

Marxism, Radical Feminism and Homosexuality

H Srikanth

WHEN I reacted to Vimal Balasubramanian's position on 'Gay Rights in India' (*EPW*, February 3, 1996), I knew that I was opening a Pandora's box. As expected my article, 'Natural Is Not Always Rational' (*EPW*, April 13, 1996) met with critical responses from different quarters, each one widening the sphere of discussion to many other related issues. In *Economic and Political Weekly (EPW)* itself two articles appeared confuting my arguments. While Sharmila Rege (*EPW*, June 1, 1996) tried to portray my interpretation as "one more piece in a mainstream homophobic tradition", Suneetha (*EPW*, November 23, 1996) concluded it was "an ill-informed and authoritarian exposition from a self-styled Marxist". Although my criticism of Vimal Balasubramanian was never based on medical or moralistic grounds, both Sharmila Rege and Suneetha quoted the opinions of American psychiatrists and cited different anthropological works to prove that there was nothing abnormal about homosexuals and that homosexuality was in practice in all cultures. Both of them raised objections to what they considered as orthodox-deterministic Marxian logic of subordinating sex to the needs of the society and argued in favour of "freedom of choice" in sexual matters. On her part, by reducing Marxist understanding of social necessity to reproduction of species and by interpreting reproduction as mere procreation, Suneetha defended technological changes that have "loosened the link between sexuality and reproduction" and argued that this "progressive step" would enable women and men "to break out of the boundaries that patriarchy imposes on the expression of their sexuality". Following similar logic, taking support from different western scholarly works, Sharmila Rege justified that gay and lesbian movements have potentiality to "reorganise heterosexuality" and that they could even pose "a challenge to capitalist system". Even though I am not in agreement with many of these and other conclusions which my critics have come to, I recognise that the issues they raised regarding sexuality, social control, sexual choice, women's emancipation and gender equality are relevant to the theory and practice of Marxism. I admit that classical Marxist literature does not have ready-made answers to all questions raised by post-modernists and feminists today, but I firmly believe that Marxism, as an analytical tool, has the capacity to comprehend and analyse the complex interplay of sex, gender and class in capitalist and socialist societies. Exposing some of the factual errors and

theoretical inadequacies of feminist and post-modernist interpretations of sexuality, in this paper I will try to justify my earlier position that forms of expression of sexuality were and are always subordinate to social necessity.

AMERICAN PSYCHIATRY AND JUSTIFICATION OF HOMOSEXUALITY

Let me begin my response with the premise from which my critics started their arguments to justify homosexuality as normal behaviour. It is true that American Psychiatric Association has removed homosexuality from the list of 'sick'. In the given social set up, where getting out of homosexual relationships becomes a problematic, interpreting homosexuality as a normal behaviour has a positive effect, in the sense that it helps homosexuals to overcome their guilt feelings and accept the way they are. While recognising the need for such a stand, one should not ignore the value premises on which the western psychiatrists base their conclusions. While appreciating the contributions of scholars like Wolbarst, Havelock Ellis, Alfred Kinsey, Wardel Pomeroy, etc, who have broadened our understanding of human sexual behaviour, we should not overlook the fact that they all examined sexual behaviour basically from a clinical point of view and that their main concentration is individual and not society. In fact their justification of homosexuality as normal behaviour is based on the assumption that anything based on mutual consent and not aimed at harming others is acceptable and permissible [Ellis 1959, Fast 1975]. This assumption is based on liberal bourgeois notion that a person is free to do anything as long as he does not touch another's nose.

To interpret that which is normal for individual is also normal for the society is to fall into the trap of bourgeois individualism which reduces society to a sum total of separate and unconnected individuals. In reality the society is much more than an individual and it has its own structure and logic guiding its development. It is, therefore, unsound to judge social attitudes towards sexual behaviour purely on the basis of individual point of view. If what is normal for individual is considered normal even for society, then according to this logic many other sexual practices, like incest, urolognia, caprolognia, fetichism, zoophilia, exhibitionism and sado-masochism, etc, should also be accepted as normal and all those who abhor such practices should be branded as phobiacs or as arrogant creatures. Basing themselves blindly on American psychiatry,

our petty bourgeois advocates of human rights may become magnanimous enough to tolerate and accommodate all such sexual practices in their dream land, but society can have its own logic in allowing or not allowing such sexual practices.

