

Dame Nita Barrow Lecture

Up Against the State: The Women's Movement in Pakistan – Implications for the Global Women's Movement

Toronto, November 1999

Nighat Said Khan

Dean, Institute of Women's Studies, Lahore Pakistan

Founding Member, Women's Action Forum

I thank the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, the Centre for Women's Studies in Education and the University of Toronto, for inviting me to present the 1999 lecture for the Dame Nita Barrow Distinguished Visitorship. I also thank all of you for coming, and hope that you will not be too disappointed in what may be a somewhat distracted lecture given that Martial Law has, yet again, been declared less than a month ago and none of us in Pakistan know what the implications of this will be, especially since it seems there are very few of us, even within progressive, liberal and left circles, who strongly oppose the military coup.

I have a further apology to make and that is for the title of the paper, which reads that the Pakistani women's movement has implications for the global women's movement. It does have implications for the Asian women's movement and perhaps Africa, Latin America, Europe and women of the diaspora, but from my discussions over the last few days with friends here, much of what I may say might not be relevant for North America both academically and in terms of the Women's Movement. Nevertheless, I hope you will bear with me and will appreciate that to struggle for a global restructuring, for global political, economic and social transformation, for a just and equitable world, we will have to reclaim global ideologies that appear to have been discarded. I refer here to Marxism, Socialism and Feminism-reformulated in the light of the imperatives of the present - but still forming the core of an ideology and a struggle to challenge global capitalism, the supposedly "free" market, political, social and racial hegemony and of course, patriarchy.

To a large extent, the onus of a global movement, including a global women's movement, lies with the North - in places such as Canada, since even the combined struggle of the South will not, and cannot, be successful in bringing about global change in what is called the new world order, since this ordering is determined by a handful of countries and significantly by the United States. We in the South can do our best but until the Women's Movement and feminist academics in the North are also against their respective States and the international world order, we will never see a global Women's Movement.

I carry within me the accumulated fatigue of a country trying to find its bearings for the last 52 years since independence (a fatigue that has propelled many a Pakistani to seek the security and the calm that Canada seems to offer!) I carry my own fatigue of fighting as a student activist, the Martial Law of General Ayub Khan from 1958 to 1969, of trying to mobilize against the Martial Law of General Yahya Khan, 1969 to 1971 when the army was unleashed against the people of East Pakistan and rape was part of military strategy. I found myself in opposition to the civilian dictatorship of Prime Minister Z.A. Bhutto, and fought against the military regime of General Zia ul Haq from 1977 to 1988. The last 11

years of four elected governments and three interim ones, again found many of us on the battle lines, particularly during the two regimes of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, with the last year bringing the confrontation to literally a life and death situation. For the Institute of Women's Studies, Lahore, that I represent, and myself personally, the last year has been particularly difficult with the Nawaz Sharif government initiating a vicious campaign against us. The Institute, and myself by name, were continuously accused (through the press and television) among other things of being anti State, anti government, anti Islam, of leading women astray, of immorality, debauchery and of being pro Hindu and pro Jewish! At least four different police and intelligence agencies including the military intelligence, and the Inter Services Intelligence, were assigned to "monitor" our activities and for two months (last May and June) we had six army trucks and jeeps stationed outside our building!

A Minister of the provincial government also made repeated calls through the Press for the public to burn our building down (and our homes) and to literally skin us alive. We received threats and were followed by right wing militants.

Women's groups, NGOs, and the Press, to a large extent, came out in support of the Institute. All the leading English dailies wrote supportive editorials and the monthly News Magazines denigrate the government. The government had not expected this support. Its tactic, in fact, was to single out one organisation, isolate it and force it to close down, with the intent that others may simply get scared and back off from similar political activities. Since that was not forthcoming and the Institute stood firm on its position and its stand, which it stated publicly through the Press, another women's organisation, Aurat Foundation, was attacked for anti government activities. NGOs, particularly women's organisations, and the Press are being perceived as the last bastions of opposition, a position that far outweighs their size or their ability, to destabilize a government. But to the extent that they voice opposition and try to alert the public, and further since they confront the government on the streets, in the press, and even in court, this opposition is perceived as a threat.

