

Prof. Dr. Claudia von Werlhof

Women`s Studies, Institute for Political Sciences at the University of Innsbruck

/ Innsbruck Institute for Research on Patriarchy, Austria

claudia.von-werlhof@uibk.ac.at

CAPITALIST PATRIARCHY AND THE STRUGGLE FOR A `DEEP` ALTERNATIVE

Contribution for the national/international Conference:

“A radically different world view is possible.

The gift-economy inside and outside Patriarchal Capitalism”

Las Vegas, USA, 13th - 14th of November 2004

Introduction:

I knew Genevieve Vaughan at the “First World Congress of Matriarchal Studies” last year in Luxemburg. She gave me her book “For-Giving” (Vaughan 1997). When I read it I was impressed by the clarity and depth of her analysis, her way to think to the bottom of the problem, and the way how she reflects a lifelong experience, knowledge and love.

On page 23 of her book she says: ”In order to reject patriarchal thinking we must be able to distinguish between it and something else: an alternative”. I can fully identify with this. Me too, I tried “to think outside patriarchy” all the time though being inside it. But, nevertheless, when listening to Jeanette Armstrong and her experiences as a Native American woman, I feel a shame of having done so little in comparison to the size of the problem. So let me at least try to add something – not to the gift-paradigm – but to the analysis of capitalist patriarchy. Because, as Gen said today, “if we don`t understand in which society we live we cannot change it: we do not know where the exit is!” Therefore, “we have to dismantle patriarchy”. This is what I am trying to do now.

I. “A different world is possible!”

This is the main slogan of the worldwide civilian movement against globalization since years. I have to add: “A *radically* different world is possible!” – it is not only possible but also urgently

needed.

But without a *vision* of this radically different world we will not be able to move into its direction. Therefore we need to discuss, first of all, a radically different world *view*. This is why we are here today.

For this purpose we have to analyze *what* is happening today and *why* it is happening. Only then we will be able to define a really *different* world, world view and vision.

1. “Globalization”, a need for explanation

A radically different world view is necessary because today we are observing a global social, economic, ecological and political development that is totally different from what it is supposed to be. The so called “globalization” obviously is not a movement towards more democracy, peace, general welfare, wealth, and ecological sustainability, as its propagators are pretending everywhere. On the contrary, the opposite is true: Never in history are so many people dying from hunger and thirst, environmental destruction and war, most of them women and children. Never in history have so many people been confined to poverty, income reduction, expulsion, expropriation and extreme exploitation, again, most of them women and children. Never in history has the technological progress led to such an intense and threatening destruction of the environment globally. Never in history has the nuclear threat been so acute. Never in history have the political systems been changing so clearly into the direction of an authoritarian, if not despotic rule in many parts of the world. And never in history has such a tiny minority on the globe been so incredibly rich and powerful like the Transnational Corporations and their “global players” of today, for whom we and the planet are nothing else but their “play material”.

In sum, this situation can be called the “development of underdevelopment” (Frank 1978). But this time underdevelopment is not only produced in the south, but also in the north. It is the result of a “new colonization of the world” (Mies 2004) which did and does not happen inexplicably, but is actively and aggressively promoted by the governments as their general and apparently “normal” policy, beginning in the eighties of the 20th century. This policy consists in a “continuing process of primitive accumulation” (Werlhof 1988) that leads to a forced economic growth through the direct expropriation of the peoples of the globe and the globe itself. The name of this policy is “neo-liberalism”. This new liberalism fits exclusively to the interests of the Corporations. For the rest of humanity it means just the opposite, totalitarianism.

Is this “New World Order” (Chomsky 1999, Chossudovsky 1996, Ziegler 2002, Wallerstein 2004, Hardt/Negri 2000) the “best of all possible worlds” that western civilization pretends to develop? Or is the current development of western civilization better defined as the peak and turning point towards its final decline? (Wallerstein 1974) And why is it that Margaret Thatcher said, namely that “There is no alternative”?

2. Capitalist Patriarchy, a historical concept

Meanwhile, many people have made *descriptions* of this situation and its dynamics. There seems to be “no future” – astonishingly enough even for the global players themselves. I call this

situation *west end* (Werlhof 2002). The self given "licence to loot" (Mies/Werlhof 2003, Werlhof 2000) the resources of the earth will find an end with the end of the resources, already underway, and the "resource wars" (Klare 2001), the new global wars for oil and water that have already begun, are the beginning of the end of this system, its logical consequence.

But, there is nearly no deeper *analysis* of the *reasons* that are leading to this extraordinary situation and its dynamics that seems to exclude any alternative. There is no real, no deeper *explanation* of the world`s dilemma and its *causes*. For example: Is the profit motive alone sufficient as an explanation? Why do most people believe that human nature is nothing but ego-centric? What about control and domination of nature? In what is it rooted?

