Monographs of the Finnish Society for Development Studies No.1
Transactions of the Finnish Anthropological Society No 20

THE WOMEN'S QUESTION AND THE MODES OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION.

An Analysis of a Tanzanian Village.

Ulla Vuorela

Monographs of the Finnish Society for Development Studies No.1
Transactions of the Finnish Anthropological Society No 20

THE WOMEN'S QUESTION AND THE MODES OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION.

An Analysis of a Tanzanian Village.

Ulla Vuorela

The Finnish Society for Development Studies and
The Finnish Anthropological Society in cooperation with
The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies

Cover, maps and figures: *Arto Nurmi*

© Ulla Vuorela 1987

ISBN 91-7106-275-0

ISSN 0248-4818

Printed in Finland by

Lomakepainatus, Helsinki 1987

Contents

Acknowledgements

INTRODUCTION 1

Background of the Study 1 Research in Msoga Village 7

Chapter I

A MATERIALIST THEORY OF THE MODES OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION: 12

Basic Concepts: Forces, Means and Relations of Human Reproduction 12 Relations of Human Reproduction: Mating and Filiation 15
Forces of Human Reproduction 17 Sexual Power 19 The Articulation of the Modes of Production and of Human Reproduction 21
The Temporal Difference Between the Production and the Human Reproduction Cycles 25 Relationship Between MOHR Analysis and Demographic Studies 27

Chapter II

THE ADHESIVE AND PATRIARCHAL MODES OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION 34

The Adhesive Mode of Human Reproduction 35 The Patriarchal Mode of Human Reproduction 40 The Agricultural Domestic Community 41 The Pastoralist Domestic Community 46 The Significance of the Agricultural and Pastoralist Domestic Communities for an Understanding of the Patriarchal MOHR 49 Debates over Reproduction and Patriarchy 51

Chapter III

THE ATOMISTIC MODE OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION — PROBLEMS OF A TRANSITION 56

Relations of Mating: A Separation of the Sexual Relations for Procreation and for Recreation 57 Relations of Filiation 58
The Atomistic Individual 59 Class and Gender and Human Reproduction 62 A Domestic Mode of Production — Does it Exist? 66

The Articulation of the MOP-MOHR and the Study of Msoga
Village 70

Chapter IV

RELATIONS OF PRODUCTION AMONG THE MATRILINEAL
KWERE — SOME HISTORY 75

Introduction 75 Msoga Village 76 Cultural Background 77
From Hunting and Gathering to the Agricultural Domestic Com-
munity 78 The Emergence of the Matrilineal Social Organization
and the Patriarchal Mode of Human Reproduction 84 The Notion
of Fraternal Interest Groups 84 The Fraternal Interest Groups and
the Domestic Communities of the Kwere and their Matrilineal
Neighbours 86 The Domestic Society of the Matrilineal Peoples in
its Contacts with Other Social Formations 91

Chapter V

THE PATRIARCHAL MODE OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION AND
THE MATRILINEAL KWERE 97

The Reproductive Cycle of the Kwere 97 The First Child and the
Establishment of a New Household (*nyumba*) 98 Conception and
Pregnancy 99 Early Survival 103 Relations of Filiation 104
Relations of Mating and Classificatory Kinship 107 Relations of
Mating and the Choice of Partner 110 Cross-Cousin Marriage 114
Fraternal Interest Groups 115 Sororal Solidarity 115 Reproduc-
tive Rituals 117 Becoming a Reproductive Adult 117 Girls and
Menarche 118 The Girl in Seclusion 119 Reproductive Rituals
and the Relations of Human Reproduction 122

Chapter VI

THE VILLAGE OF MSOGA IN A NATIONAL CONTEXT —
PROBLEMS OF PRODUCTION 128

The Colonial Period 128 Msoga After Independence 132
The Village Government 133 Agricultural Production 134
Seeds 135 Productive Technology and the Relations of Produc-
tion 137 Why The Village Did Not Reach the Cotton Targets 145
Problems of Material Reproduction 147 Women's Money-Earning
Activities 150
The Position of the Old and Young 152

Chapter VII

PROBLEMS OF HUMAN REPRODUCTION IN MSOGA VILLAGE 159

Introduction 159 Stoppage of Work and Able-Bodied Adults: Stella and Francisi 159 Production and Pregnancy in an Able-Bodied Household: Modesta 165 Patriarchal Levirate — Guardianship of Widowed Women: *Mzee* Iddi 167 A Widowed Housewife — From Patriarchal Dependency to Sororal Cooperation: Rosemary 168
Childless Wife: Agatha 171 Preserving Patriarchal Traditions: Grandmother Saada 172 Employment Policy and the Domestic Community: Martini 172 Poor Women and the State: Zaima 174
The Position of Stepchildren: Divorcee Hawa 177 Daughters as the Old Age Security for the Mother: Mwajuma 179 “Better Not Marry — For the Sake of Children”: Mwanaidi 179 A Polygamous Household: Chiku and Tabu 180 Retirement in the Village: *Mzee* Rajabu 181 Widow Takes Care of Grandchildren: Hadidja 182
Male Appropriation of the Child: Sperantia 182 Emerging Crisis of Patriarchy: The Case of the Pregnant Schoolgirl 185 Rotating Migrant: Charlie 190
Summary of Chapter VII 196

CONCLUSION 201

APPENDIX 211

BIBLIOGRAPHY 221

Acknowledgements

There are several people and institutions without whose help and cooperation this study would not have been possible.

Special thanks go to my supervisor Dr. Marja-Liisa Swantz for sparking off an interest in Tanzania and bringing me out to work in the Jipemoyo Project during 1976—1979. I am grateful to the Academy of Finland for its sponsorship between 1982—1987 which also gave me an opportunity to participate in international workshops and meetings. I am also grateful to the Tanzania National Scientific Research Council for providing me with the research clearance needed to carry out this study. A.O. Anacleti and Kemal Mustafa went far beyond the formal duties of "local contacts" appointed by the Council in providing me with invaluable intellectual stimulation and support. Kemal Mustafa also corrected my English language and was a tireless discussant at different stages of the work.

I am also greatly indebted to professor Marjorie Mbilinyi who gave me important support in the initial stages of the study. I owe a lot to her and the other members of the Women's Study Group at the Institute of Development Studies and the Women's Research and Documentation Project at the University of Dar es Salaam — they in particular opened my eyes for critical questioning around the women's question from a Third World perspective. I also feel privileged in having had the opportunity to participate in the lively seminars and debates at the University of Dar es Salaam which were a great source of inspiration and education during my years in Tanzania.

The villagers of Msoga deserve my heartfelt thanks for their cooperation, hospitality and enthusiasm without which the study would not have been possible. Particular thanks go to the village government, its chairman and secretary, Ramadhani Selemani and Mathias Mazenga, the UWT chairwoman Elizabeth Joseph as well as the Ward officials in making my work smooth. Koreta Jaribu and Peter Joseph made a great contribution in making me feel at home in the village. I remember all those villagers with gratitude and respect who gave me their company and shared their wisdom and sympathy during the research. Village storytellers and children deserve special thanks for the entertaining moments we enjoyed during the dark evening hours.

Jonas Reuben was my insightful research assistant and lots of thanks go to him and his family for a long term friendship. I am also grateful to the

members of the African Participatory Research Network who agreed to bring the Popular Theatre Workshop and the Legal Aid Workshop to the village and thus contributed significantly to making the research a two-way process. The village music and drama groups have to be praised for their spirit and the sharpness of their analysis.

My heartfelt thanks go also to professor Veronica Stolte-Heiskanen whose encouragement gave me strength to finalise the study. She also contributed significantly to improving its final form. Thanks for valuable comments also go to Juhani Koponen. Special appreciation belongs to Claude Meillassoux for tolerantly reading the manuscript and giving me important comments and valuable support.

The Institute of Development Studies at the University of Helsinki provided me with working facilities and help. I am grateful to Kristina Oleng who typed the lengthy script despite her other commitments and to Pertti Felin who corrected the language.

People who deserve very special thanks for their support, faith and patience in the course of my research include Leena and Antti Soivio and Ulla Turunen. Mrs. Sophia Mustafa and the Hon. Justice A. Mustafa are due special thanks for their hospitality in Dar es Salaam. My musical partners, Mrs. Sharon Bauer in Dar es Salaam and Dr. Olli Simola in Helsinki deserve a special mention for helping me to reconstitute my labour-power through recreation in music.

Finally, I dedicate the work to my parents, Toivo and Paula Vuorela who did not live to see its completion. My father was the first one to draw my attention in early childhood to the disproportionate workload of the Finnish peasant woman. He also encouraged me to set out on a researcher's path even if it was to take me far away from home. I am grateful to my mother for bearing the long years of my absence and to all those people who helped her do so.

Helsinki 7 July 1987

Ulla Vuorela

Map No. 1: The Coast, Morogoro and Tanga Regions and the Location of Bagamoyo District. Based on Sitari 1983, 3.

Map No. 2: Bagamoyo District. Based on Sitari 1983, 12.

Map No. 3: The Matrilineal Peoples of Eastern Tanzania. Based on the 1957 National Population Census.

Introduction

Background of the Study

This study arose from the desire to understand the problems of women in a Tanzanian village through an understanding of the women's question in a broader perspective.

The term *women's question* is here used in a very broad sense to refer to all those aspects of social life that put women as a gender in a disadvantaged position compared with men. Likewise the word *feminism* is used in a very broad sense to refer to all efforts to theorize and organize around the women's question, in order to abolish inequality between men and women. This is a very broad level of generality which subsumes a wide variety of theoretical and practical positions, as the rich literature and the various kinds of women's movements vividly testify. One of the reasons for this variety is that in each historical situation, the women's question may have to be posed differently. While sometimes it has not been posed at all, at other times it has been repressed. At a *particular* level, it gets its meaning and content depending on the historical context. One of the tasks of this work is to examine how the women's question could be approached in a study on the position of women in a Tanzanian village. *How* to pose it is first dealt with at the level of theory.

When the international UN Decade for Women was launched, there were still many people who looked at the issue of women with apprehension. In the Third World, feminism and mobilization of women for some signified yet another aspect of continued "colonization", the import of dubious ideas coming from the West with no real relevance, for instance, in the African context. There were those who argued that feminism was a preoccupation only suitable for Western, middle-class women who could afford the luxury of theorizing about the subtleties of sexual relations and sexual divisions. Even if the women in the Third World had problems, at least these were not going to be remedied by bourgeois feminism.

For others, the need to sharpen theories especially from the Third World women's perspective and for serving their interests became a more and more pressing need and an explicit concern, not only at the level of theorizing but also at the level of action. If the development agencies posed the question of how to integrate women in development, critical Third World women responded with further questions: what kind of development were they sup-

posed to be integrated into? Had they not already contributed tremendously to achieving development through their labour in production and in reproduction? Central concerns for Third World women researchers and activists were, how could women get their due share from the fruits of development and what development itself had to offer for *them*.

Posing the women's question in a country like Tanzania necessarily got its own slant within the context of struggles for a more equitable world order, for the liberation of the formerly colonized countries and in the context of building Tanzanian socialism.

Yet in Tanzania, like elsewhere, women were both united and divided in their concerns. Similar divisions and commonalities emerged in the Tanzanian debates and research as in other countries. Like elsewhere, Tanzanian research found out that women were divided along class lines. Within classes they were divided by ideological barriers and in their relationship to men. Women were oppressed by men, they were exploited at the level of households and in the wider economy, as women, as peasants and as proletarians, and superexploited as part of the Third World peasantry. Women were found working more than men in peasant production but earning less and yet, at the same time, their access to the means of production, to property, to employment, resources and services (such as land, technology, training and credit) was more constrained than that of men.¹ Further problems that women shared with the rest of the population were those of food shortages, malnutrition, a high rate of infant mortality, constrained access to clean water, various sources of energy and poor communications. Since the economic crisis which started in the 1970's, shortages of essential commodities tended to get rather more than less. With so many immediate needs to work upon, researchers faced the problems of where to start and how to tackle the dilemma of theory and action, and what the studies should concentrate on.

What has taken place in women's studies in Tanzania during the Decade speaks volumes for the need to pose the women's question as well as showing that there is scope for both theorizing and action. Tanzanian studies have been dealing with a broad variety of issues from the women's perspective, even if some areas have got more attention than others. A lot of effort has been put into research on the role of women in production as part of the Third World peasantry. The sexual division of labour and the ideologies that work to perpetuate women's oppression have been studied. In Tanzania, research also had to come to grips with the issue of analyzing relations of production in pre-capitalist social formations. At the same time, overall problems of underdevelopment have been tackled from the point of view of women and it has been necessary to study the position of women in the overall context of what has been happening in Tanzanian society at large. In this way, women

researchers have shared a number of concerns of social sciences at the University of Dar es Salaam since the 1970's. Some concerns were shared with those who debated around the "agrarian question" or the "pastoralist question" and those who criticized development theories and policies.

Influences from abroad came from various brands of feminism, both radical, marxist and socialist, as well as from the women-in-development discourse, through books, magazines and journals² and participation in international conferences, seminars and research projects. What was going on elsewhere reached Tanzania, was pondered upon, analyzed and criticized. The Domestic Labour Debate was extended to deal with women's labour inputs in peasant production, the proletarianization of women was examined in relation to the articulation of the modes of production. Two women's study groups were formed, and together with various research projects they became an arena of vivid discussions and a lot of work.³

Within this framework, Tanzanian researchers faced similar challenges as their feminist colleagues elsewhere. There continued to be those, especially among male colleagues, who questioned the need to bring in the women's perspective as a separate concern because, within this argument, the oppression of women would be resolved with the overall transformation to socialism. Those who pursued research within marxist theory were grappling with the sex blindness of the theory of the modes of production at the same time as questioning the adequacy of marxist theory or the "socialist solution". Tanzanian research faced the same dilemma which was expressed in the debates around the "unhappy marriage of marxism and feminism" among the socialist feminists in the United States:

The "marriage" of marxism and feminism has been like the marriage of husband and wife depicted in English common law: marxism and feminism are one, and that one is marxism.⁴

Many reviewers of the debate concluded in line with Molyneux and Burris who argued that both feminists and marxists had failed as yet to develop a theory which would explain both the persistence of women's subordination and its relationship to different modes of production.⁵ Some changed ideological terrain while others went on to ask how the processes of production and of reproduction affected the position of women.

At the same time as there was an increasing agreement among various brands of feminism that the position of women had to be researched both in production and reproduction, there was uncertainty about how to relate the two. Some argued that to concentrate on reproduction entailed the danger of lapsing back into biological essentialism, according to which women's subor-

dination was tied to their childbearing role.⁶ Critics of androcentric anthropology pointed out that those who identified women's subordination with their childbearing capacity regularly also made the assumption that men always controlled women. This was often combined with assumptions about a universal male psychology or inherent female capacities.⁷

Those who sought to study the issue of *patriarchy* faced similar problems. The accounts of patriarchy tended to be characterised by a lack of attention to what patriarchal relations really are or how they operate. Patriarchy could refer to a wide variety of things, such as the general rule of the father, to male control of female labour-power, to male control of women's sexuality and fertility, to a male dominated sexual division of labour, exploitation of women by men, and so on. Opinions differed about whether patriarchy was to be seen as a universal characteristic of human society or whether it was a phenomenon with a history. There were those who identified patriarchy with pre-capitalist societies only, while others considered it in its relationship to capitalism only. Socialist feminists went as far as to coin the notion of "capitalist patriarchy" as *the* "enemy" and the target of feminist action.⁸ By the latter half of the Women's Decade, efforts to combine marxism and feminism remained with several question marks as to the relationship of capitalism to patriarchy or the mode of production to reproduction.

It was these kinds of debates that became the breeding ground of theorizing in this study. One of the things that disturbed me in relation to the notions of patriarchy, the sexual division of labour, the family, capitalist patriarchy etc., was that all of them conflated several aspects into one term. Rather than trying to explain women's subordination *by* these concepts, I felt that the phenomena themselves, which the concepts signified, had to be explained. For this purpose, a higher level of abstraction would be needed.

In reaction to some of the arguments I co-authored with Deborah Bryceson a paper entitled "Outside the Domestic Labour Debate: Towards a Materialist Theory of the Modes of Human Reproduction" which was presented in a seminar at the University of Dar es Salaam.⁹ Our desire was to expand historical materialist theory of the modes of production so as to be able to deal with human reproduction as well.

In this paper we argued that we have to be able to discern the *modes of human reproduction* at the same level of abstraction as we discern the *modes of production* in a historical materialist analysis. This was an attempt to formulate a theoretical framework with historical concepts which would be capable of grasping the situation of women, including their historical subordination in concrete situations throughout history and across social formations.

We felt that the way to achieve a theory for an understanding of the

women's question and the position of women in production and reproduction would not emerge from universalizing the capitalist experience in the West, even if a lot could be learnt from such analyses. Neither would it come inductively by combining the myriad empiricist anthropological descriptions of cases all over the world and then seeking the "smallest common denominator" from these cases with a view to abstracting a theory. Instead, we suggested that an effort should be made to abstract a theory based on historical materialism but expanding it so as to encompass the basic universal constants of human existence, which according to the famous quote from Engels, were the "production and reproduction of immediate life" which "had a twofold character — on the one side, the production of the means of existence, of food, clothing and shelter and the tools necessary for that production; and on the other side, the propagation of the species".¹⁰

In our paper we argued that just as the modes of production (MOP) are constituted by distinct relations and forces of production, so too the modes of human reproduction (MOHR) are constituted by relations and forces of human reproduction. Quite briefly, within this framework, the forces of human reproduction signify the degree of control women exert over nature vis-à-vis birth and mortality, giving rise to the demographic configuration of the mode. The exercise of control over birth and mortality is influenced by the level of accumulated knowledge in the fields of disease control, environmental control and birth control.

We took the relations of human reproduction to refer to the social relationships between men and women as regards access and control to sexual union (be it marital, extra- or non-marital), procreation and the product of procreation, children. In an immediate sense, we argued, the means of human reproduction are for men, women and for women, men. Within this relationship, one of the core questions then becomes to ask, who are the subjects and who are the objects of human reproduction and who holds power over these relationships? It would seem that historically, in most societies, men have been the subjects and women the objects of human reproduction.

We argued that there was a dialectical relationship between the modes of production and of human reproduction. Their separation was an analytical one, whereas in real life, we agreed, one cannot exist without the other. We saw the analytical separation of the two modes as helpful and necessary, if we are to understand the particular nature of the "asymmetry" between men and women in relations of production and human reproduction and if we are to understand the particular nature of the position of women in any particular social formation. The conceptualization of these two modes and their articulation is necessary in order to grasp all the possible variations the oppression of women may take and in order to help us to formulate a theory and

strategy towards more liberated and equal relations of production and of human reproduction.

Since the joint paper was written, I started preparing myself for a study of the position of women in Lugoba Ward, in the Coast Region of Tanzania. After some preliminary work in the research area, I soon felt it necessary to develop the theory further. Within this process of further study I not only narrowed the scale of the case study down to the village of Msoga but I also distanced myself from some of the positions we took in our paper while retaining its main thrust.

One of the areas in our joint paper which I started questioning was its undeveloped notion of different modes of human reproduction. We did not venture into exploring these apart from being content with the Marxist notion that "if production be capitalist in form, so too will reproduction".¹¹ Elsewhere, Bryceson posited the notion of pre-capitalist and capitalist relations of human reproduction,¹² but if the different MOHRs were so named, then indeed the question of the necessity of separating the MOP and the MOHR would not arise. One would be back to square one in terms of the "sex blindness" of historical materialist theory. Consequently, I started thinking that the analysis of the relations of human reproduction would need *qualitatively* distinctive concepts capable of dealing with male/female relationships, lest our analysis of the modes of human reproduction was to remain capital-centric as well. I decided to tackle the male/female relations in procreation as the key axis of human reproduction at the social level. This was the sore point of historical materialist theory for feminists.

Even if Marx and Engels theorized about social reproduction, neither of them went into an examination of what the "propagation of the species" implied at the level of social relationships — this was outside the scope of their work. Human reproduction for Marx took place "in the way that every living individual perpetuates himself, by *procreation*".¹³ A couple of lines earlier, Marx had significantly argued that

Nature does not produce on the one side owners of money or commodities, and on the other men possessing nothing but their labour-power. This relation has no natural basis, neither is its social basis one that is common to all historical periods.¹⁴

A parallel feminist argument can easily be made: nature does produce two sexes, but the way in which *gender* is constructed is a social and cultural process.¹⁵ Thus, while acknowledging that two biological sexes meet in human reproduction, there is more scope to focus on the *social* relationships within which this process takes place.

One of the reasons why I see it necessary to dissect the MOPs and the MOHRs is the very fact that historically, it appears that a change in the mode of production has not necessarily been followed by a change in the mode of human reproduction, even if it is true that these two modes interact and influence each other all the time in a relationship which is dialectical in its essence. If we think of the "life spans" of the MOPs and the MOHRs we can see that each of them follows its own dynamic. Apart from the fact that the MOPs are epochal concepts while MOHRs are both epochal and generational, the production cycles and the reproduction cycles do not correspond in temporal terms if we think for instance of an agricultural cycle from one harvest to the next or the generational cycle of human reproduction. Even if Marx said that "the demand for men necessarily regulates the production of men", it takes a considerable delay before the desired "men" will be able to participate in what is expected of them in society, be it production or warfare. Neither is there a one-to-one correspondence in the life spans of the historical modes of feudalism, capitalism, etc., and some modes of human reproduction such as the patriarchal one.

To conclude, the study has a two-pronged aim: on the one hand, it purports to expand the historical materialist theory of the modes of production to incorporate the male/female relations in human reproduction. On the other hand, it seeks to define the particular nature of the women's question in the village of Msoga in coastal Tanzania, analyzed in a theoretical framework which takes the articulation of the modes of production and of human reproduction as its starting point.

Research in Msoga Village

The village of Msoga was chosen for the case study mainly because of my long term contact with it, its small size and the readiness for cooperation from the villagers. My first encounter with the village of Msoga was in 1976 when an initial visit was made in conjunction with the Jipemoyo Project.¹⁶ I consequently spent some time in Msoga with two Tanzanian members of the Jipemoyo team, which for me was an introduction to life in a village in Tanzania where I had newly arrived.

Since 1976, I made various short visits to the village. In 1977 and 1978 the village was included in the programme of two workshops organized for women leaders and community workers in Lugoba Ward, where issues related to women's lives were also discussed.¹⁷ In 1980, I was engaged in a study of women's role in post-harvest food conservation in Lugoba Ward and

gathered data on the socio-economic background of the Ward.¹⁸ In 1980, a contact was established through the initiative of the Finnish Director of the Jipemoyo Project between Msoga village and a Finnish secondary school, Kotkan Lyseon Lukio. This resulted in subsequent visits to the village as I mediated the donation of a milling machine for which the school children collected money. The milling machine was inaugurated in 1981 much to the satisfaction of the villagers, even if the running of the machine became problematic afterwards.

The analysis of the village which is presented in Chapters IV-VII is mainly based on fieldwork carried out between October 1984 and January 1986. All of this time was not spent in the village but the research was structured around visits of 5—10 days, and concentrated in two periods of about four months between October 1984 — January 1985 and September 1985 — January 1986. While in the village I was housed in the village Party Office which serves as a guest room because this small village has no other facilities, neither a guest-house nor rooms to let for visitors.

Because of my long term contact with the village it was easy to create a "rapport" with the people who took me as an old acquaintance right from the onset of my research project. Its purpose was explained in village meetings and repeated during the informal sessions with people. The fact that I was holding a notebook in my hand every day never let the people forget that I was learning about their lives and noting down things that were discussed with them. During the Jipemoyo Project I had been given the status of a researcher in the Ministry of National Culture and Youth and people continuously identified me with culture and an interest in women's issues. My rapport was strengthened in nocturnal storytelling sessions which also gave me further insights into the village traditions. I hope to be able to deal with this material in another context.