Intelligence agencies continued to harass women's groups and NGOs, and Islamic fundamentalists and militant organisations continued to threaten and intimidate these groups. In May 1999 the government again started its verbal campaign and harassment, this time also on television and attacked Dastak (a women's refuge), Shirkat Gah, Ajoka (a women's theatre group), the Human Rights Commission of Pakistan, AGHS (a women's law firm) and ASR/IWSL – all of these women's organisations or led by women. The accusations and language used was again emotive: pro -west, pro -Indian, anti-Islam, against Islamic values, foreign agents, national integrity, immorality etc.

In April, a young woman was murdered by her parents in the office of her lawyers Hina Jilani and Asthma Jahangir, because she had approached the lawyers to assist her in getting a divorce. Since she was a Pathan and came from the North West Frontier Province, the supposedly secular opposition party there, supported the murder as being part of its tradition of honour killings. The murderers have not been arrested and in a strange twist of justice, arrest warrants were issued on the lawyers whom Samia, the young woman, had approached for assistance.

While the government's incitement to violence by the public abated under pressure from other NGOs, the Press, International agencies and donor countries – the government with the assistance of an organization of American lawyers started drawing up a law that would allow them to disband organisations such as ours. I have been somewhat preoccupied with this: and also in our case to look for funds, since donors committed to supporting the IWSL decided not to fund Pakistan, ironically, because of its lack of good governance and its curtailment of human and women's rights. Over the summer I was

able to get some donor agencies to reconsider their positions, but we have now got caught in the range of sanctions imposed as a result of the coup.

This experience, however, needs to be contextualised, as indeed, Pakistan itself needs to be, since, whatever is, or, may have happened in Pakistan, has not occurred unrelated to regional and global imperatives.

I am not suggesting that all expressions of nationality, religion, race, identity and culture are part of a global conspiracy. Yet, Islamic fundamentalism which most concerns me today, was created and encouraged by global capitalism, particularly, by the United States, for its own ideological, political and economic purposes. For the people of those countries here Islamic fundamentalist regimes were imposed and supported, this meant two things: one that a monolithic and one dimensional Islam was forced upon them, and secondly, that this imposition of a repressive and narrowly defined Islam led to intense divisions within these countries because of the various sects, and multiple interpretations that exist within Islam. Pakistan was one of the countries where an Islamic fundamentalist regime was forced upon the people in 1977 and which was supported militarily and economically by the United States to fight communism in Afghanistan. Perhaps it is in order, at this point, to state that despite the present position of the Pakistani State, Pakistan was not intended to be an "Islamic" Republic and further that its identity as an Islamic Republic has been and continues to be contested.

Indeed the first constitution of Pakistan, passed in 1956, while declaring Pakistan to be an Islamic Republic, separated religion from the State by emphasising that, the 'Almighty Allah' has given temporal authority to the people as a sacred trust. Affirmative action for women was recognised in this constitution, by giving women two votes, one for the general constituency and one for seats reserved for women. The constitution was never put in place. The army took over in 1958 and sought to 'modernize' and liberalize Pakistan, by opening the doors to capitalist development. General Ayub Khan made changes in the Islamic Personal Law by promulgating a Muslim Family Laws Ordinance, which gave rights to women within a liberal interpretation of Islam. Pakistan still has one of the more liberal personal laws in the Muslim world. The position of women was further strengthened under Prime Minister Z.A Bhutto who was liberal and progressive in terms of women's rights. All services and professions, with the exception of the armed services, were opened to women. In the Mexico Conference in 1975 Mrs. Bhutto declared that the Peoples' Government of Pakistan was fully committed to the complete equality, emancipation and integration of women in the development process. Bhutto also set up a Women's Rights Commission, which recommended fundamental changes in legal rights, personal laws, inheritance, political participation and affirmative action an all levels. Bhutto was deposed in 1977.

1977 was a turning point for Pakistan. General Zia-ul-Haq declared Martial Law, and justified his takeover by saying that he had to Islamize Pakistan. Apart from the support of the United States, other Western countries and the military, he was supported by Islamic fundamentalist parties, and the Jamat-e-Islami joined this government. At one level, it meant no more than military repression using the language of religion, yet, Pakistan today borders on being a theocratic State, not because the clergy is supported by the people but, because the State, in giving a voice to the clergy, has created its own nemesis.