I suppose that the reason why most people do not really know why all these things are happening is due to the fact that the left as well as the right and the sciences in general have never analyzed *patriarchy*. And not knowing patriarchy also means not really knowing *capitalism*, because the two do not only share a time of being together on this earth for now 500 years, but of being deeply related to each other in a way that has not been understood by most people until today, even feminists. Therefore, it is time to do the necessary step - analyzing *capitalist patriarchy* from its roots and as a theoretical concept for the analysis of society. Only then it can be seen that patriarchy is much more than just a word for polemical purposes. It can instead be understood as a concept that explains the character of the whole social order in which we are living today, socialism included.

3. Patriarchy, the development of a "war system"

Recent studies of matriarchal societies and the change to patriarchy (Göttner-Abendroth 05) suggest mainly four things:

1) *On the genesis of patriarchy*

Patriarchal society as we know it, *did not exist "as such"* and independently from or even before the matriarchal one, but started to develop after the armed invasion, violent conquest and systematic destruction of matriarchal society by armed hordes that had lost their own originally matriarchal culture after having been exposed to "catastrophic migration" (forced migration due to climatic changes and other catastrophes). This process is reported from the 5th millennium B.C. onwards - concerning the "Kurgan" people and the Indo-European migrations in general -, and it occurred in China, India, the Middle East, North and Central Africa, Europe and the Americas as well; Gimbutas 1994, Mies 2003)).

As patriarchal society did not exist "as such" we have to analyze the conditions that led to its development.

The development of patriarchal society is related to the *invention* of something that from then on was called "war", and the development of patriarchy has been dependent on the *continuation* of war even in so called "peace times". Otherwise the people of the conquered communities and societies would have easily liberated themselves from the conquerors` rule. The logic of patriarchy since then is the *logic of war* which means that all the social institutions invented by patriarchy are principally drawn from war experiences:

a- Patriarchy invented a *political system* based on the invention of the state, which meant the hierarchical dominance of armed men over the conquered people and the dominance of men over women, because women were at the centre of pre-patriarchal society and felt responsible for the maintenance of its egalitarian principles.

b- Patriarchy invented an *economy* based on the invention of the plunder of other peoples' property, from then on called "private" property (privare = to rob), and on an always more systematic exploitation of the conquered, especially the women, because women have had the control over the means of production, were the producers and distributors, the givers, of concrete wealth, namely life, food, security, and felt responsible for the integration of everybody into the community (Vaughan 1997).

c- Patriarchy invented a *society* split into social classes, "races", generations, and "sexes" what meant that from then on especially women were regarded as being subjugated to men *by nature*, in order to be never able again to re-establish a matriarchal society.

d- Patriarchy invented a "God-Father-" or "male creator-religion" based on the "great warrior", plunderer, proprietor, or "big man" (Godelier 1987) who was regarded to be able and to be legitimized to give and to take life, replacing the Great Mother or Goddess by the idea and the ideology of an omnipotent, violent and jealous single God, a sort of an abstract patriarchal "mother-father".

e- Patriarchy invented a *technology* based on "the war as the father of all things", namely by beginning to transform the pre-patriarchal technique and philosophy of "*alchemy*" into a patriarchal one, what meant that from then on men systematically tried to use the existing (female) knowledge about life and nature in order to appropriate it, to pervert it into a means of control over life and nature, and, finally, trying to *replace* life, women and nature themselves through "technological progress" (Werlhof 2004a), the project of a sort of "*second creation*".

f- Patriarchy invented a *psychology* that defined the ways how men could develop their "masculation" (Vaughan), their competitive, ego-logical patriarchal individuality (Girard 1992), opposing the community, women and nature.

In sum, the patriarchal order of society meant a total break with matriarchal or gift-giving social rules, traditions and taboos from times immemorial, and can be defined as a "*war system*" in development (Werlhof 2004b). And even if there have been times and spaces that did not fit at all into this picture, the development or so called "evolution" of patriarchy, nevertheless, in the last instance has been a continuous one, and women did not prevent patriarchy from developing further. This can today be seen more clearly than ever before.

2) *Patriarchy as the negation of matriarchy*

In patriarchal societies we can always find *rests* of the former matriarchal ones (matriarchy as "2nd culture", Genth 1996)), left over or newly re-organized after the patriarchs had started to deny the reality and quality of matriarchal society (Werlhof 2004b). This matriarchy as 2nd culture can be observed everywhere, f. ex. in mother-child relationships, in love, and generally in gift giving (Vaughan 1997). It contradicts the patriarchal order, but also helps it to exist, because a society without *any* matriarchal relations could simply not survive. Therefore, patriarchies are

always somehow “mixed” societies, be it to a higher or lower degree, and they are hiding this fact as much as they can – for obvious reasons. But today it can be observed very clearly that patriarchy is trying to complete its negation of matriarchy in order to replace it as much as possible. This destruction and the fading away of the 2nd culture in patriarchy and of much of the still existing gift-paradigm within it is one of the main reasons for the *depth* of the crisis of the contemporary civilization.