The focus of my inquiry was the nature of the social relations of production, the basis of subsistence and the social relations of human reproduction. The analysis is, however, not based on quantitative data either in terms of production volumes or monetary output, nor does the research operate on the basis of a rigorous sampling procedure. These would be important in a consequent phase of the study. Such a study would most likely require the work of a research team. At this stage the research draws its main material from informal discussions with various villagers and the material produced in conjunction with seminars and workshops.

I had contacts with many more people than appear in the text. A list of people who have provided me with confirmation of the general line of argument presented includes a total of 74 villagers, out of whom 41 were women and 33 were men. All names of persons whose life-histories are provided have

been changed. When the exposition is about more general issues and statements made in a public context, the real names of informants are used.

In addition to the discussions and interviews, another set of data was obtained from a number of seminars and workshops conducted in the village. In addition to the seminars organized for women leaders, two other workshops were organized more recently in cooperation with the African Participatory Research Network (APRN)¹⁹ of which I am also a member. The first one, a Popular Theatre Workshop (PTW) was held in January 1985 and was run by members of the Department of Art, Music and Theatre of the University of Dar es Salaam.²⁰ A Legal Aid Workshop (LAW) followed in October 1985 and was organized together with the Legal Aid Committee of the Faculty of Law of the University of Dar es Salaam.²¹ The Popular Theatre Workshop was significant in that it brought out the villagers' own analysis of their current development process while the Legal Aid Workshop provided them with an opportunity to find out more about their rights, particularly in relation to problems that had cropped up during the Popular Theatre Workshop.

Some historical background to the village and the social formation of the Kwere is provided in Chapters IV-V. This presentation draws from historical and anthropological documentation, mainly available in the Bagamoyo District Books, in the Jipemoyo Project Archives, and in publications by Brain, Beidelman and Wembah-Rashid. The District Books of the colonial period contain descriptions written by the colonial administrators and cover a wide variety of topics. Brain and Beidelman are the two foreign anthropologists to have dealt with the Kwere. Wembah Rashid is the first Tanzanian anthropologist to have dealt with the social organization and the history of the Kwere in shorter articles and at length in a MA thesis submitted in 1978.²²

The purpose of these two chapters is to give some historical background to what will be discussed in the last two chapters. The history of Chapters IV - V combines documentary sources with some data from my own encounter with the villagers. It was difficult to separate "historical" documentation from direct observations and oral communication from the villagers because a lot of the traditions accord well with what was written about the Kwere earlier. One reason for this is certainly that the written history does not reach very far into the past. At the same time my presentation is a rereading of the published material in so far as it reinterprets the data from the point of view of the theoretical framework presented in the first part of the study.

In what follows I will first present my proposal for a theory of the modes of human reproduction. This will include an introduction to the central concepts and the general framework of the theory. In the first Chapter I will

argue the case for the analytical separation of the MOPs and of the MOHRs and the necessity to see the dialectical relationship between the two. Chapters II and III examine how different modes of human reproduction could be dissected. At the same time, these chapters present the central concepts that will be used in the case study of Msoga village. Due to the emphasis on the formation of a theory, the research carried out in Msoga does not purport to be a "full study" of the village, but is geared to giving an example of how a fuller study within the suggested framework could be carried out. The discussion on the village and the conclusions made at the end therefore aim to show the core problem areas rather than giving a final word on the position of the women in the village.

References

1. Mascarenhas and Mbilinyi 1983; Vuorela 1984.
2. These included *New Left Review*, *Monthly Review*, *Critique of Anthropology*, *Review Of African Political Economy*, *Journal of Peasant Studies*, *Capital and Class*, and *Signs*, among others.
3. The major groups were the Women's Study group at the Institute of Development Studies (IDWSG) and Women's Research and Documentation Project (WRDP) at the University of Dar es Salaam.
4. Hartmann 1981, 2.
5. Molyneux 1979; Burris 1982.
6. Molyneux 1979.
7. Coward 1983, 270.
8. Eisenstein 1979; Sargent 1982.
9. Bryceson and Vuorela 1980 and 1984.
10. Engels 1973, 71—72.
11. Marx 1972, 531.
12. Bryceson 1980 (b), 6.
13. Marx 1972, 168.
14. *Ibid*, 166.
15. The distinction between sex and gender was first made by Oakley 1972.
16. Jipemoyo Project was a Finnish-Tanzanian research project carried out in West Bagamoyo District 1975—1979. It studied the role of culture in the restructuring process of rural Tanzania. Cf Swantz 1977.
17. Taarifa ya Karakana ya Mafunzo 1977; *Semina ya Utafiti Iliyofanyika Lugoba* 1978.
18. Vuorela 1981.
19. The African Participatory Research Network is a non-governmental organization registered in Tanzania in 1983, to develop and promote the theory and practice of participatory research in Africa.
20. The Popular Theatre Workshop was organized by members of the APRN coming

from the Theatre and Arts Department of the University of Dar es Salaam, including E. Chambulikazi, Penina Mlama, P. Masanja and T. Mollel. For reports, see Chambulikazi 1985 a and b.

21. The Legal Aid Workshop was organized by the APRN in cooperation with the Legal Aid Committee of the Faculty of Law, University of Dar es Salaam. Members who participated included Issa Shivji, W. Kapinga, R. Kabudi and W.Wambali. For a report, see University of Dar es Salaam, Legal Aid Committee 1985.
22. Wembah-Rashid 1978.

Chapter I

A Materialist Theory of the Modes of Human Reproduction

Basic Concepts: Forces, Means and Relations of Human Reproduction

A theory of the modes of human reproduction addresses itself to the question of how the human species is reproduced i.e. how human beings are being produced in a social and material sense. In a material sense it is a question of the propagation of the species and hence a biological process which can be described by biologists and physiological experts, but more than that, it is also a political and economic question in relation to how the material means of biological reproduction are provided for. Human reproduction is also a social and cultural question in terms of how human being are produced as social beings with a social consciousness.

The particular meaning given to reproduction depends on the context. At the biological level it refers to the process of reproducing the human species and keeping it alive. At the social level, reproduction refers to the process of keeping societies and their constituent parts, be they classes, nations or other social groups or individuals, "alive". Reproduction as a focus in the feminist discourse has either referred to the childbearing function of women or else, attempts to define it in a broader sense have been made in dialogue with marxists, who talk of reproduction in a more centrally economic sense in relation to production.¹

The concern here is a notion of human reproduction which recognizes its biological basis, but focuses on the social relations identified with it, emphatically seen from the point of view of male/female relations and the position of women in these relations.

Biologically, the necessary condition for the production of human offspring is a heterosexual union where the egg cell is fertilized by the semen. At this biological level the human reproduction process necessarily entails a relationship between a man and a woman, or the union of male and female procreative cells. Consequently, the relations of human reproduction become the social relationships which bring these two kinds of cells together. Whatever changes the future may bring in terms of artificial insemination, *in vitro* fer-

tilization, or asexual reproduction processes such as cloning or parthenogenesis, the nature of the social relationships under which these take place remains crucial. So far in history, we can say, however, that in an immediate sense, men have been the means of human reproduction for women, and women for men, and access to sexual union has been a necessary precondition for giving birth to babies. An analysis of the relations of human reproduction in a social sense will thus address itself to the question of who is being reproduced in this process and on whose terms?

There are basically three possible answers to this question, namely the man, the woman or both. Whatever else follows in a social sense (family, kin, clan, class, nation etc.) will be extensions of the basic male and female in terms of what and who they represent. The outcome of the union, the child, then becomes the third important being as it is the child in whom the process materializes itself. Consequently, the core procreative relations evolve around the social relationships between these three. Thus, *the relations of human reproduction refer to the social relationships between men and women as regards access and control to sexual union* (be it marital, extra- or non-marital), *procreation and the product of procreation, children*.

A fundamental difference between males and females in terms of human reproduction is the fact that it is women and not men who give birth to babies. Another difference is that while a man can impregnate an indefinite number of women, a woman's ability to conceive is limited by the fact that she carries the fertilized cell for about 9 months until a new child is born. The reproductive process on the female side can be further lengthened (and usually will be) by the time taken for breast-feeding and nurturing the infant. In Meillassoux's words:

Man's ability to inseminate is practically unlimited but any man can do, while women's procreative potential is only equal to the length of her fertile period divided by the length of the periods of gestation and breastfeeding—frequently extended by cultural restrictions. During the gestation the symbiosis between the mother and her child creates an entity which is strongly *sui generis*. In other words, in terms of procreative capacities, men are expendable; each pregnant woman is unique in her kind.²

At the social level, human cultures have developed different responses to the basic physiology of procreation, so that social limitations will be put on the male inclinations to conceive an indefinite number of children as well as there being different regulations and practices as to the preferable interval considered necessary for a rest for women after childbirth. In the same way, there are and have been culturally different considerations regarding the "socially necessary time for nurturing the infants".

For instance, in France between the 13th and 19th centuries, it was common to send infants to wet nurses practically as soon as they had been born. Badinter, who wrote a study on the historical notion of motherhood³, argues that there is no such thing as a universal "motherly instinct", which makes each and every woman by nature feel and show an indiscriminate maternal love towards all her children. Instead, the socio-economic conditions and the prevailing ideologies have greatly affected maternal behaviour at various times in history.

The custom of hiring a wet nurse in France dates back to the 13th century and it was popular predominantly among the aristocracy up till the 16th century. It spread among the bourgeoisie in the 17th century and by the 18th century it was common practice in all segments of the urban society. In 1780, out of 21 000 children born in Paris, fewer than 1000 were nursed by their mothers, another 1000 by live-in wet nurses and the rest would be sent to wet nurses in the countryside. For parents in the poorest families a child was a threat to their own survival. In the case of silk workers', butchers' and bakers' wives, it cost less to send a child to a nurse than it did to hire an unskilled labourer to work instead of the mother. Among the upper classes, breastfeeding was not favoured and women considered they had better things to do.

When the newly born infant in France was sent to a wet nurse right after its birth, this separation from the parents lasted on average for four years. During this time the parents were typically little concerned with the fate of their distant child.

The nurses came from the poorest classes and often had to abandon or neglect the care of their own children or infants for the benefit of the nursing and for whatever payment they could get for this service. In practice, this "parental indifference" and the use of the poorly paid wet nurse led to the poor care of *two* children, the one who was sent to a nurse and the nurse's own child. It could result in an outright neglect of both these children as well as causing malnourishment and often premature death. Badinter comments that

It is tempting to see in this carefree attitude a kind of unconscious substitute for abortion. The terrifying mortality rate of children in the 18th century is the most shocking evidence of this.⁴

The association of women with motherly love became a publicly advocated policy in France towards the end of the 18th century, when the philosophers of the Enlightenment started advocating freedom and happiness as essential values in life, and the politicians became concerned about the depopulation of France and the need to look for ways of ensuring a better survival rate for children. To propagate this, they even took African mothers as a model.⁵

Relations of Human Reproduction: Mating and Filiation

In his critique of anthropological studies of kinship and marriage, Meillassoux pointed out that it is important to make a distinction between *mating relations* and the *relations of filiation*. He attributed a lot of the confusion by anthropologists to the failure to do so. A number of kinship studies have confused the quest for a wife with the quest for offspring — when in actual fact *kinship* as a category is only applicable to the latter. According to Meillassoux, the *relations of mating* specify possible partners for sexual union while *filiation* refers to the *relations of dependence* which an individual has to preceding generations.⁶ This distinction is an important one for a mode of human reproduction analysis and implies that we have to distinguish those social relations that lead to the birth of babies from those that contribute to the making of the adult. These relations may or may not coincide, and therefore a full mode of human reproduction analysis has to take into account both sets of relations. Talking about “mating” rather than *marital* relations takes into consideration the fact that offspring are not necessarily always born within marital relations; talking about relations of filiation implies that nurture of children and its counterpart, taking care of the old are not necessarily family or kinship-bound.

Regarding mating, the relations of human reproduction refer to those practices and considerations which will influence an individual's access to sexual union. Further, mating relations can be divided into two categories, namely sexual relations for *procreation* with the aim of producing offspring, and the sexual relations for *recreation*, geared to pleasure. These functions, again, may or may not coincide. Access to sexual union and procreation may not be as automatic as one might think on the basis of the approximate division of the global population into two halves of men and women. The individual's access to sexual union may be constrained by the non-availability of mating partners due to an unbalanced sex ratio. For instance, there was a surplus population of males in African towns during the colonial period, when male migrants were not allowed to or could not take their wives with them; correspondingly, there may be a majority of females in the countryside; in certain periods of European history prevailing ideals of monogamy have given rise to a high number of spinsters.⁷ An imbalance may be created by wars: for instance in the Soviet Union, there were only 59.1 males for every 100 females in the thirty-five to fifty-nine age-group in 1946, after the Second World War⁸ — and many more examples could be taken from history. The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe can be given as examples of economic planning which may create industrial towns with a predominantly male or female

population, when no attention is paid in the planning stage to the social aspects related to human reproduction.

The access to sexual union for procreation may also be constrained by the control by male elders over their juniors, who have to postpone their marriages due to the restrictions imposed on them; also, within polygamous households, the wives will have limited access to sexual union, be it for procreation or for recreation, while the husband in the same household may have access to sexual union with several wives, even if restricted by rules about abstinence during pregnancy and lactation.⁹

Thus we can say that, in a social and cultural sense, access to sexual union will be regulated by social considerations, such as the control over youth in terms of what is considered as the appropriate time for mating by their elders in a particular culture. What is considered the appropriate time for starting sexual relations may or may not coincide with actual biological maturity or actual marriage. The consideration may also differ vis-à-vis sex for procreation and for recreation.

Access to sexual relations for recreation aimed at pleasure may also have its constraints, such as moral, legal or religious considerations, or simply the ability to attract. Human societies have developed a number of variations in regulating their members' behaviour in this respect. Also, sexuality and what is considered sexually attractive is culturally conditioned and varies in time and place. Just as sexual attraction varies, so also do fashions, which indicate which part of a woman, for instance her legs or bosom, or a man, narrow hips or bulging muscles, will be found as *the* attractive part of his/her body. The history of fashions in clothing will show how these considerations have been manifested.

Apart from fashions in clothing, the ideals of female beauty have had a direct impact on women's bodies when involving physical mutilation, be it through foot-binding, binding of the waist or the breasts, dyeing of the hair or painting or scarring of the face. Feminists have pointed out how women have been forced into these sometimes violent acts in order to conform to male ideas about female beauty and sexuality.¹⁰ Exploring the history of the formation of "sexuality" and female bodies in history has become part of feminist reconstruction of gender.¹¹

Apart from the outward considerations related to sexual attraction, sexuality and sexual behaviour have their own history, both regarding customs and attitudes. These are intimately linked up with the prevalent modes of human reproduction, themselves intimately linked up with power and politics, class- and gender-bound. To the extent that a mode of human reproduction has linkages with power and politics, so do the ideologies regarding sexuality and sexual behaviour. It would be unrealistic to think that sexuality would be

something we could exert complete control over in private. Public opinion has always affected sexual behaviour, however hidden an act it may be.

In human history, marriage has been a dominant way of regulating the social relations of human reproduction, even though its form and content have again been influenced by the kinds of relations of production and human reproduction that a society has developed. It is through an analysis of these relations that we can understand the nature of the conjugal union rather than vice versa. The form a marriage and the relations of mating and filiation inherent therein take (or do not take) is greatly dependent on the relations of production with which the mode of human reproduction is articulated.

Forces of Human Reproduction

If availability of a sexual partner or access to the means of procreation is one of the preconditions for human reproduction, this is not necessarily enough as such. Within the materialist theory of the modes of human reproduction, the *forces of human reproduction* signify the degree of control men and women exert over nature vis-à-vis birth and mortality, giving rise to the demographic configuration of the mode.¹² The exercise of control over birth and mortality in a technical sense is influenced by the level of accumulated knowledge in the fields of birth control, disease control and environmental control. The level of the development of the forces of human reproduction is measured in terms of adaptation to nature or control over nature through physical and technical means of contraception and reproductive technology. In all societies, the biological capacity for procreation (fecundity)¹³ is far above the actual birth rate (fertility) and is thus not fully exploited. This may be because of poverty, illness, starvation, rites, beliefs or such considerations as material "well-being" in industrially advanced countries.¹⁴

In terms of child survival, the question of who is allowed to be born and to survive, is again an aspect of the social relations of human reproduction, in particular those of filiation. Apart from abortion, human societies have been known to exercise more or less direct measures of infanticide ranging from killing of the newly born to more subtle forms such as neglect, such as for instance in the case of female children in India. To the extent that there is a marked difference in the capacity of the children in different parts of the world to survive, the economic and political dimension of the social relations of human reproduction become manifest. To the extent that a high infant mortality is a class issue, the relations of production can be seen as part of the reproductive forces.

It is important to make the point that the forces of human reproduction are not a "list" of technology but link up at once with the social relations of human reproduction. For instance, if we look at the widespread use of mass-produced contraceptives in the last 20 years, it is necessary to keep in mind the warning given by Gordon:

There is a tendency to fetishize reproduction controlling technology, as if the diaphragm or the pill, rather than the social relationships that promote their use, were the "news".¹⁵

In the same vein, the struggle over birth control which was fought in the United States in the 19th century, took place with no new technical inventions.¹⁶ According to Walsh there is ample evidence to show that, historically, where under certain conditions there were good reasons for family limitation, this would have been achieved in spite of the limited methods available. She took the necessary conditions to be such social and economic circumstances that make it worthwhile to limit families, combined with a related level of culture.¹⁷

Far back in history women are known to have been able to exercise considerable control over their fertility, both through the knowledge of their own body and their knowledge of herbal medicines and contraception. They have also known various abortive methods.¹⁸ Lee gives a good example of the way in which, until recently, women in the hunting and gathering societies have been able to space their children at intervals between 2 - 4 years through post-partum anovulation effected by prolonged lactation.¹⁹ In several societies this has been combined with strict post-partum taboos which, however, deny women access to sexual intercourse while lactating.²⁰ Heinsohn and Steiger argue that a lot of reproductive knowledge of women disappeared in Europe in the context of the witch-hunt, which was largely geared to eradicating midwives who held a lot of knowledge which did not tally with the pro-natalist policies of the time.²¹

Birth control seems to have been an area where the ideological dimension of the issue has been actually stronger than the technical (and economic) opportunities. Walsh points out how slow the drug companies and the medical profession were in getting motivated for the promotion of the pill — despite the huge economic markets that could be foreseen. According to Walsh, innovation in birth control and the spread of such techniques that did exist did not progress at a pace that could have been technically possible, but were retarded by prejudices, policies and laws. It was only the fear of "population explosion" and the "political will" which was most concerned about this, particularly about the rapid population growth rate of the Third World, that

served to promote the innovations in birth control techniques and their widespread propagation.²²

Since then the use of contraceptives has had a tremendous impact on women's ability to control their own bodies in reproductive relations. In many places this continues to involve ideological and political debates over the use of the contraceptives and over the sexual relations that are identified with them. One of the effects of the new technology is a clearer difference between sexual union for pleasure or recreation and sexual union for the purpose of getting offspring, for procreation.

Sexual Power

It will be useful to introduce here the concept of *sexual power* which I take to cover two aspects, namely those of fertility and sexuality. These refer to the distinction between sexual relations for the purpose of *procreation* (i.e. human reproduction measured in terms of fertility) and for the purpose of *recreation* (i.e. sexual pleasure) manifested in sexually contented individuals and satisfactory human relations.

In the actual practice of engaging in sexual union, both of these aspects may be realised at the same time, but this may not necessarily be so, as we know of pre-marital, extra-marital, non-marital and homosexual relations. Sexual power is a concept which is comparable both with the concept of *human energy* in the sense used by Meillassoux as well as the concept of *labour power* as it has been used within historical materialism. Meillassoux differentiates between human energy which is consumed when people engage in physical activities and labour power as the saleable commodity which emerges with the capitalist mode of production.²³ In the same way that the use of labour power can be abused through exploitative practices, so too can sexual power also be abused and/or alienated in practices such as rape or prostitution. In the latter sexual power has become a commodity for sale.

The nature of women's sexual power is different from that of men firstly because of the fundamental biological difference between women and men, called *anisogamy*. Anisogamy in socio-biology refers to the fact that males produce small gametes and females large ones in all species that reproduce sexually. This difference means that males and females "invest" differently in human reproduction in a biological sense. While a man can produce millions of gametes daily it takes a considerably longer time for the female to produce one egg cell. The difference in reproductive investment starts here. After the initial provision of the gamete by the male the female is left alone

to nurture it. For socio-biologists, everything else flows from this inequality; it is in the moment of the appearance of heterosexual reproduction in the development of a species that the domination of the male over the female starts.²⁴ However, even the socio-biological opinion is starting to split: Cherfas and Gribbin recognize that in fact as far as reproduction goes, men can be seen as parasites on women. Once men have provided their gametes, the female takes over. Without the aid of a female, no male can reproduce, whereas, taken the current knowledge in reproductive technology, it would be possible for women to reproduce parthenogenetically.²⁵

The significance given to the initial physiology of human reproduction is an example of the role of ideology in the relations of human reproduction. What is made of the biological difference is arguable and constitutes one of the foci of the debates over the role of women and men in human reproduction.

Given the difference in the biology of human reproduction, another debatable issue has become the fact that the sexual power and the labour power inhabit the same human body. In the case of men this does not cause any problem whereas with women, there is a tension between the use of sexual power and the labour power of this same body. This tension has been resolved through various customs and practices and ideologies regarding the time necessary for a woman to engage in solely procreative activities. These kinds of activities and the amount of work she is allowed to engage in during pregnancy and the kind of nurture considered necessary for an infant as described above are an expression of the way this contradiction has been resolved in particular situations in particular societies. The way that the social ideas about the "appropriate" use of women's sexual power and labour power has been manipulated against the interests of women has been one the major areas attacked by feminist movements.

Women's movements have centrally criticized for instance the biological determinists who argue that the sexual power of women and its realization in the process of procreation is an all-exclusive, or at least a dominant feature of the female sex and determines to what kind of uses its human energy or labour power can be put. They argue that the first and foremost task of a woman, and her natural condition, is her childbearing role. Proponents of this line include socio-biologists, as well as representatives of various religious communities and political movements. However, real life has shown that the human energy of women can be extended to both mothering and a working life. In fact, the case of France provided by Badinter, showed that until the end of 18th century, the economic considerations in actual fact strongly overrode any "maternal instincts" of women. It took a massive ideological and

political campaign to convince the women to go back to breast-feeding their babies and to institute “motherly love”. Even here, the economic argument was the driving force behind the politicians’ interest in promoting motherhood, as it resulted from a new awareness in France of the importance to the nation of the size of its population.²⁶

The Articulation of the Modes of Production and of Human Reproduction

The next two sections aim to demonstrate the necessity for the *analytical* separation of the mode of production and the mode of human reproduction, as well as showing the way in which these two interact and feed into each other. It is necessary to remind ourselves again of the fact that in the final analysis these two modes are seen as being dialectically linked and one cannot exist without the other. However, their *analytical* separation is a necessary condition for understanding the dynamics of the articulation and the dialectical relationship between the two.

The relationship between the mode of production and the mode of human reproduction can be initially presented in the form of a simple diagram which in actual fact is a representation of the famous quote of Engels in a graphic form:

According to the materialist conception, the determining factor in history is, in the final instance, the production and reproduction of immediate life. This again, is of a twofold character: on the one hand, the production of the means of existence, of food, clothing, and the shelter and the tools necessary for that production; on the other side, the production of human beings themselves the propagation of the species. The social organization under which the people of a particular historical country live is determined by both kinds of production: by the stage of development of labour on the one hand, and of the family on the other. . .²⁷

Figure 1: *The Articulation of the Mode of Production and the Mode of Human Reproduction*

The arrows in Figure 1 indicate the connection of the two modes and how they “feed” into each other. The mode of production produces the means of existence, food, clothing and shelter and the tools necessary for that production. Throughout history this has developed into more and more complex forms with different branches of production together with the development of social relations of production and the technology and the knowledge necessary for the development of the productive forces.

