

No Critique of Capitalism without a Critique of Patriarchy!

***Why the Left Is No Alternative*¹**

Claudia von Werlhof*

*Professor of Women's Studies at the Institute for Political Science, Department of Political Science and Sociology, University of Innsbruck, Austria

In: CNS – Capitalism – Nature – Socialism, Vol. 18, Nr. 1, New York/London (Routledge), March 2007, pp. 13-27

Feminist Research and the Left

Since the second half of the 1970s, a unique political understanding emerged within the new women's movement; one that not only questioned the foundations of Right-wing politics, but also those of the Left, and even the basis of modern science. In Germany, this work of a new and profound critique of capitalism and patriarchy was led by Maria Mies, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, and myself Claudia von Werlhof - known as the Bielefeld School and later as a part of ecofeminism² It did not take long, however, before the women's movement at large was beset by the fate of most social movements and became divided: in this case,

¹Translation by Gabriel Kuhn, Manila / Innsbruck, August 2006. Article adapted from Claudia von Werlhof, "Keine Kapitalismus-Kritik ohne Patriarchatskritik! Warum die Linke keine Alternative ist," *Widerspruch. Beiträge zu sozialistischer Politik*, Nr. 50: Alternativen!, 26.Jg./1. Halbjahr 2006, Zürich, pp. 99-111

² Maria Mies, „Methodische Postulate zur Frauenforschung – dargestellt am Beispiel der Gewalt gegen Frauen“, *Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis*, Nr. 1: Erste Orientierungen, München, pp. 41-63. Maria Mies, *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in the International Division of Labour* (London: zedpress, 1986). Claudia v. Werlhof, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Maria Mies, *Frauen, die letzte Kolonie* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1983), in english, *Women, the Last Colony* (London: zedpress, 1988). Claudia v. Werlhof, „Frauenarbeit: der blinde Fleck in der Kritik der politischen Ökonomie“, *Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis*, Nr.1, München 1978, pp.18-32. Claudia v. Werlhof, *Wenn die Bauern wiederkommen. Frauen, Arbeit und Agrobusiness in Venezuela* (Bremen: periferia/CON, 1985). Ariel Salleh, *Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern* (London: zedpress, 1997)

into “Left-wing” women on the one side, and “feminist” women, on the other.³ In the 1980s, feminist research began to be replaced almost exclusively by “gender studies” imported from the US. The result was a de-politicization of the feminist movement and of women’s studies. This did not mean that women were now less present in science or in politics. In fact, the opposite was the case. However, the edge and radicalism of women’s studies all but disappeared.⁴

What is called “globalization” has caused such a rapid deterioration of the living conditions of most people on this planet that it seems inexplicable why science and politics – including most women involved in both – seem to stubbornly ignore the issue.⁵ This must strike us as particularly peculiar, since the right questions had long been asked, and an understanding had been reached to a degree that not only made proper analyses possible, but also opened up discussions about real alternatives. It has to be assumed, though, that it was exactly this achievement that caused the well orchestrated drives from the Left as much as the Right, to undermine the women’s movement and feminist research. That episode in political history is too complex to be described here. Rather, this essay will examine the tension between feminism and the Left. As will become clear, it is the contention of the Bielefeld School that, despite its rhetoric, the Left does not – and cannot – pursue an alternative to the system we are living in.

What does Capitalism Really Mean?

Amongst the first issues the new women’s movement and its research focused on, were violence against women and unpaid domestic labor. The “woman question” was addressed as a part of the wider social and ecological context. The intent was to explain how these phenomena could exist in the midst of alleged peace and democracy, a capitalist regime of wage labor, and allegedly ever increasing standards of living within industrialized nations – what passes for “western civilization”. However, a look beyond the confines of the so-called “First World” expanded the question further: How was it possible that, despite its incorporation under “progress” and “development”, the so-called “Third World” remained characterized by underdevelopment and a lack of wage labor – not to

³ Claudia v. Werlhof, „Lohn hat einen „Wert“, Leben nicht? Auseinandersetzung mit einer „linken“ Frau“, *Prokla*, Nr. 50: Marx und der Marxismus, Berlin 1983, pp.38-58

⁴ Diane Bell and Renate Klein (eds.), *Radically Speaking. Feminism Reclaimed* (London: zedpress, 1996). Claudia v. Werlhof, „(Haus)Frauen, „Gender“ und die Schein-Macht des Patriarchats“, *Widerspruch*, Nr. 44, 23. Jg./1. Halbjahr 2003, Zürich, pp.173-189

⁵ Maria Mies and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.), *Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen – MAI – Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft, und was wir dagegen tun können* (Hamburg: Rotbuch, 1998)

mention dictatorship, war, and violence? And how was it possible that the supposedly anti-capitalist “socialism” of the so-called “Second World” (apparently engaged in a “competition of systems” with the West) did not even allow pseudo-democratic political conditions and never reached its “plan target”?

Following deliberation on all these matters, socio-economical research by Mies, Bennholdt-Thomsen, and myself, focused significantly on the so-called “Third part” of the world. The result was theorization of a *new, extended notion of capitalism*.⁶ What follows is a summary statement of that theoretical position.

On Capitalist “Relations of Production”

- The main contradiction in capitalism is not that between wage labor and capital but that between all labor - life - and capital.
- A capitalist economy is not understood by those who understand wage labor, but by those who understand unpaid labor, especially modern domestic labor /“house work”. Capitalism follows the credo that labor – just as natural resources or house work – should be as free and “fruitful” as possible.
- It is not the proletarianization but “housewifization” of labor (including ALWAYS MORE the labor of white men) which characterizes capitalist development
- Tendencies for the normal wage labor system to disappear do not mean a disappearance of capitalism, but, to the contrary, its DEEPENING and expansion.
- Even more than the wage labor system, it is the forms of unpaid labor (or at least forms of non-regular wage labor) that define capitalism: domestic labor; new forms of slavery, forced labor, and serfdom;