The *negation of matriarchy* as such consisted and consists in:

a- *Presupposing* that there has never been any matriarchal society; that patriarchal society existed from the beginnings of human life on earth; and /or pretending that a violent and evil *rule of women* had to be broken before patriarchal society could develop so called “civilization” and “progress”.

Due to this patriarchal *mythology* most people today still think that matriarchy did never exist, or that it meant “rule of women” instead of “rule of men”, which indeed never was the case in matriarchal, but may be sometimes in *patriarchal* society. So, most people do not understand that the terms “matriarchy” and “patriarchy” are not just referring to men and women, or “male” and “female”, but to the character of the *whole social order*, so that both men and women living in matriarchy have to be considered “matriarchal”, and living in patriarchy both have to be considered principally “patriarchal”, referring to their thinking, acting and feeling.

Furthermore the negation of matriarchy consisted and consists in:

b- *Destroying* the matriarchal society as a social order on its own;

c- *Appropriating* everything from matriarchal society that seemed important to the patriarchs, trying to rob and to usurp it, especially the image and the abilities of the mother (and the goddess), because patriarchy did not have an own original culture and could destroy but not originate life on its own;

d- *Perverting* everything matriarchal into its opposite; which is the way how “*the patriarchal*” is defined;

e- Trying to *transform* the originally matriarchal society into a patriarchal one by developing the policies of “divide and rule”, by dissolving and abstracting from the interconnectedness of people, communities, genders, generations, cult, commons, and nature in general; and by

f- Trying subsequently to *replace* them and the whole matriarchal order by a “purely” patriarchal one.

Especially this last question of the transformation and substitution of nature and women as such has nearly never been regarded in their crucial importance.

3) *The “Gnostic” world view of patriarchy*

Peoples` experiences with patriarchal society, war, despotic rule, and ceaseless violence logically led to a complete change in the general *world view*, too.

The "*Gnostic*" world view appeared (Sloterdijk/Macho 1991). Gnosis means recognition: It is recognized that the world is "bad", "evil", "low", primitive, violent, sinful and not worth living in it. A better, "higher", more developed, "noble" and civilized world, therefore, is becoming the ideal of people in patriarchy. But it is believed that this "higher" world cannot be found on earth, less in the matriarchal past or presence elsewhere. So the "higher world" is thought of as a *metaphysical* world that can only be envisioned by imagination.

A metaphysical world *beyond physics* was not thought of in matriarchal society, because the words "mater" and "arché" together do not mean "rule of mothers", but: *in the beginning the mother*, life stems from mothers, "uterus". Therefore, life, death, the mother and the goddess, are always *here* in this world, and they *all belong* to each other, so that there is neither the need, nor the idea of another (metaphysical) world *beyond* the one in which we live every day (Chattopadhyaya 1973).

In patriarchal society, on the contrary, another world *beyond* the existing one has to be invented, because the words "pater" and "arché" together do not simply mean "rule of fathers", but: *in the beginning the "father"* – a word unknown in matriarchal times. Or: life stems from fathers *instead* of from mothers; fathers are men with uteruses who in the last instance are able to give life themselves without needing women at all! (The Pharaoh Echnaton, f. ex., made himself be painted as a pregnant man, s. Wolf 1994). Only on the basis of this fantasy men would be legitimized to rule - over those who are not "fathers", the people and especially the mothers. The "father", therefore, is defined as somebody who is a ruling man and as such not only able to take, but also to "give" life.

In patriarchy the word "arché" thus did not only mean "beginning, origin, uterus", *but also* "rule" and "domination", *too*. This second meaning of "arché" *did not appear before patriarchy*, so that in matriarchy "arché" could never have meant domination, much less mothers' or women's rule! There simply was no domination, and therefore there was no word for it. Etymology shows that 1) a matriarchal society in which women were in power the way men are in patriarchal society, did never exist, and that 2) the "father" in patriarchal society has to be related to power as a *system* of domination, at least as long as he cannot replace the mother.

This means that the *political system* of patriarchal society can be regarded as a first step into the direction of the development of a "pure", fully elaborated patriarchy, in which the fathers would really be "men with uteruses" or with something like "uterus-machines", who then would not be in need of domination any more, because they would be able to do without nature, women and the matriarchal society or the rests of it at all. The political system of patriarchy would only be needed as a *method for the period in which patriarchy moves towards its realization*, in which it is on its way *towards a "full patriarchy"*, conceived of as the *end of history*. From this point of view, history is only the time in which patriarchy appeared and "evolved" until it became a hundred percent reality.

