens, New York; WEAS Task Force

Wilson, Elizabeth and Weir, Angela; 1986; Hidden Agendas: Theory, Politics and Experience in the Women's Movement;
London; Tavistock Publications

Zak, Michele; 1983; Women And The Politics Of Culture; New York; Longman Inc.

PERSONAL COMMUNICATION

Beazley, Mike; 1989; Ph.D Seminar on Radical Theory; Vancouver; University of British Columbia