In so far as the mode of production is producing the means of human existence, its output will be fed into the mode of human reproduction, where the products are consumed. Indeed this mode cannot function without some provision of the basic needs of human existence. On the other hand, the production process cannot go on without the human energy or the concrete labour power invested and consumed in it, which is fed into it by the mode of human reproduction. These modes are, however, not “closed” as represented in Figure 1. It is very important to note that instead, they are better represented as open ended spirals, as shown in Figure 2.

Figure 2: *The Articulation of the Mode of Production and the Mode of Human Reproduction in Terms of Open-ended Spirals*

As can be seen from Figure 2, Modes of production and of human reproduction together constitute a spiral of articulated unity. At different periods in time, one or the other mode may be qualitatively transformed.

Before giving specific examples, however, I will present a diagram which shows graphically how I see this articulation affecting the domestic units and how the domestic units²⁸ (be they the domestic community, the family, or an individual or a network of reproductive relations) are situated in the production and the reproduction processes.

The domestic unit is situated in and around the intersection of the production and the reproduction processes at the empirical level, and at the more abstract level, at the intersection of the modes of production and of human reproduction (Figure 3).

Figure 3: *The Articulation of the MOP and MOHR as It Affects the Domestic Units*

Figure 4: *The Articulation of the MOP and MOHR under Capitalism*

Figure 4 shows the articulation of the MOP and MOHR under capitalism.

As can be seen from Figure 4, the mode of human reproduction produces the labour power which enters into the labour market and engages in production (a — b). The mode of production produces commodities and wages which enter into the domestic unit, a household (c — d). Domestic labour (d) transforms the wage into use-values and consumes the commodities (d — a) as part of the mode of human reproduction. It has to be remembered, however, that the domestic labour represents only *part* of the reproduction of labour.²⁹ Domestic labour is thus consumption from the point of view of the household and at the same time it is productive consumption from the point of view of capital, if it is assumed that domestic labour contributes to capitalist production by producing workers that have been fed and bred.³⁰

Although this MOP-MOHR diagram is a highly abstract one, it is import-

ant to point out that the household must not be equated with the MOHR. Whereas the MOHR is a theoretical category the household is an empirical one. The contribution of the MOP to MOHR does not include only commodities but the wages and the revenue collected from taxes, part of which enter into the MOHR in the form of day care centres, schools, educational institutions, health and reproductive institutions as well as recreational activities which are all part of the reproductive process and not necessarily situated in the household.

Figure 5 represents the intersection of a domestic unit by the articulated modes of human reproduction under capitalism.

Figure 5: *Intersection of the Domestic Unit by the Articulated MOP-MOHR under Capitalism*

1. Necessary production. 2. Reproductive institutions. 3. Domestic labour. 4. Recreation based on consumption of wages.

Dissecting the modes of production and of human reproduction in this way may lead us to new insights about the nature of domestic labour. The old debate focused on whether domestic labour or women's housework could be considered "productive" or not. Taking a narrow view of domestic labour as the concrete work predominantly done by women in the home prevented the discussion from gaining clarity over this issue. The question of "productiveness" was posed from the point of view of the mode of production only, even when nominally concerned about reproduction as well, not from the point of view of the mode of human reproduction in its totality. Hence the ambiguous conclusion that domestic labour was not productive even if it was necessary. The productive — non-productive dichotomy was a capital-centric one and too narrow a conceptualization for an understanding of the women's question.³¹

By analysing the MOP-MOHR as represented here, we are in a position to see all social labour in terms of its *productive* and *reproductive* aspects, both of which are necessary for the reproduction of human life.

The Temporal Difference Between the Production and the Human Reproduction Cycles

Another way of grasping the need for analytical separation of the MOP and MOHR is to consider the temporal difference between production cycles and human reproduction cycles at a more empirical level. If we take the example of a cultivation process in agriculture, the annual cycle of food production is basically from one harvest to the next, but the length of time may vary according to the kind of crop and the ecological conditions etc. In real life, several production processes are taking place at the same time and their durations vary, but basically all follow the same pattern of

PRODUCTION — DISTRIBUTION — CONSUMPTION — PRODUCTION.

There are even temporal differences in different systems of production. For instance, in his discussion of the differences between hunting and gathering and agricultural societies, Meillassoux makes a distinction between production processes with *instant* and *delayed* returns. In societies where land is the subject of labour (as in hunting and gathering) its products (tubers, fruits and nuts) are appropriated directly from nature without any human energy being invested in them previously. As a result, an instant return to labour is achieved as the labour only involves extracting the fruits of nature's "labour".

As opposed to an extraction economy which gives immediate returns, agriculture is a production process which requires an investment of human energy, i.e. labour in land (land as an instrument of labour), and the return on this investment can be achieved only after the crop has matured, i.e. at the time of the harvest.³²

In terms of food production in both the hunting and gathering and agricultural societies, we can talk of an annual reproduction cycle which will only vary insofar as weather conditions (droughts, excessive rains, and natural interventions of pests and animals etc.) affect it. Likewise, the production of goods in pastoral societies follows the cycle characterised by the composition and reproduction of the herds and their ability to produce a consumable stock of food.

In the same way that production can be seen as a cycle of production — distribution — consumption — production, so too we can visualise human reproduction as a generational cycle between

BIRTH — MATING — CONCEPTION — BIRTH.

Within this framework, we can say that it takes a generation to produce a new labour force even if a new reproduction process is being set in motion every day when new babies are being born. The formation of a new labour force to be employed in the production process implies physical maturity and the acquiring of the necessary skills, and is thus a lengthy process. While the consequences of a harvest failure may on occasions only be experienced in the next cultivating season, imbalances from loss of population take much longer to "rectify". As a result, booms and slumps in population growth tend to have much longer term effects.

If we take the example of the Finnish educational system, we find that the children of the post-war "baby-boom" were exposed to severe competition for school places, lacked day-care and kindergarten facilities, were forced into big classes on a two shift basis, faced unemployment and will probably also have difficulties in ensuring access to grave-plots. However, in the next generation a lot of new schools were built and for a time there was a problem of empty schools, teachers' unemployment etc., following the unexpected contraction in the number of babies born after the boom was over. The Finnish state now faces the problem of who is going to pay for the pensions of the boom generation when the numbers of the younger generation have been so reduced.³³

This juxtaposition of the production and human reproduction cycles should have hopefully demonstrated the need for separating the MOP and MOHR for analytical purposes. However, the point to be remembered is that a change from one mode of production to another does not necessarily coincide with a change in the mode of human reproduction although these modes do influence each other.

Relationship Between MOHR Analysis and Demographic Studies

The very fact that the mode of production and the mode of human reproduction have their own distinctive momentums gave rise to the science of *demography*, which basically attempts to help (governments) to match the two, i.e. it purports to provide knowledge for human engineering of fertility to meet the needs of production and not to exceed the material resources at the disposal of society. In the same way that economics analyses the production process we can say that demography does the same to the human reproduction process: it describes and measures the outcome of reproductive activities (vis-à-vis fertility, mortality and population growth) and attempts

to project the previous trends into the future. These projections are then fed into policies relevant to population issues depending on whether reduction of growth or further growth is desirable. The power and prosperity of states has historically been associated by their rulers with large populations, especially for workers, potential consumers and potential members of the armed forces. Governments have attempted to encourage population growth through, for instance, welfare benefits, tax allowances, as well as prohibition of birth control.³⁴ Pro-natalist laws and policies have their counterpart in policies geared to limiting the family-size such as the recent one-child policy of China. Regulations of the marriageable age try to prevent population growth through postponement of marriage.

The question of population growth poses the issue of reproduction relations at the national and global levels, and it becomes basically a political question. The concern for human reproduction is very much affected by the concerns of the social formation. The very context within which demography arose highlights its essential role in servicing economics and politics.

Badinter's analysis of France shows how by the end of the 18th century children acquired a new value in society as a potential resource together with the realization that all human beings were precious assets for the State as producers of wealth and as the basis of its military power.³⁵ This meant that any decline in population was considered a loss by the state. The economic interests in production in general and the political and military anxiety about an assumed depopulation of France found their expression in the realization of the economic and human value of children at the policy level. This changed the attitudes about child-care which became more favourable towards efforts geared to increasing population. The physiocrats posited that from a quantitative point of view all human beings had value as productive forces:

Even the poor beggars, prostitutes and abandoned children became significant as possible productive forces. They could for instance be sent to populate French colonies, those great reservoirs of wealth awaiting only strong arms to bring forth their best fruits.

These ideas had already started emerging in the 16th and in the 17th Centuries. Colbert, Louis XIV's Minister of Finance, was the first to commission a major national survey of the population in France. The first questionnaire was drawn up in 1663 but it took several efforts before the first national survey was ready for publishing in 1709.³⁶

Colbert attempted to populate Canada by forcefully sending each year

Strong, healthy women as well as animals for reproduction . . . We are preparing the 150 women, the mares, stallions, and sheep that we are sending to Canada.³⁷

Colbert also believed that work was a citizen's obligation as a civic duty. At the same time as he was developing a national work ethic by locking up paupers in hospitals to make them work more, he struggled against the high percentage of "non-productive" people in society. He complained about priests and nuns not only because they worked less but because they deprived the public of all the children they themselves might produce.

It took a hundred years until Chamousset pointed out that it would be more effective to fight depopulation by ensuring the survival of children who had already been born. He made detailed calculations of the profits that could be reaped from rescuing abandoned children who would otherwise be an economic loss to the state:

Children who have no mother other than the fatherland, must belong to it and be used in the way that will be most useful to it.³⁸

It is in this spirit that he planned the large scale exportation of children to Louisiana at the age of 5—6, where their "dead weight" could be transformed into a productive force while growing various crops during weekdays and

From the age of 10 until they married they would spend Sundays and holidays in military exercises, setting aside enough time to gain a working knowledge of the principles of Religion. They would be raised according to 'sentiments in conformity with a holy Politic'. Later they would be married off, between 20 — 25, and given as much land as they could profitably farm.³⁹

This was an 18th century version of a state mode of human reproduction. Parallels can be found from other periods as well, especially in the 20th century. One extreme example of a totalitarian state intervention in human reproduction was, of course fascist Germany where the racially and socially 'inferior' were sterilized or sent to gas chambers. 'Aryan' women were prevented from working or from using contraceptives as well as being denied other rights and they were subjected to intensive propaganda in order to force them to breed as rapidly as possible.⁴⁰ Practically parallel to his is the racist mode of human reproduction in South Africa.

The basic concern of demographic studies has been to analyse population growth rates, dependency ratios, etc., in order to provide more and more accurate tools for projecting population trends into the future. Due to difficulties in anticipating people's reproductive behaviour more and more elaborate tools for studying its sociological aspects have been developed. Fertility studies have developed various models for sociological analyses of

fertility levels, which are seen as part of complex systems of social, biological and environmental interactions. For instance, Davis and Blake have developed an elaborate model on the classes of variables affecting fertility in pre-industrial societies such as

1. The means of fertility control that fall between the social organization and the social norms on the one hand and fertility on the other. These include: factors affecting exposure to intercourse; factors affecting exposure to conception; factors affecting gestation and successful parturition.
2. Social norms about family size
3. Social norms about each of the intermediate variables
4. Aspects about the social organization that function to support the norms about family size by providing social rewards and punishments that depend on the numbers of children in the familial unit
5. Other factors that affect fertility by influencing the norms or actual values for the intermediate variables either independent of or in relation to the effect of the norms about fertility
6. The mortality level which determines how large a surplus of birth is required to produce the normative number of children
7. The migration level which determines the number and ages of persons available to the families and the society as a whole
8. Other factors in the environment which affect the intermediate variables inconsistent with the fertility norms.⁴¹

Models such as these have become important for improving predictions about the population growth on the basis of understanding the fertility patterns of any social collectivity. Freedman sees the increasing interest in human fertility studies as being due to, firstly, a growing realization that the problematic factor in population issues is the fertility rate. Growth rates have been seen to depend mainly on mortality and fertility levels and little on international migration. It has also been increasingly shown that population growth rates in developed countries now depend mainly on fertility trends.⁴² Secondly, the age structure of a population appears to depend much more on fertility than mortality trends. Thirdly, a re-emphasis on the essential functions of the family in an industrial urban society related to population growth has contributed to an increasing focus on the family as a reproductive unit. As the concern of the demographers and policymakers is to find and launch special social incentives for childbearing it has become important to understand the relationship between family life and fertility:

. . . The short-run episodic changes in fertility and family life makes basic long-run research on fertility so important. For the entire period of 1920—70 we are uncertain about what is secular trend and what are short-term variations.⁴³

Further, methodological developments have created more possibilities for many kinds of fertility studies at the same time as people have come to believe that fertility above optimum levels causes major social and personal problems. Finally, Freedman concludes that development issues have stimulated a growing amount of population research by economists. The popular interest in ecology has made the question of fertility above replacement a major factor in discussing pollution, crime, congestion, survival, etc. As a result, there seems to be a general agreement that in the long run a *zero growth rate* for population is inevitable.⁴⁴

However elaborate and accurate the demographic models and studies on fertility may be, the problem still remains in relation to human reproduction that the effects of changes in fertility are long term and the behaviour patterns remain unpredictable to a certain degree, even if better levels of projection accuracy have been attained. The ultimate questions posed still remain the same: what variables will affect the population size as well as its growth and decline in numerical terms, how can these be further stimulated into desired directions, and what would be the optimal population growth rate for a particular social formation? In relation to the last question, some kind of equilibrium model is posited for an optimal balance between the economic and ecological resources and the desirable size of population. The variables used continue to show an economic and political bias due to the very economic and political purpose of the exercise, and thus remain descriptive seeing the population issue as a technical problem, the solution of which depends on the correct manipulation of the human variables. Some schools of population studies even talk in terms of neoclassical economics and use concepts such as the supply and demand of children in society.

There is also a difference between pro- and anti-natal policies running along political lines. For instance, some of the socialist countries consider human population as a productive resource whereas capitalist countries are concerned about a global equilibrium and more than that, an equilibrium which would reduce the size of the population in the developing countries.⁴⁵ Thus, interest in population trends remains a macro-issue and of concern to governments and the "development establishment"⁴⁶ in global terms. Population policies have historically shown class and ideological biases. There is currently a struggle between the "global interests" in impeding population growth on the one hand, and the national interests that face some of the developed countries (Finland included) and the desire to populate the sparsely inhabited African countries. Particular contradictions arise when development agencies are keen to limit the population growth in the Third World in the name of eradicating poverty combined with the global

resources-population balance and these countries themselves, such as Tanzania, consider that there is still room for more people.⁴⁷

The macro concerns of population policies, which have led to intensive studies on women's fertility rates and family size issues, are thus guided by national and international political, economic and ideological interests and take families and women as instruments or variables to be engineered in desired directions. Although claiming to be concerned about global well-being, they are not looking at the fertility and population issues in terms of the quality of women's lives or male/female relationships.

The materialist theory of the articulation of the modes of production and of human reproduction differs from the demographic approach in its political orientation for an understanding of male/female relationships in production and reproduction and the issue of the equality between the sexes in productive and reproductive spheres of life. The MOHR analysis addresses itself to the social relationships of human reproduction between men, women and children and non-productive dependents while laying emphasis on equality and the liberation of women from male domination. The feminist concern in these issues centers around women's ability to control their own bodies and fertility and is thus aimed against the patriarchal mode of human reproduction, a notion completely absent from demographic and population studies.

References

1. For instance Edholm, Harris and Young 1977; Harris and Young 1981.
2. Meillassoux 1981, 25.
3. Badinter 1981.
4. Badinter 1981, 42.
5. Badinter 1981, 40—159.
6. Meillassoux 1981, 18—20.
7. Adam 1975; Jallinoja 1983.
8. Lapidus 1978, 169.
9. For Msoga, cf Chapter V.
10. For instance Dworkin 1981; Steele 1985.
11. For instance Haug 1983.
12. Bryceson and Vuorela 1984, 140—141.
13. According to Monsted and Walji, *fertility* is the actual performance of persons in terms of reproduction and measured by counting the number of live-births. *Fecundity* is the biological capacity of persons to reproduce themselves (Monsted and Walji 1978, 102).
14. Meillassoux 1981, xii.
15. Gordon 1983, 48.

16. Ibid, 44.
17. Fischer 1979; Cherfas and Gribbin 1985; Mies 1986.
18. Lee 1979.
19. Lee 1979; Mies 1986.
20. Heinsohn and Steiger 1984; Mies 1986, 81.
21. Molnos 1972—73 provides a survey regarding these customs in Tanzania.
22. Walsh 1980, 191.
23. Meillassoux 1981, 50—51.
24. Wilson 1975; Lagadec 1982.
25. Cherfas and Gribbin 1985, 59.
26. Badinter 1981, 118.
27. Engels 1972, 71—72.
28. Domestic Unit is used here as a transhistorical concept, to cover the different historical forms a domestic unit can take such as the domestic community, the family, an atomistic individual and unions of atomistic individuals.
29. Cf Seccombe 1980, 218. Here Seccombe argues that domestic labour is one of several labours integral to the reproduction of labour-power in capitalist societies. All of the labour that goes into the production of commodity goods and services purchased with the wage (labour expended in education, health care and in the building and maintaining of the urban residence) combine with domestic labour to reproduce labour-power on a continuous and expanding basis.
30. Marx 1972, 179.
31. Cf Benston 1969; Seccombe 1974 and 1975; Gardiner 1975; Harrison 1973; Molyneux 1979; Bryceson and Vuorela 1984.
32. Meillassoux 1981, 14—15; 39—40.
33. Västöliitto (The Population Union in Finland) in 1982 expressed concern over the fact that the number of children born in Finland has been on the decline since 1975. A continuation of this trend combined with the increasing number of retired persons would mean that in future an ever greater share of work of the people in the productive age has to be geared to the upkeep of the old. According to the Union's calculations, a balanced population growth in Finland would require that the number of those in the productive age should be about 50—55 % of the total population. This means that the annual number of births in Finland should rise to 80 000 instead of the current 65 000. To achieve this, the Union suggested that the family size in Finland should grow in the 1980's because the number of those in the reproductive age has contracted compared with the previous years. (Västöliitto 1982, 4).
34. Walsh 1980, 187.
35. Badinter 1981, 120—129.
36. Ibid, 126.
37. Ibid.
38. Ibid, 120.
39. Ibid.
40. Walsh 1980, 189.
41. Freedman 1975, 13—18, summarizing Davis and Blake 1956.
42. Freedman 1975, 5.
43. Ibid, 7—9.
44. Monsted and Walji 1978, 27—28.

45. As late as in 1969, when introducing the Second Five Year Plan, President Nyerere stated: "It is very good to increase our population because our country is large and there is plenty of unused land" (Tanzania 1969).
46. "Development establishment" is used here to refer to the international organizations and agencies dealing with development aid, and governments engaged in development cooperations. This concept implies the political notion that the recipients of aid are usually in a less powerful position compared with the establishment. Terms of aid are mostly dictated by the development establishment rather than the recipient despite the rhetoric which might indicate otherwise. Cf for instance Meena 1979.
47. As late as in 1969, when introducing the Second Five Year Plan, President Nyerere stated, "It is very good to increase our population because our country is large and there is plenty of unused land" (Tanzania 1969).

Chapter II

The Adhesive and the Patriarchal Modes of Human Reproduction

The previous chapter presented the basic concepts to be applied in a modes of human reproduction analysis. These included the forces of human reproduction, the relations of mating and filiation, the notion of sexual power and the dialectical interaction of the processes of production and of human reproduction. If different modes of human reproduction are to be dissected, then, it will be done through the application of these concepts. The central question posed from a feminist perspective asks essentially what is people's ability to control their sexual power, set in motion in the reproductive process and how is this linked to their ability to control their labour-power, set in motion in the productive process. Or, in other words, what happens to people as holders of human energy/labour-power and sexuality/sexual power as they enter social life as producers and reproducers. If demographers were looking for the laws of population, feminists will be looking at the nature of gender relations in both production and in human reproduction.

The study suggests that three different MOHRs can be distinguished from each other on the basis of the characteristic relations of mating and filiation, which together with the forces of human reproduction constitute different modes of human reproduction. In these different modes, the relations of mating and filiation relate differently to each other at the same time as their relationship manifests itself in the position of women and men as social agents and controllers of the human reproduction process. An egalitarian, *adhesive* MOHR has been thought out on the basis of Meillassoux's discussion of the difference between hunting and gathering bands and agricultural domestic communities. The other two modes suggested have been termed here as the *patriarchal* and the *atomistic* modes of human reproduction. The existence of these MOHRs is intimately linked up with the level of development of the productive forces but their history does not follow the history of the modes of production in a one-to-one relationship. One of the central arguments for the analytical separation of the MOP and the MOHR was the realization that a change in the mode of production was not necessarily followed by a change in the MOHR. At the same time it is argued that no universal sequence of

historical MOHRs can be traced but instead, an analysis of the MOHR has to be carried out in each particular case on the basis of the central concepts suggested above and in their articulation of the MOP of the social formation. There are no clear-cut divisions between the different MOHRs in history either, as history is seen as a continuous process rather than a series of abrupt changes from one MOP to another or from one MOHR to another. Articulated history considers processes whereby elements and relations of different MOPs and MOHRs are in the process of disappearing and coming into being, and articulating with each other at the same time.

In this chapter, two of the MOHRs suggested by the theory, the adhesive and the patriarchal MOHRs, will be discussed more systematically. These are juxtaposed in order to bring out more clearly some of their essential differences. This will follow the model given by Meillassoux in his discussion on the hunting and gathering bands and the agricultural domestic community in his book *Maidens, Meal and Money*.¹ My presentation will thus draw heavily on his insights, but adds to it the dimension of the modes of human reproduction. Although Meillassoux himself does not use such a concept, his study on the domestic community clearly demonstrates the linkage between production and reproduction relations. The notion of the MOHR is seen helpful in complementing Meillassoux's thesis which has been criticised for its lack of attention to the gender relations. Thus the present chapter will provide a critique of Meillassoux's treatment of reproduction at the same time as raising serious questions about the adequacy of his concept of the *domestic mode of production*. The elaboration of the concept of MOHR therefore represents a critique of Meillassoux's concept of domestic mode of production.

The Adhesive Mode of Human Reproduction²

The adhesive MOHR refers to those historical formations where male/female relationships for mating can be characterised as *relations of adhesion*, and relations of filiation are not given much importance. The term *adhesive relations* has been coined by Meillassoux with regard to hunting and gathering societies, where the relations of production and the co-operation production requires are of a temporary nature. Meillassoux draws a line between extractive and productive economies based on an analysis of the forces and relations of production. In doing so, he comes close to the line of argument presented by Morgan and Engels with regard to an interpretation of history as an evolutionary sequence of different stages in material production. In reaction to various criticisms against Morgan and Engels, Eleanor Leacock reconsiders

some of their arguments in her introduction to the *Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*³ Her reading of Morgan and Engels points to the research tradition to which Meillassoux's contribution can be seen as a response, critique and continuation. Meillassoux belongs to this tradition, but makes an important contribution by showing the dynamic of the articulation between productive and reproductive processes and in this way how relations of production and reproduction are interlinked and influence each other.