⁶ For an account of the Bielefeld School see Arbeitsgruppe Bielefelder Entwicklungssoziologen (ed.), *Subsistenzproduktion und Akkumulation* (Saarbrücken: Breitenbach, 1979). Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, „Marginalität in Lateinamerika. Eine Theoriekritik“, *Lateinamerika. Analysen und Berichte*, 3: Verelendungsprozesse und Widerstandsformen (Berlin: Olle & Wolter, 1980), pp.45-85. Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, „Subsistenzproduktion und erweiterte Reproduktion. Ein Beitrag zur Produktionsweisendiskussion“, *Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie*, Nr. 14, Frankfurt 1981, pp.30-51. Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, *Bauern in Mexiko zwischen Subsistenz- und Warenproduktion* (Frankfurt/New York: Campus, 1982). Claudia v. Werlhof, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Maria Mies 1983, *ibid.*; Maria Mies, 1986, *ibid.* Claudia v. Werlhof, 1985, *op.cit.* Claudia v. Werlhof, *Was haben die Hühner mit dem Dollar zu tun? Frauen und Ökonomie* (München: Frauenoffensive, 1991)

“marginality” and various hybrid forms of these PRECARIOUS relations of production (and we are not only talking of commodity production, but of subsistence production as well).⁷ None of these relations of production are to be misunderstood as pre-capitalist – they are all inherently capitalist! Capitalism is not about wage labor, but about the cheapest possible forms of commodity production.

- Capitalism has created the modern “sexual division of labor”. This division is its foundation and is reproduced in the international division of labor within the capitalist world system. Peasants and colonial labor forces take on the role of women. No REAL value is attached to their labor and so it does NEARLY not have to be remunerated.

On the “Accumulation of Capital”

- The objective of capitalism is not the transformation of all labor into wage labor, but the transformation of all labor, all life, and of the planet itself into capital, in other words: into money, commodity, machinery, and the “command over labor” (Marx).⁸ The accumulation of capital does not only happen by exploiting wage labor, but by exploiting all labor, as well as nature and life itself. It is not the “socialization” of labor by “free contract” that allows devaluating labor and life and hence accumulating more capital, but it is labor’s and life’s “naturalization” and its transformation into a “natural resource” for exploitation/extraction (its “natural-resourcization”) that do so.⁹
- The so-called “original” or “primitive” accumulation (the separation of the producers from the means of production) does not only play a role in capitalism’s beginnings. It finds itself constantly reproduced in capitalism and is hence not pre- or non-capitalist, but an integral part of capitalism.¹⁰
- The “continued” original accumulation consists of theft. It is accumulation by expropriation. Those who are expropriated are predominantly women who are – anew with every generation and in an organized manner – separated from the control over their bodies as their “means of production”, from the results of their labor, from their children, and from their vital powers.
- All aspects of original accumulation are characterized by systems of violence. This “secret” (Marx) of original accumulation explains the

⁷ Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen 1980, *ibid.*

⁸ Karl Marx in MEW (Marx-Engels-Werke), vol. 23, *Das Kapital 1* (Berlin 1974: Dietz), pp. 168, 381, 391, 400, 424, 447

⁹ Claudia v. Werlhof 1991 *op.cit.*, Günther Anders, *Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen*, 2 volumes (München: Beck, 1989)

¹⁰ Rosa Luxemburg, *The Accumulation of Capital* (1913) (London: Routledge, 1967). André Gunder Frank, “On so-called Primitive Accumulation”, *Dialectical Anthropology*, No. 2, 1977, pp.87-106. Claudia v. Werlhof 1978, *op.cit.*

permanent violence against women, nature and the colonized. What we are facing here is a perpetual war.¹¹

On the Capitalist “Mode of Production”

- Capitalism as a mode of production is based on an array of different relations of production, often misunderstood as separate “intertwined modes of production”.¹² Capitalism is a global mode of appropriation and expropriation, and an equally violent mode of transformation and destruction. War is no exceptional state; it has always been a necessary and permanent aspect of capitalism’s economy as a political one.
- War in capitalism does not only mean war of conquest, colonial war, or war of aggression. The capitalist mode of production itself always means both, war against humanity and war between humanity and nature.
- The capitalist mode of production has – contrary to common perception – an ongoing colonial character. Methods of internal and external colonization are its typical characteristics. This is precisely what defines its “modernity”, “progress”, and “civilization”.¹³
- Intrinsically connected to the capitalist mode of production are not only imperialistic but also imperial tendencies that are based on the modern world system and that demand totalitarian world domination. Democratic political conditions are only a temporary expression of the capitalist mode of production and are by no means necessarily linked to it.¹⁴
- Capitalism as a “mode of production” – truly: of destruction - has always been based on the whole of the globe. This is why – reversing the common notion – it is the entire world that has to be the “unit of analysis” (Wallerstein) – not a “First”, “Second”, or “Third” World; or an individual nation state¹⁵, since the nation state is only a consequence and perpetuation of the international division of labor/the world order. This is what we call “the illusion of the nation state”.

Since the shock caused by the Chernobyl nuclear disaster in 1986 – which marked the beginning of the Soviet Union’s downfall – some of us have focused increasingly on a critique of the so-called “development of the

¹¹ Karl Marx, 1974, *op.cit.*, pp. 741-744

¹² Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1981, *op.cit.*

¹³ Maria Mies, 1986, *op.cit.*

¹⁴ Claudia v. Werlhof, 1991, *op.cit.*, *Claudia v. Werlhof, Männliche Natur und künstliches Geschlecht. Texte zur Erkenntniskrise der Moderne* (Wien: Frauenverlag, 1991b)

¹⁵ Immanuel Wallerstein, “The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis”, *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, Vol. 16, No. 4, 1974, pp.387-415.

productive forces”, in other words: on a critique of technology in capitalism.¹⁶ This happened parallel to an intensified critique of patriarchy. It soon became apparent that the latter was in fact a precondition of the former.