HOMOSEXUALITY AND PRIMITIVE CULTURES

The authors attempting to rationalise homosexuality on the basis of anthropological studies usually overlook the fact that sexual freedom was never absolute even in primitive societies. There hardly exists a culture in history which did not impose some kind of restrictions on sexual expression or behaviour of its members. Anthropology speaks of several prohibitions, taboos and myths with regard to incest, menstruation, pregnancy and child birth in different cultures. It is possible that some cultures are tolerant of homosexuality, but even they had their norms, regulations and justifications. For example, although male members belonging to Itamul and Arapesh communities involve in homosexual acts with persons belonging to other tribes, they desist from such acts within their own communities [Mead 1954:58]. The Trobrianders accept sex as a natural instinct, yet they ridicule and discourage the practice of homosexuality. They feel homosexual acts among men as unclean because of its association with the excreta [Seward 1954:87]. Among the Keraki Indians of Southern New Guinea homosexuality is seen as a stage towards mature heterosexual relations. The Sambians may organise initiation ceremonies encouraging homosexuality among men [Herd 1981], but we can also see the Marind Anim community organising special rituals to initiate men into the heterosexual relationships out of the fear that their people may not find heterosexuality sufficiently rewarding to indulge in it. Degree of tolerance and acceptance of homosexuality differs from one culture to another, but there is hardly a tribal community which has not recognised the need for heterosexuality to foster genetic process of growth around which their group life revolves.

Further, while referring to these cultures, one should not ignore geographical, social, economic and demographic factors conditioning these communities. Social attitudes regarding sexual practices vary from culture to culture, and from one stage of development to the other. What was essential and permissible in one culture at one stage of development, may not be acceptable to the people of other cultures at a different stage of development. In such situations we need to judge sexual taboos and attitudes on the basis of whether they retard or contribute to the progress of the communities as a whole at a given point of history. Feminists and gay activists who cite existence of homosexual practices in certain tribal cultures

need to answer whether the culture in which we live today has anything to do with those primitive cultures. Will those who romanticise and appreciate social acceptance of homosexuality in those societies give up all the comforts that modern civilisation provides to them and prefer to lead a subsistent living? When that is not possible, it is better we stop referring to anthropological studies in a selective way and confine our discussions to its relevance in the given historical context.

FAMILY AND SEXUALITY

Sharmila Rege tried to convince readers that the real causes of homosexuality are not yet known to science. Indeed scholars are divided in their opinions as to whether homosexuality is congenital or acquired. Those who believe in congenital theories lay stress on genetic factors and hormonal imbalances and argue that a homosexual remains a homosexual forever. Others who think that homosexuality is acquired, emphasise the process of socialisation and individual experiences in the development of sexual orientations. Psychiatrists like Dr Pomeroy worked on the assumption that both personality and environmental factors shape homosexual orientation in a person [Fast 1975:254]. Different studies made on homosexuals revealed that their sexual orientation is the result of many factors such as accidents of upbringing, close-binding or dominating mothers, weak or absent fathers, child's identification with wrong parent, excessive fear of the parent of opposite sex, traumatic sexual experiences and lack of opportunities for hetero-sexual contacts [Seward 1954; Schwarz 1958; Connell 1995]. It was, however, pointed out that in certain cases one can see homosexual tendencies even in those persons who did not experience any of the above mentioned situations. What actually drove such people towards homosexuality is yet to be ascertained. This limitation, however, does not negate the significance of earlier studies. Just as the hypothesis that smoking causes cancer does not become invalid just because all smokers do not end up with cancer and all those who suffer from cancer need not necessarily be smokers, the absence of explanation with regard to certain categories of homosexuals does not automatically invalidate earlier assumptions about homosexuality.

