Development Critiques and Alternatives: A Feminist Perspective

Margarita Aguinaga[1], Miriam Lang[2], Dunia Mokrani[3], Alejandra Santillana[4]

Feminism thinking today must be emancipatory. It must be rooted in the diversity and potential of life and have a holistic perspective, looking at the whole picture. To reach its goal of becoming an emerging revolutionary movement, it must analyse the various dimensions of power in connection with each other, and hence any feminist critique of development will have an integrative approach. This contribution to the feminist debates about development brings together various dimensions, including the environment, economics, the productive model, colonialism and patriarchy.

Taking a historical perspective, this chapter looks at the various contributions feminism has made to development. The authors feel that it is paramount to propose a form of analysis which is different from the classical academic and economic development discourse, since feminism arose precisely as a political challenge to the effects of an androcentric discourse, traditionally presented as scientific and universal, but which has systematically undermined other knowledge and has gained domination in a number of areas –including women's bodies and speech, the mainstream arguments of medicine and psychoanalysis, as well as philosophy and anthropology (Dorlin, 2009).

If feminism is seen as knowledge, similar to a genealogy, a proposal to transform life with a comprehensive perspective, it is possible to engage with both academia, political discourses and women's individual and collective struggles to transform an unequal and unfair economic, social and political system. But above all, it enables us to draw on ideas arising from the wider Latin American debates. Currently, following the recent constitutional processes, Latin Americans have proposed *Buen Vivir* (a term in Spanish that can be translated as "living well," but with a distinctive meaning in the Latin American and particularly indigenous context) as a goal which diverges from the paradigm of development. Feminism is helping to build this, articulating the processes of decolonisation and dismantling patriarchy.

The 1970s: Women in development

Feminist critiques of the concept of development emerged in the 1970s, about twenty years after the new global North-South hierarchy was launched by the

United States president, Harry Truman[5]. Following the 1968 uprisings, the 1970s produced the "Second Wave" of the feminist movement, not only in the industrialised countries but also to a great extent in Latin America. This included left-wing counter-cultural feminism as much as liberal feminism.

A seminal contribution to the discourse on gender and development was formulated by the Danish economist Ester Boserup in 1970. In her book *Woman's Role in Economic Development* she criticised development as being a system that excluded women, and proposed a break with a series of dogmas established in development discourse and policies. She used some empirical research in Africa to question the outcomes of post-1945 development programmes, showing that they had serious implications for women's participation and well-being. Until the 1970s, women had only been included in development policies as passive beneficiaries, or mothers and housewives, while training, technology and finance were geared to men. The Western model became widespread through development programmes and focused on the home as a standard recipient unit and particularly on men as breadwinners with a salaried job. Women were dependants, in charge of the home. The model ignored the fact that in many cultures women worked in agriculture and food production (for example) and that there were different, or much more flexible, sexual divisions of labour. It also ignored the fact that the home, or the household, was a mesh of power relations that did not necessarily convert the aid given to male breadwinners into profit for "dependants" of either sex.

The work of Boserup and her contemporaries was successful, leading to the first World Conference on Women in Mexico on July 2, 1975, at which the United Nations declared the next decade the "Decade of Women" and institutionalised women's perspective as part of development[6]. This was intended to be not so much a criticism of the idea of development itself as a way of reversing the exclusion of women from the array of development-related resources. It would also mean that women's productive and reproductive work, which makes a significant contribution to national economies (Safa, 1995), would cease to be disregarded.

With the introduction of the concept of "Women in Development" (WID), large numbers of NGOs emerged, geared to helping women access funds earmarked for development, and be included as programme beneficiaries, which in future would have a "women component". This concept also argued that women, because they are socialised as carers which involves a greater sense of responsibility to others, would be better resource administrators, better savers, and they were even considered a "so-far unexploited resource for greater efficiency in development"

(Jackson, 1992: 89). This for example led to a series of programmes especially for women, such as microcredit, and to certain recognition of women's work in the productive economy. The "Women in Development" focus nevertheless did not question the consensus between liberal political ideologies and neoclassical economics, carved into the paradigm of modernisation that had characterised development policies during those years.

Another current of thought, "Women and Development" (WAD) emerged in the second half of the 1970s as a response to the constraints of modernism. This has its roots in Marxist feminism and the theory of dependence, which see the development of the North as the fruit of the exploitation of the South[7].