On the “Development of the Productive Forces” in Capitalism

- The development of the productive forces has always been tied to the needs of war, hence to the needs of inherently destructive forces.
- Labor that corresponds to these technologies has to be “war-like” or “soldier-like”. It has to enter both obedient and aggressive relations with its “enemy”, the object of labor. No “humanization” or “democratization” can be expected from such technologies.
- The factory is modeled after the military camp. Its technology is not that of the artisan, but that of a machine geared for war. There is nothing “neutral” about such a technology.
- Contrary to artisanship, the technology of the machine is based on the notion of *divide and conquer*. It thereby follows the logic of the “alchemical” tradition, which, unnoticed by most, has always implied the principle of the machine.¹⁷ Today, the technology of the machine is alchemy’s modern and total implementation. Nonetheless, alchemy has so

¹⁶ Claudia v. Werlhof, „Wir werden das Leben unserer Kinder nicht dem Fortschritt opfern“, in Gambaroff, Marina et.al., *Tschernobyl hat unser Leben verändert. Vom Ausstieg der Frauen* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1986), pp.8-24; Maria Mies, 1986, *op.cit.*, Maria Mies, *Wider die Industrialisierung des Lebens* (Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus, 1992). Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism* (London: zedpress, 1993). Renate Genth, *Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis. Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis* (Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang, 2002). Claudia v. Werlhof, „Ökonomie, die praktische Seite der Religion. Zum Zusammenhang von Patriarchat, Kapitalismus und Christentum“, in Ulla Ernst et.al. (eds.), *Ökonomie(M)macht Angst. Zum Verhältnis von Ökonomie und Religion* (Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang, 1997), pp.95-121. Claudia v. Werlhof, „Patriarchat als “Alchemistisches System”. Die (Z)Ersetzung des Lebendigen“, in Maria Wolf (ed.), *Optimierung und Zerstörung. Intertheoretische Analysen zum menschlich Lebendigen* (Innsbruck: STUDIA, 2000), pp.13-31. Claudia v. Werlhof, „Losing Faith in Progress: Capitalist Patriarchy as an Alchemical System“, in Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.), *There is an Alternative. Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization* (London: zedpress, 2001), pp.15-40. Claudia v. Werlhof, “Using, Producing and Replacing Life?: Alchemy as Theory and Practice in Capitalism”, in Immanuel Wallerstein (ed.), *The Modern World System in the Longue Durée* (Boulder: paradigm, 2004b), pp. 65-78. Claudia v. Werlhof, “Natur, Maschine, Mimesis. Zur Kritik patriarchalischer Naturkonzepte”, *Widerspruch*, Nr. 47, 24. Jg./2. Halbjahr 2004, Zürich, pp.155-171

¹⁷ Claudia v. Werlhof, 1997, *op.cit.* Claudia v. Werlhof, 2000, *op.cit.* Claudia v. Werlhof, 2001, *op.cit.*

far failed in its ambition to separate productivity and creation from nature and women as part of its quest for world domination.

- At first, the machine is a “closed system”. It is LIKE a total(itarian) institution. It has nothing to do with “artisanship” as a general technique anymore.¹⁸ As an objective, anonymous, impersonal factual constraint, the machine is “congealed domination” and “congealed war”.
- The output of the machine: the commodity, is (as capital/money is in general) “congealed, past life” (Marx), hence “corpse-like” (Bloch) – not only in the sense of being dead, but also in the sense of having been killed.¹⁹ The commodity serves the accumulation of capital and not the satisfaction of human needs. This satisfaction has therefore little to do with the consumption of commodities.
- Today’s “new” technologies are particularly harmful to women and mothers, the creation of life, and to life itself. Nowadays “machinization” – the transformation of life into machines - violently penetrates the bodies of women, men, and nature.
- It is the modern scientific notion of nature that provides the foundation for the development of the productive forces. Within this notion, nature is reduced to a dead object, to lifeless material and spiritless matter. It is seen as an incessantly exploitable resource.²⁰ Treated like this, nature finally becomes what it was always supposed to be within the logic of an unrestricted human “productivity” that aims at dominating it: namely, a socially constructed “second nature” instead of a self-creative “first (wild) nature”. This self-fulfilling prophecy denies of course the violence and destruction this process means for nature as a living – and therefore precisely not incessantly exploitable but destructible and finite – entity.
- Seen as a system, nature appears as a mechanism, a machine. Finally, the machine itself is seen as nature and manages to pretend to have really taken first nature’s place.²¹
- Women have been seen as a part of this “machine nature” since the Enlightenment. Only male labor is regarded as “productive”, especially when applying machines (and women – as part of the machine). Female labor – for example, the “production of human life” – is denied any value. The same goes for any non-machine related activity and the productivity of nature itself.²²
- It is not surprising that the reasons for today’s ecological disaster, which is also a human disaster, cannot be understood. They are rooted in

¹⁸ Renate Genth, 2002, *op.cit.*

¹⁹ Karl Marx, 1974, *op.cit.*, pp.247, 209, 271, 446. Ernst Bloch, *Naturrecht und menschliche Würde* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1991)

²⁰ Carolyn Merchant, *The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983). Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, 1993, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2004, *op.cit.*

²¹ Genth, Renate, 2002, *op.cit.*

²² Maria Mies, 1986, *op.cit.*

the fact that the truly productive forces: those of life (“first nature”) have essentially been destroyed by their transformation through capitalist “production”. Yet, instead of recognizing this, it is still nature that is made responsible for the ecological question and even for bringing further measures of its oppression upon itself – as if it was nature that is threatening man rather than man destroying nature.

- A true male productivity could only arise where it was not bound to the machine. Currently, however, man is working on fortifying the machine using a sort of alchemical “vitalization”: be it in form of a robot (artificial intelligence), or as a bio-machine of reproduction (“reproductive technologies”, cyborgs, GMOs, nanotechnology).²³ Life becomes “programmed” into the machine, or – seen the other way round – the machine is “forced on to” life. The intention is to coerce life into sustaining the machine and to make both inseparable so that finally the machine itself can appear as truly “productive” and “creative”. This way, the machine becomes an “open system”. THIS WAY it is no longer “under” but “out of” control. Nonetheless, it is supposed to reproduce itself as an allegedly highly superior substitute for mothers and nature.

Feminist Research: Globalization and Full Capitalization

This analysis of capitalism replaces the reductionism of both the natural sciences and of political economy (and the “critique” thereof). It thereby sees much further than the Left. The Left does not even want to see the true contradictions of real existing capitalism. Our analysis, on the other hand, puts capitalism “from its head on its feet”. Seen from “below” and from “the outside”, capitalism looks very different (at times even antithetical) to what it has so far been presented and criticized as – also by the Left. From this perspective, notions that long served as guidelines for a better future lose their meaning: - the proletariat, the unions, Left politics, technological progress, the “development” of industrialized nations, the leading role of the North, the superiority of men over women. If we were to follow these notions, nothing would await us but a dead-end road.