The patriarchal usurpation, destruction, and perversion of the mother and the wish to replace her thus led to an early sort of "*science fiction*": to the idea that what is only – and absurdly - *supposed*, namely that life stems from the father and *not* the mother, is considered even *more real* than what can be experienced every day, namely the opposite. It is this "credo quia absurdum" – I believe in the absurd – of the early church-patriarchs, that from then on began its nearly uninterrupted career on earth.

Gnostic metaphysics and the belief in it as another, “higher” reality appeared everywhere, in every theological as well as philosophical tradition until today. Since then the *belief in metaphysical assumptions* has become much *more important than the knowledge about the world in which we live*, even more so in the secularized modern sciences of today, as we shall see below.

In sum: The historically new concept of the “father” is a triple fiction: it *imitates* the *fiction* of a powerful patriarchal “mother” and/or “goddess” and *imagines* to have successfully *replaced her*. This way the “father” is defined as a sort of “*patriarchal mother*”, the god as a sort of patriarchal goddess, who – as a contradiction in itself – could never have been thought of before.

This shows that the father originally is not regarded to be a man who relates to a woman with whom he has a child. This type of a father, as we normally define him today, is much less the “idea” of the father than the early fiction of a man with a uterus. The reason for this “loss” in defining the father is very simple: It has until now really been impossible to have new life without women.

But we know that biotechnology and genetic engineering are working hard to solve this main problem of patriarchy: The problem that only men should be the creators of life. Still having to be born from women seems to be the biggest scandal for patriarchal men and society (see Anders` 1994 description of a “shame of being born instead of being made”). Our actual “soft” understanding of the father who is still dependent on a mother proves every day that *patriarchy in reality does not yet exist* at all the way it is supposed to. The world – at least in this respect – basically still functions the matriarchal way.

4) *From idealism to materialism*

But the fiction is program. The *idea* of patriarchy has become its political and technological project. Patriarchy as a society in which life stems from fathers and not from mothers has to be artificially produced, or it will never really exist. The project is: Life - or what is considered to be life - should be born or be made by men. And: Only what men produce is considered to be “real life” and to have a “value”, *as if* patriarchy would have been realized already.

This way patriarchy becomes not only a *theory* (vision of God), but also a *theology* (the logic, the true words of God, his creation by the word that was “in the beginning”), a “*theo-gnosis*” (proof of the existence of God) and a *theophany* (God is appearing), and it becomes structurally *theomorphical* and *theocratic*. On top of that patriarchy seems to prove its *entelechy* (its capacity to evolve its “naturally” given form to its perfection) and its potential for *eschatology* (end and new beginning of the world, death and rebirth).

Once that all this is the case, the system of domination even is imagined to be eventually abolished, because there would *really* be no alternative to patriarchy any longer (comp. the discussion about an “abolition of the state” and the idea of a “communist” society in Marx). Only if men have become “real” fathers, patriarchal society would – in the long run - not have to fear women and matriarchy or the gift-economy as an alternative any longer (Sombart 1991).

The patriarchs since Aristotle did not only pretend that their theory about life was true, even if they could not prove it, but they started to do something about it.

This is how the *Gnostic view became practical and “materialistic”* in the patriarchal sense of the

word: from the patriarchal viewpoint a material is a “mater”-matter, a “mother-material”, generally called “raw material” that is treated in order to produce something like patriarchal “life”, being a “resource” for “value-” or life-production, something like a “mother-machine” (c. Corea 1985). From this perversion stems *fetishism* as the confusion between dead things and living beings.

This *becoming materialistic* of the Gnostic world view, nevertheless, did not mean to return from metaphysical adventures. On the contrary, it meant *trying to realize on earth what had been imagined beyond it!* Plato`s “ideas”, for example. The Gnostic view, therefore, was not abolished at all. It became *the* program for patriarchal society, instead.

(It is as if today f. ex. the electronic production of the “virtual world” would be considered to be the only “real world”, and the real world would be considered to *be replaced* by the cyber world already, continuing its existence as the former real world only in imagination – so to say as a new “metaphysical” world “beyond” the virtual world. But this time metaphysics are not welcome any more. On the contrary, they appear as outmoded and old -fashioned, if not reactionary, because they remember the natural world. This would be the real patriarchal perversion! And it has entered the thinking of women as well, even if they did not much for the invention of machine-technology (Genth 2002). But this form of so called “post-materialism” can be found in many “gender-studies” that criticise f. ex. the discourse on “nature” as being “essentialist” which means being metaphysical, because nature is supposed of not existing in reality - any more! (Werlhof 2003; Bell/Klein 1996).)