The authors of this chapter are critical of both concepts, and make it clear that women have always been an integral part of development in their societies – not only since 1970– and that their work, at home and elsewhere, has always helped sustain societies, and that this integration of women merely helped sustain international structures of inequality.

The WAD approach is more analytical than the WID concept, but does not make concrete proposals for development policies, unlike the WID. The WAD focus hardly analyses gender relations within social classes and pays little attention to gender subordination (which is true of Marxism in general), putting greater emphasis on unequal class structures and oppressive international structures. It stresses productive work at the expense of women's reproductive work. Like WID, WAD focused on income generation for women, without considering what this meant for them in terms of 'double-day' work. As a result, this feminist theory about development, just like the androcentric theories of dependence, modernity and the political economy, saw caring work as part of the "private" domain, which does not produce value and hence is beyond the purposes of development (Rathgeber, 1990).

The 1980s: Gender in Development and Socialist Feminism

The 1980s witnessed the Third Wave of feminist movements. As Amelia Valcárcel (2008) has said, it is when in theory the category of "gender" came to the fore of globalisation debates.

Even into the 1980s, women in Latin American countries who did have access to the social benefits consolidated by the continent's partial industrialisation did so through subsidies given to a man as the "breadwinner". Women were not

considered subjects of direct social security, nor as economic subjects, nor as full citizens. Families or partners were only seen through the male breadwinner, while women were for the most part in charge of reproducing the life of the family. Men were in the domain of production and salaried work while women were in the domain of reproduction. This gap began to close in the 1980s, with the approach known as "Gender and Development" (GAD).

This new current of thought has its roots in socialist feminism and in the post-structuralist critique. Socialist feminists challenged capitalism and patriarchy at the same time, and succeeded in closing the flawed debate about the "secondary contradiction" within the Left. They identified the socially-constructed division between productive and reproductive work as the basis of the oppression of women, and laid the foundations for left-wing feminist economics (see Rowbotham, 1973, and later works by the same author).

GAD is a constructivist approach which starts from a comprehensive perspective. It looks at the whole of the political, economic and social organisation of society. GAD does not place "women" at the centre of its analysis, but questions the assumption that "women" are a homogeneous social category. It stresses that both genders are social constructs, beyond biological sex, and that women are shaped not only by gender, but by other categories of domination, such as their ethnic and cultural origin, their sexual orientation and age. It posits the need to research these power relations in all social spheres and to make women's empowerment policies cross-cutting.

The GAD focus criticises the hegemonic logic that economic change alone will empower women. From that perspective it criticises the social policies of microcredit which is given above all to poor women without questioning the domination they suffer (frequently at the hands of their husbands), the lack of proper infrastructure, or any chance of social redistribution which would enable them to be successful in their micro-business.

On the contrary, it encourages women to get into debt and promotes a collective responsibility which is often imposed on them. GAD emphasises gender roles and relations in what has been called the "gender system", and advocates structural change. It argues strongly that gender-differentiated policies are needed to reduce poverty. Its objective is equality; it makes the double workload women face visible and does not use the household as the exclusive unit of analysis for development-related sciences. It also opens the doors to contributions from men who are committed to equality, unlike earlier feminist perspectives.

Both the socialist feminist perspective of the 1980s and the GAD approach reject the dichotomy between the public and private spheres, and focus their attention on the oppression of women in the family or home, which is the basis of marital relations. Both see women as agents of change, rather than recipients of development, and emphasise the need for women to be organised and build up more effective political representation. It was then that feminists began to join up the gender, race and class forms of oppression in their analyses and link them to a critique of development (Maguire, 1984; Sen y Grown, 1988).

Practical needs and strategic needs

At that time, the feminist academic Caroline Moser (1986, 1993) helped develop a differentiated gender planning model for development programmes and projects which distinguish between women's practical and strategic needs. This was widely circulated. Practical needs include access to basic services, food etc.; while strategic needs are those that question the subordination in the gender system depending on the specific social context. They may include demands for equal pay for equal work, or against gender violence, or proposing that women may freely decide over their sexuality and the number of children they have. Moser's model has the advantage of obtaining more complex data to describe a specific context where programmes are planned.

This focus was officially adopted by major international organisations like the United Nations and the World Bank, and is currently part of the hegemonic canon for development planning. In practice however, it has not achieved the objectives proposed. Moser's model is technocratic, something intrinsic to development policies, which aim to address complex and diverse problems by using a "toolbox" that is supposedly universally applicable, but which in fact is a colonial transfer of a multitude of Western epistemological preconceptions to the concrete contexts of the South.