Since capitalism is an inherently global enterprise, it comprises the “Second World” and “Third World” rather than embodying an alternative to the allegedly “feudal” South or the “red” East. Capitalism, or the “First

²³ Janice Raymond, *Women as Wombs. Reproductive Technologies and the Battle over Women`s Freedom* (San Francisco/Melbourne: Spinifex, 1994). Renate Klein, “Globalized Bodies in the Twenty-first Century: The Final Patriarchal Takeover?” in Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.) 2001, *op.cit.*, pp. 91-105; Joseph Weizenbaum, *Computer Power and Human Reason: From Judgement to Calculation* (San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Company, 1976). Jeremy Rifkin, *Algeny* (New York: Viking, 1983). Frank Schirrmacher (ed.), *Die Darwin AG. Wie Nanotechnologie, Biotechnologie und Computer den neuen Menschen träumen* (Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch, 2001)

World”, seems to have emerged as the sole winner of the last 30 years of “globalization”. “Socialism”, understood as a “post-capitalist” world, has almost entirely vanished. However, since 1989, the victorious West/North faces a crisis (“illusion of the welfare state”) into which it has maneuvered ALSO itself by plundering and destroying the world. The so-called “battle of production” proves to be much more battle than production. It has become impossible for anyone with open eyes to ignore the parasitic and counter-productive character of the capitalist world system.

Hence, the collapse of the real socialist state system did not mean the end of any “competition of systems,” it merely marked the collapse of one part of the capitalist world system. Other parts can be expected to follow. The South is already caught in a downward spiral. And in the North, due to “reform politics” and the growing “precarity” of working conditions, many of the system’s pillars begin to unravel: the bourgeois institutions, the wage labor system, the loyalty of the masses.²⁴ Rather than liberating people from suffering, capitalism is what makes people suffer in the first place. “Development” for some inevitably means underdevelopment for others. Instead of creating prosperity for all, capitalism exploits and destroys the riches of the earth (“privatization”). “Progress” means nothing but the improvement of violent methods of appropriation, expropriation, and destruction. “Growth” means war on all levels.²⁵

The consequences drawn from this analysis of capitalism have to be uncompromising. What is at stake is how to stop the capitalist world system and its development from reaching its logical conclusion as a global war system. This implies leaving commodity production behind and reviving a subsistence economy that has long been oppressed and largely destroyed. This goes for both the North and the South. As developed by Bennholdt-Thomsen, Mies, Shiva, myself and others in our international debates, the *subsistence perspective* formulates the possibilities of a successive liberation of subsistence, life, existence, work, gender relations, politics, nature, and culture. It means liberation from the permanent war against humanity and nature waged by commodity production and the continued original accumulation.²⁶ The subsistence

²⁴ *Widerspruch*; Nr. 49, 25. Jg./2. Halbjahr 2005, Prekäre Arbeitsgesellschaft, Zürich. See also: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Precarity>

²⁵ Maria Mies, *Krieg ohne Grenzen. Die neue Kolonisierung der Welt* (Köln: PapyRossa, 2004)

²⁶ Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1981, *op.cit.*, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1982, *op.cit.*, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, *Juchitán – Stadt der Frauen. Vom Leben im Matriarchat* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 1994). Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Brigitte Holzer and Christa Müller (eds.), *Das Subsistenzhandbuch. Widerstandskulturen in Europa, Asien und Lateinamerika* (Wien: Promedia, 1999). Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Maria Mies, *Eine Kuh für Hillary. Die Subsistenzperspektive* (München:

perspective has long been practiced and discussed as a viable alternative in the South, and is increasingly so in the North as well.²⁷

What has to be pursued is a politics of “the self-evidence of an existence without domination”, which means the re-creation of egalitarian social relations.²⁸ Our proposals have always been provocative for the Left. The concept of “subsistence” was seen as nothing but a regress to “traditionalism” and “underdevelopment” and regarded as unworthy of discussion – despite the obvious fact that it is precisely modern commodity production that causes *real* underdevelopment. The ecofeminist perspective of a different relation to nature struck the Left as “romantic” since nature was deemed violent and man had to allegedly control and dominate it. Yet, the natural catastrophes that we are witnessing today are nothing but the result of this so-called “domination of nature” – instead of reflecting nature’s violence, they reflect the violence of those trying to dominate it. As far as alternative gender relations are concerned, the male Left could not even conceive of any; and when it tried, it always saw itself instantly overpowered by women (instead of feeling overwhelmed by women’s contributions!)

The critique of the machine seemed to be an outright affront and was decidedly rejected - as if “Man” loses his identity without his machine world. Finally (and strangely enough, it would seem), our vision of social relations without domination seemed to cause fear within the Left. Our

Frauenoffensive, 1995), in english, *The Subsistence Perspective. Beyond the Globalized Ecobnomy* (London: zedpress, 1999). Maria Mies, 1986, *op.cit.*, Maria Mies and Vandana Shiva, 1993, *op.cit.* Claudia v. Werlhof, 1985, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof 1991, *op.cit.*,. Claudia v. Werlhof, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Maria Mies, 1983, *op.cit.*, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.), *There is an Alternatrive. Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization* (London:zedpress, 2001)

²⁷ Maria Mies, *Globalisierung von unten* (Hamburg: Rotbuch, 2001). Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.) 2001, *op.cit.*

²⁸ Claudia v. Werlhof, 1985, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 1986, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2001, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, “Das Patriarchat als Negation des Matriarchats. Zur Perspektive eines Wahns“, in Heide Göttner-Abendroth (ed.), *Gesellschaft in Balance. Dokumente vom 1. Weltkongress für Matriarchatsforschung 2003* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2006), in print. Claudia v. Werlhof, Annemarie Schweighofer, and Werner Ernst (eds.), *Herren-Los. Herrschaft – Erkenntnis – Lebensform* (Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang, 1996)

critique of domination was seen as a critique without a theory – as “anarchy”. What a betrayal! Does theory have to establish and maintain domination in order to be considered “scientific” or “political”; or to be “relevant”? Does “Man” base his identity solely on his role as one who dominates? It seems to be so. However, true feminists can never be included in a state project as the state has been invented for domination.