Many feminists and psychiatrists laid stress on environmental factors rather than congenital factors and family is being seen as a site where sexual orientations among the children are shaped. Now there is a broad agreement among the scholars that oedipal (Freudians) and pre-oedipal (Chodorow, Jane Flax) experiences are instrumental in shaping sexual orientation and gender consciousness among the people. It is probable that these tensions exist even in the clan societies where there exists some kind of division of labour along sex lines. But it would be simplistic

to argue that all kinds of families based on heterosexuality, are oppressive and biased towards men. The classic works of Morgan and Bachofen have given enough insights into the nature of families and the status of women in the primitive societies. Even Malinowski (1927 and 1932) and Margaret Mead (1954 and 1963) account of the life pattern of the aboriginal groups like the Marquesans, the Arapesh, the Cannibal Mundugumor, the Tchambuli show that the women enjoy a respectable position *vis-a-vis* men and that the gender roles are not strictly defined to prevent women from involving in social production and men from the responsibility of child care. In such families oedipal and pre-oedipal tensions are easily manageable. Only with the birth of patriarchy which coincides with the development of private property that the family system turned oppressive and became a means for the reproduction of class and gender inequalities. It is only in the patriarchal families that child care became the exclusive concern of women, whose position was, by then, devalued within a family and also in the society. When the child is brought up in such families based on gender differentiation, it cannot avoid rigid oedipal and pre-oedipal tensions. The process of socialisation helps majority of them to conform to heterosexual norms and accept the gender specified roles, as ordained by the society. But this process may fail to work in the case of a few individuals, who because of congenital or acquired factors, or sometimes, due to a combination of both, exhibit homosexual tendencies. One can call such persons deviants, not because they exhibit any pathological tendencies, but because they could not conform to the norms of the society. The more oppressive the patriarchal family turns, the greater the scope of such deviant behaviour in the society. The growth of nuclear families that followed the development of capitalism has further aggravated the problem of sexuality. Some feminists rightly understood that this problem can be overcome if the father takes equal responsibility in child care and household work and mother gets equal access to the world outside. Conscious and enlightened persons should make attempts to create such a family atmosphere for their children. When the child gets attention of both parents and grows up without any gender bias, it can overcome oedipal and pre-oedipal complexes, typical of patriarchal family system, without much difficulty. Even if the child develops sexual attraction towards the same sex in such families, in the absence of oppression and inequalities associated with patriarchy, it would not be difficult to change the sexual orientation of the persons. But it needs to be kept in mind that in the present society dominated by patriarchal values, existing method and quality of child care cannot be radically changed without destroying the material and ideological foundations of

patriarchy. This limitation makes the task of fighting against capitalism as a primary condition for overcoming patriarchy in all its forms.

FEMINISM AND HISTORY OF HOMOSEXUALITY

It follows from the above that apart from natural biological reasons, the sexual orientations and attitudes are the results of historically conditioned familial, social and psychological situations. At no point of time in history, not even in promiscuity, man could place sex above societal needs. Every culture provides opportunities for gratification of sexual instincts within certain limits. What exactly the limits would be, are decided by social, economic, geographical and demographic compulsions of the given society. Sexual taboos, myths and prohibitions were present in all cultures. However, stupid and harsh some of them might appear to be to the people of the present generation, one should not forget that they were reflections of social needs at one point of time. It would be wrong to see society as something external to man. Society is as natural and as essential to man as his physical impulses. As a member of the society, it becomes essential for man to pattern and channelise his libido and involve in social production without which he cannot live as a man. As the civilisation advances, organised sex life becomes a norm in all societies.