Neoliberal policies and the feminisation of poverty

Under neoliberalism, women became visible as subjects in development but they were not recognised by social policies. They took over the social policies which neoliberal governments had abandoned. Deregulation through structural adjustment policies, a condition imposed on Latin America in the years of the foreign debt crisis, hit women hardest. It was women who had to create jobs for

themselves and move into the labour market in unequal conditions, where they suffered wage discrimination. At the same time, in the export-based economies, feeding the family – traditionally a woman's job– became an increasingly complex task. Despite the assumption that women were "included in development", the patriarchal modification within the household and in the public domain adopted another form, starting a new cycle of poverty for women and the feminisation of poverty, anchored in subsistence economies.

Alternatives in the South

At the second World Conference on Women in Nairobi in 1985, the network of women from the South, Development Alternatives with Women for a New Era (DAWN), challenged the assumption that the problem was simply that women did not participate enough in an otherwise "benevolent" process of development and growth. The movement rejected the narrow definition of progress as being economic growth and contended that consumerism and indebtedness are key factors in the crises that have aggravated the living standards of women in the South. It also criticised the over-exploitation of women through being "integrated into development" and used to offset the public spending cuts demanded by the North as part of structural adjustment.

These women redefined development as "the socially responsible management and use of resources, the elimination of gender subordination and social inequality and the organisational restructuring that can bring these about" (Sen and Grown, 1987). They insisted that economic development should be considered a tool for achieving human development and not vice versa and criticised development policies as a form of continuing colonialism, pointing out the systematic deprecation of traditional institutions and attitudes in "under-developed" countries.

The socialist feminist movement of the 1980s questioned women's waged work, which had always been lower-paid than that of men and which the WID strategy aimed to increase. These feminists demanded equal work for equal pay and analysed the labour conditions of women in the feminised sectors like the *maquila* assembly plants. They showed that when certain jobs were feminised, usually when increasing numbers of women entered the labour market, they were considered less important because they were "women's work", and hence of lower status and paid less. School teaching is a good example of this in much of Latin America: women began to work as teachers in the sector from the 1950s on.

Post-colonial feminist movements

Since the 1990s, in what became known as post-colonial feminism, some feminists in the South have strongly criticised both essentialist feminism - which maintains that women have some innate or spiritual superiority - and the attempts of hegemonic feminism and an ethnocentric trend anchored in the North to homogenise the concept of "Third World women" as one group of development beneficiaries. Post-colonial feminists were much influenced by deconstruction and the black, Chicana and lesbian feminists in the United States of the 1980s, who were the first to insist on differentiation.

The Indian feminist Chandra Talpade Mohanty, for example, states that to use one homogeneous category of "women" that appeals to sorority, reduces women ahistorically to a condition of gender identity, ignoring other factors which have determined their identity such as class and ethnic origin. Mohanty argues that if we think of "Third World" women as oppressed, we make "First World" women subjects of a history in which Third World women would have the status of objects. This is no more than a form of colonising and appropriating the diversity of women in different social classes and ethnic groups. Ethnocentric universalist feminism tends to judge the religious, family, legal and economic structures of the cultures of the South, taking Western standards as the reference point and defining these structures as "under-developed" or "developing". This makes it seem that the only development possible is that of the "First World", thereby hiding all experiences of resistance, considering them marginal (Portolés, 2004). Mohanty on the other hand proposes transcultural feminism based on feminist solidarity that is neither colonialist, imperialist, nor racist (1997). The recognition of cultures becomes a source of transformation, arising from the recognition of differences.

Gayatri Spivak, the Bengali post-colonial feminist theorist, sees development as the neocolonial successor of the civilising mission of imperialism. She criticises a world neoliberal economic system which in the name of development - even sustainable development - stops at nothing in order to penetrate the most fragile national economies, jeopardising any chance of social distribution. Spivak points out that developing countries are united not only by the common link of extensive environmental destruction, but also by the complicity between those who hold local power - and try to carry out "development" - and the forces of global capital. Spivak advocates 'strategic essentialism' over and above the current differences between women, to forge alliances around concrete struggles such as the fight against control over reproduction. She says: "The responsibility for the exhaustion of world resources is concentrated on the demographic explosion

of the South and hence on the poor women of the South" (1999). Controlling reproduction in the poor countries provides development with a justification for "aid" and draws attention away from the excesses of consumerism in the North. For Spivak, globalisation is manifest in population control (demanded by the "rationalisation" of sexuality), and in post-Fordist work in the home which, although a pre-capitalist remnant, goes hand-in-hand with industrial capitalism (Portolés, 2004).