In short, the Gnostic view which is so typical for all the other patriarchal ideologies until today did not help against patriarchy, though it correctly “recognized” many of the evils that since then had come to the world. But the consequences drawn out of this recognition were not oriented towards a matriarchal world any more. All the evils that were recognized by the Gnosis were not considered to be the ones of a patriarchal society. They were considered, instead, to be of society *in general*, of “the world”, of people and even nature everywhere. A difference between a matriarchal society and a patriarchal one, or between society and nature, or between the ruling and the ruled, was not thought of any more. At that time *patriarchy was taken for granted* already.

The Gnostic view had accepted the state. It did not question it any more, and those who could afford it tried to flee its consequences and its ugliness. This way the two main tendencies in the thinking of patriarchal society came about: *idealism* and *materialism*. The two should, therefore, not be regarded as pure contradictions, as it is usual, but as the two sides of one coin, the “*Siamese twins*” of patriarchy: the “materialistic” one fighting actively against the lasting importance of “*matter*”, the mater-mother, nature, the goddess and life in order to get them under control, - the “idealistic” one propagating the *ideal* of a motherless world, a purely patriarchal *utopian paradise* that seems peaceful because it appears to have finally resolved the contradictions with the material matriarchal world or the rests of it.

This way idealism proves to be not less violent than materialism, because it is formulating the *idea* that became the project of a *material realization* which cannot be other than radically violent.

From then on nature and women were not respected any more in their own subjectivity, beauty, truth, goodness and strength, their inventions, abilities, products and culture, their *gifts* to the

world since times immemorial. They were seen, instead, under the perspective of representing the “chaos”, the “sin” and the “evil” that necessarily had to be subjugated *under* and transformed *by* the socio-economic-political-ideological-religious-technological project of patriarchy. From this point of view women and nature had to be oppressed, exploited, expropriated, transformed and destroyed in a way that could be used as a proof for male superiority, strength and creativity.

4. Capitalism, the latest stage of patriarchy

Having defined patriarchy, what does this mean for defining *capitalism*?

From my analysis of patriarchy follows that capitalism and modernity, including so called socialism, far from being or becoming independent from patriarchy, is the *latest stage of patriarchy*. My hypothesis is that *patriarchy crystallizes into capitalism*. Capitalism is the period in which patriarchy becomes really serious: “Homo faber” is supposed to be finally replaced by “homo creator”, a sort of secularized God.

This means that with capitalism there is a break as well as a continuation of patriarchy. But both go into the same direction, namely fostering patriarchy. The logics of patriarchy led straight forward into the modern epoch, because *capitalism is the promise to finally realize the futuristic Gnostic utopia materially and on earth*. It consists in the intent to produce *a purely patriarchal society, cleaned from matriarchal rests whatsoever and propagated as a male made second paradise, the creation of a finally “good” patriarchal “mother”*.

Metaphysics are to become the new physics. This is the propaganda of modern society as a whole, its politics, economy, religion – especially in the form of Protestantism - and technology.

Gnosticism becomes secularized: The content is the same, but the program has become one of *action*. The times of mere contemplation are fading away, the “vita contemplativa” is followed by a new kind of “vita activa” (Arendt 1987).

Since the Renaissance, always more inventors and colonizers, scientists and soldiers, entrepreneurs and explorers, settlers and missionaries, merchants and money lenders are the modern activists on their way to the proposed 2nd man – made and final paradise on earth (Rifkin 1998).

This is the beginning of the “Great Transformation” (Polanyi 1978) for which modern Europe became so famous. The new epoch was mostly *not* seen as a continuation of an earlier one. It seemed, instead, to be the birth hour of a totally new society, not bound to history any more, a society that would be able to solve all the problems of mankind (indeed not of womankind) for ever – like the US today.

From the point of view of patriarchy, capitalism is the epoch in which women, nature, and life in general are finally supposed to be successfully replaced by the artificial products of industry: gifts by exchange, subsistence goods by commodities, local markets by a world market, foreign cultures by Western culture, concrete wealth – gifts - by money, machinery, and capital - the new abstract wealth -, living labour by machines, the brain/ rational thinking by “artificial intelligence”, women by sex-machines and “cyber-sex”, real mothers and/ or their wombs by “mother-machines”, life energy by nuclear energy, chemistry and bio-industry; and life in general

by “artificial life” like GMOs. The only problem left today seems to consist in how to “replace” the elements and the globe itself.

Therefore, the so called *technological progress* through the development of modern sciences and the *invention of the machine as a totally new techno - system, has been the logical backbone of the modern patriarchal epoch. Patriarchy itself is progress*, and all “progress” today is patriarchal. It serves the project of a *materialization of metaphysical images* via an industrial “life”-production which I call the “*alchemical system*” *in development*, because the idea behind it is as old as patriarchy and its first intents to progress using the methods of a patriarchally modified “alchemy” (Werlhof 2001).