Morgan, who was also influenced by Darwin, posed the question about what was the basis for the emergence of new and successive social forms. His answer was that it was the "successive arts of subsistence which arose at long intervals" which were responsible for the development of the three major stages of human society which he named "savagery", "barbarism" and "civilisation". Leacock argues for the need to see beyond the labels, and points out that Morgan offered his scheme as "provisional" in order to indicate the major divisions in the successive arts of subsistence. These Morgan identified as 1) subsistence on available fruits and roots; 2) addition of fish with the use of fire and slow addition of meat as a permanent part of the diet, particularly after the invention of the bow and arrow; 3) dependence on cultivated cereals and plants; 4) dependence on meat and milk of domesticated animals; 5) "unlimited subsistence" through the improvement of agricultural techniques, notably the plough. However, Morgan was not able to relate the new stages in food appropriation and production to equivalent social stages. It was Engels who then clarified and emphasized the major distinction between the periods of so-called "savagery" and "barbarism" by saying that their major difference was in the way they moved from appropriation of nature to food production. Savagery he saw as a period in which people's appropriation of products in their natural state predominated and barbarism emerged when people learnt to breed domestic animals and to practise agriculture and acquired methods of increasing the supply of natural products by human activity. This distinction is, in current terminology, the basic distinction between food gathering and food production, or between extractive and productive economies.⁴

Meillassoux, then, linking up with this research tradition, shows the interlinkage between the processes of production and reproduction. His description of the band introduces the notion of adhesive relations of production and reproduction as the mechanism for social reproduction.⁵

Within band societies social reproduction is characterised by a free and voluntary movement between bands of adults of both sexes.

The social distribution of individuals is not decided at birth by ties of filiation pre-established by their elders' marriages but during each individual's own active life. Procreation is merely a by-product of sexual relationships. Age- and sex-spread

tends to be random. Social reproduction of the band, and the balance between productive and non-productive members thus depend above all on its ability to retain or attract adults of both sexes.⁶

Why is this so? Meillassoux gives two major reasons. Due to the nature of the extraction economy which gives instant returns, co-operation in collective production (hunting or gathering expeditions of various length — either on a daily or on a longer basis) can be concluded at the end of each enterprise. With a low level of investment, when each participant uses his/her own tools or no tools at all and the produce is shared and consumed after each enterprise, nothing demands that the same producers work together in the same group in future.⁷ The sharing concludes the enterprise and releases each person from obligation to others.

The social relations in the band, then, are initially defined in terms of its *present* membership, expressed by participation in the common activities of production and consumption. The social relations of production resulting from this short term cooperation are themselves precarious — and so are the relations of human reproduction as well: active males and females move from one band to the other, either because of disagreements, or because another group is more appealing, or to get a sexual partner. Unions between men and women are fragile. After weaning, and sometimes before, children are adopted by members of the band as a whole and do not necessarily follow their genitors' movements. There are no rules of virilocality nor of gynecolocality. Social reproduction of the band, and the balance between productive and non-productive members thus depend above all on its ability to retain or attract adults of both sexes.⁸ Thus, the bands do not necessarily reproduce genetically from within themselves, but through recruitment of people from other bands or through processes whereby big bands split or small ones join together. This process of fission and fusion is different from the changes in the composition of households which take place at different stages of the reproductive cycle of families.⁹

Within the band, ties of consanguinity are far less important than relations of adhesion. Hence bands are more likely to use terms referring to people in terms of categories connected with participation in productive activities (non-productive children, adults, old people) and to sexual unions.¹⁰

On the basis of the above discussion, the characteristic features of the adhesive mode of human reproduction include:

- relations of adhesion both in production and in human reproduction
- relations of filiation not important or non-existent
- no major food stores, no property to be inherited
- absence of reproductive rituals such as marriage and funerals

- children and old people neglected at times of distress — “left to die”
- egalitarian relationships between men and women, characterised by complementarity, companionship.¹¹

This picture of the adhesive mode of human reproduction can be further complemented on the basis of Lee's observations in the hunting and gathering camps of the !Kung in the Kalahari desert where he carried out research in the 1960's.¹² The fact that the description is from the 1960's should not worry us because the features that emerged can be clearly identified with an extraction economy with land as an instrument of labour and adhesive relations in the fission and fusion of the hunting and gathering camps. Lee's observations on the position of women in productive and reproductive activities add to our knowledge of the male/female relations in human reproduction in the camps. In fact, his analysis shows the tight unity of the relations of production and of human reproduction.

What emerges is that women in these camps had considerable control over their sexual power in terms of fertility, mating relations, child-spacing and child-survival with little interference from men.

Women's work in these camps centered around foraging for subsistence and childcare. Women provided the bulk of subsistence by their collecting of plants, fruits, nuts and roots. On their gathering trips women carried their children until these reached four years and could walk on their own. On the basis of the findings which showed that women walked on average a total distance of about 2,400 km per year on these trips, Lee calculated that to carry a child for four years requires a work input of 72,280 kilometre-kilograms, when the weight of the child is multiplied by the distance walked by the mother. Thus, the actual work in raising young children for the woman is a function of three variables: the weight of children, distance to be covered by walking and child-spacing.¹³

Lee's research indicated that an average woman's reproductive career was about three children born within the time span of ten years. With shorter spacing, both the number of children and the weight to be carried increase. Shorter birth spacing would have high costs in terms of an added work load to the mother. It is only with reduced mobility that a woman can shorten the interval between successive births and continue to give each child adequate care while keeping her work effort constant.

The spacing of children characteristic of the !Kung women was made possible through the effect of long lactation which suppresses ovulation. Among the !Kung, nursing was vigorous, frequent and given on demand throughout day and night. Lee concludes that women's knowledge of the connection between long lactation and amenorrhea made them accept the cultural norm of carrying the child with them for so long, as they can then go on nursing their

children most effectively. Thus the fertility of women in the !Kung camps was adjusted to the requirements of production in foraging activities and childcare to achieve an optimal combination of the use of women's sexual power and their human energy.¹⁴

That the fertility of women in the !Kung camps was adjusted to the requirements of their labour in production as such does not make the mode of human reproduction much different from other reproductive modes. What is different is that the reproductive process is so much under the control of women themselves through their knowledge of their own physiology, particularly when compared with the patriarchal mode of human reproduction. The !Kung women did not only control their sexual power in terms of child spacing, but they could also decide among themselves whether a newly-born child was allowed to live or not. As men had no entry to the site of birth, women could decide whether the child was worth investing the amount of labour its care required. Thus women had control over child-spacing and infanticide with little interference from men.¹⁵ Men did not need to take an active interest in female fertility because of the way that the camps reproduced themselves through a process of fission and fusion in the form of adhesive relations.

In Lee's account, the !Kung camps had a stable basis provided by the existence of a core of old people, usually siblings or cousins who were generally considered to be the owners of a waterhole, surrounded by food resources. However, more centrally, camp continuity was administered by a consideration of the dependency ratio between producers and non-producers. Camps with very high or very low ratios took steps to bring in more producers or more dependents. Failing that, groups could disband or merge with other groups. Even if camps in essence consisted of kinspeople and affines, these had joined together by choice rather than by birth, as the camps consisted of people who had found that they could live and work well together. Marriages existed, but a new marriage did not mean an addition or subtraction of one person only. Instead, entire families of the bride and the groom could combine into a single camp, or, in marrying, spouses could bring along their core siblings and their spouses. Thus the essential reproduction of the camps was not based on a circulation of women as reproductive means negotiated by male elders but on fission and fusion of groups of people of various composition.¹⁶

Looking at the total position of women in the !Kung camps, the picture of their life has to be complemented by the notion that, according to Lee's observation, 90 % of the childcare was in the hands of women who also provided the major bulk of the subsistence consumed in the camps. This brings out the question about the much acclaimed egalitarianism and complementarity of

male-female relations in hunting and gathering societies.¹⁷ Clearly, one has to be cautious about the dimension of egalitarianism or equality one is talking about in each case. The core characteristic that emerges from the example of the hunting and gathering camps of the relations of mating were not dictated by relations of filiation, nor did men exercise control over matrimonial affairs. Consequently, it can be assumed that there was a greater gender equality in the relations of mating than under patriarchy. Women had considerable control of their own fertility and together with it, there was a tight closeness of the mother and child unit.

Within the adhesive MOHR, examined in the case of a hunting and gathering way of life, relations of mating are not conditioned by the relations of filiation. The relations of filiation are not significant and procreation can be seen as a side product of the relations of mating which can be initiated by either men or women. Female fertility is a response to the requirements of the productive process and the level of development of the productive and reproductive forces. Women's ability to control their sexual power is manifested in their ability to adapt to nature through their knowledge of the reproductive functions of their bodies and socially in their ability to decide on child survival. Women and men do not differ in terms of the relations of filiation as the relations of production are shaped by relations of adhesion and children belong to the "bands" rather than to lineages or genealogical families. As the social reproduction is through recruitment and the relations of adhesion, men do not develop an interest in controlling the sexual power of women. This is the core quality that distinguishes the adhesive MOHR from the patriarchal MOHR.

The Patriarchal Mode of Human Reproduction

The patriarchal mode of human reproduction is not based on egalitarian relationships between men and women, but it is a mode where the males dominate, and the male/female relations are characterised by female dependence on the males. A mode of human reproduction is patriarchal as long as women can be seen as the means of human reproduction for men or male dominated communities and women's sexual power, i.e. their fertility and sexuality are controlled and manipulated by men.

Historically, the patriarchal mode of human reproduction can be identified with the emergence of the production systems with delayed returns in conjunction with the appearance of sedentary agriculture and the domestication of animals. A shift from extractive economies into production with delayed

returns and the organization of people into domestic communities implied that men got a stake in controlling the reproduction of these communities through their control of the production of offspring. This led to a process whereby women were subordinated into means of human reproduction to be controlled on male terms. Correspondingly, a process started whereby women were to lose the control they had over their sexual power under the adhesive mode of human reproduction. This involved a gradual loss of control of fertility in child-spacing which had to be adjusted not only to a change in the productive activities but also to the social and political quest for more offspring within the domestic communities. When social reproduction becomes a particular concern for men, a process takes place whereby women lose control of their sexuality in relations of mating that they could exercise within the adhesive mode. That women become objects and means to be manipulated by male transactions can be seen as their "reification". The emergence of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction, whereby men become the agents of human reproduction and women its reified objects, thus actually signifies what has been referred to as the "world historical defeat of the female sex". This defeat is here interpreted essentially as a change in the reproductive mode.

Even if there is basically only one patriarchal mode of human reproduction, this mode takes different forms in its articulation with different modes of production and in particular social formations. This is manifested in the different forms that the domestic unit may take, be it a domestic community or a family within the articulation of the productive and reproductive processes.

The Agricultural Domestic Community

The emergence of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction is related to the emergence of what Meillassoux has termed the agricultural domestic community.¹⁸ I see the pastoralist domestic community as being a parallel development, with the only difference being in the form and content of the production process, rather than the relations of production. As Marx said, it is not so important *what* is being produced, but *what matters* is the social relations under which the production takes place.¹⁹

The word *domestic* is, I think, very appropriate because, being derived from the Latin word *domus*, meaning a house or home, it expresses the difference between foraging extractive economies and communities based on more or less sedentary production processes. As opposed to the foraging bands, the

domestic communities engaged in agriculture or cattle keeping depend on productive economies with *delayed* as opposed to immediate returns. This requires that the groups which cooperate in production stay together until the distribution of the products from their joint investment and efforts can take place.

Because of the alternation between the productive and non-productive periods in the agricultural cycle, the products of one season have also to be stored, managed and distributed in such a way that a community can survive from one harvest to the next. Even if hunting, gathering and fishing may make up for shortfalls, they become subordinated to the agricultural social organization. Within this cycle, agricultural activity creates links between individuals in two ways: a) between those who have worked together from the preparation period until harvest and b) those workers who, in each season, depend for their survival during the non-productive period and in preparation for the next cycle on the subsistence food produced during the previous productive period.

From one season to the next, the majority of the workers remain the same, but over time the work-team changes: the older workers disappear while young ones take their place. This, in the end, leads to a change of generation. The change in the composition of the team is reflected in the evaluating hierarchy, which divides *those who came first* from *those who came after*. This hierarchy rests on positions of anteriority. The "first ones" are the elders, i.e. those to whom the others owe their initial seed and subsistence. The oldest in the hierarchy owes nothing to any living person in the productive cycle.²⁰

The series of advances and returns in production between those who came first and those who came after gradually leads to long term relations of mutual dependency. The repetition of the agricultural cycle creates a solidarity between the producers who succeed each other in the cycle on the one hand and, on the other, a hierarchy based on the notion of anteriority. The domestic community becomes the object of careful social control. In this context, relations of filiation become important as the key in the definition of the position of future producers, the offspring.

Because a unit constituted solely for production functions is too small to guarantee its own generational reproduction, access to other similar communities, which together form a body large enough to ensure their genetic and social reproduction, becomes indispensable. When the maintenance and survival of the working team through biological reproduction becomes important, women gain a greater social value than men as the living means of human reproduction. This is because of the basic difference in the male and female physiology which makes each woman unique in her procreative capacity while men remain expendable. Elders who already hold a position of power in the

productive relations have to engage in politics in order to gain control over the sexual power of women.

As a solution, peaceful alliances are created which organize and regulate a circulation of pubescent women. Their mobility makes it possible to ensure an optimal reproduction rate by means of a better distribution of the reproductive capacity of women between communities. Meillassoux assumes that the mobility of women is preferred to that of men because

Gynecostatic systems which seek to keep women and their children in their original households, are inflexible, unstable and turbulent because they are unable to adjust (demographically) within their own norms. Demographic accidents will be difficult to correct in uxorilocal and matrilineal societies — unless by resorting to warfare or abduction or patriliney.²¹

When women are circulated as reproducers, an agreement has to be reached which defines the relations of filiation, i.e. who appropriates the woman's offspring. Meillassoux takes it that jurally constituted patrilineal filiation must replace self-evident matrilineal filiation as the woman who has been circulated does not procreate for her own community of origin nor does she procreate for her own benefit. The institutionalization of the rules of filiation becomes an important aspect of the agreement which regulates the conditions under which the new producer is produced, i.e. marriage.

Matrimonial alliances are formed and the reproduction of the group now depends on the ability of the elders to negotiate a peaceful acquisition of women. When the exchange of women becomes a delayed affair and multilateral exchange systems emerge to allow for reproduction to spread over time and be managed more flexibly, matrimonial alliances and networks are formed. These are based on the exchange of women because anybody who gives out a pubescent woman, a valuable reproductive resource, wants to have another for compensation. Thus only those individuals who are in a position to return a woman in the foreseeable future can in principle take part in these transactions. To maintain their power to negotiate, elders must ensure that the girls of their community are available for exchange and hence must maintain control over the fate of the latter.

When elders start organizing matrimonial exchange, their authority which was initially based on their position in the organization of production for subsistence, is then transformed into an authority over the social reproduction. Matrimonial control now becomes desirable for them because it gives them power over a wider area than a simple management limited to productive activities in their own domestic community.

Meillassoux's interpretation thus makes the male acquisition of the control

over the reproductive process and the sexual power of women an essentially political event.²²

When the productive cell, in order to reproduce itself, must open itself to the outside world in order to secure wives, the elder's power tends to shift from control over subsistence to control over women — from the management of material goods to political control over people. Political authority gained through the control of women can be extended to a larger community than can an authority gained through the material management of subsistence. As the group grows, food management becomes burdensome while matrimonial politics is demonstrably more efficient.²³

Thus food production and its control for subsistence can be delegated to women and juniors while the management of matrimonial relations is seized by male elders.

I read Meillassoux's description of the male seizure of the managerial control over women's sexual power in reproduction as an account of the emergence of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction. The "defeat of the female sex" in this context means a loss of women's control over their fertility and sexuality in human reproduction to the male management of matrimonial relations. With the exchange of women between male elders, men became the subjects in human reproduction, the agents whose communities are being reproduced on their terms, and women became the objects of exchange, the living means for human reproduction.

This kind of change in the mode of human reproduction demonstrates that the male control of the reproductive relations is not something ascribed to them by nature, but the result of a political process with a history. That men had to assert male filiation is indicated in the plethora of laws which establish paternal links between men and their offspring and the coerciveness of the ideologies that have to be formed to uphold the male control over sexuality.²⁴

However, Meillassoux's account of this history has to be criticized for its immediate assertion of patriliney and the circulation of women only. It has to be qualified by an examination of those societies which established matrilineal filiation. We will return to this question in Chapter IV, in conjunction with the history of the matrilineal *Kwere* who make up the majority of the population in the village of Msoga.

The question of how men were able to seize power in the mode of human reproduction has also to be complemented by accounts of those features which helped them to acquire it — it is not likely that these developments took place with no resistance. The question can also be posed whether there was something for women to gain with the new mode in exchange for the loss of the power they previously held in terms of the control over their own body. Finally, however long it took to establish the patriarchal mode, the fact re-

mains that the assertion of male control over matrimonial relations signified a transformation from the adhesive to patriarchal relations of human reproduction.

Within the agricultural domestic community, where communal relations of production articulate with the patriarchal mode of human reproduction, the domination of women became a concrete reality through the "protection" of women as exchangeable agents. The gender relationship became thus characterised as that of female subordination. This is different from individual female dependence on individual men for subsistence in material terms identified with the bourgeois family.

Within the patriarchal mode of human reproduction articulated with a communal mode of production, no one woman is dependent on one particular man for her subsistence because of the nature of the communal relations of production and the equivalent concept of property. The rights to land for both men and women are mediated by their being members of the community. An individual's relation to the objective conditions of labour is mediated through her/his presence as a member of the commune and the individual can never appear "in a dot-like isolation in which he appears as mere full worker".²⁵

An isolated individual could no more have property in land and soil than he could speak. The relation to the earth as property is always mediated through the occupation of the land and soil by the tribe, the commune.²⁶

The inequality which exists in the domestic community is not primarily related to the access to the means of production, nor can the male/female relationships be characterised through exploitation of females by males in production. Rather the gender relationship is characterised by the fact that women have become reified, subordinated and controlled by the community with the elders at its apex primarily in the relations of human reproduction. What is being reproduced is the male dominated domestic community with women as its reified means of human reproduction. Their access to land and seeds or cattle and subsistence is conditioned by the subordination of their reproductive capacity to men. The primary contradiction between the sexes within the community is in the reproductive sphere while that in the productive sphere is a secondary one.

It is also important to reflect on the concept of *property*. Meillassoux points out that property as a category in its full meaning contains the rights of *usus*, *fructus* and *abusus*. As such it is linked to the market economy which allows products to be alienated and transformed into commodities i.e. which draws people into contractual relations of production, different in kind from those prevailing in the domestic community. According to Meillassoux the term

'property' is thus inappropriate even though it is commonly used. Instead, he suggests the concept of *patrimony*, which refers to "a good which belongs indivisibly to members of a community and is transferred by inheritance, gift or donation between its members, i.e. without counterclaim".²⁷

This notion has to be qualified, however, as it clearly assumes a circulation of goods between *men*. Hence, it can be only identified with the patriarchal mode of human reproduction.

It can also be concluded that the emergence of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction took place long before there was any private property in the sense of involving individual *usus*, *fructus* and *abusus*. This insight makes a reading of the history of the family and private property a more subtle and complicated one than that proposed by Engels.

The Pastoralist Domestic Community

Meillassoux's account of the agricultural domestic community can be complemented by looking at the pastoralist societies as well. A pastoralist domestic community can be conceptualized as being parallel to the agricultural community, from which it differs mainly on account of the different nature of the products and the production process in relation to its subsistence. The difference is essentially based on the difference between *what* (cereals or cattle) is being produced, rather than on the essential relations under which the production takes place. Even the fact that pastoralist societies are nomadic and not settled does not represent a very essential difference since shifting cultivators also move. Rather the essential similarity lies in the fact that both production systems are characterised by *delayed* returns as opposed to the immediate return in hunting and gathering societies. As in the agricultural domestic community, the production cycle of the pastoral domestic community with delayed returns demands cooperation between people in the domestic community who have to remain together so as to be able to appropriate the fruits of their joint labour.

Pierre Bonte²⁸ has described the main characteristics of production in pre-capitalist pastoralist societies. According to him, the domestication of animals implies the accumulation of human labour and its transmission in the form of herds. This means a clear-cut break at the level of social organization from that associated with hunting and gathering. The distinction made by Meillassoux between land as the subject of labour among hunters and gatherers and as an instrument of labour among cultivators can be applied to pastoralist production with pastures and domesticated animals being seen as

instruments of labour and means of production respectively. Thus in pastoral societies it becomes necessary to reproduce the conditions for the domestication of animals and the domestic units on a long term basis, taking into account technical factors such as the length of fallow observed for pastures and other environmental factors as well.²⁹

When domesticated animals become means of production for the pastoralist community, the domestic animals are primary consumers of vegetation while human beings become secondary consumers, through the animals. Domestic animals are thus intermediaries between nature and humans as secondary consumers. The herds are the means of production of the domestic groups, which are the units of appropriation of herds and of the distribution of its products.³⁰ The appropriation of the resources is communal by nature, with each domestic unit of production exploiting these resources in two ways: (a) through the family's possession of a herd and (b) through the appropriation of natural resources by the more or less stable association of these domestic groups within a cooperative or co-residential framework of camps.³¹

Bonte points out that the organization of production among pastoral nomads cannot be reduced to the opposition between domestic and communal production but that two levels of social organization have also to be distinguished. Firstly, the cooperative or co-residential groups or camps respond to the need for expanded cooperation between domestic groups among which labour-power and the means of production are unequally distributed at particular moments in the reproductive cycle of domestic groups. The composition of these groups varies in different societies and fluctuates in relation to environmental conditions and variations in the distribution of labour-power and animals among domestic groups. Secondly, the community collectively exploiting a set of natural resources, a given territory, engages in communal appropriation of resources.³²

Clearly, we have here the pastoralist equivalent to the domestic community as described by Meillassoux for agriculturalists.

Within pastoralist domestic communities, the composition and reproduction of the herds becomes closely linked up with the composition and the reproduction of the domestic community itself in terms of its households, which depend on the herds for their subsistence. According to Dahl and Hjort, the keeping of large herds is closely linked to the need to protect the household against the effects of droughts or epizootics as well as for food requirements during a particularly dry period. A sufficient number of animals must be able to survive a disaster so that the household can exist while the herd is being rebuilt.³³

Dahl and Hjort define the pastoral household as the minimum independent

societal unit containing sufficient personnel and an integral division of labour which enables it to carry out the most important tasks in looking after a herd and at the same time being of sufficient size to supply the household members with their requirements for milk and meat and occasionally blood. In this way the household can be regarded as the minimum management unit and there is an intimate link between herd size and household size.

Pastoral societies are further characterized by the constant redistribution of wealth in the form of animals, and no individual herd grows or decreases independently of other herds. Gifts are given or received and animals are borrowed or loaned. The necessity of redistribution mechanisms becomes apparent when there is a drastic reduction in herds following a drought.³⁴

As the reproduction of the herds is dependent on the appropriate number of cows and the reproduction of the domestic community is dependent on its ability to have an appropriate number of pubescent females, it is not surprising that an exchange of pubescent females becomes intimately linked up with and mediated by the exchange of cattle. Again, a woman is being reified as an important means for the reproduction of the domestic community, but more than that, her reproductive role is intimately tied with the reproduction of the productive assets (cattle) as well. As a result, the male "protection" and control over women becomes even more imperative than in the agricultural domestic community, and the power of the elders even more pronounced. This is because, as will be discussed later in Chapter IV, as means of production, cattle represent a more valuable economic resource than land under shifting cultivation.