The holistic perspective proposed here must include – within a general critique of development – a critique of reproductive heterosexuality as a form of the reproductive and productive social organisation of colonial and patriarchal systems of domination – .

Ecofeminism

Another important debate in the various feminist movements which is critical of development – particularly for discerning the way towards alternatives to development – is ecofeminism. This contends that there are important historical, cultural and symbolic parallels between the oppression and exploitation of women and of nature. In patriarchal arguments, the dichotomy between women and men often corresponds to that of nature and civilisation, emotion and reason, and even tradition and modernity; the first half of the combination is always deprecated.

Ecofeminism arose as a counter-culture in the 1970s. It condemned the degrading association that the patriarchy establishes between women and nature. It also criticises the left-wing movements for not taking this into account and questions the paradigm of progress of "real socialism" and movements within the communist parties.

One of the trends in ecofeminism is essentialism. It is based on the assumption that there is a feminine essence that places women closer to nature than men. Women appear to be a kind of hope for humanity and the conservation of nature on the basis of the supposition that because of their very essence, women are more likely to protect living beings and have an ethic of care, which originates in the maternal instinct.

Another trend of ecofeminism however rejects this kind of essentialism and its literature is richer and more complex. Writers like Vandana Shiva, Maria Mies and Bina Agarwal define the origin of women's greater compatibility with nature

in the social and historical construction of gender, which is specific to each culture. For them, gender environmental awareness is born of the divisions of labour and specific social roles established in historical gender and class systems, and in the political and economic power relations associated with them – when women's household and community tasks include, for example, getting firewood and water or tending orchards (Paulson, 1998). They contend that "development" is in fact a Western colonisation strategy, rooted in domination over women and nature. In the words of Vandana Shiva:

> Although the last five decades have been characterised by a badly-directed development and the export of a Western and unsustainable industrial paradigm in the name of development, recent trends are geared towards an environmental apartheid in which, through the global policy established by the 'Holy Trinity', Western multinational companies, backed by the governments of economically powerful countries, try to conserve the economic power of the North and the wasteful life of the rich. In order to do so, they export the environmental costs to the Third World. (2001:1)

For the German ecofeminist Maria Mies, a woman's body has become the third colony, additional to colonised states and subjected nature. This argument condemns colonial processes and patriarchal forms of domination, and leads to a position critical of development, bringing together complex forms of decolonisation and dismantling of patriarchal relations.

This view looks to alternatives to development that appeal to women's environmental awareness. It cannot be separated from a parallel critique of the sexual division of labour which (re)produces power and wealth based on the positions of gender, race and class. This is fundamental, given that the discourses on *Buen Vivir*, in cultural essentialism, often ascribe to indigenous women the role of guardians of their culture, who continue to wear their traditional dress while men use western styles to migrate to the cities. This is not matched, however, with the political commitment to criticise relations within the cultures that produce gender inequality.

Maria Mies analyses the economic sciences, including Marxism, and argues that to a great extent they conceal the preconditions that make wage labour possible but do not figure explicitly in the capitalist model of accumulation: caring, women's reproduction, the work of small farmers that guarantee subsistence or that local basic needs are met (often left to women with men absent as migrant workers).

They also hide nature itself as the supplier of natural resources. Although these conditions provide support without which capitalist accumulation could not exist, they are invisible in hegemonic discourse and economic policies, and considered "free". Mies contends that this fails to recognise the social and environmental costs of development, which through indicators such as the gross domestic product only takes into consideration work that contributes directly to generating capital gain, and establishes no link at all with human well-being.

Mies reaches the conclusion that sustainability is incompatible with a growth-based economic system, which leads her to question the primacy of economics in strategies for achieving well-being. She proposes an alternative model, for which the preservation of life is the central objective. Reproductive activities would be shared by men and women, and include the stakeholders excluded by the capitalist discourse, such as nature. Mies emphasises the importance of common goods and solidarity between communities and community decision-taking to safeguard the collective interest. She suggests overcoming the antagonism between labour and nature, and giving priority to local and regional economies instead of global markets, to recover the direct correlation between production and consumption (Mies, 1998).