It has not only been the experience of the Bielefeld School that the Left is not interested in real alternatives. The alternatives proposed by the Left are indeed none. They are all reduced to one agenda: the mere redistribution of capital = command, money and commodities. The Left’s only question has always been: How do we come to power? The goal was never to topple the system (maybe to “reform” it) or to pursue a real alternative. When were real alternatives ever implemented from above? So why does the Left not want an alternative?

What Does Patriarchy Mean, and What Does It Have to Do with Capitalism?

The Left’s analysis of capitalism is limited: one, because the Left exists, thinks, and feels *within* capitalist logic; and, two, because it is deeply entrenched in patriarchy. Only as the limits of capitalism come into sight can we look at the before and the after of capitalism. And once we do this, we encounter (non- or pre-capitalist) patriarchy and matriarchy. The analysis of these concepts as theoretical concepts (and not only as polemic ones) has characterized our work more and more since the 1990s.²⁹ Women have long spoken of patriarchy, especially since capitalism is so obviously hostile to women and exploits them in specifically scrupulous ways.³⁰ It always remained unclear, though, what patriarchy really meant. For most women, it has meant merely the rule of men or fathers – within the family, the work place, or the state. It is known that patriarchy is older than capitalism. But some on the Left

29 Heide Göttner-Abendroth, *Das Matriarchat I: Geschichte seiner Erforschung* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1988). Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1994, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 1991, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof 1991b, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, *MutterLos. Frauen im Patriarchat zwischen Angleichung und Dissidenz* (München: Frauenoffensive, 1996). Claudia v. Werlhof, „Frauen, Wissenschaft und Naturverhältnis. Oder: Was heißt heute Kritik am Patriarchat?“, *Widerspruch*, Nr. 34, 17. Jg./ 1. Halbjahr 1997b, Zürich, pp.147-170. Claudia v. Werlhof, 2000, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, „Gewalt und Geschlecht“, *Widerspruch*, Nr. 42, 22. Jg./1. Halbjahr 2002, Zürich, pp. 13-33; Claudia v. Werlhof, 2001, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2003, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2004, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2006, *op.cit.*

³⁰ Maria Mies, 1986, *op.cit.*

thought that patriarchy was mainly a quasi-irrational historical remnant that would eventually be discarded by capitalism and “progress”. However, in this respect, too, things are not always what they seem to be.

Thesis I: Patriarchy is the basic foundation, “Tiefenstruktur” or “deep structure” of capitalism.

If one goes beyond capitalism and explores historical depths, one finds patriarchy and with it many realities that characterize capitalism too: war as a means to plunder and conquer; systematic domination (the state system); the categorical submission of women; class divisions; systems of exploitation of humanity and nature; ideologies of male “productivity” and religions of male “creation”; alchemical practices that are supposed to “prove” them; and the dependence on the real productivity and creative forces of others – a thoroughly “parasitic civilization”. Patriarchy has been known to reach back for at least 5-7000 years. During this time, Europe experienced several waves of patriarchalization.³¹ These are variously described as “Kurgan” invasions, Romanization, Christianization, and the Feudalism that followed it.³²

What are the differences between patriarchy and capitalism, and what do they have in common? Capitalism has old and far-reaching patriarchal roots; capitalism is, in fact, patriarchy’s latest expression. In this sense, capitalism and patriarchy belong together. The differences lie in what is specific to capitalism: the extension of wage labor; the invention of unpaid house work (which is directly tied to the former); the generalization of commodity production (in various ways); the guiding role of capital as abstract wealth; the creation of a “world system” that replaces the former “empires” (Wallerstein); and the globalization of the entire capitalist enterprise to the point of its possible collapse due to reaching the limits of what the earth can take and what can technologically be transcended.³³ Yet all these specific developments still lie within the general patriarchal trajectory³⁴

Thesis II: Capitalism attempts to realize the utopia of patriarchy: a world without nature or mothers (“full patriarchalization”).

³¹ Marija Gimbutas, *The Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe. 6500-3500 Myths and Cult Images* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1984). Claudia v. Werlhof, 2002, *op.cit.*

³² Maria Mies, “Über die Notwendigkeit, Europa zu entkolonisieren“, in Claudia v. Werlhof, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen and Nicholas Faraclas (eds.), *Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung* (Wien: Promedia, 2003), pp.19-40

³³ Immanuel Wallerstein, 1974, *op.cit.*, Ronald Wright, *Eine kleine Geschichte des Fortschritts* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2006)

³⁴ André Gunder Frank and Barry Gills (eds.), *The World System. Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?* (London: Routledge, 1996)

The one aspect that is entirely new to the patriarchy of modernity is the attempt to turn the ideologies of male “productivity” and male-divine “creation” into material reality. This transition from patriarchal idealism to patriarchal materialism – which first occurred in Western Europe – is what truly distinguishes capitalism from all other forms of patriarchy and all other modes of production. However, this transition is still not to be misunderstood as a rupture in patriarchal history. To the contrary, it brings it to its end and full realization by proving once and for all (in “reality”) that it was indeed the *ruler, father, man, god*, who has created the world and is the true creator of life.³⁵ Capitalism is the utopian project of modern patriarchy. Its aim is to make an ideological justification of domination unnecessary. It is now the material achievements of capitalism themselves that are supposed to prove that the patriarchs are indeed “creators”. The ultimate objective is to end the dependence on who will always be the only *true* creator and producer: *nature, the goddess, the mother*. The idea is to substitute her by something supposedly superior.

What is at least implicit in these efforts is the fact that there has never been any true patriarchal creation. In fact, until modernity the notion of patriarchal creation was a mere abstract claim. What distinguishes the modern or capitalist-patriarchal project from its predecessors is that it does not content itself anymore with trying to appropriate or imitate the creation of nature (an obviously futile attempt), but that it actively tries to substitute this creation by something entirely new. What we are facing today is a “real utopian” project directed against the order of life. This is what I call patriarchy as an “alchemical” or “war system”.³⁶ The capitalist form of patriarchy is the apex of patriarchal development, of the “evolution” that patriarchy itself has invented. It tries to establish a “pure”, “complete” and “eternal” patriarchy as a new paradise, bereft of all matriarchal and natural traces. The intention is to go beyond the world as we know it and to reach an allegedly superior one – by a process of metaphysical “birth giving”.³⁷

Thesis III: Patriarchy will not be overcome by progress; since it is progress itself in its capitalist form.