The interlinkage between herd reproduction and the reproduction of the pastoralist domestic community is manifested not only in the exchange of cattle against a bride but also in the way in which cattle are allocated to women. To begin with, as a bride, the woman is allocated some cattle when she enters the new domestic unit. This will build up into a herd over whose milk she has usufruct rights and which will grow not only in terms of its natural pace but also according to the pace at which she gives birth to children. At the birth of each child, she is entrusted with new cattle, in the form of a patrimony which she keeps for her children. For instance, with the Parakuyo Maasai and the Arusha Maasai in Tanzania, the cattle given to the mother at the birth of a male child, will form part of his bridewealth cattle while those given at the birth of a female child will return to her father's herd (or the male head of that particular household).³⁵

The Significance of the Agricultural and Pastoralist Domestic Communities for an Understanding of the Patriarchal MOHR

The formation of the agricultural and pastoralist domestic communities proved to be significant in terms of understanding the patriarchal mode of human reproduction. It became important in these communities for male elders to gain control of social reproduction from within, and this they achieved by seizing the control of the sexual power of women and the matrimonial relations. The point to be emphasized is that this control emerged in a particular historical context with a certain combination of the level of both the forces of production and of human reproduction. Therefore, the question posed by some analysts as to why it should be necessary for men to control the women and not vice versa loses force. It cannot be argued in general terms that men have to control women in human reproduction but it can be demonstrated that, right or wrong, at certain points in history in some societies men *did* take over the control of matrimonial relations and of women as the means of human reproduction. Under certain historical circumstances men have been able to manipulate the difference in male and female sexual power in such a way as to enable men to become controllers of women's reproductive capacity and not vice versa.

The patriarchal MOHR that emerged can also be identified with a hierarchy that emerged between elders and juniors based in anteriority in production and between men and women as the latter were subordinated by men into living means of human reproduction. No longer could women so easily initiate mating relations nor were they able to go on controlling their fertility with the same caution as in hunting and gathering bands. With settled agriculture and food stores, the domestic community is more capable of taking care of children born at shorter intervals than in societies where women have to carry their children long distances while engaged in foraging activities.

From the time of the emergence of the patriarchal MOHR in conjunction with the agricultural and pastoralist domestic communities, male guardianship, control and supervision of women becomes a permanent characteristic of the mode of human reproduction. In the process, corresponding ideologies are formed.

Throughout the history of the patriarchal MOHR, philosophers (male) and authorities (the church and the state) have sought to reinforce patriarchal and hierarchical thinking and give it new justifications. For example, male authority of the domestic communities started to appear "natural", and was perpetuated for instance in the philosophical thinking of Aristotle which has

had a long lasting impact on Western thinking.³⁶ Other proponents and ideologues of patriarchy have been such representatives of the Christian Church as the apostle Paul and the saint Augustine.³⁷ It is only recently that feminist readings of history have started to bring to light powerful demonstrations of the way in which patriarchal ideologies have been formed and how they have influenced the lives of women.

As an ideology of male dominance over women and elders over juniors, patriarchy has not only shaped the mode of human reproduction but has also with time penetrated the relations of production. The way in which different types of sexual divisions of labour have been shaped is an indication of the different ways that the articulation of the MOP-MOHR has been conceptualized in different societies. Patriarchal considerations have been central in formulating the rationale for such practices. It is in this context that the fact that a woman's sexual power and her labour power reside in the same body has been manipulated to correspond to society's (and men's) other purposes and interests, especially in the relations of production. One familiar example would be the way in which women have been made into a reserve army of labour for instance in Europe. When there is a scarcity of workers like there was during the world wars, women have been accepted to the paid labour-force; when unemployment becomes a threat, women's childbearing role is emphasized and they are sent back home. Similar processes can be observed in the Third World, particularly in the Far East where patriarchal ideologies have had to absorb women's liberation to the extent that they can be sent to work in the world-market factories where they have been working under very unfavourable working conditions.³⁸

This section concludes that patriarchy began as an attribute of the mode of human reproduction which through its articulation with production relations has exerted its influence onto other areas of life as well. This conceptualization resolves the problems in the feminist discourse which have been manifested in the difficulties of defining patriarchy. As Rosalind Coward observed, the accounts of patriarchy "tend to be characterised by a surprising lack of attention to what patriarchal relations are and how they operate"³⁹ For a feminist strategy, it is essential to recognise the historical beginnings of patriarchy as a mode of human reproduction because of the implications of this recognition for the feminist strategy, both in research and in action.

Debates over Reproduction and Patriarchy

To conceive of patriarchy as a mode of human reproduction is not a new idea as such. This conceptualization has been suggested by at least some Marxist feminists, even if its proponents did not pursue or develop the idea further.

For instance Mackintosh took patriarchy as the characteristic relation of human reproduction which involved the control of the sexuality and fertility of women by men.⁴⁰ Further, she argued that "no theory of a mode of production is complete without a theory of the relations between men and women in the family".⁴¹ I certainly agree with her in the conviction that without the element of male/female relations in human reproduction, an important contradiction within the mode of production is missing.⁴²

McDonough and Harrison argued along the same lines when they stated that any further development of the concept of patriarchy must lie in the interrelation between the relations of production and the relations of human reproduction. However, their definition of the social relations of human reproduction remained empiricist and was, in fact, essentially a projection of the Western nuclear and monogamous family onto a more general theoretical plane. In their definition

The social relations of human reproduction are class specific relations. They comprise the form and control of the wife's sexual fidelity. Just as the labour process is always situated within a particular mode of production and its social relations, so is the procreative process. Historically, too the procreative process. . . has been shaped by a relation of control, the relation of patriarchy.⁴³

However, both McDonough and Harrison as well as Mackintosh lapsed into seeing patriarchy as a transhistorical phenomenon which has always existed. This came out particularly clearly in Mackintosh's critique of Meillassoux.

Mackintosh was among those critics who rejected his notion of the agricultural domestic community. In her assessment:

. . . no theory of the relations of human to social reproduction can be constructed for the "domestic agricultural community", because the problem of reproduction of the relations of human reproduction has been eliminated or ignored. The theory of the mode of production is incomplete. And it cannot be completed, because Meillassoux's construction is never located in time and space, it is supposed to be some universal first society.⁴⁴

The "failure of Meillassoux to situate the domestic community in time and space" has been noted by other empiricist critiques as well, for instance Edholm and others⁴⁵ and Burris.⁴⁶ However, these critiques fail to see the way in which Meillassoux gives the reader the tools to situate the agricultural domestic community in time and space. One does not reject the existence of

the capitalist mode of production on the basis of it being a theoretical construction only, but its existence can be tested and analysed in different social formations and in different historical contexts. Meillassoux's domestic community definitely does not refer to "some universal first society": in *Maidens, Meal and Money* he mentions other communities which *preceded* the agricultural domestic community, such as the hunting and gathering band. The mode of argument is in fact based on the definition of the agricultural domestic community in contradistinction to such societies that existed before it. The concept is essentially a theoretical abstraction, referring to a particular kind of society which can be identified in different times and places on the basis of the productive forces and the social relations of production that are implied by them. It is the task of concrete research to analyse and measure the societies studied against the heuristic device given by Meillassoux. His theoretical guideline for such an analysis suggests that

An analysis should start from the relations that develop between the producers and their means of production (particularly the land) and the social relations which are necessary for setting these means of production to work. The relations which unite producers depend on the means they employ, the labour processes and the nature of the product and its use.⁴⁷

Mackintosh, who rejects the approach, does so by saying that

A materialist analysis does not consist in deducing social relations from some "material fact" such as the productive forces, and indeed an attempt to make such a deduction will block any attempt to grasp the mutual determinations, the sources of power and the nature of oppression within any mode of production.⁴⁸

Her statement makes a basic theoretical error in its failure to grasp the nature of historical materialist analysis of modes of production, which sees a mode of production as a determinate of social relations forming a dialectical unity with a particular set of productive forces.⁴⁹ The agricultural domestic community in Meillassoux's theory is an abstracted category which can be identified in different places at different times when certain conditions prevail. Meillassoux did not contend that the domestic community is an ahistorical phenomenon which has "existed since prehistory". Therefore, Mackintosh is wrong to argue that:

It is not the domestic community which has existed since prehistory, but female subordination. Control of women's fertility and sexuality, labour and progeny, has *always* been sought by dominant groups and classes as means of control of reproduction of the social system. And this control *has always had to be fought for* and maintained by political, economic and ideological means.⁵⁰ (Emphasis mine)

The ahistoricity is fully on Mackintosh's side. In fact she bluntly posits an ahistorical and universal concept of patriarchy. She asserts further that

The form taken by the social relations of human reproduction is the patriarchal relations of men to women which dominated the relations of human sexuality and reproduction.⁵¹

As the discussion on the agricultural and the pastoralist domestic communities indicated, I agree with Mackintosh that patriarchy is a relation of human reproduction. But more than that, I argue that it is a *historical* mode of human reproduction, which by no means has always existed, and which I believe, it is possible to overthrow. This requires that its historical nature be understood and that the conditions for its overthrow (in terms of the productive and reproductive forces) are ripe. If patriarchy was a transhistorical phenomenon, as some anthropologists and socio-biologists together with large numbers of other people would like to think, there would not be much scope nor hope for women's movements, which, essentially, have been directed against the patriarchal MOHR. So far, only partial victories have been won, precisely because the material conditions for women becoming equal subjects of human reproduction with men have not yet been sufficiently realized.

One of the tasks of feminist research and strategy formation is to unravel the history of patriarchy. There is not just one history of one patriarchy but several histories because of the different conditions and the different pace at which it has taken shape. It is the task of historians to determine how the formation of patriarchy took place in different social formations and what forms its cultural manifestations have assumed. The outward forms of patriarchy as a cultural phenomenon may vary, but theoretically, all of them are subsumed into one reproductive mode, the patriarchal one. This is so as long as the principal relationship between men and women remains the same in its essence — men being the subjects and women the objectified means of human reproduction, whereby gender relations are characterised by male domination and female subordination. The persistence of the patriarchal MOHR has to do with the need of men to control the sexual power of women in procreation which goes on for as long as men have vested interests in controlling their own offspring and the reproduction of labour-power.

The key characteristics of patriarchy have taken different forms according to the nature of the production processes and the MOPs they have historically articulated with. So the practices of patriarchy in feudal societies, among landed aristocracy or vasallage may vary for instance with regard to whether inheritance of property is to the oldest or the youngest son and with regard to who has the responsibility of taking care of the old. The landless peasants and peasant women in particular may be exposed to different effects of

patriarchal relations. When articulated with capitalist relations, the patriarchal mode of human reproduction gradually developed and crystallized the male-headed nuclear family as a domestic unit of human reproduction.

It is only when patterns of inheritance and systems of taking care of the old have become publicly mediated that patriarchy and the male domination of women start to lose importance and change. This requires an adequate wage and social security system as a basis for an individual's reproduction from birth to death and a notion of the worker as an individual, a man or a woman, instead of a notion of the worker as a man with dependents. The emergence of a completely new mode of human reproduction, however, only takes place with significant changes in the forces and relations of human reproduction. It is only now that we are witnessing the emergence of such elements that point to a new reproductive mode, here called the *atomistic mode of human reproduction*. Some of its key characteristics will be discussed in the following chapter in order to indicate that theoretically at least, an alternative to patriarchy as a MOHR can be figured out, even if it has not yet taken full shape.

The next chapter will outline some of the elements of this new reproductive mode. A juxtaposition of the atomistic and the patriarchal MOHRs will be accompanied with some more clarification of the theoretical ground before embarking onto an analysis of the case study of the village of Msoga.

References

1. Meillassoux 1981.
2. The term adhesive has been adopted from Meillassoux (1981) who uses it to denote both relations of production and reproduction.
3. Leacock 1972.
4. Leacock 1972, 10—17.
5. Meillassoux 1981, 14—22.
6. Ibid, 16.
7. Ibid, 15.
8. Ibid, 16—17.
9. Cf Sahlin 1976, 11, for instance.
10. Meillassoux 1981, 17. Cf Bleek 1931, 279 for the Hadza in Tanzania.
11. Cf Draper 1975 about !Kung Bushmen. Bali's account of the Hadza accords well with Draper's observations (Bali 1985).
12. Lee 1979.
13. Ibid, 310—315.
14. Ibid, 317—332.
15. Ibid.
16. Ibid, 54—72.

17. Ibid, 450—451. Cf Draper 1975; Rohrllich-Leavitt & al 1975; Etienne and Leacock 1980; Leacock 1983.
18. Meillassoux 1981, 3.
19. Marx 1972, 175.
20. Meillassoux 1981, 40—42.
21. Ibid, 31.
22. Ibid, 40—49.
23. Ibid, 45.
24. Ibid.
25. Marx 1972, 485—486.
26. Ibid, 485.
27. Meillassoux 1981, 36.
28. Bonte 1981.
29. Bonte 1981, 25.
30. Ibid, 24.
31. Ibid, 26—27.
33. Ibid, 27.
33. Dahl and Hjort 1976, 21.
34. Ibid, 21—22.
35. Oral communication from Steven Wanga, Lugoba, August 1980. UVN.
36. Patoluoto 1981, 88; Manninen 1984, 37; Badinter 1981, 8—10.
37. Badinter 1981, 10—15.
38. Elson and Pearson 1981.
39. Coward 1983, 270.
40. Mackintosh 1977, 122.
41. Ibid, 126.
42. Ibid.
43. McDonough and Harrison 1978, 37.
44. Mackintosh 1977, 123.
45. Edholm, Harris and Young 1977.
46. Burris 1982.
47. Meillassoux 1981, 10.
48. Mackintosh 1977, 121.
49. Bernstein 1975; Mustafa 1977.
50. Mackintosh 1977, 127.
51. Ibid.

Chapter III

The Atomistic Mode of Human Reproduction — Problems of a Transition

It is with the emergence of elements of an *atomistic¹ mode of human reproduction* that the real possibility for reproductive equality between men and women is beginning to materialize. We can now talk only of emerging elements of this new mode because nowhere has an atomistic MOHR crystallized into a dominant mode of human reproduction. What shape it will finally take, or how it will transform the patriarchal reproductive mode which is currently based on the existence of male-headed families in large parts of the world, is still open. In the process of coming into being of the atomistic mode, the patriarchal family is being replaced as the basic cell of society by the atomistic individual, a man or a woman, as this basic cell. This process involves the male control of the reproductive relations and the sexual power of women losing the significance it had in the patriarchal MOHR.

The current stage of the mode of human reproduction is a transitional one, characterised by a crisis in the patriarchal mode of human reproduction, which is disintegrating under attack from elements of the atomistic mode of human reproduction working towards a new mode. The current contradictions are both an outcome of the effects of the capitalist mode of production on reproductive relations as well as their manifestation in the ideological struggles channeled through the women's movements. In my view, this struggle is likely to lead to a transformation of the reproductive domestic unit, the domestic community, and the family, into new modes of interaction between the state and atomistic individuals organized in various types of longer or shorter term associations.

Even if the domestic unit may retain the outward form of a family, the new mode of human reproduction will mean a restructuring of the gender relations within it. One of the basic changes will be the overthrow of patriarchy i.e. the male domination in the family and the labour market which will entail a restructuring of the reproduction process between the "private" and the "public" spheres. Both of these changes are already underway, but this pro-

cess is fraught with contradictions as patriarchy does all it can to prop up its old hegemony.

In essence, the current developments in the social relations for human reproduction, together with the current stage of the proletarianization process, point to a *shift from the family as the "basic cell" of society into the atomistic individual (man or woman, with or without dependents) as this basic unit*. If the contradiction between the "public" and the "private" within the patriarchal mode of human reproduction takes the form of the state versus the male-headed family, under the atomistic mode this opposition will be one between the state and the atomistic individual. This is the logical end-point of the history of the organization of the reproductive relations from larger to smaller units, from the extended family to the nuclear one, and consequently from the nuclear family to the atomistic individual.

Relations of Mating: A Separation of the Sexual Relations for Procreation and for Recreation

At the level of the *relations of mating*, we can now observe as signs of the emerging atomistic mode of human reproduction the gradual transformation of women *from objects and/or means* of human reproduction within the patriarchal mode *into more equal subjects* of human reproduction with men. This is because of their increasing ability to choose or reject motherhood without patriarchal control. For women this means an increasing ability to control their own sexuality and fertility, the realization of their sexual power and the amount and quality of their reproductive labour.

Changes in the forces and relations of human reproduction brought along by the large-scale adoption of the contraceptive pill contribute towards a liberation of the relations of mating because both men and women can effectively distinguish between *sex for procreation* and *sex for recreation*. Certainly, this separation has always existed as a possibility, but more so for men than for women.

Nevertheless, better contraceptive technology can affect the social relations of human reproduction only onesidedly: by giving women the ability to *reject* motherhood through preventive measures. It is only the advances in reproductive technology that have expanded women's possibility to *choose* motherhood in addition to being able to reject it. It is the new medical competence in inducing pregnancies through artificial insemination, *in vitro* fertilization and surrogate motherhood² that have opened the possibility for

women to get better access to male seed and conception irrespective of their marital status or relationship to any man. Whether these technologies are implemented under patriarchal or atomistic relations is a point of debate which is an indication of the contradictions between the old patriarchal MOHR and the elements of the emerging atomistic MOHR.

It is worth remembering also that so far the contraceptive technology has been developed under patriarchal relations, and asymmetrically: it is mainly implemented on the female body which has also carried the risks involved. How this technology is "pregnant" with politics is also manifested in the way the experiments involved have been carried out on the bodies of women of the Third World. The implementation of population policies also had a class bias in the case of sterilization of males in India for instance, where the objects of contraceptive measures have been the poor powerless men.³

Relations of Filiation

At the same time, *relations of filiation* are in the process of change. New reproductive technologies may have an impact in lessening the ideological emphasis on the biological basis of reproduction. Consequently, there is potentially more space for socially rather than biologically defined parenting. Even previously social parenting was possible through adoption but this mainly took place under patriarchal relations. Within the atomistic MOHR, the adopting unit doesn't need to be a patriarchal family, but adoption should be possible to various types of atomistic unions, even single individuals. Tensions between biological and social parenting, patriarchy and atomism have already given rise to ideological debates which are characteristic of the transitional stage between the patriarchal and the atomistic MOHRs. Gender issues are also involved in the possibility for choosing the sex of children or in the possibility of aborting a child of unwanted sex. Philosophically these issues boil down to the questions of who is considered to be the ultimate authority of human reproduction: whether the decision lies with "nature" or "God" or with human authorities and if so, with the state or with individuals, from a male or a female, patriarchal or atomistic perspective.

While advances in the forces of human reproduction in terms of contraceptive technology and reproductive engineering mean the possibility for major changes in sexual relations, they are not a sufficient condition for a major change in the entire *mode* of human reproduction. Even if the changes in the forces of human reproduction can lead to a greater equality between men and women as subjects in sexual relations for procreation and for recreation, this

is not enough. Advances in reproductive technology do not alone and by themselves liberate women from patriarchal domination unless the social relations of human reproduction (most notably those of filiation) change on a wider basis. Becoming a subject in human reproduction requires a material basis both in terms of the biological process of reproduction as well as in the ability to take care of the offspring. Both have to be accompanied by an egalitarian ideology which has to be forged in sometimes forceful debates regarding not only who appropriates the child but also regarding the division of reproductive labour. Even if women's options in choosing motherhood have become a possibility, the physical opportunity of women becoming "reproductive subjects" on an equal footing with men does not make much sense unless there is a material base for the nurture, care and rearing of the children, lest women remain captives of reproductive labour more than ever. A new subjectivity for women has only been made possible by the emergence of the atomistic individual in the proletarianization process and the *wage* as the basis for individual reproduction.

The Atomistic Individual

When the proletarianized individual selling her labour-power is more and more often a woman, the patriarchal concept of the worker as the "man and his dependents" is gradually giving way to the new proletarian or propertied individual, the *atomistic individual* of either sex with or without dependents. Basically, the atomistic individual is a single person standing on her/his own in the social relations of production and of human reproduction. The atomistic individual enters into relations of production in a direct contract between her/him and the employer (capital, the state etc.) so that her access to the means of subsistence is not mediated by a relationship of dependency to a man. A housewife subsisting on the male wage would not be an atomistic individual until she establishes herself as a person subsisting on her own earnings or property and old age security allotted to her in *her person*, not for instance in the name of a late husband. Her male counterpart is a man who does not depend on unpaid female domestic labour nor does he count on support from his own children in old age. The wages rather than a dependency between generations mediated by kin or between sexes mediated by matrimony have become the basis of reproduction for individuals from birth to death.

The ideology that emerges within this process posits the atomistic individual as a self-reliant subject who is not dependent on another person either for her/his subsistence or for reproduction in old age, but who subsists on the

basis of individually accumulated old age security. The relations of filiation of the patriarchal mode have lost significance because the family (except for the rich) is collapsing as an economic infrastructure⁴: the relations of intrafamilial and generational dependency are taken over by other ways of structuring the relationship between those who produce and those who do not.

What follows is a shift from the dependence between approximate generations at the level of the domestic unit into a publicly mediated one. The fact that interpersonal dependence for one's reproduction loses significance has implications for the nature of the new domestic unit/s and the organization of the domestic sphere. An analysis of the mode of human reproduction will thus require an analysis of the interaction between the "domestic" and the "public" spheres, both of which experience the effects of the restructuring of the relations of human reproduction.⁵

The fact that patriarchy is losing its basis in the form of family property and men's individual quest for offspring for old age security is vanishing, in its turn contributes to the liberalization of the social relations of human reproduction. This is one aspect that has aided the emergence of permissive ideologies vis-à-vis the use of various reproductive and contraceptive technologies. Women can be given more freedom in sexual relations because men no longer need to be so interested in having their own children for old age security. The same concern is removed to the level of the state and population policies — into a worry about a "correct" ratio between those in the productive age and those who depend on publicly mediated transfers of income and pensions.

Under such circumstances, the question may be posed whether the strength of women's movements now is partly due to the very erosion of patriarchy — when men, as guardians of patriarchal relations and representatives of capital, can now "afford" to allow women's liberation to take place, or, whether it is because the world has now gained a better "understanding" of the plight of women.

Despite these kinds of developments, long term struggles for an egalitarian MOHR are still ahead: "atomism" has not permeated any society yet and a security for life-long maintenance on the basis of wages has remained a privilege for the few. Patriarchy is also getting aggressive as it is put on the defensive. The women's movements, debates over the women's question and gender relations are part and parcel of the transformation in the MOHR, as the result of the economic crisis of capitalism and the economic and ideological crisis of patriarchy. The crisis and its manifestations have a deepgoing impact on human interaction both in the labour-market and in private life. In both, life-long bonds are gradually being replaced by short-

term contracts, contacts, and associations. People both move away from life-long marriages and "life-long" employment into consecutive short term unions and contracts and short term relationships with labour-unions; from a life-long support of a certain party or ideology to short term commitments and struggles over particular issues such as suburban committees, ecological issues, women's liberation groups and the like. The atomistic MOHR is accompanied by new ideological and cultural expressions manifested in new types of human interaction and alliances. People may have to form new types of affiliation for mutual support outside the "official" channels not mediated by patriarchal relations of dependency.

To sum up, the emerging atomistic elements are the result of two simultaneous processes: the proletarianization process under capitalism and the changes in the forces of human reproduction that are articulated with it. Women's greater equality with men is partly an outcome of the tendency of capitalism to transform all social relationships into those between capital and labour irrespective of sex, accompanied by the achievements of human rights and women's movements which have fought for equality between men and women as workers and as legal individuals. Insofar as individual people irrespective of their sex become potential holders of contracts, property and legal rights, women are freed from dependency on men and from guardianship by men. That their equality with men remains a partial victory is both because no full equality in the sense of human rights has been achieved so far despite a number of improvements. Also, during a transition period when the patriarchal MOHR is collapsing and the new one has not been forged yet, a number of women may "fall in between" by losing benefits from both — so for instance in the case of lost benefits of an alimony or a widow's pension. So far, also the equality of men and women as proletarians has not only not been fully achieved yet, but the class relationship will continue to polarize atomistic individuals with regard to access to the means of subsistence and their ability to reproduce themselves.

The way in which reproduction operates at a general level continues to differ according to the political economy of a social formation. The relationship between the atomistic individual and the state differs in the same way and becomes one of the *foci* through which the form to be taken by the atomistic MOHR will be forged.