Ivone Gebara is a Brazilian ecofeminist with a feminist theological insight. She holds that the fundamental criticism of development is that it is a hegemonic discourse for modernity. Gebara argues that modernity introduces two fundamental practices: the torture of witches and the establishment of the scientific method, in a context where women are defined in the domestic domain as subordinate to marital relations and to the family and where, at the same time, nature becomes dominated by the masculine scientific spirit. For Gebara, the oppressed - women and nature – were in the discourses of the dominating strategies of politics, philosophy and theology of modern Western thought from the advent of capitalism. Ecofeminism hence involves proposing that the destiny of the oppressed is intimately linked to the destiny of the Earth: "Every appeal to social justice implies eco-justice" (quoted in Pobierzym, 2002).

Feminist ecology also has another face, one which proposes questioning the situation of women in the environment, and which was promoted by international cooperation agencies from the mid-1990s. Development received further criticism, because women live in conditions of oppression. They are exposed to an excessive workload regarding environmental care which is barely recognised; they are generally seen to be "in charge" of caring for nature, not to mention the difficulties they face (over-exploitation and subordination) for taking an active part in decisions for managing environmental resources (Nieves Rico, 1998).

Feminist economics and the economics of care

Feminist economics establishes critiques and theory about the concept of nature, the form of capitalist production and the sphere of reproduction, and how this is related to production. Feminist economists first deconstruct some of the myths of the hegemonic economic sciences: instead of supporting the hypothesis that the market works neutrally and creates well-being for all men and women indiscriminately, they ask what values are being created in economics and for whom. Second, they criticise market-centred economic sciences, arguing that economic activity does not take place only in the market, but rather exists in a mixture of the private market, state benefits, non-profit activities, informal sectors and the household (Knobloch, 2010).

Like Maria Mies, they start with the assumption that unpaid work in the home generates economic value by maintaining the labour force of the members of the household. Feminist economics not only aims to make this economic value visible within national accounting methods, but also to raise awareness about the over-exploitation of women, who, while having recently begun to participate more in paid work, are still in charge of housework. As time-use surveys show, even in the industrialised societies of the North, the total amount of unpaid work in a national economy is greater than the total amount of paid work (Winkler, 2010). In Latin America, the state provides minimal care services, which worsens over-exploitation and gives it a marked class bias, since only those who are able to pay can afford private care (Rodríguez, 2005). Feminist economists hence aim to build equality in the private domain, and in the distribution of the burden of labour in the home and elsewhere.

Even today, neither the GDP nor public budgets show the value and productivity of care. This debate is indirectly related to the concept of development, as it lays bare the blindness of macro policies and hegemonic micro-economics, from classical economics until today. It also doubts whether with these precepts - growth-centred development strategies, the integration of women in the market and the fight against poverty - are able to generate well-being. It does not accept the position international development cooperation has assigned to women at the centre of their "economic development" strategies. To quote Annemarie Sancar, the biological stereotyping of women and the emphasis on their "special abilities" still shape development programmes today: "It is clear today that it was not women's rights that were decisive here, but rather the neoliberal economies' desire for growth. Women were found to be good at business and at driving growth, following the World Bank's concept of smart economics" (Sancar, 2010)."

The economics of care identify the need for the care of children, the sick, those with special abilities and the elderly, as one of the most important of human needs for living a full life with dignity. Yet this has been completely ignored by the political discourse and economic reductionism of development. The debate on the economics of care builds bridges towards *Buen Vivir* as a goal of transformation. The feminist economist Ulrike Knobloch (2010) proposes an ethic of economics which goes further than the criterion of efficiency, and questions the sense of each economic activity geared to *Buen Vivir*: what are the fundamental objectives of economics? According to Knobloch, economics can only be a means to a higher end. This is a philosophical question, way beyond economic sciences. These work with the simplistic assumption that the market satisfies the preferences of economic subjects, Knobloch argues that it cannot be automatically assumed that the market provides children and men and women with what they really need if they are to have a full life. She also questions the goal of a 'fair coexistence'. For whom do our economic practices generate values? What principles must be observed to guarantee a fair coexistence? A gender-sensitive economic ethic must also go beyond the androcentric perspective focused on wage labour to shed light on how modern economics are based on gender inequality. Instead of an asexual *homo economicus*, it should contemplate men and women in their respective contexts and living conditions.