³⁵ Claudia v. Werlhof, “The Utopia of a Motherless World – Patriarchy as War-System”, paper, 2nd World Congress of Matriarchal Studies: Societies of Peace, Austin 2005

³⁶ Claudia v. Werlhof, 2000, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2001, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2006, *op.cit.*

³⁷ Christel Neusüß, *Die Kopfgeburten der Arbeiterbewegung. Oder: Die Genossin Luxemburg bringt alles durcheinander* (Hamburg: Rasch & Röhrig, 1985)

From its beginnings, modern science stood in relation to nature “as an army in enemy territory, knowing nothing about it”.³⁸ In the form of modern technology, namely: in the form of the machine, modern science set out to virtually extinguish (“substitute”) not only life, death, and the creation of life as we know it; but also humanity, women, and mothers; the earth, plants, and animals; and matter itself.

The new technologies - “nuclear alchemy”, biochemistry, nanotechnology, reproduction technology, and genetic engineering - (“algeny”, Rifkin) clearly reveal the intentions of this modernized form of patriarchal alchemy: to prove the alleged existence of male creation/production. But of course, this project is carried out not in cooperation with women and nature but in opposition to them. The machine itself represented the first attempt to substitute humanity and nature (the machine of killing, work, sex, and reproduction). By now it is complemented by a “machinization” of nature itself. The machine as an “open system” does not substitute for nature by a mere apparatus. Rather it forces nature to do by itself what genetic modification and “information” induced by the molecular-machinist means demand.³⁹ This technology wants to do away with the “gestalt”, the forms of life themselves.

For instance, the trick of the machine as an “open system” instead of a closed one, is to use technologies like GM or Nano to replace the information of cells by new information resulting from forced genetic combination or mini-pics. Once introduced into the living body, these are supposed to reproduce themselves therein. But natural cycles are partially put out of order as this other order is installed, a programmed one from outside.

So far, these attempts have fallen short of men’s aspirations for control. In fact, for those of us with a non-capitalist/non-patriarchal understanding of nature and the body, it seems obvious that any attempt to produce an immortal, better, higher, superior, more perfect being or form of “life” is doomed to fail. All that the current capitalist attempt has done is unleash forces of violence that are destroying ultimately all natural relations and cycles – both from outside and from within. Recent plans for “trans-human” or even “post-human” life illustrate the system’s ludicrousness and danger: if human beings cannot be artificially created, they might as well be eliminated!⁴⁰ Modern capitalist patriarchy obviously

³⁸ Otto Ullrich, *Technik und Herrschaft. Vom Handwerk zur verdinglichten Blockstruktur industrieller Produktion* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1977)

³⁹ Jeremy Rifkin, 1983, *op.cit.*, Frank Schirrmacher, 2001, *op.cit.*,

⁴⁰ Damien Broderick, *Die molekulare Manufaktur. Wie Nanotechnologie unsere Zukunft beeinflusst* (Reinbek: Rowohlt, 2004). Bernhard Irrgang, *Posthumanes Menschsein?* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 2005). Martin Kurthen, *Die dritte Natur. Über posthumane Faktizität* (Münster: LIT, 2004)

knows no moral restrictions and has already done a lot of irreversible harm to life on this planet.

Thesis IV: As long as capitalist patriarchy remains the utopia of the Left, the Left can provide no alternative.

Analyzing patriarchy makes it much easier to understand why the Left has such difficulties in finding alternatives to capitalism. Capitalism is capitalist patriarchy, and if the former vanished, so would the latter. Patriarchy would then only survive in a pre-capitalist form, one that does not imply the notion of “utopian materialism”. However, it is highly unlikely that the Left would ever forsake technological progress – the heart of capitalist patriarchy. Hence, the “liberation” of patriarchy from capitalism is not in sight. The reverse is of course utterly impossible: capitalism can never be liberated from patriarchy because without patriarchy no capitalism would ever exist. It is the utopia of patriarchy and the attempt at realization that has allowed capitalism to appear. There is no capitalist mode of production outside of patriarchy.

A true alternative to capitalist patriarchy would have to be an *alterna-depth*.⁴¹ This is to say that scholars would not deal with 500 years of capitalism anymore – rather, we would take on 5000 years of patriarchy!⁴² We need to free ourselves from a religion that counts even atheists amongst its followers and that is characterized by a firm belief in the systems of violence that have defined patriarchy’s history since its beginnings. Especially in the North, Leftist and academic men have long adhered to this belief, and these days increasing numbers of women do so as well.⁴³ We need to find entirely new ways of feeling, thinking, and acting. We have to follow the iceberg from its tip to the enormous depths that really define it. Only this will allow modern humanity, the Left and many feminists among them, to turn it upside down and reveal the hidden truths of our society.

Thus, the problem of the Left when searching for an alternative is even more fundamental than what we had already suspected. The Left is not interested in an alternative to real existing capitalism because capitalism intends to realize the patriarchal utopia and patriarchy is firmly inscribed into the Left’s “collective subconsciousness”.⁴⁴ What needs to be addressed is the *whole*, the *alterna-depth*, which shines through historical

⁴¹ Translator’s note: The German term for “depth” is “Tiefe”. The author’s word play -“Alternative”/“Alterna-Tiefe” – cannot be reproduced in English.

⁴² Immanuel Wallerstein, “World System versus World Systems. A critique”, in André Gunder Frank and Barry Gills (eds.), 1999, *op.cit.*, pp. 292-296

⁴³ Dirk Baecker (ed.), *Kapitalismus als Religion* (Berlin: Kadmos, 2003)

⁴⁴ Mario Erdheim, *Die gesellschaftliche Produktion von Unbewusstheit* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1984)

matriarchy (the “maternal order”) as well as the relics of matriarchy that still exist even in the midst of patriarchy.⁴⁵ Until today the Left does not acknowledge the result of recent research that confirms that the world’s matriarchal societies – contrary to capitalist modernity and all patriarchal societies – have never known a state, domination, classes, war, gender conflicts, or ecological catastrophes. We can draw no other conclusion than to let go of all hope that the Left can be of any support for us as we face future challenges. Hence we will not waste our energies any longer trying to explain our point of view. We will focus on the *alterna-depth* instead.