Radical feminists and gay activists are right in saying that heterosexuality was imposed on man, who is otherwise bisexual in nature. But here they conveniently ignore the fact that the force was applied not only for controlling homosexual behaviour, but also in checking different heterosexual practices such as incest, polyandry and polygamy. It is not force *per se*, but the context in which and the purpose for which the force was applied, which need explanation. Answering this question, some radical feminists came out with fatuous theories according to which homosexuality was forcibly controlled by men who wanted to exercise physical supremacy over women's bodies and lives [Rich 1980; Daly 1979]. Without trying to historicise the conditions wherein men intended to and became capable of controlling women, they talk as if men are oppressive and anti-women in all societies. Earlier, although they are critical of Marxists, who they think have not realised the significance of sexuality, radical feminists did not ignore the relevance of class as a unit of analysis. But in course of time, sexuality became such an obsession to them that certain groups of feminists, who later proclaimed themselves as lesbian feminists or cultural feminists, totally ignored the need to fight against private property that institutionalises patriarchy and gender oppression. Characterising heterosexuality as a reactionary institutional structure imposed on women to maintain the male supremacy, some of them started characterising all heterosexuals as

collaborators and reactionaries. The Leeds revolutionary feminists gave the slogan, 'Feminism is the theory and lesbianism the practice', as if the practice of lesbianism would liberate women from the yoke of patriarchy and capitalism. Certain radical feminist scholars like Atkinson (1973), Echols (1989), Willis (1984), etc, who earlier had faith in the progressive character of the lesbian movements, themselves began recognising deradicalisation of women's movement by cultural feminists and lesbian feminists advocating essentialism, separatism and alternative lifestyle within the system as the paths for women's emancipation. Although criticism of such theorisations are coming from within, considering the premise from which the radical feminists start their analyses, I feel that lesbian feminism is a logical extension of radical feminism. When one attempts to comprehend patriarchy without relating it to the institution of private property and to locate gender inequalities in the sexual act, it is but natural that one finds all other alternatives for reorganisation of gender relations closed and lesbianism naturally appears as the only alternative to escape male domination.

It appears that all confusions of these feminists result from not being able to see the distinction between heterosexuality and monogamy. Heterosexuality became a norm in many tribal societies long before the emergence of the institution of private property. Heterosexuality was imposed both on men and women. If the intention of compulsory heterosexuality was only to make "natural lesbian experience, history and culture of women look invisible and abnormal", then it needs to be answered as to why men did not retain the privilege of male homosexuality, as they did while imposing monogamy on women, without giving up the privilege of polygamy or bigamy. If men had vested interest in preventing lesbian activities, one fails to know why male dominated societies abhorred and punished the male homosexuals more than the lesbians. The very fact that heterosexuality was made compulsory to both men and women in many societies clearly indicate that attaining male supremacy could not have been the sole motive for enforcing heterosexuality. The actual possibility of male domination appeared only after the development of private property and the institutionalisation of patriarchy. Regulation of sex became oppressive and discriminatory to women only in patriarchal family system based on the institution of private property. This fact is deliberately overlooked by the critics of heterosexuality. By magnifying physical and sexual differences between man and woman and by locating the cause of male domination in heterosexuality, the lesbian feminists belittle the roles played by private property and patriarchal monogamous relations in undermining the status of women in the society.

MYTHS AND MISINTERPRETATIONS

I don't deny that the masses have many false notions and impressions about homosexuality. There is indeed a need for a better appreciation of the problems of the homosexuals. To the extent the feminists and gay activists are fighting against what they call 'homophobia' and appealing for a

greater toleration and understanding by the heterosexuals, I have no dispute with them. But I consider their attempts to misinterpret Marxian tenets and create new myths to give a progressive colour to the practice of homosexuality as highly objectionable. Sharmila Rege and Suneetha's misinterpretation of the term 'reproduction', reminds me of the intelligent strategy of naming