The economics of care criticises the privatisation and individualisation of social services under neoliberalism and demands a public policy for care. This need not "necessarily imply that the state must be the sole provider of the care services needed for social reproduction, but that it should design a comprehensive system with the various providers in order to guarantee a collective solution to society's demand for care" (Rodríguez Enríquez, 2005: 29). It proposes that the work of care should be at the centre of political strategies, which should also foster community action. It demands that time-use be made democratic, so that women also can enjoy leisure. Here, the German socialist feminist Frigga Haug proposes what she describes as a "time economy". In her "utopia for women to achieve a good life for all men and women", which is located in the North, Haug suggests distributing time in life between paid work, reproduction, culture and political participation. She proposes drastically cutting time in paid work to four hours a day, to guarantee the necessary productivity, democratising access to work in a context of an employment crisis. She suggests balancing the time gained between care work, personal interests and developing new ideas about what a good life means – summarised as "culture"– and finally participation in politics, understood as social creation from the bottom up (Haug, 2009).

The discussions arising from the economics of care, conceived as the theory and practice of the sustainability of life, provide an opportunity to question individual competence as the driving force of economics by advancing in ways that create links of solidarity. They also present the mercantilisation of care as the main problem, with its consequences of the production and reproduction of new and old inequalities in global and national economies. The discussion joins the debate about *Buen Vivir*, with the challenge of making mutually supportive, fairer and egalitarian social models of organisation (Salazar et al., 2010).

This debate also suggests that poverty reduction should tackle the social need for care as a matter of public policy, to prevent the care crisis – which goes hand-in-hand with the crisis in capitalism – from further damaging the quality of life of many women, driving them into poverty. Vital human needs, instead of economic growth and profit, should be central to social transformation, which makes necessary a revolution in care and a profound reformulation of political action by left-wing movements.

Feminism and Latin America's progressive, neodevelopment governments

Progressive governments have emerged in Latin America which dissociated themselves from neoliberal policies, above all by redistributing wealth. Their appearance has highlighted a tension in feminism between two currents of thought, which has existed since the 1970s.

The first demands that women have unrestricted access to the promise of development with a feminist economics, and which generally questions the patriarchy in the system. The new progressive governments and their state institutions gave great opportunities to this movement for promoting policies geared to increasing women's income and thereby their consumption as stakeholders in the development model.

The second current is more left-wing. It questions the policy of giving money to poor women, seeing this as paternalist and 'assistentialist', and describes it as reinforcing patriarchy. It questions the development model based on the extractive industries and agribusiness, and sees feminism as the driving force behind the comprehensive transformation of society. The solidarity economy, food sovereignty and the defence of the land are at the centre of this current of thought, which looks at feminism from below, from the position of the poor and the community. Both of these currents can be found co-existing within many

women's organisations, and create dissension about the deeper meaning of the struggle against the patriarchy.

Andean, 'popular' and community feminism

As has been noted, over the last few decades Latin American countries have witnessed a series of neoliberal reforms, which strengthened extractive activities and the international division of labour to the detriment of the impoverished majority. It was poor women - the indigenous, mestizo, black and peasant women - who bore the brunt of a greater burden of domestic and productive work (unrecognised, insecure, the product of brutal impoverishment and conflicts arising from the state's withdrawal from the strategic areas of investment and the guarantee of social and economic rights); but under the dominant neoliberal mercantilisation, they also suffered the fragmentation of their demands, and with them, their identities. New roles rained down on them imposed by development and cooperation, they were "maternalised" and became uncertain clients of privatised services.

During those years, however, Latin America also witnessed organised resistance movements, with indigenous organisations and peoples playing a central part in a two-fold process: a resistance to neoliberalism; and a quest for the state to recover its role in redistribution, guaranteeing social, economic and cultural rights and standing up to imperialism. They also fought for the state to become plurinational. This meant questioning the very structure of the state as incomplete, post-colonial and oligarchic, a product of the constraints of the colonial pact made when the independent republics arose. It was this context, particularly in Ecuador and Bolivia, which saw the growth of a feminist movement which over the years has become known as "community and popular feminism".[8]

This chapter will not show the differences between the contexts or the feminist organisations in both countries, but will mention some points they have in common. First, they see themselves and their activities as part of the resistance, demonstrations, uprisings and construction of the poor, the indigenous, the peasant farmers and workers of Latin America since the struggle for independence, and even back to the Conquest and the Spanish colonial occupation over five hundred years ago. These feminist movements abjure the notion that feminism has been brought from the North and is a movement of white women in developed countries.