Class and Gender and Human Reproduction

The issue of class and gender remains on the agenda because a possible overthrow of patriarchy does not in itself do away the inequalities that are due to the contradiction between classes. A history of the domestic units would show how a polarization in people's ability to reproduce has been manifested in the differences of the composition of the domestic units and the well-being of their members. In the early stages of capitalism the proletarians in Europe were not able to lead a family life equivalent to that of the bourgeoisie. In some countries, the proletarians were even prohibited by law from entering marriage. For instance in Germany, this prohibition was only abolished in 1868. Until then, the ideas of Malthus prevailed which considered large proletarian masses as a threat to global food sufficiency. It was even argued that the poor should curb their sexual "instincts" because otherwise there would be too many poor for the scarce food supply. Proletarians were only allowed to marry following criticisms against Malthus and the concerns of reproducing labour power from within the working classes themselves.⁶

The ideological formation of the so-called family wage contributed to consolidating the worker-individual as the man with a wife and children as his dependents. This both served to drive women out of competition with men in the labour market and to cheapen the cost of reproduction of labour-power through the domestic labour of women.⁷ In this aim, working class men allied with capitalists in the consolidation of the patriarchal MOHR, despite the fact that the family wage tended to remain illusory for the working classes whose women still had to seek work outside home while going on with domestic labour as well. What exactly the contribution of women's housework has been in the reproduction of capital came up forcefully again in the domestic labour debate carried out in the 1970's, initiated by Wally Secombe.⁸ Without going into the debate here, to my mind, we cannot ask *in abstracto* if domestic labour creates surplus value or not. Instead, we have to ask whose domestic labour creates surplus value and who appropriates it because this is a question which poses the issue of class and gender very centrally.

The relationship between people in the exploited and exploiting classes is a class contradiction which is centrally shown in the differences in their ability to maintain (reproduce) themselves and their children. It is at this level of human reproduction that classes and the class relationships themselves become reproduced. Not only is the family's ability to reproduce itself dependent on its class position but also, at the same time, classes themselves are perpetuated through the dynamics of the mode of human reproduction. It is in the process of class formation that the relations of production in fact be-

come relations of human reproduction and the relations of human reproduction actually depend on the relations of production. Within the patriarchal MOHR, women are forced to share the same class position with their husbands, when the man is posited as the individual and women and children as his dependents.⁹

The exploiting classes reproduce themselves precisely because of their access to surplus value. Consequently they are able to enjoy a real family wage which will allow them a standard of living with servants, recreational activities and children adequately fed and clad and well educated. The exploited classes, however, are only able to reproduce themselves with difficulty through their surplus and necessary labour, i.e. labour which is socially necessary. The contradiction between classes at the level of human reproduction is precisely about what is considered the socially necessary minimum for the survival of the proletarianized classes.

The class difference is also manifested between women who belong to the exploiting classes through their access to the socially produced surplus value and the women of the exploited classes whose surplus labour indirectly contributes to the creation of this surplus. The mode of human reproduction structures the gender-relationship and consequently, the position of women under the patriarchal MOHR is mediated by their dependency on men and the ideology of the reproductive mode. When domestic labour is seen as part of the reproductive process, it cannot be considered that domestic labour carried out by all women creates surplus-value for capitalist production because some women are able to enjoy the surplus-value in the form of a real family wage mediated by the patriarchal MOHR. The reproductive labour of the wives (or their servants) in the exploiting classes is thus being compensated for by the surplus value generated by the exploited classes, made up of both men and women. It is only through the emergence of the proletarianized and atomistic individual of either sex that the class and gender fusion can potentially be resolved. But even then, to start with, the class contradiction remains.

In fact, the very emergence of elements of an atomistic MOHR can be seen as a manifestation of intensifying class contradictions. While atomism is a phenomenon now observable in the advanced capitalist countries, problems of human reproduction in the Third World continue to be manifested in the high rate of infant mortality and short life expectancy.¹⁰ Thus the contradictory effect of the capitalist mode of production on human reproduction is essentially one and the same process globally: at the one end, one can observe the emergence of the atomistic individual and at the other, the impoverished mother in the Third World whose children die prematurely of starvation and disease and who is exploited at the level of production and squeezed to the extreme as a subject of human reproduction. Within this perspective, the issue

of human reproduction brings into relief some of the essential contradictions in the position of women in the advanced capitalist countries and in the Third World. These are part and parcel of the contradictions in the reproduction of labour power within integrated capitalism and in countries where human reproduction continues to be left to the workers' individual inclinations.

This argument necessitates a further discussion on how the differences in human reproduction in fact come about. What is the relationship between an atomistic individual and, say, a member of a domestic community in the Third World? An atomistic individual was defined as a person whose reproduction is secured throughout life. The point to be emphasized is that the atomistic individual is not an individual subsisting on the so-called "bachelor's wage", a person whose wage only covers the reconstitution of the labour-power consumed at the site of capitalist (or socialist) production. By definition, an atomistic individual is one whose full reproduction is covered from birth to death. In Meillassoux's words, the full reproduction of workers implies that their incomes should cover their individual needs throughout their lives irrespective of the amount of labour-power they actually supply. If workers are to be reproduced in a real sense within integrated capitalism, Meillassoux argues, the cost of their reproduction is to be carried by the capitalist mode of production.¹¹ If workers are to be reproduced in a real sense, the wage should cover the following three elements of the real value of labour-power: 1) the *sustenance* of the workers during periods of employment, i.e. the reconstitution of their immediate labour-power; 2) the *maintenance* during periods of unemployment (which may be due to stoppages, ill-health and so on); and 3) the *replacement* of the workers by breeding of offspring. Historically, it is mainly the first of these three elements, the sustenance of the labour-power as a commodity, that has been covered by the wage in practice.

To illustrate his case, Meillassoux takes the example of contemporary France, where the minimum wage is calculated to cover the needs of a bachelor, thus a person who is not reproducing. The implicit assumption is that "he is employed uninterruptedly for the total number of workable hours in the year", thus presupposing that "he is never ill or unemployed and that he dies at the age of his retirement",¹²

This is what was also assumed by the colonial capitalist employers who recruited labourers to the plantations in countries like Tanzania, and this is a consideration which will also be of critical importance in the analysis of Msoga village which follows. The wages in the plantations of colonial Tanganyika were based on the simple reconstitution of the labour power in the cheapest possible way, and were only designed to cover the period of stay of the worker at the plantation. Nutritionists calculated the minimum re-

quirements of food needed for the worker to keep him at work. At the same time the politicians were concerned that the food rations should not be shared by anybody else, such as the workers' wives and relatives, in order to ensure that the expenses incurred really met the needs of the individual owner of the commodity labour-power and nobody else.¹³ Simple reproduction in the employer's eyes did not take into consideration the existence of any family nor any needs of a human life over and above the reconstitution of the immediate labour-power for production purposes.

In Europe, the capitalist employers showed similar tendencies, but were met by the reaction of the workers' struggles for better conditions of work and wages. This was not achieved in the colonies, where the workers were not in a position to organize themselves; any attempt to do so was effectively blocked.¹⁴ The concern shown by the ruling classes in Europe about social unrest and the loss of family life among the workers¹⁵ did not reach the colonies where the labourers were out of sight and out of mind and thus could not pose a threat to their social peace. Their well-being only attracted attention when the workers started dying in large numbers due to malnutrition and diseases and were found to be defective for work and for military recruitment or when their labour was in great demand by the colonial state.¹⁶

The current concern for the "basic needs" of the Third World by international agencies is but one variation of the same theme — taking care of the masses with the least of expenditure and concessions from the advanced capitalist countries. The root question is — what is the minimum required to satisfy the basic needs? What are the minimal needs of the people in the Third World that have to be satisfied so that these people will not become a threat to world peace and don't seek to overthrow the dominant and exploitative relations of imperialism?¹⁷ The basic needs discourse (particularly carried out within the ILO and UNICEF)¹⁸ is fundamentally a discourse for the establishment, for those in power. From a radical and anti-imperialist Third World perspective the issue is, of course, not of defining and fulfilling minimal basic needs for the continuation of imperialist domination, but the removal of this domination and the demand for the best possible life in the Third World as well.

The issue about how the improved reproduction of the workers and their dependents can be achieved, links up with the question of how the productive adults will be produced and reproduced by a social formation, how the costs will be covered, the labour carried out, as well as on whose terms this whole process will take place. One path, as we saw above, has been to struggle for the integration of these costs into social production. In different countries, this has been resolved in various ways, depending on the national economy, the nature of the labour movement and its impact in a particular social forma-

tion. In some capitalist countries, such as France, this may have been resolved through the payment of indirect wages in the form of fringe benefits¹⁹ or through social security systems based on transfers of income from one section of the population to another through taxation and obligatory payments for old age pension and health insurance, such as in Great Britain, West Germany and the Scandinavian countries.

In some countries the question of reproductive costs may have been left unresolved, if no demands, or no opportunity for demands, for instance through the ban on strikes, have been there for workers. It is one of Meillassoux's central arguments that, where the proletariat is paid only direct hourly wages and the reproduction and the maintenance of labour-power is not taken care of within the sphere of capitalist production, this will necessarily be borne by another mode of production, the domestic mode.²⁰

Within this perspective, underdevelopment in the Third World is fundamentally caused by a reproductive process which creates the wealth of the capitalist sector on the one hand and the underdevelopment of the Third World on the other: it is by establishing organic relations between capital and domestic communities that imperialism set up the mechanism for reproducing cheap labour-power to its profit.²¹ Meillassoux argues that in this process the capitalist economy works to preserve the domestic community on which it depends for the reproduction of its labour-power and yet, at the same time it works to destroy it. According to Meillassoux, in the encounter between the capitalist mode of production and the Third World, it is the "domestic mode of production" that is left to bear the cost of reproduction of labour-power in the advanced capitalist countries.²² Consequently, it can be argued that the "self-reliant" atomistic individual of the advanced capitalist countries appears at the cost of the reproduction of the domestic community in the Third World. In the following, we move into an examination of the validity of the concept of the "domestic mode of production", especially because of the importance of the argument for an analysis of the position of women and reproductive relations within Third World social formations.

A Domestic Mode of Production — Does It Exist?

Meillassoux's notion of the "domestic mode of production" aroused critical comments, partly made with reference to the domestic labour debate and its concern about the nature of housework under capitalism. One of the questions in this debate was whether housework could be seen as a vestige of pre-capitalist modes of production or else, could it be considered a distinct mode

of production. Some of the feminist and marxist critics who rejected both options also went on to reject Meillassoux's notion of the domestic mode of production as well because, as it was argued, taken to its logical conclusion the existence of the domestic mode of production would also make the case for a housework mode of production.²³ However, this point was not fully justified because a careful reading of Meillassoux's definition of the domestic MOP would not allow for such an identification.

If we go back to *Maidens, Meal and Money*, Meillassoux actually operates with three notions built around domestic relations, namely, the agricultural domestic community, the domestic society and the domestic mode of production. In his definition, the *agricultural domestic community* has an organized capacity for production and reproduction, which goes on from one generation to the next. This distinguishes it from the hunting and gathering band, which is only maintained through the adhesive relations in the process of fission and fusion. The band is only able to maintain itself, while the agricultural domestic community is capable of reproducing itself.²⁴ The social organization of the agricultural domestic community is based both upon the relations of production and upon the relations of reproduction necessary to perpetuate the productive cell. This domestic community has existed since the neolithic period and came about with the shift to agriculture with delayed returns.

The reproductive capacity of the domestic community is not an internal one but requires relations with other similar communities because its ability to reproduce itself depends on the political capabilities of the elders to negotiate with other similar communities an exchange of reproducers, i.e. women, seen as the means of human reproduction. The central product of the domestic community in its reproduction is human energy, labour-power. It is one of Meillassoux's central arguments that an important part of the reproduction of the labour-power necessary for the development of capitalism still depends on the domestic community and its modern form, the family. The *domestic society*, then is a collectivity of domestic communities which is also said to correspond to a *matrimonial area* "covering the space occupied by all communities involved with each other in matrimonial exchanges":

The domestic community does not constitute a society by itself, but only in its association for reproductive purposes, with other similar communities. Whether achieved through violence or law, this necessary association creates a delimited social entity, a collectivity which corresponds to a matrimonial area covering the space occupied by all the communities involved with each other in matrimonial exchanges. This collectivity (if isolated from the market economy) may be considered a *society* based on combined relations of production and reproduction which, at the level of the productive forces to which they correspond, constitute what may be named the *domestic mode of production*.²⁵

When defined in this way, the notion of the domestic mode of production cannot possibly be identified with housework under capitalism.

My argument is that the significance of Meillassoux's contribution is not in his concept of the domestic mode of production, but in his emphasis on the dimension of *reproduction* for both an analysis of underdevelopment as well as for an understanding of the position of women. His argument makes a significant contribution to the historical materialist analysis of the position of women and of reproductive relations on at least two levels: it shows, albeit indirectly, the necessity for an analysis of imperialism for both feminism and the "women in development" discourse;²⁶ also it indicates the centrality of the reproductive processes for an analysis of the position of women both in a historical perspective and in all social formations. The notion of imperialism has for too long been practically non-existent in Western feminist discourse as well as being absent in the pragmatic analyses of the authorities on the "Women in development discourse" such as Boserup and Rogers.²⁷

Having agreed with Meillassoux this much, there is still space for a critical note on his notion of the *domestic mode of production*. But my argument is that it has to be done from the perspective of the *modes* of human reproduction. Meillassoux made a valid point in his emphasis on the importance of understanding how *both* the relations of production and reproduction operate in a social formation at the same time. One of the key points in this discourse is the observation that

The relationships to ensure reproduction are of a different kind from those formed around production so that, as Leroi-Gourhan noted, there are always at least two different levels of social organization: that of the productive cell, and that of the reproductive group. If there is to be a (domestic) 'mode of production' it is here, in this gathering of productive units that it is to be found.²⁸

The problem with Meillassoux's analysis is not that he did not appreciate the role of women in production as was argued by some of his critics.²⁹ Instead, the major weakness is that despite a recognition of the two levels of social organization, Meillassoux does not pursue an analysis based on this insight. Instead, he labels the relations of mating and filiation (which the matrimonial exchanges and the reproduction of labour-power actually refer to) as elements of a mode of production. In so doing he negates his major theoretical contribution himself. The problem with the domestic mode of production is that it conflates productive and reproductive relations under one term.

For Meillassoux, domestic relations may refer to both those of production and of reproduction. This is because his analysis is of the particular case of an agricultural domestic community where, as he himself notes, the productive and reproductive relations *merge* both institutionally and organiza-

tionally. Consequently, Meillassoux fails to see the two sets of relations and ignores the possibility of situations where they do *not* merge. Meillassoux's otherwise powerful and seminal analysis is flawed because he lacks the notion of the mode of human reproduction.³⁰ This is fatal because it is only by taking a specific look at the gender relations in human reproduction that we can pursue an analysis which separates the relations of production and of human reproduction. It is only after separating these that we can understand the particular nature of their articulation within the agricultural domestic community, and more than that, we can see how their articulation operates in other societies where they do not merge.

This insight is important because there is a tension between the MOP and the MOHR whose unity was posited as a dialectical one within the theoretical framework presented in this work. There are moments when the relations of production and of human reproduction do merge, but there are situations when they do not. The very tension between the MOP and the MOHR is caused by the tendency of the MOP to "harness" the MOHR to serve its interests, to subordinate the relations of production to be such that are most beneficial for the reproduction of the *productive* relations. From the point of view of *human reproduction*, which stands opposed to the MOP, human beings have always engaged in a struggle to make production serve the purposes of human reproduction i.e. to attain a better life. The contradiction between the MOP and the MOHR is at its starkest under imperialism which, as the highest form of capitalism, works to simultaneously mould the MOHR to serve the purposes of the production process and to destroy the domestic community.

Rejecting the notion of the domestic MOP, I would retain that of the domestic community, which I take as the site of the articulation of the relations of production and human reproduction. The logical flaw caused by defining the domestic mode of production merely in terms of the historical level of development of the productive forces to which it corresponds³¹ can be resolved by seeing the level of the productive forces as a characteristic of the MOP, while the reproductive forces and relations are characteristic of the mode of human reproduction. Meillassoux has conflated these models simply because of the nature of the articulation of the relations of production and of human reproduction within the agricultural domestic community. His theoretical clarity has thus been obscured by his empiricist basis.

The reason why Meillassoux does not satisfy a feminist analyst in terms of understanding the gender relations within the agricultural domestic community is also because he does not carry through his analysis of the relations of human reproduction in terms of contradictions inherent in the reproductive process. He has made a significant contribution to materialist feminist

analysis in giving us the clues for seeing how the patriarchal mode of human reproduction came into being. All the elements for an understanding of the differences of various modes of human reproduction can be found in his text, but he does not make the point because he does not theorize around the gender relations inherent in the process of human reproduction.

What for Meillassoux is an articulation between the capitalist and the domestic modes of production has to be reconceptualized. There are two levels of articulation operating at the same time in an encounter between the pre-capitalist and the penetrating capitalist relations of production: at the same time there is an articulation between the patriarchal mode of human reproduction which is disintegrating and elements of an atomistic mode of human reproduction which are beginning to emerge.

Consequently, if we accept the notion that in any social formation two processes operate at the same time, the process of production and the process of human reproduction, we can simply replace the "domestic mode of production" with the concept of the mode of human reproduction. Currently in Third World social formations it is under the patriarchal mode of human reproduction, located in the domestic community and organized as the relations of human reproduction, that labour-power is being produced and reproduced.

The Articulation of MOP—MOHR and the Study of Msoga Village

A move into studying the village of Msoga in coastal Tanzania at once poses a challenge to the theoretical framework which gave such historical scope to the patriarchal mode of human reproduction and so much significance to the debated notion of the agricultural domestic community. This is not only because to apply a theory in practice always poses some problems, but in particular because the *Kwere* population of Msoga village is *matrilineal* by tradition. Even Meillassoux seemed to assume that the emergence of the agricultural domestic community *implied* patriliney³² and suggested that to deal with matriliney would require its own theory.³³

Indeed, the notion of matriliney has been considered somewhat of a puzzle within anthropological theory ever since the discipline became preoccupied with kinship studies.³⁴ Reading about matrilineal peoples in preparation for my research in Msoga I got somewhat alarmed by the obviously androcentric approach through which the issue has been dealt with. Even such researchers

as Audrey Richards, whose study on the Bemba made her an authority on matrilineal societies, wrote from an astonishingly male perspective. She seemed to be more concerned about the ambivalent position of the *man* within the matrilineal context than that of women. For Richards, the "matrilineal puzzle" (a term coined by her) meant the question of the man's status within marriage. Together with her male colleagues she was concerned about, for instance, the conflicting loyalties a man had to face between his "own" kin and that of his wife. "How do brothers divide authority with the husband of their sister who is living elsewhere?" was one of the problems posed by Richards at the same time as seeming to deplore the fact that "in matrilineal societies the man's control over his wife can never be complete even if this can be balanced by the power he can gain by virtue of the brideservice . . ."³⁵ These concerns have persisted in anthropological literature and have also been absorbed into Tanzanian research on the *Kwere*. Following on from Oldaker, Wembah-Rashid, who has provided extensive descriptions on their social organization, also regretted the subordinated position of the husband who could not feel secure while staying with his in-laws. His productive initiative was curbed because "What he produced was consumed by more people from his wife's clan than he could consume as a single person himself".³⁶ Mbilinyi correctly pointed out that the description of the "strangeness" with in-laws could as well be the description of the majority of peasant women in Tanzania within a patrilineal context.³⁷

To come to grips with the issues of kinship and the notion of the agricultural domestic community, my study will not take these as its starting point. Following my proposal for a theory of the modes of human reproduction, I will take as my starting point the central concepts developed for this framework. Hence, the analysis starts from a look into the forces and relations of production and of human reproduction. Thus, the procedure comes close to Meillassoux's prescription for the identification of the agricultural domestic community which was a combination of an analysis of the forces of production and the mode of circulating women. Following my critique of his lack of the notion of the MOHR, the "mode of circulating women" is replaced by an analysis of the MOHR. Asking the essential questions of who marries whom and who appropriates the offspring will enable the research to delineate the MOHR at the same time as focusing on the male/female relations. In so doing the starting point is *not* an assumption that it is women who are circulated. Instead, the research looks at old issues, such as kinship, from a higher level of abstraction.

Because of the central importance given to the notion of the articulation of the MOP-MOHR, the presentation will move to and fro between an analysis of the relations of production and those of human reproduction. The focus

is to try and understand the problems of Msoga villagers and especially those of women in the production and reproduction of their daily lives at present.³⁸ In order to gain a historical perspective, chapters IV and V will start from a discussion of the forces and relations of production. Chapter VI will bring into focus some of the problems that link the village into national and international political relations. Against this background, the last chapter will then present fragments of individual life histories in order to provide a village profile. Its purpose is to illustrate and analyse how women, men and children live their lives in a coastal village in Tanzania — how their maintenance and reproduction is secured at different stages of their lives — during the productive years of adulthood, the pre-productive years of childhood and in old age, after retirement.

The focus will not be in asking (like the Domestic Labour Debate did) what role the domestic community plays in the reproduction of capital which is a capital-centric question. Instead, the focus is on the impact of the relations of production on the mode of human reproduction and the ability of the villagers to subsist and survive. In other words, the relations of production are examined from the perspective of human reproduction and with special reference to women. Thus the theoretical framework provides the research with a feminist position which is anti-imperialist and not capital centric.

At the same time, starting from the local base, the presentation purports to avoid such history writing which sees African history as a mere succession of outside influences. Because of the theoretical scope of the presentation, what follows will not even attempt to provide a full analysis of women in Msoga village, but the ultimate aim is to try and indicate *how* such a study could be conducted within the modes of human reproduction framework.

References

1. The *atomistic* concept is not new as such. Carle C. Zimmerman talked about the *atomistic family* in his *Family and Civilization* (1947). Zimmerman calls a family atomistic when individuals are increasingly freed from family bonds and the state is to become much more an organization of individuals. For him atomism entailed a negative connotation: if atomistic individuals become freed from the restraints of custom and religion and begin to think of the family as a private contract, this for him was a threat to the continuity of civilization. Obviously, the "civilization" and the "family" Zimmerman defended were those of the patriarchal MOHR. For those concerned with the women's question, it is not possible to share his view of the necessity for the continuation of the patriarchal family.
2. Hanmer and Allen 1980; Singer and Wells 1984; Rosser 1986.

3. Rosser 1986, 53—54.
4. Meillassoux 1981, 141.
5. The term “domestic” is used here to replace the term “private” with reference to the notion of the “domestic unit” of the MOP—MOHR analysis.
6. Mies 1986, 104—106, quoting Heinsohn and Knieper 1976 and Heinsohn et al 1979.
7. The lines of early socialists were divided around this issue. According to the “Lassalleian” line women should be excluded from industrial production as this would increase male employment and increase the average male wage. Those agreeing with Bebel considered that the plight of women should be related to that of the working class in general: women’s oppression will be removed with the transition to socialism (Coward 1983, 173—175).
8. The domestic labour debate, sparked off by Benston 1969 and Dalla Costa 1972, was mainly conducted in the *New Left Review* in responses to Seccombe 1974.
9. Also Marx operated with the notion of the worker as a *man* with dependents.
10. Cf for instance UNICEF 1987.
11. Meillassoux 1981, 100—101.
12. *Ibid*, 101.
13. Vuorela 1983, 10—11; Charron 1944, 43; Shivji 1982, 118.
14. Shivji 1982.
15. Cf previous chapter and Creighton 1983.
16. Vuorela 1983, 4—5; Shivji 1982, 131.
17. Meillassoux 1981 and 1987.
18. Cf ILO 1976.
19. Meillassoux 1981, 102.
20. *Ibid*, 103.
21. *Ibid*, 95.
22. *Ibid*.
23. For instance Molyneux 1979 provides a summary of the arguments.
24. Meillassoux 1981, 78.
25. *Ibid*, 84.
26. “Women in Development” discourse refers to research and policy statements regarding the issue of involving Third World women more effectively into global development. Participants in the discourse are mainly policymakers in international organizations and governments working in multi- and bi-lateral development cooperation as well as researchers commissioned by the same or seeking commissions from the same.
27. Boserup 1970; Rogers 1980.
28. Meillassoux 1981, 14.
29. For instance Mackintosh 1977 and Mbilinyi 1977.
30. Meillassoux 1981, 84.
31. *Ibid*, 33ff.
32. *Ibid*, 43.
33. *Ibid*, 32.
34. Cf Schneider and Gough 1961; Coward 1983.
35. Richards 1975, 208—246.
36. Wembah-Rashid 1978, 160—161. Oldaker 1957, 135; Turner 1957 also dealt with the problem of how matrilineal societies reconcile the conflicting interests of *men*

as members of a matrilineage, brothers, husbands and brothers-in-law? (Kuper 1983, 151—152).