While not being able to 'convert' the nation, or to bring about any fundamental changes in its capitalist economy, Zia-ul-Haq concentrated on issues such as Islamic punishments, on legal changes, and on refining the definition of Islam and what it means to be a Muslim. Fasting in Ramzan, saying one's prayers, being forced to give charity in the exact percentage determined by Islam became the parameters

of being a Muslim, while the larger morality got lost in the ritual. In separating the wheat from the chaff, non-Muslims were completely marginalized and now are only nominal citizens.

However, the lynchpin of this process of Islamisation was women. In his first address to the nation Zia-ul-Haq vowed to uphold 'the sanctity of chadder and chardivari' (the veil and the four walls). The State moved to take over the lives of women, to control their bodies, their space, to decide what they should wear, how they should conduct themselves, the jobs they could take, the sports they could play, and took it upon itself to define and regulate women's morality. This was done through a series of legislative changes such as the Zina and Hudood Ordinances (Islamic punishments), and the Islamic Law of Evidence; through directives such as the dress code, and women not being allowed to participate in spectator sports; but mainly through a persistent ideology that women were not equal to men and that they must be regulated.

Women, in particular, have been fighting back, especially since 1981. The Hudood Ordinance which specifies Islamic punishments was passed in 1979. It requires the evidence of four Muslim males of good repute for maximum punishment, and makes no distinction between rape, adultery or fornication. The enormity of its implications became evident in 1981 when a woman and a man were arrested for adultery and sentenced to a hundred lashes each and stoning to death. This galvanized women into coming together and forming the Women's Action Forum, which was then an alliance of several women's groups and individuals. Since then women's organisations have fought every anti-women measure, and the first demonstration against Martial Law and Islamization was a women's demonstration in 1983 against the proposed law of Evidence which stipulated that the evidence of two women would be equal to that of one man. Despite State repression and State violence, the women's movement grew in size with several other groups and organisations being formed.

Indeed, the women's movement did not confine itself to so called women's issues. Women were not only in the forefront of the Movement for the Restoration of Democracy but also emerged as leaders of the peace movement (particularly peace between India and Pakistan); the environment movement; within the trade unions; were the first to challenge injustice through public interest litigation (for example on bonded labour); by forming NGOs; and many women played a key role as journalists and editors of major Newspapers and Journals. While admittedly these were mainly middle class professional women, one of the largest organisations then was the Sindhiani Tehreeq or Sindhi Women's Movement, which had an active membership of over 15000 mainly peasant women. What is of importance, nevertheless, was the role that women played, as opposed to their male counterparts. I would suggest that this reinforces the argument that not only did women bear the brunt of Islamisation, but that men were not only not threatened by it but since patriarchy and masculinity was reinforced by the State, many men even collaborated - At least by their silence. This is not to suggest that men were not fighting against Martial Law- only to say that women were fighting both Martial Law and Islamisation; and have continued to fight on several fronts.

General Zia ul Haq was killed on Aug 17, 1988 and a woman Prime Minister, Benazir Bhutto, elected in November of that year. Since then Pakistan has had four elected governments and three interim ones, a total of 7 in 11 years, with the Military coup as the 8th! Given the history of direct military rule and a clause inserted by Zia ul Haq in the constitution which until recently allowed a President to dismiss a government, the parliamentary system or other form of civilian government has never been allowed to take root in Pakistan. This does not suggest that the governments were not corrupt, inefficient and self seeking, only that the electoral system has not been allowed to take its own course.

As far as women are concerned there was a difference in Benazir Bhutto's two tenures and that of Nawaz Sharif's. Benazir Bhutto never had a two thirds majority in Parliament to overturn the anti women legislations passed by Zia ul Haq, but instinctively she allowed a greater space and a freedom to express women's concerns. Nawaz Sharif on the other hand passed another Islamic Amendment in 1991, in his first tenure, and was in the process of passing the 15th Amendment to the Constitution which, in effect, would have made the Prime Minister of the Federation the Supreme interpreter of the Quran and Sunnah (Injunctions in Islam) – literally the Commander of the Faithful. This would have led to a process where the Pakistani State would be very akin to Saudi Arabia with all religious and temporal authority concentrated in a single person. Women's organizations, NGOs and the English Language Press vociferously opposed these measures and indeed it was perhaps the movements' success in not letting it become law; and in raising awareness and mobilizing the public against the nuclear tests and nuclear proliferation, that also triggered off the massive attack on women's groups.