Second, these movements have overcome the apparent contradiction between

'difference' and 'equality' feminism. They question both the post-modern fragmentation of the struggles for identity and the isolation of particularity, and the patriarchal stage of equality and inclusion. They envisage a new kind of universality, in which sexual, racial and contextual diversity is recognised with all its colonial and class connotations and its relations with nature, but their politics involve building recognition, dialogue and the collective construction of transformation. However, they also see equality as a product of dismantling patriarchal relations, anchored in the construction of plurinational states. The core reference of equality is no longer the paradigm of individual rights, but the transformation of society as a whole.

Third, they see a complex connection between decolonisation, fighting patriarchalism, defeating capitalism and the construction of a new relationship with nature. It is a complex concept which rethinks ideas like community, the public domain and repertoires of action. These feminist movements present the community as an unnatural but historical construction, a place of political and emotional encounter. Their aim to establish a plurinational state facilitates dialogue between women because it provides a chance to reflect on the political community that will, ideally, follow the national state.

Finally, Andean feminism is no longer mainly for middle-class, professional and mestizo women. It provides an arena – at times troubled – for lower-income women who identify themselves as feminists, and who redefine feminism from their own contexts, experiences and cultural production in their daily lives;, a view in which nature - the *Pachamama* - is central both to encounter and to mobilisation.

These are peasant, indigenous and black women who support the discourse about the importance of nature and the political, economic and cultural relationship from other standpoints and with other meanings from those originally put forward by ecofeminism. At the World People's Conference on Climate Change in Tiquipaya, Cochabamba in April 2010, the community feminists declared:

> We understand the *Pachamama*, the *Mapu*, as a whole, beyond visible nature, beyond the planets, which contains life, the relations established between living beings, their energy, their needs and their wishes. We condemn the understanding of the *Pachamama* as the Mother Earth as reductionist and chauvinist, as it only refers to fertility in order to keep women and the *Pachamama* at its patriarchal whim.

> "Mother Earth" is a concept which has been used for a number of years and that this People's Conference on Climate Change aims to consolidate with the aim of reducing the *Pachamama* – as we women are reduced – to the function of a productive and reproductive uterus at the service of the patriarchy. The *Pachamama* is understood as something which can be dominated and manipulated at the service of "development" and consumption, and not as the cosmos of which humanity is just a small part.
>
> The cosmos: this is not the "Father Cosmos". The cosmos is part of the *Pachamama*. We do not accept their being "married", that the *Pachamama* is obliged to marry. At this conference we have heard unprecedented things, for example that there is a "Father Cosmos" who exists independently of the *Pachamama* and we have seen that the protagonism of women and the *Pachamama* are not tolerated, nor is it accepted that she or we decide our own destiny. When people speak of "Father Cosmos" they are trying to minimise and subordinate the *Pachamama* to a masculine and heterosexual head of family. But she, the *Pachamama*, is a whole and does not belong to us. Women and men are hers.[9]

Conclusion

It is clear that women and feminist movements have debated 'development' from the widest variety of positions. The development system incorporated some of their demands, mainly those of liberal feminists. A legion of entities were created to take charge of women's development, but women still have a secondary role in them, be they international or national. Development policies today have a series of indicators to show the situation of women, such as gender-sensitive budgeting. In comparison, the question of patriarchal power relations within the family - which condition all access women have to other political or economic spheres - has barely been addressed, above all in public policy. Hard-line economic sciences continue to ignore the gender dimension and the productivity of care, and continue to use GDP as the primary indicator.

A number of the feminist movements described here have joined the debate about the question of *Buen Vivir* as an alternative to development, from a variety of positions. They also debate the issue of a plurinational state, through the struggles to transform the post-colonial state, with the emancipatory perspective

of decolonisation and undoing patriarchal relations. While ecofeminists criticise the devaluation entailed by what is considered "natural" and "feminine", for economists of care, time-use is central to "*Buen Vivir*, and they have a different perspective on redistribution and happiness – one which is applicable in both urban and rural areas, both in the North and the South. They all work with a perspective of the 'crisis of civilisation', which can only be resolved by tackling the different dimensions of domination identified by feminist theory: class, race, gender and relationship with nature. Their proposals for economics to be dethroned as the master discipline of the capitalist world and governed by another ethic that responds to human needs are a bridge to other discourses critical of development.