37. Mascarenhas-Mbilinyi 1983, 92.

38. This refers roughly to a period between 1976—1986 and in particular, 1984—1986 when I stayed in the village for longer periods.

Chapter IV

Relations of Production Among the Matrilineal Kwere — Some History

Introduction

This chapter presents the argument that the notion of the agricultural domestic community can be extended to deal with matrilineally organized societies as well. Meillassoux, who limited his case of the agricultural domestic community to the patrilineal societies, went on to argue that societies with a matrilineal social organization would need a specific theory capable of dealing with them.¹ This is an instance where the limitations of Meillassoux's way of combining the productive and reproductive relations into one concept of the domestic mode of production come to the fore. My argument is that moving the analysis on to the level of the mode of human reproduction will allow us to look at the patrilineally and matrilineally organized societies at a higher level of abstraction, beyond empirical descriptions of kinship and inheritance by anthropologists which Meillassoux himself so aptly criticised.²

According to Meillassoux, the principle for defining an agricultural domestic community is based on an analysis of the productive forces and the mode of circulating women. I will follow this prescription in my discussion of the history of the matrilineal Kwere but with the qualification that the mode of circulating women is an aspect of the mode of human reproduction. Thus, a look into the transformation from a hunting and gathering way of life into shifting agriculture is complemented by the argument that the mode of human reproduction of the matrilineal Kwere is a patriarchal one. This interpretation differs conceptually from Meillassoux's position and empirically from the position of Levi-Strauss who takes the asymmetry between the sexes in the male mode of circulating women as a universal characteristic of human society.³ The presentation is based on the assumption that there is a close interlinkage in the history of the agricultural domestic community and the development of patriarchal relations.

Finally, it will be argued that the social formation of the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania in the pre-capitalist and pre-colonial periods can be characterised as a *domestic society* in the sense that this concept has been developed by Meillassoux. This domestic society was an agricultural one, in

contradistinction to those neighbouring peoples whose economy was based on cattle-keeping. Beidelman described the relationship of the matrilineal peoples to these neighbours as hostile and quarrelsome.⁴

Moreover, it will be argued that the agricultural domestic society of the matrilineal peoples was composed of smaller domestic communities. These were distinguished from each other by local names which referred to either a locality, an ethnic group or a clan but basically, what constituted the domestic community was a village. That several of these ethnic groups (the Zaramo, Kwere, Luguru, Kutu, Kaguru, Sagara, Vidunda, Ngulu, and the Zigua) shared similar clan names, is taken as an indication of the fact that these peoples were engaged in relations of production with each other under a communal mode of production. The communal relations meant that the different domestic communities engaged in a friendly and equal exchange of productive assets (e.g. cultivable land and food) and were engaged in matrimonial relations through the exchange of women under a patriarchal mode of human reproduction.

Msoga Village

Msoga is a small agricultural village situated in West Bagamoyo District, at a distance of about 120 kilometres from Dar es Salaam. The distance to the Ward Headquarters of Lugoba is about 10 kilometres while the distance to the trading centre of Chalinze, is about eight kilometres (See Map 2).

During its history the village position has changed from a central location along the caravan routes during the period of merchant's capital trade to an administrative centre in the colonial period. Again, there was a change from a position along the main road into a "bush village" off the road since the new Chalinze-Korogwe road was built in the 1960's.

In 1984, the village population was slightly under 700, but this number fluctuates quite a lot. According to the National Population Census of 1978, the village had then almost 1,400 inhabitants. A more detailed introduction to the village profile is given in the appendix.

Agriculture provides the main source of livelihood and maize, which is the main product of the village makes up the main daily staple together with millet. The main daily relish, *mchunga*, a kind of wild spinach is still collected by women from the forests and the fallow lying fields around the village, while the meat supply is sometimes complemented by small game. When falling short of grains, the villagers may get help in the form of government assistance or else, they go and buy maize meal in Dar es Salaam or other com-

mercial centres nearby. The villagers are getting integrated into the national economy through the organization of agricultural production under the guidance of the Party and the government. At the same time individual villagers are seeking employment through casual labour and a more or less regular labour migration. The villagers are increasingly getting involved in various forms of petty trade both in and outside the village. While commoditization and the cash economy are penetrating all aspects of village life, relations based on traditional ways of mutual assistance also exist side by side.

Thus a description of the productive basis will show elements from the former hunting and gathering way of life combined with shifting cultivation and efforts coming from the state to stabilize agricultural activities and to enhance cash crop production for export. So when we discuss the village history and a shift from hunting and gathering to settled agriculture, this has to be seen as a very long term process which has not even been completed fully as yet.

A combination of the old and new elements is also manifested in the use of cultivation technology where the digging stick features more centrally than the tractor and the hand hoe continues to be the main agricultural tool. Chapter VI will demonstrate how current village problems centre around questions of farming technology and efforts to increase the productivity of labour, i.e. the development of the productive forces.

Cultural Background

Culturally the people of Msoga village identify themselves as *Kwere*, one of those peoples in Eastern Tanzania whose social organization has been characterized as a matrilineal one. Beidelman, who published a survey of the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania took matrilineality as the common denominator of the group of peoples living in a geographic area which comprised parts of the present day Coast, Morogoro and Tanga Regions (See Maps 2 and 3). Beidelman whose survey dealt with the Zaramo, *Kwere*, Luguru, Kutu, Kaguru, Sagara, Vidunda, Ngulu and Zigua was struck by the great number of social features shared by most or all of the ethnic groups included in his survey. Not only did these people share a common culture in terms of the languages they spoke — all closely related to each other — but their material culture and the basis of their subsistence was practically the same. All of these peoples were hoe-cultivators with maize and millet as their staples, even if some of them living in the lowlands and mountain areas of Luguru, Vidunda, Zaramo and Ngulu, had dry rice as their staple. Tradi-

tionally, all of them practised iron-working, pottery-making, basketry and wood-carving of stools and decorative equipment. In all areas, shifting cultivation was practised except in those valleys which could sustain perennial cultivation. The main common denominator was the matrilineal social organization and the fact that historically, none of these societies had a truly centralized political system. According to Beidelman:

All of these societies were traditionally organized in small neighbourhood groups, the inhabitants of each being linked to one another through common ties to a dominant matrilineal group.⁵

A matrilineal group was usually acknowledged as "dominant" because of its numerical size, and such dominance was expressed in terms of "ownership" of the land, i.e. authority within a matrilineage to allocate rights to land for house-sites and cultivation. In every area, members of many matrilineages would live together, and the names of a large number of these matri-clans were common to most of these societies.

In all of these tribal groups certain clans were associated with one another in permanent joking relations, expressed through certain institutionalised behaviour in sexuality, affinity and various mortuary and proprietary rights.⁶

Beidelman enumerated common features in the kinship systems and terminologies which extended to the marital customs and the ceremonies held for the initiation of male and female youth.⁷

In actual fact, when one reads through the survey it seems that the differences between the ethnic groups reflected in the survey could either be accounted for by the difference in the data basis (some groups have been dealt with more extensively in the literature than others) or the extent to which the particular peoples have been in contact with their neighbours and through the changes in their productive bases and adaptation to different ecological conditions.

From Hunting and Gathering to an Agricultural Domestic Community

The productive history of the *Kwere* has to be seen not only in the context of the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania but also in the context of what is known of the Eastern parts of the continent more generally. Even if detailed local history is not available from many places, some trends can be con-

structed. Without going into details, a general background to the village is provided by a combination of data from general history and oral history from the village itself. The reconstruction is guided by the theory of the emergence of the agricultural domestic communities accompanied by the formation of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction.

The transition from hunting and gathering to agricultural domestic communities was a long term process which was marked by the beginning of food production, which slowly complemented and replaced the previous economy based on hunting and gathering only. This is a process which took place at different times in various parts of Africa, depending on the ecological conditions and the different ways plant domestication or the adoption of cultivable plants took place. As Harlan points out, the domestication of plants is a process, not an event, and in this process each crop and each locality has a story of its own to tell.⁸ Despite the fact that sorghum and some related plants can be taken as indigenous plants to Africa, they did not appear at the same time in the whole continent, and the exact timing of their original cultivation is extremely difficult to establish.⁹

Until recently, the period from 500 BC until 1 000 AD was taken as the period which saw the change from hunting and gathering to food production in Africa south of the Equator. Until then, most food was either hunted or gathered. The transition to food production is thought to have coincided more or less with the transition from the Stone Age to the Iron Age.¹⁰ Schmidt has, however, corrected Oliver's argument and placed the transition from the Stone Age to the Iron Age even earlier, to about 500—300 BC.¹¹ However, these bits of information refer mainly to the areas near Lake Victoria, where settled agriculture, iron production and the formation of kingdoms took place considerably earlier than in the areas to the south.¹²

The area being discussed now was not in the forefront of these developments, situated as it was outside the savannah belt, in an area covered by forests until very late. According to Sutton, until around 500 AD, the impact of the pastoralists and agriculturalists was slight and confined to the Eastern Rift Valley Zone as far south as Lake Eyasi.¹³

Most of the food plants in East Africa were introduced from outside, either from the northern parts of the African continent or from overseas. Millet and sorghum were apparently adopted from within Africa, whereas bananas and rice began to reach the continent through the trade and migration routes of the Indian Ocean. Maize, cassava and sweet potatoes have only been introduced during the last five centuries from the Americas, although very few East African populations used these on a large scale before the 19th or the 20th centuries.¹⁴

Oral history from the village of Msoga lacks dates and refers to a series of

events limited to a smaller locality which does not reach very far beyond the area where the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania live, but it follows roughly the same sequence of events as suggested by archaeology in terms of the basis of their subsistence.

The myth of Mp'hengo and Msagara,¹⁵ which relates the origin of the Kwere, refers to hunting as the basis of the people's subsistence. Other oral stories also refer to a time when people did not cultivate. During a Popular Theatre Workshop held in Msoga village in 1985, one of the old men in the village jokingly took to interviewing the village Chairman on the issue. This was after the Chairman had told the audience about the origin of the millet and maize seeds among the Kwere.

Mzee Madewa:

Now if you did not have maize and millet, what did you cultivate then? You, a Mkwere, if you did not have the seeds of maize and if you did not have the seeds of millet, and there you were living in your place and giving birth to children, now, according to your own tradition, what did you eat then?

Ramadhani Selemani (The Village Chairman):

Ewallah! Thank you for a good question. I was eating wild fruits. And these were all kinds of fruit. And what kind of a mixture was it then? *These were God's fruits.* Firstly, we were eating *lugo*. Then I was eating *sanzi*, and then I was eating *luhindi*. Now these, we did not cultivate, because we did not have access to the seeds (kwa sababu sipati mlango wa kupata kitu kile chenye mizaa). But since we got the seeds, we stopped eating these wild fruits. Until we got the millet and the maize, we did not have any seeds.¹⁶ (Emphasis mine)

Oral history here then refers to a time when the Kwere did not cultivate, because they did not know how to get the seeds and how to use them for sowing. At this time they were simply appropriating their food from nature and the "God's fruits" described by the Chairman, were the produce of the land as a "subject of labour".

The shift from an extraction economy with the land as a subject of labour into one based on food production took place when people learned about the use of seeds, either through the domestication of wild plants or through cultural contacts. In the case of the Kwere, oral history links the adoption of millet seeds to a cultural contact with the Sagara in Kilosa.

Now there is this millet. We the Kwere did not have the millet. Where did we go then? The millet came from Kilosa, from Msagara. They had all these seeds of *zebele*. Others were called *kihembo*, *mzigo* and *kobero*. Out of these bred another seed which we are cultivating now and which is called *nghalasi*. There are different

structed. Without going into details, a general background to the village is provided by a combination of data from general history and oral history from the village itself. The reconstruction is guided by the theory of the emergence of the agricultural domestic communities accompanied by the formation of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction.

The transition from hunting and gathering to agricultural domestic communities was a long term process which was marked by the beginning of food production, which slowly complemented and replaced the previous economy based on hunting and gathering only. This is a process which took place at different times in various parts of Africa, depending on the ecological conditions and the different ways plant domestication or the adoption of cultivable plants took place. As Harlan points out, the domestication of plants is a process, not an event, and in this process each crop and each locality has a story of its own to tell.⁸ Despite the fact that sorghum and some related plants can be taken as indigenous plants to Africa, they did not appear at the same time in the whole continent, and the exact timing of their original cultivation is extremely difficult to establish.⁹

Until recently, the period from 500 BC until 1 000 AD was taken as the period which saw the change from hunting and gathering to food production in Africa south of the Equator. Until then, most food was either hunted or gathered. The transition to food production is thought to have coincided more or less with the transition from the Stone Age to the Iron Age.¹⁰ Schmidt has, however, corrected Oliver's argument and placed the transition from the Stone Age to the Iron Age even earlier, to about 500—300 BC.¹¹ However, these bits of information refer mainly to the areas near Lake Victoria, where settled agriculture, iron production and the formation of kingdoms took place considerably earlier than in the areas to the south.¹²

The area being discussed now was not in the forefront of these developments, situated as it was outside the savannah belt, in an area covered by forests until very late. According to Sutton, until around 500 AD, the impact of the pastoralists and agriculturalists was slight and confined to the Eastern Rift Valley Zone as far south as Lake Eyasi.¹³

Most of the food plants in East Africa were introduced from outside, either from the northern parts of the African continent or from overseas. Millet and sorghum were apparently adopted from within Africa, whereas bananas and rice began to reach the continent through the trade and migration routes of the Indian Ocean. Maize, cassava and sweet potatoes have only been introduced during the last five centuries from the Americas, although very few East African populations used these on a large scale before the 19th or the 20th centuries.¹⁴

Oral history from the village of Msoga lacks dates and refers to a series of

events limited to a smaller locality which does not reach very far beyond the area where the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania live, but it follows roughly the same sequence of events as suggested by archaeology in terms of the basis of their subsistence.

The myth of Mp'hengo and Msagara,¹⁵ which relates the origin of the Kwere, refers to hunting as the basis of the people's subsistence. Other oral stories also refer to a time when people did not cultivate. During a Popular Theatre Workshop held in Msoga village in 1985, one of the old men in the village jokingly took to interviewing the village Chairman on the issue. This was after the Chairman had told the audience about the origin of the millet and maize seeds among the Kwere.

Mzee Madewa:

Now if you did not have maize and millet, what did you cultivate then? You, a Mkwere, if you did not have the seeds of maize and if you did not have the seeds of millet, and there you were living in your place and giving birth to children, now, according to your own tradition, what did you eat then?

Ramadhani Selemani (The Village Chairman):

Ewallah! Thank you for a good question. I was eating wild fruits. And these were all kinds of fruit. And what kind of a mixture was it then? *These were God's fruits.* Firstly, we were eating *lugo*. Then I was eating *sanzi*, and then I was eating *luhindi*. Now these, we did not cultivate, because we did not have access to the seeds (kwa sababu sipati mlango wa kupata kitu kile chenye mizaa). But since we got the seeds, we stopped eating these wild fruits. Until we got the millet and the maize, we did not have any seeds.¹⁶ (Emphasis mine)

Oral history here then refers to a time when the Kwere did not cultivate, because they did not know how to get the seeds and how to use them for sowing. At this time they were simply appropriating their food from nature and the "God's fruits" described by the Chairman, were the produce of the land as a "subject of labour".

The shift from an extraction economy with the land as a subject of labour into one based on food production took place when people learned about the use of seeds, either through the domestication of wild plants or through cultural contacts. In the case of the Kwere, oral history links the adoption of millet seeds to a cultural contact with the Sagara in Kilosa.

Now there is this millet. We the Kwere did not have the millet. Where did we go then? The millet came from Kilosa, from Msagara. They had all these seeds of *zebele*. Others were called *kihembo*, *mzigo* and *kobero*. Out of these bred another seed which we are cultivating now and which is called *nghalasi*. There are different

types of *nghalasi*, such as *mgindo* and *mbagara*, but they are *nghalasi* all the same. What we are cultivating now is one of the *nghalasi* called *zebele* and we plant it in January-February. In the third month we harvest it.¹⁷

The adoption of the millet seeds and cultivation, whenever it happened, marked the beginning of the transformation of the forces and relations of production. These changes can be seen with the gradual emergence of the agricultural domestic community. With the planting of seeds, land became an "instrument of labour", and the process of cultivation now demanded that human energy be invested in the land. The first tools used in this cultivation were simple digging sticks with which small holes could be dug in the ground. Digging sticks, called *muhaya*, that are still used in Msoga during the *vuli* (short rain) cultivation, can thus be seen as an element preserved until today from the very earliest adoption of cultivation in this society. When the Kwere refer to *vuli* cultivation now they say: "Ah, this is not real cultivation, we just plant in the grass", meaning that no preparation of the land is made before the planting of the seeds.¹⁸

Apart from the land becoming an instrument of labour, the investment of human energy and seeds in the land also requires that the producers stay together in anticipation of the harvest, as a result of the delayed returns of the joint labour. This period of waiting for the product of the labour also requires cooperation in different cultivation tasks. These include guarding the crops against birds and animals which might spoil the fields or appropriate the crop before it was ready for human consumption. Thus, one can assume that the social relations that were prevalent when subsistence was based on hunting and gathering only, gradually got transformed as the cultivation activities became more predominant.

The use of grains for food also requires tools for their processing, which in the early periods was done by grinding stones. According to oral history, the people of Msoga only adopted the use of wooden mortars relatively recently. Some identify them with maize cultivation or else, with the British colonial rule. Baumann, who travelled through the coastal area in the 1890's observed that the people used grinding stones.¹⁹

According to Sutton, the East African peoples knew how to produce stone bowls and pottery already during the early Stone Age.²⁰ Storing grains in earthenware pots is known to be a very old custom in Africa: archaeological findings from Iron Age cultures in Zambia show that grainbins were used and storage pits were dug into the underlying soil.²¹ We also know that until very recently, seeds in Msoga were kept in earthenware pots and dug into the soil. In 1978, the villagers revealed that sometimes men hid these in the forest in a place unknown to women in order to prevent "soft-hearted mothers from

feeding the seeds to the children who were crying for food".²²

According to the Village Chairman, preserving the seeds or acquiring new seeds was the responsibility of men. Also seeds could be preserved together with other grains in the open air, by being hung on trees. Millet could be made into bundles called *vunde* which were tied to trees and maize was plaited into *maiko*, and likewise hung on trees, or as in done even today, hung over the fireplace in the house.²³ These customs had also been observed by Picarda at the end of the 19th century:

One is astonished to see how the majority of the villages conserve huge bundles of maize hung on simple poles in the open air, within the reach of anybody or a sack of beans hung on the tree.²⁴

Thus the adoption of millet cultivation can be identified with the use of digging sticks for cultivation, use of grinding stones, the use of pottery within which the seeds (surplus) could be preserved, and the storing of grains from one harvest to the next in the open air. The relations of production within which this technology operated ensured the distribution of the products as well as the reproduction of the productive cycle.

Cooperation in cultivation was needed both in preparing the land, in protecting the fields and during harvest time. According to the historical division of labour, men had the task of clearing the land for cultivation. Flou and Flou describe the slash and burn cultivation which used four main tools: the *panga* (machete), the *nhembo* (a small axe), the hoe and the *mchaya* (digging stick). Because of the diversity of the agricultural tools, this description probably refers to a relatively recent period. For clearing the land, trees were felled with the small axe and the machete. About 2 foot high stumps were left in the ground while the trunks and the branches were carried away to be used either as firewood or for building houses. The rest was then burnt and the land was left to wait for the rains, when the cultivation took place.²⁵

The core cultivating team was the husband and the wife. Even before the use of the hoes, the husband dug a little hole in the earth with the *muhaya* and the wife followed and dropped the seeds in the holes and covered them with earth by using her foot. This is still done today, during the short rain cultivation.

During the growing season, the fields needed constant attention, sometimes during the day and night, to prevent the crops from being spoilt or eaten by wild animals. Children were given the task of chasing the birds, but the whole family could participate in this. Different technologies were devised to make the chasing of animals more effective, such as slings, with which earth or stones could be thrown at them or various traps which were set to catch small

animals. Men could organize hunting teams for preventing bigger animals from coming near the fields.

Hunters used bows, arrows, spears, nets and clubs. Usually a band of hunters would spread some nets around an area believed to contain animals, a dense part of the bush or forest. Some would lie in ambush near the nets, while others went to round the animals from the other side. Animals were then killed with spears and clubs.²⁶

Harvesting of millet was also done in teams: men would first cut the stalks at ground level and leave them in the ground, in more or less regular lines. After they had dried a little, women would cut the ears off the stalks and heap them to dry. Then they were bound in bundles of regular size. Transporting the harvest, if it was large, demanded team work. Beer was made and relatives were called to help with the transport, against the compensation of beer drinking.²⁷

The relations of production were relatively egalitarian and the division of labour was a complementary one. It contained a technical division of tasks whereby some tasks were given to men, some to women, some to children, while others were based on cooperative labour. The harvest which was the product of joint labour, was jointly consumed: one section was kept for food, another for communal consumption in exchange for labour and a third part was kept to be used as seeds. What was communally produced was communally shared. This principle is reflected even in today's practice. At the death of a husband, even if the wife does not inherit from him in principle, she will be able to keep her share of the crop on which the couple worked together.²⁸ It is also said that the women had historically full control of the food stores and no man was allowed to take anything from the store.²⁹ This accords well with the argument made by Meillassoux that the male elders in the agricultural domestic community could delegate and decentralize the control of the food stores and the productive activities because it was politically more important for them to gain control over *reproduction* and the matrimonial relations. It can be assumed that this is what took place in the domestic community of the Kwere as well. A male takeover of political power resulted as the elders took over the control of the reproductive assets, the seeds and the women, which also accorded them power to regulate the use of junior male labour.

The Emergence of Matrilineal Social Organization and the Patriarchal Mode of Human Reproduction

Meillassoux argued that within the domestic community economic reproduction takes place by producing subsistence goods (the means of reproducing human energy) and distributing these means between the past, present and future producers.³⁰ It is my argument that the social relations which regulate this distribution are those linked up with and shaped by the formation of fraternal interest groups under matrilineal social organization following the emergence of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction. Matrilineal social organization is a particular form taken by the relations of mating and filiation under the patriarchal mode of human reproduction with weak fraternal interest groups. As within the domestic communities, the relations of production and of human reproduction merge very closely. But also, the matrilineal social organization can be seen to represent the particular form the articulation of the MOP and the MOHR in these communities took.

The Notion of Fraternal Interest Groups

The notion of *fraternal interest groups* is introduced here to describe the social bases of power available to men in asserting their rights over women and their reproductive capacity. It has been adopted from Paige and Paige who developed the concept in the context of a cross-cultural survey of reproductive rituals.³¹ In their interpretation, reproductive rituals are attempts to gain political advantage in conflicts over women and children rather than mechanisms for satisfying the psychological needs of individuals or for symbolically reducing social conflict and tensions.