Bibliography

Anders, Günther 1989: Die Antiquiertheit des Menschen, 2 volumes., München: Beck

Arbeitsgruppe Bielefelder Entwicklungssoziologen (ed.) 1979: Subsistenzproduktion und Akkumulation, Saarbrücken: Breitenbach

Baecker, Dirk (ed.) 2003: Kapitalismus als Religion, Berlin: Kadmos

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

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika 1980: Marginalität in Lateinamerika. Eine Theoriekritik, in: Lateinamerika. Analysen und Berichte 3: Verelendungsprozesse und Widerstandsformen, Berlin: Olle & Wolter, pp. 45-85

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika 1981: Subsistenzproduktion und erweiterte Reproduktion. Ein Beitrag zur Produktionsweisendiskussion, in: Gesellschaft. Beiträge zur Marxschen Theorie 14, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 30-51

⁴⁵ Heide Göttner-Abendroth, 1988, *op.cit.*, Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, 1994, *op.cit.*, Renate Genth, „Matriarchat als zweite Kultur“, in Claudia v. Werlhof, Annemarie Schweighofer and Werner Ernst (eds.), 1996, *op.cit.*, pp. 17-38. Veronika Bennholdt-Thomsen, Nicholas Faraclas and Claudia v. Werlhof (eds.), 2001, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, 2006, *op.cit.*, Claudia v. Werlhof, „Capitalist Patriarchy and the Struggle for a „Deep“ Alternative“, in Genevieve Vaughan (ed.), *A Radically Different World View is Possible. The Gift-Economy Inside and Outside Patriarchal Capitalism* (Toronto : Innana, 2006a), in print

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika 1982: Bauern in Mexiko zwischen Subsistenz- und Warenproduktion, Frankfurt/New York: Campus

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika 1994: Juchitán – Stadt der Frauen. Vom Leben im Matriarchat, Reinbek: Rowohlt

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Holzer, Brigitte / Müller, Christa (eds.) 1999: Das Subsistenzhandbuch. Widerstandskulturen in Europa, Asien und Lateinamerika, Wien: Promedia

Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Mies, Maria 1995: Eine Kuh für Hillary. Die Subsistenzperspektive, München: Frauenoffensive (1999: The Subsistence Perspective. Beyond the Globalized Economy, London: zedpress)

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

Bloch, Ernst 1991: Naturrecht und menschliche Würde, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp

Broderick, Damien 2004: Die molekulare Manufaktur. Wie Nanotechnologie unsere Zukunft beeinflusst, Reinbek: Rowohlt

Erdheim, Mario 1984: Die gesellschaftliche Produktion von Unbewusstheit, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp

Frank, André Gunder 1977: On so-called Primitive Accumulation, in: Dialectical Anthropology, 2, pp. 87-106

Frank, André Gunder /Gills, Barry (eds.) 1996: The World System. Five Hundred Years or Five Thousand?, London: Routledge

Genth, Renate 1996: Matriarchat als zweite Kultur, in: Werlhof v., Claudia / Schweighofer, Annemarie / Ernst, Werner (eds.): Herren Los. Herrschaft – Erkenntnis – Lebensform, Frankfurt, Paris, New York: Peter Lang, pp. 17-38

Genth, Renate 2002: Über Maschinisierung und Mimesis. Erfindungsgeist und mimetische Begabung im Widerstreit und ihre Bedeutung für das Mensch-Maschine-Verhältnis, Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang

Gimbutas, Marija 1984: The Goddesses and Gods of Old Europe. 6500-3500 Myths and Cult Images, London: Thames & Hudson

Göttner-Abendroth, Heide 1988: Das Matriarchat I: Geschichte seiner Erforschung, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer

Irrgang, Bernhard 2005: Posthumanes Menschsein? Künstliche Intelligenz, Cyberspace, Roboter, Cyborgs und Designer-Menschen – Anthropologie des künstlichen Menschen im 21. Jahrhundert, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner

Klein, Renate 2001: Globalized Bodies in the Twenty-first Century: The Final Patriarchal Takeover?, in: Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Faraclas, Nicholas / Werlhof, v. Claudia (eds.): There is an Alternative. Subsistence and Worldwide Resistance to Corporate Globalization, London: zedpress, pp.91-105

Kurthen, Martin 2004: Die dritte Natur. Über posthumane Faktizität, Münster: LIT

Luxemburg, Rosa 1967 (1913): The Accumulation of Capital, London, Routledge

Merchant, Carolyn 1982: The Death of Nature: Women, Ecology and the Scientific Revolution, San Francisco: Harper & Row

MEW (Marx-Engels-Werke) 1974, Bd. 23, Das Kapital 1, Berlin: Dietz

Mies, Maria 1978: Methodische Postulate zur Frauenforschung – dargestellt am Beispiel der Gewalt gegen Frauen, in: Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis, Nr. 1: Erste Orientierungen, München, pp. 41-63

Mies, Maria 1986: Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale. Women in the International Division of Labour, London: zedpress

Mies, Maria 1992: Wider die Industrialisierung des Lebens, Pfaffenweiler: Centaurus

Mies, Maria 2001: Globalisierung von unten, Hamburg: Rotbuch

Mies, Maria 2003: Über die Notwendigkeit, Europa zu entkolonisieren, in: Werlhof, v. Claudia / Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Faraclas, Nicholas (eds.): Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung, Wien: Promedia, pp. 19-40

Mies, Maria 2004: Krieg ohne Grenzen. Die neue Kolonisierung der Welt, Köln: PapyRossa

Mies, Maria / Shiva, Vandana 1993: Ecofeminism, London: zedpress

Mies, Maria / Werlhof, v. Claudia (eds.) 1998/2004: Lizenz zum Plündern. Das Multilaterale Abkommen über Investitionen, MAI – Globalisierung der Konzernherrschaft, und was wir dagegen tun können, Hamburg: Rotbuch

Neusüß, Christel 1985: Die Kopfgeburten der Arbeiterbewegung, oder: Die Genossin Luxemburg bringt alles durcheinander, Hamburg: Rasch & Röhrig