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF ADVANCED STUDY

RASHTRAPATI NIVAS, SHIMLA - 171005

Advertisement No. 1/97

- Application on prescribed form are invited for award of Fellowships for the academic session commencing from April 1, 1998 from scholars holding Ph.D. degree who have experience of independent research at advanced level, in the following areas:
HUMANITIES: (i) Art and Aesthetics; (ii) Comparative Study of Literature; (iii) Religious Studies with emphasis on Comparative Studies; and Philosophy.
SOCIAL SCIENCES: (i) Development Studies; (ii) Comparative Study of Political Institutions; and (iii) Socio-Economic and Socio-Cultural Formation in Historical Perspective.
NATURAL AND LIFE SCIENCES: (i) State Policies on Science and Technology; (ii) Science, Technology and Development; and (iii) Methodologies and Techniques.
- A few Fellowships may be awarded for projects of exceptional interest even outside these areas and also to eminent scholars not necessarily possessing research degrees.
- About two-thirds of the Fellowships will be earmarked for those who are already working in Universities, Research Institutions or other responsible positions. Preference is given to those who have already done considerable work on their projects and wish to avail of the facilities at the IAS to complete their work. The Institute does not encourage studies which involve field work.
- One Fellowship will be earmarked for scholars belonging to Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes. The Institute encourages pursuit of research project relating to the problems of scheduled castes and scheduled tribes.
- The selection of Fellows will not be restricted to those who respond to this advertisement. The Institute has the discretion to select Fellows in other ways as well.
- The detail of the amount of Fellowship grant payable to Fellows will be supplied along with the application form.
- The term of Fellowship ranges from three months to two years, depending upon the nature of the project. In exceptional cases, a Fellowship may be extended into the third year.
- Residence at the Institute is compulsory from April to November, and optional from December to March. All Fellows are provided free hard-furnished accommodation on the campus as well as secretarial assistance.
- The prescribed application form may be obtained from the Deputy Secretary (Administration) of the Institute by sending a self-addressed envelope (25 cm x 10 cm) or personally from the Institute by November 30, 1997. The application form duly completed, should reach the Institute latest by December 15, 1997. In the case of candidates living abroad, applications will be accepted upto December 31, 1997. Those in service should apply through proper channel.

someone a dog and killing him. By 'liberally' interpreting the term reproduction as 'procreation' and attributing that mistake to me, they tried to fight it out by effectively arguing that homosexuality does not come in the way of reproduction, i.e. 'procreation'. But in this age of artificial insemination and test tube babies, who does not know that physical intercourse is not essential to have babies? Which Marxist has interpreted reproduction as mere procreation? The term 'reproduction' in marxist discourse always means social reproduction. It involves along with physical reproduction of human beings, all such essential activities like child care, education, training and building up of values and attitudes conducive for continuation of the social system. Development of science and technology may have some effect on methods of human procreation, but they alone cannot alter the social and ideological bases of different actors and structures involved in production and reproduction of material conditions for human existence. It is ridiculous to expect contraceptives to play the role which the human beings are expected to play.

Justifying the practice of homosexuality, feminists' and gay activists' attempt to project homosexuals as a homogeneous group, incapable of coming out of homosexuality. It is true that because of certain physiological and psychological reasons, a section of the homosexuals may find it difficult to switch over to heterosexuality. But there are many cases where persons engage in homosexual practices either due to lack of opportunities for heterosexual contacts (as in prisons, barracks and hostels) or just to explore a new experience. Such situational or casual or furtive encounters do not last for long. Once the situation changes, they get out of homosexual practices and easily adjust to heterosexuality. For them the gay slogan of "(Be) come (in) out" of heterosexuality [Phelan 1993; Williams 1978] has no relevance. Interpreting all homosexual instincts as cravings for relationship and understanding is another myth-making attempt by the lesbian feminists. I do not deny that there will be sexualised emotional relationships in some cases, but to many, the homosexual acts are merely sexual encounters. Most homosexuals themselves do not have any such pretensions or illusions. In an interview with the authors of *Body Language*, one homosexual openly admitted, "I don't love the men I have sex with, I may like them and have affection for them, but I really would not use the word 'love'. When I say I make love to a man, I am using the word in its sexual sense." In another interview in the same book, refuting the lesbian feminists, a bisexual woman asserted, "I think I can know someone without going to bed with her. If that's the only way you can get to know some one, then you are crazy" [Fast 1974:66,92]. That homosexual love is superior to heterosexual love is yet another

myth floated by the lesbian feminists. The studies on homosexual lives show that homosexuals are not above all that pettiness and hypocrisy associated with monogamous relations as they exist today. The roots of ideas of domination and subordination, superiority and inferiority, jealousy and deceptions lie not in sexuality *per se*, but in private property and mental complexes associated with this institution.