The last 22 years of Pakistan fall into two neat phases, 11 years of Zia's Martial Law and 11 years of parliamentary democracy. The women's movement can also be seen in two distinct phases, partly because the lifting of Martial Law broadened the focus and the strategies of the movement, and also, post Nairobi there was a global trend towards "mainstreaming". The 1980's also gave rise to debates among feminists on the "end of ideology"; reform versus revolution; the "difference" debates; the concept of "religious specificity"; "gender" etc. While feminist academics and the women's movement in Pakistan were not, by and large, aware of these debates, the positions came through in diluted and often distorted forms, through the donor community (World Bank, the United Nations and bilateral assistance) and dependence on funding and on the agendas of the funding agencies, and indeed the scale of funding, changed the nature of the women's movement in Pakistan and else where. In Pakistan for example, the dynamic, spontaneous, non-funded, politically oriented and feminist organizations such as Women's Action Forum and Sindhiani Tehreeq gave way to non-ideological women's rights groups. While militant, and feminists groups still exist yet, even we in ASR and the IWSL are under pressure to either change our orientation and our politics, or simply to cease to exist for lack of funds – or because we are considered "passe/".

In other words, while women in Pakistan have fought a brave and courageous struggle and that is today acknowledged by the United Nations, by governments and other institutions, the negative aspect of this support has been that the women's movement itself has lost its political edge and, in some cases, its commitment. This trend has led to some more powerful groups becoming not only part of the establishment but has led to these groups taking on the very male norms that they were earlier challenging.

What is even more unfortunate is that the women's movement has begun to be defined only by a few women centred groups, mainly in the urban areas. This has tended to exclude and to overlook the efforts that women have been making all over Pakistan, in their own areas of work or expression and this in turn has meant that the media, the government, the international agencies and even these organisations, believe that it is only they who give legitimacy to the movement.

There is, however, little validity in the assumption that the interest, issues, understanding, and in some cases, sophistication of urban/professional groups are different from those women not considered part of the movement. If anything, experience shows that women from different class, ethnic, religious, and professional backgrounds are much more able and willing to understand and grapple with issues of their own subordination. For example, it is often said by urban/professional women or women's rights groups that the women's movement cannot be very political, or confrontational, or secular, or conceptual, or feminist, because the 'average' woman is not yet ready for any of these. Yet we have often found that

these women are much more willing and able to understand and identify with these notions than the middle class urban women, and that these women (and some men) are more willing to travel long distances, put up with uncomfortable situations, take leave from their jobs, stay away from their families, and even take enormous personal risks, to be a part of something that they believe in. To them, the issues of class contradictions in society, the patriarchy inherent in all religions; militarization; poverty; unemployment, suppression of creativity, etc. are not only concepts or objective realities, but also what they deal with on a daily basis. They are, therefore, much more interested in why this happens and how it may be resolved.

Recently, there have been attempts at redefining the movement by including development activities and projects. In many cases however, projects, programmes, and action plans have subsumed and/or negated the very activism and the commitment that the movement is premised on. These initiatives have in a concrete sense depleted much of the dynamism, energy, and flexibility of the movement. For instance, in most cases these activities are financially supported which invariably brings with it the constraints of paper work, proposals, reports, accounts etc., quite apart from the fact that often activities also get defined by the agendas and the constraints of the funding agencies. This also leads to professionalism, since management and efficiency become important, and to a competition for resources and financial support. In the case of funded activities, and the responsibility of “keeping the office operational”, continuity of the issue and the activity become a further problem since the group must end the programme once the project period is over, and it goes into another programme without seeing the first one to its logical and necessary conclusion.

Paid political and social activism, whether it is the academia, the NGOs, or the press, or other institutions that supposedly work in the public interest, also gives a false sense of commitment and fulfillment. If for example, one is spending several hours a day doing ‘good works’ there is a tendency to switch off when one is ‘free’. Activism in this sense has increasingly become a job or a task, and the issues and actions not necessarily internalized. This not only leads to a further fragmentation of the self and to a false consciousness, but, by reinforcing the separation of the public and the private, it negates what the women’s movement is trying to struggle for.