Raymond, Janice 1994: Women as Wombs. Reproductive Technologies and the Battle over Women's Freedom, San Francisco, Melbourne: Spinifex

Rifkin, Jeremy 1983: Algeny, New York: Viking

Salleh, Ariel 1997: Ecofeminism as Politics: Nature, Marx and the Postmodern, London, zedpress

Schirmmacher, Frank (ed.) 2001: Die Darwin AG. Wie Nanotechnologie, Biotechnologie und Computer den neuen Menschen träumen, Köln: Kiepenheuer & Witsch

Ullrich, Otto 1977: Technik und Herrschaft. Vom Handwerk zur verdinglichten Blockstruktur industrieller Produktion, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp

Wallerstein, Immanuel 1979: Aufstieg und künftiger Niedergang des kapitalistischen Weltsystems, in: Senghaas, Dieter (ed.): Kapitalistische Weltökonomie. Kontroversen über ihren Ursprung und ihre Entwicklungsdynamik, Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, pp. 31-67

Wallerstein, Immanuel 1996: World System versus World Systems. A critique, in: Frank, André Gunder / Gills, Barry K. (eds.): The World System. Five hundred years of five thousand? London: Routledge, pp. 292-296

Weizenbaum, Joseph 1976: Computer Power and Human Reason: From Judgement to Calculation, San Francisco: W.H. Freeman & Company

Werlhof v., Claudia 1978: Frauenarbeit: der blinde Fleck in der Kritik der Politischen Ökonomie, in: Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis, Nr.1, Erste Orientierungen, München, pp. 18-32 (in english 1988: Women's Work: The Blind Spot in the Critique of Political Economy, in: Mies, Maria / Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Werlhof v., Claudia: Women, The Last Colony, London, zedpress)

Werlhof v., Claudia 1983: Lohn hat einen „Wert“, Leben nicht? Auseinandersetzung mit einer „linken“ Frau, in: Prokla, Nr.50: Marx und der Marxismus, Berlin, pp. 38-58

Werlhof v., Claudia 1985: Wenn die Bauern wiederkommen. Frauen, Arbeit und Agrobusiness in Venezuela, Bremen: periferia/CON

Werlhof v., Claudia 1986: Wir werden das Leben unserer Kinder nicht dem Fortschritt opfern, in: Gambaroff, Marina. et.al.: Tschernobyl hat unser Leben verändert. Vom Ausstieg der Frauen, Reinbek: Rowohlt, pp. 8-24

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

Werlhof, v. Claudia 1991b: Männliche Natur und künstliches Geschlecht. Texte zur Erkenntniskrise der Moderne, Wien: Frauenverlag

Werlhof v., Claudia 1996: Mutter-Los. Frauen im Patriarchat zwischen Angleichung und Dissidenz, München: Frauenoffensive

Werlhof v., Claudia 1997: Ökonomie, die praktische Seite der Religion. Wirtschaft als Gottesbeweis und die Methode der Alchemie. Zum Zusammenhang von Patriarchat. Kapitalismus und Christentum, in: Ernst, U. et.al. (eds.): Ökonomie M(m)acht Angst, Zum Verhältnis von Ökonomie und Religion, Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang, pp. 95-121

Werlhof v., Claudia 1997b: Frauen, Wissenschaft und Naturverhältnis. Vier Thesen wider den Emanzipationsansatz. Oder: Was heißt heute Kritik am Patriarchat? In: Widerspruch, Nr. 34, 17. Jg./1. Halbjahr, Zürich, pp. 147-170

Werlhof v., Claudia 2000: Patriarchat als „Alchemistisches System“. Die (Z)ErSetzung des Lebendigen, in: Wolf, M. (ed.): Optimierung und Zerstörung. Intertheoretische Analysen zum menschlich Lebendigen, Innsbruck: STUDIA, pp. 13-31

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

Werlhof v., Claudia 2002: Gewalt und Geschlecht, in: Widerspruch, Nr. 42, 22. Jg./1. Halbjahr, Zürich, pp. 13-33

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

Werlhof v., Claudia 2004: Natur, Maschine, Mimesis. Zur Kritik patriarchalischer Naturkonzepte, in: Widerspruch, Nr. 47, 24. Jg./2. Halbjahr, Zürich, pp. 155-171

Werlhof v., Claudia 2004b: Using, Producing and Replacing Life? Alchamy as Theory and Practice in Capitalism, in: Wallerstein, Immanuel (ed.): The Modern World System in the *Long Durée*, Boulder: paradigm, pp. 65-78

Werlhof v., Claudia 2005: The Utopia of a Motherless World -- Patriarchy as War-System, paper, "2nd World Congress of Matriarchal Studies: Societies of Peace", 29.9.-2.10, Austin, Texas

Werlhof v., Claudia 2006: Das Patriarchat als Negation des Matriarchats. Zur Perspektive eines Wahns, in: Göttner-Abendroth, Heide (ed.): Gesellschaft in Balance. Dokumente vom 1. Weltkongress für Matriarchatsforschung 2003, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer (in print)

Werlhof v., Claudia 2006b: Capitalist Patriarchy and the Struggle for a „Deep“ Alternative, in: Vaughan, Genevieve (ed.): A Radically Different World View is Possible. The Gift-Economy inside and outside Patriarchal Capitalism, Toronto: Innana (in print)

Werlhof v., Claudia / Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Mies. Maria 1983: Frauen, die letzte Kolonie, Reinbek: Rowohlt (in english 1988: Women, the Last Colony, London: zedpress)

Werlhof v., Claudia / Ernst, Werner / Schweighofer, Annemarie (eds.) 1996: Herren Los. Herrschaft – Erkenntnis – Lebensform, Frankfurt/Paris/New York: Peter Lang

Werlhof v., Claudia / Bennholdt-Thomsen, Veronika / Faraclas, Nicholas (eds.) 2003: Subsistenz und Widerstand. Alternativen zur Globalisierung, Wien: Promedia

Widerspruch 2005: Nr. 49, Prekäre Arbeitsgesellschaft, Zürich

Wright, Ronald 2006: Eine kleine Geschichte des Fortschritts, Reinbek: Rowohlt