To me, the greatest of all such myths, however, is the belief that homosexuality has potentiality to destroy the capitalist system. Participation of certain gay and lesbian groups in New Left and other protest movements cannot automatically lead to the conclusion that the homosexuals, as a community, are radicals and progressive. While recognising positive contributions of such persons, one should not lose sight of the presence of thousands of liberal and anarchic gay groups well absorbed in the bourgeois set up. Other than asking for freedom for sexual activities, they do not have any other laudable objectives. The homosexuals need not have any antagonism with patriarchy or private property, just because they are homosexuals. Moreover, the homosexuals are so deeply divided on the lines of class, race, ideology and strategy that there is hardly any possibility of their emerging as a homogeneous community threatening the capitalist-imperialist system. It is precisely the reason why the bourgeoisie, who cannot tolerate any opposition to capital accumulation process, do not mind taking 'liberal' and 'democratic' stand when it comes to gay and lesbian movements. Rather such movements give an opportunity for the bourgeoisie to divert the attention of the people from more important problems confronting them. The fact that the organised sex industry in the west openly whips up homosexual instincts and even makes them attractive to the people through pornographic films and literature clearly indicates that the bourgeoisie are not afraid of the practice of homosexuality. Maybe at one stage in history, when the institution of private property was just emerging and consolidating itself, forcible imposition of heterosexual-monogamous relations under patriarchal domination was necessary for reproduction of private property. But now, when the institution of private property has reached the stage of globalised capitalism, even if a section of the people indulge in homosexual acts, it will not have any adverse effect on reproduction of capital. Ignoring these facts, if any feminist or 'creative marxist' believes that homosexuality can pose a threat to capitalism, he or she is only living in a fool's paradise.

SOCIALISM, PATRIARCHY AND REGULATION OF SEXUALITY

Since my response to Vimal Balasubramanian became controversial owing to some of the statements I made with regard to Marxist approach to the question of homo-

sexuality, I feel the need to elaborate my ideas further. Initially, it should be clear to all that what we call socialism today is only a transitional phase from capitalism to communism, wherein the proletariat wields state power. The revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois-landlord state and the attainment of political power by the working class are preconditions for building up of socialist society. During this transitional period, the working class state initiates structural changes necessary for improving the living conditions of the people. Appropriation of properties belonging to the capitalists and the landlords, formation of co-operatives and collective farms, development of socialist industry, rapid expansion of educational opportunities, creation of necessary scientific and technological base, etc, are some of the essential tasks that the working class state cannot neglect. Similarly, organisation of a powerful people's army and creation of an effective police system becomes essential to deal with all internal and external enemies attempting to sabotage the socialist revolution. All these tasks cannot be accomplished without people voluntarily subordinating their individual interests for the sake of collective interests. Creating a disciplined social organisation of people conscious of their historic role becomes a social necessity. This social necessity is determined by the concrete circumstances in which the people find themselves and it has nothing to do with the "value judgments of the individuals", that Sharmila Rege talks of.