The invention of the profit that could be drawn out of this adventure of a transformation of the whole world has convinced always more people, mostly men. But many people, especially women, had to be violently forced to participate in the new game (witch-hunt, process of “original accumulation”), by leaving nearly no way how to survive beyond capitalism.

Through all this progress mother earth is going to be more and more destroyed. Some of these fast growing destructions are already irreversible, especially the nuclear and the genetic ones (Anders 1995; Chargaff 1988). What are left is *artificial death and artificial wealth* – the violent “Nothing” – a lot of money. The earth is on the way of being transformed into dead “capital”, full of empty holes one the one side, and trash-hills for the next billion years on the other.

That all this is possible shows that most people *believe* in the violent *nihilism* of patriarchy and its dangerous *delusion* to become a “real” one. This astonishing fact can only be explained when taking into consideration that the “alchemical wonders” patriarchy is promising, do not just stem from modern times but are prophecies since 5000 years already. Therefore, the destruction and desertification of the global ecology, including the human one, did not lead to a general panic until now. On the contrary, it seems that, at least in the West, it is believed that only when the natural world has gone, the patriarchal one can finally be constructed instead, in order to appear in all its glory.

Capitalism – as well as socialism - with its activism, optimism, positivism, rationality, and its irrational belief in patriarchy, world domination, money, science, technology and violence, is not just capitalism, but has to be defined as *capitalist patriarchy* (and –by the way-.not as “patriarchal capitalism” because there is no non-patriarchal capitalism). This epoch is still on the march because it has not yet reached its aim at all. Therefore, there is no post-capitalist, post-industrial, post-modern or post-materialist epoch in sight, unless capitalist patriarchy is stopped by a breakdown of its resources, technologies, markets, and money systems, by huge natural and or social catastrophes or by an upheaval of the people who do not want to loose their lives, their globe and the future of their children. In one word: If the “matter” of capitalism, its “mater”, its mothers, its women and its matriarchal rests do not “obey” any more, and if nature does not as well, only then will capitalist patriarchy disappear. And as capitalist patriarchy is obviously not a society for eternity, all this may happen already now.

II. The “deep” alternative

1. What has to be Recognized

The *alternative* to capitalist patriarchy has to be a “deep” one, or it will fail. First of all, the “roots” of this war system will have to be recognized at all levels of society, individual life, history, and the globe. This will occur like a huge trans-disciplinary research-project of and for the people. Out of this experience the alternative will be a systematically non-capitalist and non-patriarchal one. It will be based on the rests of the “2nd culture” of matriarchy and of the gift-paradigm within patriarchal society. Because they offer a body of concrete experiences people in reality do make every day since humankind exists on earth, though they have been underestimated, hidden and made invisible to most of us. They can be made conscious again, and this is happening already in many parts of the world (Bennholdt-Thomsen et.al.2001)

But even if it appears difficult to be not only confronted with 500 years of modernity, but with 5000 years of patriarchal traditions that have to be overcome, this is little in comparison to hundreds of thousands of years of a human experiences outside patriarchy.

Maintaining features of capitalist patriarchy, instead, will most probably and quickly lead back into the system that has to be overcome if we want to continue life on earth. Whether the alternative/s that can be found on this basis will again be matriarchal ones or not, cannot be foreseen. At least they will be *post-patriarchal*. At the moment it is historically open if matriarchy can be re-invented, and/or what a matriarchal society and a gift-economy would mean today.

2. What has to be Done

- De-constructing patriarchal institutions, policies, economies, technologies and ideologies
- Making visible matriarchy as the 2nd culture and the gift paradigm and realizing their importance in every day life
- Giving up the metaphysical Gnostic world view, including the belief in patriarchal religions and the patriarchal philosophy of idealism-materialism
- Re-gaining a matriarchal spirituality that is leading again into the interconnectedness of all life
- Not defining technology/progress any longer as having to produce a substitute for life, women and nature in general
- Not defining economy any longer as having to produce a “value” and a profit
- Recognizing that the paradise which is supposed to be invented, is already there: it is the earth as the only planet in the known universe that is full of life and the only one, on which human beings can survive

- Taking action to save the earth from further human destruction
- Liberating ourselves from the idea that “material” life on earth is unimportant, sinful, humble, and something that has to be overcome
- Liberating ourselves from the delusion and the hubris that there can ever be a substitute for life and nature on earth
- Learning the lessons of nature again, recognizing that the destruction of nature with the purpose of its transformation does not lead to a better world, but to its destruction
- Giving up making war, believing in violence and trying to rule over others. Learning instead to live in commonality and organizing around egalitarian principles
- Taking serious what we are doing in and to the world, accepting our responsibility for the maintenance of life on the globe
- Learning to rehabilitate and love life, including our own one, and the earth as such
- Trying to be creative for the maintenance and culture of life on the earth, acting in favour of and not in contradiction to them
- Giving up “masculation” (Vaughan 1997), “egotism” as the search for competitive “identity”, and identifying instead with gift-giving and the traditions of men and women in matriarchal cultures
- Learning that women can teach us a lot
- Falling off belief in patriarchy and joining in order to stop it, listening to the joyful song of mother earth.