This chapter has shown how the various currents of feminism have moved from questioning the development paradigm in itself to proposing development alternatives, a move that is drawing strength from the discourse and practice arising from the changes set in motion in Latin America. With the advent of progressive governments in the Andean region, feminism has focused on strengthening the state and the implementation of social and redistribution policies. It is also rethinking and updating the critique of development: the tension between social justice and overcoming inequality, post-extractivism and nature as a subject of rights. Women in the region are building new practices of organisation and struggle – known as popular and community feminism - based on ideas different from those of Latin American feminism of previous decades in which liberal, middle-class women had the greater say. Over the last thirty years, feminist political and theory production in the South has been crucial to the formation of new trends and proposals for all of humanity.

After several decades in which feminist thinking was mainly formulated in the North, it is the feminist movements of the South that are reviving and refreshing the debates linking patriarchy, the crisis of civilisation, the prevailing production and development models, and alternatives to this paradigm. Today, women in the South are productive and reproductive workers and subjects who are sustaining humanity and establishing different links with the planet.

These same peasant women, indigenous women, black women and women of the shanty towns who swell the ranks of popular feminism in the South are the women whom the official development paradigm perceives solely as programme recipients, as inferiors. Today, with their experience of the social solidarity (or community) economy, in the face of the destruction of their habitat by "development" mega-projects, they are using their collective voice to demand that their societies take a different direction. They reject any gender or cultural

essentialism and are demanding their rights as women within the indigenous or original justice systems.

These new feminist movements in the Andean region are not the product of progressive governments, but have grown out of the contradictions of particular changes, as a response to the current multiple crises, which these women experience in their own lives. They are facing the contradiction between the politics of producing an economic surplus for an equal distribution of resources and the immediate political goal of ceasing extractive activities, which produce most of the surplus, but also destroy the environment. This is the context for their discussion of the meaning of *Buen Vivir*, an expression too often expropriated by government programmes or corporate initiatives.

These women speak of the relationship of knowledge, the symbolic relationship of respect, wisdom and the meaning of community property and of the *Pachamama*. They condemn the extractive model of development not only as economistic and a means of making use of nature, but as a model which is profoundly racist, patriarchal and classist; and one which, unless these dimensions of power are addressed, will be impossible to dismantle.

Notes

1. Margarita Aguinaga Barragán is an Ecuadorean sociologist and feminist and is active in the Ecuador Women's Assembly (AMPDE). She is a researcher at the Institute of Ecuadorean Studies (IEE) and is a member of the Standing Committee on Alternatives to Development.

2. Miriam Lang is the director of the Andean Regional Office of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation. She has a doctorate in sociology from the Free University of Berlin, with a specialisation in Gender Studies and a master's degree in Latin American Studies. She has wide experience working of working with women's and indigenous people's organisations in Latin America.

3. Dunia Mokrani Chávez, politologist and lecturer at the San Andrés University (CIDES-UMSA) in philosophy and political science. She is active in the Samka Sawuri (Dream Weavers) women's collective and is project coordinator for Bolivia at the Andean Regional Office of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation.

4. Alejandra Santillana has a master's degree in sociology from the Latin American Faculty of Social Sciences (FLACSO) and is a militant of the Ecuadorean Women's Assembly (AMPDE). She is project coordinator for Ecuador at the Andean Regional Office of the Rosa Luxemburg Foundation.

5. The development plan introduced by Truman in 1945 included an economic recovery plan for Europe and the reduction of trade barriers in developing countries. The plan sought, through major private investment, to increase industrial activity in the South as a fundamental measure for "improving the standard of living" in the poor countries.

6. The conference paved the way for the creation of the International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) and the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).

7. For an explanation of development as an ideology of modernism, see the chapter "Debates on Development and its Alternatives in Latin America: a brief heterodox guide" by Eduardo Gudynas, in this book.

8. The authors will consider these new feminist movements by looking at the experience and political militancy of feminist organisations in both countries: in Ecuador, the women's movement Luna Creciente, and the Ecuador Women's Assembly; in Bolivia, Mujeres Creando.

9. Declaration of the Community Feminists at the World People's Conference on Climate Change (Tiquipaya, Cochabamba, April 2010).