The women’s movement has moved from being a movement, to becoming institutionalised, and becoming a part of the establishment. The anti-thesis has therefore, been through the synthesis and is increasingly becoming the thesis. Women’s groups are now institutions, feminists are members of the establishment, women’s studies is rapidly being incorporated in many universities, women’s lists are carried by mainstream publishers, women’s issues are being addressed by governments, and key women are being included in decision making in State structures. If one has a dialectical understanding of history, this thesis or establishment will produce a new anti-thesis to challenge it. This is a global as well as a national phenomenon, and the movement everywhere is not necessarily responding to the challenge within it, with an openness and a flexibility that would allow it to move to a higher stage of development and a higher stage of politics. The question is, how do we get out of this stagnation and out of the apathy that funding and post modernism or the non-existence of ideology inculcates, or, where do we go from here?

What has often been identified as the second wave of feminism started in the 1960s – for two decades, until perhaps Nairobi it was a vibrant political movement that sought to challenge not only patriarchy at all levels but to challenge the existing socio-political/economic structures, from the family to the State and to international institutions. Indeed, its most profound critique was of patriarchy and of the State and

international structures. It was also extremely dynamic, in that it accepted nothing as the norm and opened up new territories, spaces, choices and alternatives.

Those of you active then will recall that women went to Nairobi as a coming together of women in an international women's movement, seeking an understanding, political alliances and common struggles among themselves. Most of us were oblivious of the UN Conference and in any case were critiquing not only our Nation States but also the United Nations.

Nairobi should have been a watershed for a stronger women's movement and had it been, we today may not have been saying (in despair) as we are in Asia, that not much has changed since Beijing. History is made by people's movements – people propel history forward by confronting the status quo. History is never made by “collaborating” (a derogatory term at best) or by being in “partnership” with the oppressor, or by “lobbying”. The term and process of lobbying incidentally is very disturbing. It comes out of the American political system where people get paid by interest groups to hang out in the lobbies of power, to further their interests. It is most unfortunate that this very base aspect of the American political system has been taken on by social activists – often to the exclusion of all other forms of political activity.

In any case it seems ironic to me that if we identify the State, the global institutions, (including the UN) and patriarchal forces as the oppressors, that is if we identify them as the problem, that we then expect them also to be the solution. The question is whether we have this critique any longer – of patriarchy, the State or the UN, or whether we are only interested now in being included in the system. Certainly we are part of the system, as academics, NGOs, as paid social activists, dependent on resources from these very institutions and Nation States, following agendas already decided, within spaces already determined.

Apart from the critique of patriarchy and the State, we in Asia no longer critique the family and seem to have totally discarded the feminist critique of marriage. Sexuality and the institution of marriage is the seat of women's oppression. By moving away from discussions, debates, positions, and encouraging alternative ways of relating we not only reinforce patriarchy and the heterosexual family (which with single headed households is no longer even the norm) but reinforce the dichotomy of the public and the private. The issue of sexuality is also important since the religious right and ‘conservatives’ are preoccupied with the female body and female sexuality. By shying away from discussing and positioning ourselves on this crucial aspect of women's oppression, we strengthen patriarchy by our silence and also internalize the “shame” that we are meant to feel regarding our own bodies and our sexuality.

Not addressing these issues also leads to the extreme homophobia in the Asian women's movement, where lesbian women will at best be encouraged to be silent, or will be marginalized if they are not.

Religious identity and religious conservatism, or worse the strategic use of religion also dogs the women's movement in the South. Speaking of secularism is discouraged and being able to declare oneself an atheist is anathema. This has stifled debate on a crucial issue, not only because it has defined religion as the only parameter, but also has led to a reinforcement of religious identity which is liable to be tapped by the State or religious forces. Indeed women's groups trying to understand or use religion strategically have been no more successful in mobilizing women than secular groups. Instead, they may well have played into the hands of the religious right by not opposing more directly the use of religion.

Perhaps the most conservative aspect of this movement in the last 16 years has been the shift from feminism to gender. Feminism very simply is the recognition of patriarchy as a system of male oppression and domination which has a material (that is economic) base. Feminists, therefore, seek a more holistic and structural transformation of society, and a transformation of all relationships including the personal. The women's rights movement is a necessary stage towards this transformation, just as a democratic, liberal stage may be necessary for a greater social and economic structural transformation in general, but as far as feminism is concerned equal rights within the existing system is not an end in itself. This requires an autonomous feminist movement that challenges patriarchy – by first providing a space for women to articulate their own oppression – from and by men.