Marxists know the fact that alongside class contradictions, there are many other contradictions in society based on caste, religion, nationality, gender, etc. Even then, if Marxists give primacy to the class struggle and hold revolutionary overthrow of capitalism as a social necessity, it is not due to their class bias or indifference to gender issues, but because they realise that it is not possible to resolve other contradictions without first destroying the private property and the mental complex associated with it. Far from weakening the women's cause, elimination of social division of labour based on the institution of private property will only facilitate gradual disappearance of oppression and inequalities based on gender. I lay stress on the word 'gradual', for it is not possible to break with patriarchy abruptly for two reasons. Firstly, because changes in culture and values do not keep pace with the changes in economic and political structures. Secondly, because, even if capitalism can be destroyed, the institution of private property exists in different forms for a long time to come. For these two reasons, families continue to exist even in socialism, although they do overcome many of the evils associated with patriarchy. The institution of family remains in existence so long as production has not reached abundance, all vestiges of private property not fully eliminated, basic necessities of people not fulfilled and the

society itself has not reached a stage where it can take over the responsibility of the children and the aged. It is only in the higher phase of communism that these conditions are fulfilled and real gender equality established. Till such time, the women should continue their two-fold struggle of strengthening socialism and at the same time fighting against all vestiges of patriarchal values and culture within socialism.

If one correctly comprehends this complicated process of development under socialism, it becomes easier to understand why Marxists do not openly advocate sexual reforms under socialism. Radical feminists rightly recognise that sexuality is subordinated to patriarchal structures, but they overlook the fact that patriarchy itself is the by-product of the institution of private property. There is no possibility of blossoming of sex love without eliminating patriarchy and private property. The zealots of post-modernism who advocate the principle of choice, should know that choice can be exercised only in a society which can offer choices. Individual rights in all societies are historically conditioned by the structure of the mode of production and the nature of the civil society. Even socialism cannot transcend this law of development. It is not any phobia or ignorance or arrogance, as my critics tried to attribute to all Marxists in general and to me in particular, but correct understanding of the process of social development and the need for realisation of immediate social needs that prompt Marxists to take a cautious attitude towards all sex-related issues, including homosexuality. Phobias and taboos regarding sex are unavoidable in the conditions of scarcity of resources and of knowledge. Sex is so sensitive a subject to the majority of people in a backward country like India that any stress on sex-related issue may alienate the masses from revolution. For academic feminists and post-modernists, settled mostly in the ivory towers of elite universities and research institutes, people's sensitivities may not matter much, but the Marxist revolutionaries involved in a conscious struggle to organise and lead the masses against capitalist exploitation cannot afford to take risks. When they know that the problem of sexuality cannot be solved in this society, they don't waste time thinking too much about sexuality. When they realise that 'coming out' of communal mentality, caste outlook, national jingoism and male chauvinism are more important for socialist revolution, they will not give slogans exhorting people to come out of the so-called compulsory heterosexuality.

Finally, let me clarify that by 'use of force', I did not mean that the homosexuals are to be hunted and persecuted as in the medieval Europe or in west Asia. It is neither possible nor desirable for the socialist state to peep into everyone's house to know whether the people are involved in homo-

sexual activities or not. Marxists should definitely take a sympathetic stand towards those homosexuals who for physiological or psychological reasons find it difficult to change their sexual orientation. In such cases, it is necessary to convince the people to understand and appreciate their limitations. But apart from those categories, there are also individuals who involve in homosexual activities for pleasure, adventure or experience. If such people feel guilty and uncomfortable with homosexual acts, I think psychiatric treatment does help in converting them to heterosexuality. By weakening patriarchy and minimising gender inequalities, socialism reduces oedipal and pre-oedipal tensions in the child, thereby increasing the capability of a person to direct his libido in whichever direction he feels it necessary. I believe that psychiatric treatment which does not work amidst adverse conditions in capitalist societies can have positive effect in socialism in view of the changed circumstances in which the individual finds himself. If 'coming out' of compulsory heterosexuality is possible, I don't see any reasons why an individual cannot come out of homosexual relations, that too in a system where monogamous relations cease to be discriminatory and oppressive. Under socialism sexual relations can be regulated easily by new forms of socialisation, education, child care and familial relations. Structural changes that accompany the socialist revolution considerably minimise the need for using of force. But even there, in the name of gay culture and lifestyle, if the gay activists take out vulgar parades displaying their half naked bodies, wearing flashy clothes and clone outfits and fondling and caressing one another in public, as they do in Sydney, San Francisco and New York, I doubt whether the socialist state will remain a silent spectator. I am sure the Marxist revolutionaries do not hesitate to use force to ban such activities in the socialist societies. They do so, not because of any phobia or arrogance on their part, but because in the ultimate analysis even socialism is a class state and no ruling class can tolerate any movement which is likely to go against its immediate social interests. I know that this answer will not be palatable to radical feminists and petty bourgeois human rights activists, but I am sure Marxists will not have any problem in convincing the people, including the homosexuals, that freedom from hunger, unemployment, capitalist exploitation and gender oppression is more important than freedom for sexual choice.