In sum:

What is needed is a re-version of a perverted parasitic society and (wo)mankind. The patriarchal “mother-father” as a “cyborg” that is the alchemical materialization of a metaphysical fiction has to fade away as soon as possible.

Being able to perceive an alternative to capitalist patriarchy shows that this alternative is already in the making. And already in the near future we will not believe it any more how men and women could have maintained their support and even admiration for such a destructive delusion for such a long time!

3. The struggle

Many *alternative movements* in the whole world are *already in this process*, for historical reasons most of them in the global *south* and most of them *guided by women*. This is the case because the south and women have and had to bear the responsibility and most of the negative consequences of patriarchy and especially capitalist patriarchy. This is why they are on the front of the new

movements. Additionally, for women it is still much easier to remember matriarchal society, culture and gift-giving, because the matriarchal rests have mostly been maintained by them. The way into a post-patriarchal society, therefore, is much more logical and visible for women than for men. The thinking, acting and feeling of women, especially of poor women in the south, often shows a high level of dissidence with western globalization and culture. They are decided to defend life on the “*two fronts*” of the conflict: against the war system of capitalist patriarchy and in favour of a new society (Bennholdt-Thomsen et. al 2001, Werlhof 1985, 1991, 1996. At the University of Innsbruck a new international research project is planned, the title of which is “On the way to a new civilization?” In this research project current alternative movements worldwide will be compared).

Movements that are either active on only one of the “two fronts” we are facing today, or that do not address to each of the most important aspects and dimensions of life under patriarchal attack, are stepping into crisis, sooner or later. This is still the case with many movements in the north and of those traditionally guided by man.

It seems as if a larger and deeper movement in the north will only be possible when the illusions to move upward within the system have been lost and the daily conditions of life have worsened further. But in the meantime extremists of the far right and “religious” fundamentalists everywhere are preparing their field of action, too.

Nobody knows what will be left over even of alternative groups and “deep feminism” in north and south when the patriarchal system and order of society is imploding and dissolving itself, and when the conflicts within it become always more violent. But if anybody has a chance to move into the right direction it is in the really alternative post-patriarchal groups, communities and movements worldwide.

Literature:

Anders, Günther: Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen, München (Beck) 1994/1995 (1956/1980)

Arendt, Hannah: Vita Activa. Oder Vom tätigen Leben, München/Zürich (Piper) 1987 (1967)

Bell, Diane / Klein, Renate (eds.): Radically Speaking: Feminism Reclaimed, London (zedpress) 1996

Bennholdt-Thomsen/Werlhof/Faraclas (eds): There is an Alternative. Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization, London (zedpress) 2001

Chargaff, Erwin: Unbegreifliches Geheimnis. Wissenschaft als Kampf für und gegen die Natur, Stuttgart (Klett Cotta) 1988

Chattopadyaya, Debiprasad: Lokayata. A Study in Ancient Indian Materialism, New Delhi (Peoples Publishing House) 1973 (1959)

Chomsky, Noam: Profit over People. Neoliberalism and Global Order, New York (Seven Stories Press) 1999