Under the influence of the donor community and the imperatives of funding, but also to avoid vulnerability and/or marginalization, a large number of feminists and women activists have begun to use the word 'gender' in place of 'women' when discussing the issues of equality and rights. Women's equality has given way to gender equality, women's consciousness has become gender consciousness and awareness of women's issues has become gender awareness. Feminist thought has gone from being alternative and oppositional to mainstream and establishment, and development agencies like the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, have appropriated the language of feminism and co-opted it into their own discourse.

The problem with the notion of 'gender' is that it can mean *both* men and women or *either* man or woman. The specificity of women's oppression disappears. In development jargon 'gender' implies that both men and women are equally oppressed by the strict sexual division of labour and that emancipation for both is necessary for society to be free. While it is true that men are also locked in strict masculine/feminine divisions, the important fact is that they are the ones who stand to gain from this division. The impression of equality or equal oppression created by this highly neutralized term obfuscates the fact that women are oppressed and subjugated by men. Men gain from patriarchy, women lose. It is recognized by most feminists that patriarchy cuts across the barriers of class, race, region, ethnicity and religion and is universal. The notion of gender denies patriarchy and, in doing so, denies structure. In any patriarchal structure, women occupy the lower and subordinate positions and men are powerful.

By denying the structure of power, the 'neutral' word 'gender' depoliticises the issue of women's subservience. This notion has been derived from liberal philosophy in which all ideas have equal validity and all groups, regardless of their social position, are accorded a morally equal status. For example, in moral terms, workers cannot be equated with capitalists since workers are *exploited* and capitalists are *exploiters* who gain from the relationship. In this structure, one party rules over the other and uses it for its own ends. Patriarchy is a similar structure but the word 'gender' implies that men and women are two equal entities facing each other in a non-confrontational position. In fact, men and women stand in a relationship of mutual conflict, as their interests are not the same. In simple terms men are not equally oppressed. In the structure of social relation, they are positioned differently from women. Notions of gender training and gender sensitisation fail to take into account the vastly different positions from which men and women come. Such activities operate on the assumption that 'gender' oppression is the result of social attitudes, beliefs, religious ideology and cultural values, an assumption supported by the liberal disciplines like social psychology. The material basis of patriarchy, the fact that men control and own most of the world's resources including those produced by women, is denied in this discourse. As long as men control economic and survival resources, no amount of awareness and sensitisation is going to make a difference in relations between men and women. The one who owns will inevitably control and use the one who doesn't. Without challenging the material basis of

patriarchal relations, gender sensitisation and awareness will not change power relations in society. Assuming that they will, is equivalent to saying that by making capitalists and workers aware of and sensitive to the exploitation involved in their relationship, they will both realise what is happening and decide to change things. Economic, political and material struggles are necessary since no groups ever renounce power and control willingly.

As Sunila Abeysekera, a Sri Lankan friend says: one needs to be wary that the process of engendering does not lead to women being endangered as a species! As one who is despairing of the way the world has turned over the last decade or so and as one who strongly believes that a socialist feminist ideological position and struggle is essential to fight capitalist and fundamentalist ideologies, I leave you with four questions which are applicable to all of us (1) Will the women's movement or feminist academia continue if funds are no longer available? (2) Will "collaboration", "partnership", "lobbying" and hand-outs from the State bring about the changes that we seek – in reality and on the ground – without a simultaneously active feminist, socialist, and anti racist movement to challenge and confront the global class, patriarchy, and hegemonic structures (3) If we do not have an ideological position and a larger dream will we ever get the energy, the commitment and the resistance needed to fight patriarchy, bring about the structural change that we seek and (4) when academics and NGOs really begin to challenge the status quo – or are perceived to be doing so, will the State or the UN allow them to continue? The political space is being restricted in many countries and in Pakistan we have seen a full scale attack on women centered NGOs and feminist academics, what will the institutions do in this case? Backtrack? Compromise? Negotiate a space? or continue with their confrontation, regardless?

As we approach the new millennium, I strongly believe it is time to take stock and to re-examine what we are doing and why- I believe we need to get back and relook at the critiques and the principles of feminism and Marxism and the feminist and socialist movements. I have faith that fundamentalism, conservatism and patriarchy can be challenged by a counter ideology and by a continuing struggle on all fronts. I believe we need a new all encompassing dream. I still cling to mine, for as Langston Hughes, a Black American poet said " Hold fast to dreams for when dreams die life is a broken winged bird that cannot fly".