Paige and Paige argue that the reproductive dilemmas of male and female puberty, birth and menstruation represent a special case in band and tribal societies, where women and their offspring represent important economic and political assets. In the absence of centralized legal authority in societies which have no police, no standing armies and no formal legal systems independent of claimants, disputes over rights to women must be settled by bargains among the interested parties themselves. Fraternal interest groups are formed by men of consanguineal kin groups to enforce power in these kinds of disputes.

These groups, however, have different bargaining power in different societies, and the strength of the fraternal interest groups is determined by three main factors. These include the value of the dominant economic

resources available in society, the military vulnerability of these resources and the extent to which sons must rely on fathers for access to wealth. Strong fraternal interest groups are identified with societies with stable valuable economic resources which include economies based on herding of domesticates (cattle, horses, camels) or the cultivation of land by hoes, ploughs and the use of irrigation. Weak fraternal interest groups, again, are identified with societies whose economic resources are unstable and low-value. These include societies in which the dominant subsistence activity is digging stick cultivation, buffalo-hunting, fishing or hunting and gathering. By contrast, the fraternal interest groups are practically absent in hunting and gathering economies where food supplies represent the only important form of economic wealth.³²

The formation of fraternal interest groups to ensure male access to the reproductive capacity of women is adopted here to explain the patriarchal scheme in asserting power over the reproductive means. The notion of fraternal interest groups also adds a further dimension to our understanding of the operation of the patriarchal mode of human reproduction even in a matrilineal context.

Interpreted within the framework of the modes of human reproduction theory, the dynamics of the strong and weak fraternal interest groups allow us to specify the mode of human reproduction in different societies. Fraternal interest groups are here seen as an element of the political organization through which the social relations of human reproduction are operationalized. These interest groups are the tools with which the relations of mating and filiation can be politically bargained for and managed. Within a materialist theory of the modes of human reproduction, the presence or absence of valuable resources refers to the level of development of the productive forces. The need of men to form corporate units or temporary coalitions gives the relations of mating and filiation their form and content. In other words, the forms that the relations of mating and filiation take are linked up with the nature of the valuable resources of the society, and the consequent formation of the fraternal interest groups which become the guardians and managers of these resources. The strength of the fraternal interest groups (weak or strong or absent) becomes a measure of the relative power men have over women and their sexual power. The mode of human reproduction can be said to be patriarchal both in the matrilineally and patrilineally organized societies with the qualification that in the former, the fraternal interest groups are weak and identified with low value economic resources while in the latter, strong fraternal interest groups go together with high value economic resources. Consequently, the adhesive mode of human reproduction is identified with no fraternal interest groups.

The Fraternal Interest Groups and the Domestic Communities of the Kwere and Their Matrilineal Neighbours

It is argued here that it was through the process of the fraternal interest group formation that the patriarchal mode of human reproduction gradually came into being and women became reified as the means of human reproduction. In this way, men took control over those vital assets which ensured continuity both in production and in human reproduction, namely the seeds and the women.

The patriarchal mode of human reproduction, which will be described in more detail in chapter V, meant in terms of the social relations of the Kwere that both men and women were under the control of the male elders from birth to death. That this control could not be evaded was ensured by the system whereby at the death of a man, another male relative would be chosen to take over his duties and responsibilities.³³ The male elders who formed these fraternal interest groups in essence consisted of the father and the maternal uncle of the person, both of whom extended the fraternal interest group through their brothers, either by blood or by classification. So the marital transaction, for instance, would take place through negotiations between the fathers (and their "real" and classificatory brothers) and the maternal uncles (and their "real" and classificatory brothers) of both the girl and the boy. The fathers and the uncles remained the "trustees" of the marriage throughout its span, and any quarrels and settlement of divorce would have to be negotiated between the same persons.

Within this network of relations, a man would have to show loyalty to the male elders (the fraternal interest group) on his mother's side as well as sharing fraternal interests with all his brothers. As his children were supervised by the fraternal elders of his wife, he had to respect these and cooperate with them in all matters regarding his own children, who would finally inherit from the uncle, i.e. the property and/or the position of their maternal uncles. That these fraternal interest groups were "weak", has to do with the nature of the property to be transferred, as there was no need to assert exclusive rights to a piece of land or other valuable resources. The mutual interests evolved more around relations of human reproduction than of production in terms of creating a wide network of related households and domestic communities.

We do not know much about how long it took to shape these fraternal interest groups. It can be assumed that the development of these fraternal interest groups and a matrilineal social organization came about as a result of a long and slow process which went together with the formation of the agricultural domestic communities and the organization of the relations of human reproduction and production identified with shifting cultivation.

That the fraternal interest groups were weak in the social formation we are discussing now, was manifested in the matrilineal social organization whereby inheritance of property was from uncles to nephews and the link between father and sons was given much less importance.

The weak fraternal interest groups formed within the agricultural domestic communities can be associated with the low value of the economic resources these communities had at their disposal. Combined with shifting cultivation, the importance attached to a piece of land was not great, because it had to be abandoned after a few years of cultivation. The shifting agriculture practised in sub-Saharan Africa and the forest regions has been described as a system whereby the same land would be cultivated for 3—4 years after which it needed a recuperation period of up to 15—20 years, depending on the soils.³⁴ This system of land use lends itself to a mobile way of life and a social organization which does not lay emphasis on keeping related cultivators in the same village or location for a long time. Rather, a flexibility in moving and creating social relations between different domestic communities becomes important. Thus the production pattern, the type of habitation and the social relations of production and of human reproduction accord well with what Paige and Paige concluded about societies with unstable and low-value resources.³⁵

A matrilineal social organization which allows for the fission of households and the mobility of males provided the domestic community of the shifting cultivators with a mechanism which could ensure friendly relations between domestic communities spread over a wide area. This was beneficial as a social security system in a society with a low level of development of the productive forces and where the success of cultivation was dependent on the availability of rains and crop failures could not be prevented by technical means. It offered a social and political solution to the alleviation of hunger and food shortages while at the same time allowing resort to hunting and gathering activities.

The descriptions of the life of the matrilineal peoples in the 19th century also reflect a mobile way of life whereby small domestic communities would split easily and new communities would be formed. Peter Horner who travelled in the area in the 1870's described the Kwere villages

The villages consist of about a dozen huts, due to the pride of the natives each of whom wants to be a chief. As soon as a person has gained some respect among his equals, then he will move out with his dependents and establish a hamlet and makes himself its chief and takes the title of a *mpasi*, which means something like a king.³⁶

The flexible composition of the domestic communities and the mobility of the people was also referred to by Father Vermunt who has made an extensive documentation of the life of the matrilineal Luguru. He also discusses the Kwere:

Until the end of the 18th century these peoples were always on the move. Clans were divided into sub-clans and remained behind or moved into opposite directions, many times changing clan names.³⁷

Even if we may have to exercise some caution as to the extent people moved, it can be safely assumed that the domestic communities of the matrilineal peoples were small and volatile in composition. It is argued here that this was a way of matching the social relations with the low level of development of the productive forces and adaptation to nature. This was important in dealing with the constraints the natural conditions offered to cultivation and the reproduction of the domestic communities. It is in this context that a matrilineal social organization was a rational choice.

That the same clan names can be found among different ethnic groups also speaks for the mobility of the people which was based on the fission of households through marriage and according to the way new land was opened up for cultivation. The spread of the clans over large areas ensured the friendly political relations which were needed when food production failed in one area and people had to go to another area in search of food or cultivable land during food shortages. If this was done on a temporary basis, the people who went to look for food from their clan allies would return to their original domestic community. During more serious droughts, or when land in some area was exhausted under shifting cultivation, a whole domestic community could move into a new place. Where clan relations did not constitute a network of friendly alliances, these were created through the mechanism of joking relationships,³⁸ which established a "trade pact" for exchange of food and other commodities before the arrival of the monetary economy.

The point about matrilineal social organization in Eastern Tanzania is not that it puts men under stress with conflicting loyalties, nor is it that it gives women more power but rather the point is that it creates a wider network of friendly alliances between domestic communities.³⁹ In so doing it links a greater number of households through marital and kinship ties, which can then be manipulated for the redistribution of agricultural products as well as for the sharing of the means of production and reproductive assets in times of need. These ties create a network of mutual assistance and dependency mediated by broadly based fraternal alliances on the basis of the patriarchal

mode of human reproduction, which accords male elders political power in administering these relations.

With insecure availability of rains and fluctuating food crops, the matrilineal social organization creates friendly ties of kinship and cooperation between a wider group of men and domestic communities than in those societies where males, united by strong fraternal interest groups, are concentrated in one locality. It also allows for a greater flexibility in the fission and fusion of the domestic communities.⁴⁰ A dispersal of classificatory brothers and in-laws over a wide geographical area ensures that people in one locality will not starve but will be able to ensure the reproduction of their domestic communities even when hit by droughts, pests, or other calamities. Thus the dispersal of the domestic communities enables these to engage in equal exchange with other similar domestic communities mediated by the relations of production and of human reproduction. As a social security system, the domestic communities with matriliney were more concerned about sharing resources during people's life-time than passing property on from the dead to the living. This was due to the nature of the property itself.

Elements of this kind of cooperation continued among the Kwere until at least the 1940's.⁴¹ The tradition of *kuhemea*, to go and look for food elsewhere or to forage, still practised by villagers in Msoga and its neighbouring villages, is a direct continuation of these practices.

According to Kwere elders from Msoga, men had the responsibility of going to forage, *kuhemea*, either in search of seeds or in search of food. If the seeds were finished, the men had to go to look for more seed before going to search for additional food. Sometimes, when returning home with extra seed, a man would hide a portion in the forest:

Coming home, he would then take an earthenware pot, take his hoe and go to his secret place in the forest. He mixes the seeds with ashes, places them in the pot, digs a hole in the earth and places the earthenware pot there. On top he puts a smaller pot with sand and covers the place with grass. When the rains then come, he will go to his secret store and sow the seeds with his wife who is amazed to see that the husband did have some seeds.⁴²

If the old stores of food were finished and the prospects of a harvest were not certain, a household could first plant their seeds, leave somebody to guard the field and then move out in search of food from elsewhere. If the news was brought to them that the seeds had germinated they could then return back home.⁴³ Sometimes a hamlet or a household could divide into two: some members went foraging while others stayed behind relying on famine foods, roots and berries such as *mdudu*, *kalabaka*, *lugomba*, *siga*, *nghambe* and others which were available near home. When others came back with food

they would give a share to those who stayed behind.⁴⁴

In the recollection of Kwere elders both in Msoga and Lugoba, Uluguru, Udoe and Uzigua were the (Cf Map 3) places where most of them went when facing a food shortage in their home village. Uluguru was the most common area for this because it had a reputation as a place "where one never fails to get food",⁴⁵ even if going there meant a trip of eight days on foot in one direction. During bad famines it even happened that parents had to leave their smallest infant behind to die in the forest on their way to Uluguru, because they were too weak to carry the child and to feed it.⁴⁶

In the distant past, people who went in search of food were either given food in the form of assistance or they could be given a small area to work on and then be given a share from the crop. Food could also be obtained in exchange for local products such as baskets, cooking pots or hoes that people took with them from home.⁴⁷ Later this exchange was monetized, and people could be hired against money or they could purchase the food with money. Some of the informants tell that the tradition of foraging was stopped when the missionaries created the need for labour in their estates and people could go and work for them in return for money.⁴⁸ Others mention that during the colonial period, foraging became unnecessary as the colonial government started bringing in famine relief during food shortages.⁴⁹

Thus, to sum up, the unity of the social formation of the matrilineal peoples was based on a similar level of the development of the productive forces: the use of land as an instrument of labour; land as a low value economic resource in the use of which human energy was invested; the social relations which tied the smaller domestic communities to each other through equal exchanges of food, seed and women; as well as the common patriarchal mode of human reproduction. The unity of the relations of production and of human reproduction found its expression in the similarity of the culture of the various domestic communities within this social formation.⁵⁰

Labour was not only the most significant part of the productive forces together with the land as an instrument of labour, but could also be exchanged. Exchange between people took two main forms: women, seeds and food could circulate on the basis of replacing each other in a delayed exchange, or else, food, seeds and women could be obtained in exchange for labour with no other mediator (such as money) used in between. "Trade" was in other words barter and based on the direct exchange of social products against each other or against human labour.

This is where the *domestic society* of the matrilineal peoples of Eastern Tanzania came into existence: the domestic society was a combination of small domestic communities which shared similar culture and were tied to each other through political relations which allowed for a flexibility of movement

and residence and were facilitated by the matrimonial relations managed by the male elders. The level of the development of the productive forces created the boundaries of this society as it was only within communities where economic resources were of similar value and similar conditions existed that the barter could be exercised on an equal base and the matrimonial negotiations i.e. exchange of women and junior labour could be successfully bargained. That political power got into the hands of the fraternal interest groups under the leadership of the maternal uncles made the mode of human reproduction into a patriarchal one.

The Domestic Society of the Matrilineal Peoples and Its Contacts with Other Social Formations

It cannot be assumed that the domestic society of the matrilineal peoples existed in complete isolation from other social formations: its people must have engaged in some kind of contacts with the outside in order to get access to products which were not available within their own boundaries.

Among the early contacts were those with the Muslim cities on the coast. The formation of towns on the coast goes back to the 12th century so that by the 17th century there were 37 towns along the coastal strip between Kilwa and Mogadishu.⁵¹ These towns had been created under the impact of the Arab trade which was based on the export of spices, ivory, skins and slaves from East Africa in return for beads and cloth.⁵² Contact with the interior was mainly in terms of slave-raiding and the penetration of elephant hunters.⁵³ Even if we do not know exactly when this began, it is clear that the matrilineal domestic society came into contact with the slave mode of production which was established on the Coast.⁵⁴ This meant that the domestic society lost some of its members to slavery.

Oral history in Msoga has many accounts about slaves, but it also alludes to the fact that the matrilineal domestic society also practised its own kind of slavery.⁵⁵ Within the domestic society, this seems to have been a way of dealing with the labour problems or the problems of human reproduction of the domestic communities, which often suffered labour shortages. Children were often given as slaves by people in debt.⁵⁶ A number of stories emphasize that the slaves had to be treated as normal members of the family, but they were obliged to work and if they misbehaved they could be killed by their owners.⁵⁷ Until now, the marital contract is concluded by a string of

beads which symbolizes the fact that the bride has been taken by the husband to be a wife, not a slave.⁵⁸

By the 16th and 17th centuries, a number of feudal states had already developed in the neighbourhood of the matrilineal domestic society. Beidelman describes the relations between the matrilineal peoples and their neighbours as hostile and warlike in contrast to the peaceful exchange of resources within the matrilineal domestic society.⁵⁹ The boundaries between the domestic society of the shifting cultivators and other social formations were marked by both ecological differences as well as the contrast between production systems based on either cattle-keeping (the Gogo and the Maasai) or more permanent settlements based on agriculture with more developed productive forces and differentiated social relations, such as, for instance, the social formations of the Hehe and the Shambaa.⁶⁰ The Gogo and the Maasai social formations constituted pastoralist domestic communities with a higher value resource base in the form of cattle, and a more hierarchical social organization. The Hehe were practising more advanced agriculture with terraces which yielded more crops than the shifting cultivation of the Kwere. They also kept cattle and were known as cattle raiders.⁶¹ The Shambaa kingdom has been characterised as a feudal state which had already been established by the 16th century.⁶²

Also within the matrilineal domestic society, some communities began to differentiate on the basis of the ecological conditions and the development of the forces of production into a more settled type of agricultural production. According to Kjekshus, the Zigua developed their grain production into a system of permanent cropping on a rotational basis with three years of cropping and one year of fallow. As a result, they were able to trade their food surpluses to Saadani and Pangani.⁶³ Consequently, some of the domestic communities of the Zigua started to distinguish themselves from the others as they were able to produce and trade food surpluses and also adopted cattle-keeping. They became involved in trade whereby they sold grain surpluses to the coastal towns, and also raided their neighbours for slaves and livestock.⁶⁴ In contrast to their fellow matrilineal peoples, the Zigua developed a chiefship which was inherited patrilineally from father to son.⁶⁵ This supports the argument that more effective production, which provides a social formation with higher value economic resources, would contribute to strengthening fraternal interest groups as questions of ownership and inheritance become more important.⁶⁶

Some of the matrilineal groups such as the Sagara developed elaborate irrigation techniques and were familiar with the use of animal manure as a fertilizer.⁶⁷

Friendly trade relations that went beyond the boundaries of the domestic society developed also and were sanctioned by creating joking relationships with the new partners. The interethnic joking relationships can thus be seen as a kind of trade and mutual assistance pact between different pre-colonial social formations. Caravan trade that passed through the area brought people from outside into contact with the peoples of the domestic society within their own boundaries.

One of the slave trading routes is said to have passed near Msoga from Bagamoyo via Mazizi to Tabora.⁶⁸ According to the village Chairman, the Nyamwezi who passed through Msoga, came from Kidugalo via Kisemo, and would arrive at Msoga where they would spend a night en route to Bagamoyo.⁶⁹ While in Msoga, the traders would be given food in exchange for various commodities.

A number of cultural innovations found their way to Msoga through the passing traders and most of them were credited to the Nyamwezi.⁷⁰ One of the significant innovations credited to the Nyamwezi is said to have been the adoption of maize cultivation.⁷¹ These contacts also brought in the use of onions, coconuts and dried small fish, the *dagaa*.⁷² Other imported articles included iron hoes which gradually replaced the old wooden hoes of the Kwere which were made of ebony. From the traders people also got beads, salt, *merekani* cloth and necklaces. Imported salt replaced the one made locally by burning leaves of pawpaw and using its ashes. *Merekani* cloth gradually replaced the bark cloth which had also been made locally.

Not only did the trade mean cultural contacts but it contributed to a change in the economy of the people who became surplus producers of food which was sold to the caravans or exchanged for other commodities. This meant an intensifying penetration of the domestic society by merchants' capital and a gradual integration of the domestic society into the world capitalist system. The earliest contacts did not have the impact of effectively transforming the pre-capitalist communal relations of the matrilineal domestic society. The process of transforming the precapitalist communal relations through the dominating effect of the capitalist relations only developed forcefully between 1840—1899, when Zanzibar became the capital of Seyyid Said's sultanate and the trade relations between the interior and the coast intensified. As a result of this process, the Kwere became incorporated into the reproduction circuit of merchants' capital by the end of the 19th century.

For the Kwere this meant an emerging role as food producers for both trade caravans as well as the towns of Bagamoyo and Zanzibar. The Kwere were thus producing means of subsistence and exchanging them below value for imported commodities from the capitalist countries. In Mwelupungwi's

assessment they were thus already victims of unequal exchange. This created the basis for differentiated social relations, with the emergence of classes of surplus producers and traders.⁷³

References

1. Meillassoux 1981, 32.
2. Ibid, 101.
3. Levi-Strauss 1969.
4. Beidelman 1967, ix-x.
5. Ibid, xiii.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Harlan 1978, 631-653.
9. Ibid, 639.
10. Oliver 1978, 342.
11. Schmidt 1974.
12. Oliver 1978, 342.
13. Sutton 1975, 68.
14. Ibid, 73.
15. One version is presented in Sengo and Lucas 1975, 44—46.
16. *Mzee* Selemani M. Madewa and *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani, 22.1.1985, Msoga. PTW 3.
17. *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani, 22.1.1985, Msoga. PTW 3.
18. *Mzee* Alfonsi Laini and *Bibi* Christina Chanzi, 24.11.1984, Msoga. UVN.
19. Baumann 1891, 273.
20. Sutton 1975.
21. Oliver 1978, 386.
22. Semina ya utafiti 1978, 13.
23. *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani 2.11.1984, Msoga. UVT II.
24. Picarda 1886, 235.
25. Flou and Flou 1971 in UTAf 1977/7.44—52. Kemal Mustafa. Translation from the Danish by UV.
26. Wembah-Rashid 1978, 114.
27. Cf Father Vermunt manuscript (n.d.) for the Luguru and the Kwere.
28. Maria John Tengeneza, 4.11.1984, Msoga. UVN.
29. Semina ya utafiti 1978.
30. Meillassoux 1981, 43.
31. Paige and Paige 1981.
32. Ibid.
33. *Mzee* Haji Segesera, 28.11.1984; Peter Joseph, 25.12.1985; *Bibi* Christina Chanzi, 24.11.1984, Msoga. UVN.
34. Oliver 1978; Kjekshus 1977, 29; Baumann 1891.
35. Paige and Paige 1981, 55.
36. Horner 1977, 60.

37. Father Vermunt, unpublished manuscript.
38. The joking relationships of the Kwere have been dealt with by Sengo and Lucas 1974 and 1975; Mwerangi 1975; Brain 1962 and Wembah-Rashid 1978.
According to the the Msoga Village Chairman, joking partners can take anything from each other without permission and without creating anger. This is really not a "theft" nor a haphazard appropriation of another person's wealth, but a kind of "loan" which is expected to be paid back or compensated for, sooner or later. Thus it is a mutual system of help in need.
39. Paige and Paige 1981, 55.
40. This can be observed in today's Msoga as well: a homestead can show considerable variety in its composition over time.
41. Interviews with Kwere elders conducted by Jonas Reuben in Lugoba. *Wazee*: Anastasi Mavula 22.11.1984; Mjuga Muhode 24.11.1984; Henry Kusimsemwa 6.11.1984; Ramadhani Mandewa 15.11.1984; Simon Amedee Dindili 2.12.1984.
42. *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani, 2.11.1984, Msoga. UVT II.
43. Ibid.
44. *Mzee* Ramadhani Mandewa 15.11.1985, Lugoba. UVN.
45. *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani, 2.11.1984, Msoga. UVT II.
46. *Mzee* Haji Segesera, 28.11.1984, Msoga. UVN. This is also reflected in some stories. For instance those told by George Nambari, 12.12.1984 UVT IX; and Zena Shabani, 19.9.1985. UVT XVA.
47. *Mzee* Henri Kusimsemwa, 6.11.1984, Lugoba. UVN.
48. For instance Josephena Frances, 29.11.1984, Lugoba. UVN
49. Bryceson mentions that during the British colonial period, famine relief was distributed in Bagamoyo District in 1929, 1933, 1934, 1943, 1953 and 1961 (Bryceson 1980, 209).
50. Cf Beidelman 1967, x-xiii.
51. Marsh and Kingsnorth 1972, 17—18.
52. According to Chittick, the Arab traders had started to penetrate into the interior by 1780 in search of ivory and slaves. These they bartered against metal tools, machetes, daggers, awls and lances (Chittick 1968, 106).
53. Cf Miono seminar report 1977, 194—195.
54. For the slave mode of production, cf Hindess and Hirst 1975, 125—177.
55. Cf Stories by Asha binti Ramadhani and Zainabu Salum, 22.11.1984 UVT II; Rajabu Rashidi Muruale 29.11.1984 UVT VII.
56. Wembah-Rashid 1978, 143—144.
57. *Mzee* Haji Segesera, 12.10.1985, Msoga. UVN.
58. *Mzee* Haji Segesera, 28.11.1984, Msoga. UVN; Brain 1962, 235.
59. Beidelman 1967, ix-x.
60. Kjekshus 1977, 38.
61. Ibid.
62. Feierman 1974.
63. Baumann 1891, 273.
64. Kjekshus 1977, 58.
65. Beidelman 1967, 66—67.
66. Cf Paige and Paige 1981.
67. Kjekshus 1977, 36.
68. Miono seminar report 1977, 195
69. *Mzee* Ramadhani Selemani, 2.11.1984, Msoga. UVT II.

70. According to Berg it has been estimated that direct commercial contacts of the Nyamwezi with the Coast started a decade or two before 1839 (Berg 1968, 132).
71. *Mzee Ramadhani Selemani*, 26.10.1984, Msoga. UVN.
72. *Ibid*, 22.1.1985. PTW 3.
73. UTAf 1977/17.1—11. Kemal Mustafa: Mwelupungwi 1976.