Chossudovsky, Michel: The Globalization of Poverty, London (zedpress) 1996

- Corea, Gena: *The MotherMachine*, New York (Harper& Row) 1985
- Frank, André Gunder: *Dependent Accumulation and Underdevelopment*, London (Basigstoke) 1978
- Genth, Renate: *Matriarchat als 2. Kultur*, in: Werlhof/Schweighofer/Ernst (Eds.): *Herren-Los. Herrschaft – Erkenntnis – Lebensform*, Frankfurt (Peter Lang) 1996, pp. 17-38
- Genth, Renate: *Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis. Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis*, Frankfurt/New York (Peter Lang) 2002
- Gimbutas, Marija: *Das Ende Alteuropas. Der Einfall der Steppennomaden aus Südrussland und die Indogermanisierung Mitteleuropas*, Innsbruck (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft, Sonderheft 90), 1994
- Girard, René: *Das Heilige und die Gewalt*, Frankfurt 1992
- Godelier, Maurice: *Die Produktion der Großen Männer*, Frankfurt/New York (Campus) 1987
- Göttner-Abendroth, Heide (Ed): *Gesellschaft in Balance, Dokumentation des „1. Weltkongresses für Matriarchatsforschung“ in Luxemburg 2003*, Stuttgart (Kohlhammer) 2005 (English version forthcoming)
- Hard, Michael/Negri, Antonio: *Empire*, Harvard (Harvard Univ. Press) 2000
- Klare, Michael: *Resource Wars. The new landscape of global conflict*, New York (Henry Holt and Company) 2001
- Mies, Maria: *Über die Notwendigkeit, Europa zu entkolonisieren*, in: Werlhof/Bennholdt-Thomsen/Faraclas (eds.): *Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung*, Wien (Promedia), 2003, pp.19-40
- Mies, Maria/Werlhof, Claudia von (Eds): *Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen – MAI – Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft und was wir dagegen tun können*, Hamburg (Rotbuch/EVA, 2003 (1998)
- Mies, Maria: *Krieg ohne Grenzen. Die neue Kolonisierung der Welt*, Köln (Papyrossa) 2004
- Polanyi, Karl: *The Great Transformation. Politische und ökonomische Ursprünge von Gesellschaften und Wirtschaftssystemen*, Frankfurt 1978 (1944)
- Rifkin, Jeremy: *The Biotech Century*, New York (Tarcher/Putnam) 1998
- Sloterdijk, Peter/Macho, Thomas (Eds): *Weltrevolution der Seele. Ein Lese- und Arbeitsbuch zur Gnosis*, 2 Bde, Gütersloh (Artemis und Winkler) 1991
- Sombart, Nicolaus: *Die Deutschen Männer und ihre Feinde. Carl Schmitt. Ein deutsches Schicksal zwischen Männerbund und Matriarchatsmythos*, München/Wien (Carl Hanser) 1991
- Vaughan, Genevieve: *For-Giving. A Feminist Criticism of Exchange*, Austin (Plain View Press/Anomaly Press) 1997

Wallerstein, Immanuel: The Rise und Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative analysis, in: Comparative Studies in Society and History 16 (4), 1974, pp. 387-415

Wallerstein, Immanuel: Interview at the World Social Forum, Mumbai 2004, in: Netzwerk gegen Konzernherrschaft und neoliberale Politik, Infobrief Nr. 15, March 2004 (Köln): Demokratie von unten statt Post-Demokratie, pp. 8-10

Werlhof, Claudia von: Wenn die Bauern wiederkommen. Frauen, Arbeit und Agrobusiness in Venezuela, Bremen (Peripheria/CON) 1985

Werlhof, Claudia von: Was haben die Hühner mit dem Dollar zu tun? Frauen und Ökonomie, München (Frauenoffensive) 1991

Werlhof, Claudia von: Subsistenz: Abschied vom ökonomischen Kalkül?, in: Werlhof/Schweighofer/Ernst (Eds): Herren-Los. Herrschaft – Erkenntnis-Lebensform, Frankfurt/New York (Peter Lang), 1996, pp. 364-393

Werlhof, Claudia von: Women`s Work: The Blind Spot in the Critique of Political Economy, in: Mies/Bennholdt-Thomsen/Werlhof: Women, the Last Colony, London (zedpress) 1988, pp. 13-26

Werlhof, Claudia von: “Globalization” and the “Permanent” Process of “Primitive Accumulation”: The Example of the MAI, the Multilateral Agreement on Investment, in: Arrighi, Giovanni/Goldfrank, W.L. (Eds): Festschrift for Immanuel Wallerstein – Part II (Journal of World-Systems Research VI/Nr.3, Fall/Winter), 2000, pp.728-747

Werlhof, Claudia von: Losing Faith in Progress. Capitalist Patriarchy as an “Alchemical System”, in: Bennholdt-Thomsen/Faraclas/Werlhof (Eds): There is an Alternative. Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization, London (zedpress) 2001, pp.15-40

Werlhof, Claudia von: Go West End, in Stecher, Christine (Ed): Der Tag, an dem die Türme fielen. Symbolik und Botschaft des Anschlags, München (Droemer/Knaur) 2002, pp.274-280

Werlhof, Claudia von: (Haus)Frauen, „Gender“ und die Schein-Macht des Patriarchats, in: Widerspruch 44, 23.Jg./1. Halbjahr 2003 (Zürich), pp.173-189

Werlhof, Claudia von: Using, Producing and Replacing Life? : Alchemy as Theory and Practice in Capitalism, in: Wallerstein, Immanuel (Ed): The Modern World System in the Longue Durée, (Paradigm Publishers) 2004 a

Werlhof, Claudia von: Patriarchy as Negation of Matriarchy – the Perspective of a Delusion, Contribution to the “First World Congress of Matriarchal Studies” in Luxemburg 2003 (English translation) 2004 b (German version to appear in Göttner-Abendroth, Heide (Ed): Gesellschaft in Balance, Stuttgart (Kohlhammer) 2005)

Wolf, Doris: Was war vor den Pharaonen? Die Entdeckung der Urmütter Ägyptens, Zürich (Kreuz) 1994

Ziegler, Jean: Die neuen Herrscher der Welt und ihre globalen Widersacher, München (Bertelsmann) 2002