References

- Atkinson, Ti Grace (1973): 'Lesbianism and Feminism' in Phillis Burkby et al (eds), *Amazon Expedition: A Lesbian Feminist Anthology*, Times Change Press, New York.
- Balasubramanian, Vimal (1996): 'Gay Rights in India', *Economic and Political Weekly*, February 13.

- Barret, Michele (1980): *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis*, Villiers Publications, London.
- Beauvoir, Simone de (1988): *The Second Sex*, Pelican.
- Chodorow, Nancy (1978): *The Reproduction of Mothering*, University of California Press, Berkeley.
- Connell, R W (1995): *Masculinities*, Polity Press, Oxford.
- Daly, Mary (1979): *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, The Women's Press, London.
- Echols, Alice (1989): *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-75*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Ellis, Havelock (1959): *Psychology of Sex*, Mentor.
- Fast, Julius and Wells, Hall (1975): *Bisexual Living*, Pocket Books, New York.
- Flax, Jane (1980): 'Mother-Daughter Relationships: Psychodynamics, Politics and Philosophy' in H Eisenstein and A Jordan (eds), *The Future of Difference*, G K Hall, Boston.
- Fromm, Eric (1983): *Beyond the Chains of Illusion*, Abacus.
- Hartmann, Heidi (1979): 'The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union' in L Sargent (ed), *Women and Revolution*, Monthly Review Press, New York.
- Herdt, Gilbert H (1981): *Guardians of the Flutes: Idioms of Masculinity*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Humm, Maggie (ed) (1992): *Feminisms: A Reader*, Harvester-Wheateaf.
- Kinsey, Alfred C, Wardell B Pomeroy and Clyde E Martin (1948): *Sexual Behaviour in the Human Male*, Saunders, Philadelphia.
- Malinowski (1927): *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, New York.
- (1932): *The Sexual Life of Savages in North Western Malanesia*, Routledge and Kegan Paul, London.
- Mead, Margaret (1954): *Male and Female: A Study of the Sexes in a Changing World*, Mentor.
- (1963): *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*, New York.
- Mitchell, Juliet (1975): *Psychoanalysis and Feminism*, Vintage Books, New York.
- Nye, Andrea (1988): *Feminist Theory and Philosophies of Man*, Routledge.
- Phelan, Shane (1993): '(Be) Coming Out: Lesbian Identity and Politics', *Signs*, Summer 18(4).
- Rege, Sharmila (1996): 'Homophobia in the Name of Marxism', *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 1.
- Rich, Adrienne (1980): 'Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence', *Signs*, Vol 5, No 4.
- Rosaldo, M Z and Lamphere (1974): *Women, Culture and Society*, Stanford University Press, California.
- Seward, Georgene H (1954): *Sex and the Social Order*, Pelican.
- Schwarz, Oswald (1958): *The Psychology of Sex*, Pelican.
- Srikanth, H (1996): 'Natural Is Not Always Rational', *Economic and Political Weekly*, April 13.
- Suneetha (1996): 'Homosexuality: Against Hubris', *Economic and Political Weekly*, November 13.
- Williams, Brook (1978): 'The Retreat to Cultural Feminism' in Redstockings of the Women Liberation Movement's *Feminist Revolution*, Random House, New York.
- Willis, Ellen (1984): 'Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism' in Sanya Sayres et al (eds), *The 60s without Apology*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.