Jha, Priya. "“Making a Point by Choice”: Maternal Imperialism, Second Wave Feminism, and Transnational Epistemologies." *Women's Activism and “Second Wave” Feminism*. By Barbara Molony and Jennifer Nelson. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. 173–192. *Bloomsbury Collections*. Web. 26 Apr. 2023. <<http://dx.doi.org/10.5040/9781474250542.ch-008>>.

Downloaded from Bloomsbury Collections, www.bloomsburycollections.com, 26 April 2023, 13:30 UTC.

Copyright © Barbara Molony, Jennifer Nelson and Contributors 2017. Released under a CC BY-NC-ND licence (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>). You may share this work for non-commercial purposes only, provided you give attribution to the copyright holder and the publisher, and provide a link to the Creative Commons licence.

“Making a Point by Choice”: Maternal Imperialism, Second Wave Feminism, and Transnational Epistemologies

Priya Jha

As outsiders, we need each other for support and connection and all the other necessities of living on the borders. But in order to come together we must recognize each other. Yet I feel that since you have so completely unrecognized me, perhaps I have been in error concerning you and no longer recognize you.

—Audre Lorde¹

Introduction

Mary Daly's book *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism*, first published in 1978, is central to the canon of second wave feminist writing in the United States.² As Ross Kraemer points out in a review of the book: “it issues an invitation ‘to women who choose to be present to each other’ to undertake the perilous and arduous journey of self-becoming.”³ Drawing from Christian theology, particularly Gnostic mythology, Daly argues that the root of patriarchal oppression of women is located in the “destruction of the bonds between women and the fragmentation of the selves of women.”⁴ As a cornerstone of feminist theory and as an example of radical academic feminism during the second wave feminist movement of the 1970s and the 1980s in the United States, *Gyn/Ecology's* significance in the formation of a field of critical inquiry is not to be underrated. The book introduces the reader to both Western and non-Western rituals that she asserts are deeply embedded in the mythico-religious realm, which she argues serves only to imprison women further in their sex and within the confines of Patriarchy (with a capital “P”)—a term deployed as uninterrogated and universal in Daly's book. By framing her analyses of cultural sites, both in Western and non-Western contexts, within Christianity, Daly is already working within the very institution she wishes to challenge: androcentric history. For non-Western women, then, their experiences are already circumscribed within a language and vocabulary

that is removed from their local histories and the existing frameworks that have informed indigenous feminist activism and scholarship.

The "Second Passage" of the book, in particular, is of importance to this chapter. In the Passage, we learn about the Indian practice of *suttee* (widow-burning) in India; Chinese foot-binding; African female genital mutilation; European witch-burnings; and Nazi medicine and American gynecology. Even while reviews were generally favorable during the time of its publication, Margo Moore's comments in *The Australian Left Review* echo some of the central issues I take up in the pages that follow. Moore acknowledges the "visionary" and "poetic" styles of the book and its call for a celebration of women's power. At the same time, she also points to one of the book's major failings: "one most obvious example is the a-historicism of her work. The framework of Patriarchy is assumed in all instances."⁵ Moore's recognition is a pointed reminder of one of the critical and historical quagmires in much feminist work and is not to be taken lightly, particularly when it comes to Daly's lack of analysis of women in the non-Western worlds. Uma Narayan's critique of Daly's ahistorical discussion of *suttee* provides an opening into examining the mediating forces of colonial historiography and Western modernities that determine the roots/routes that these studies take and the inherent tensions in (re)casting women as belonging to/in a global patriarchal culture. The latter has some dire consequences for feminist epistemologies in relation to translating indigenous women's lives for Western academic feminism.

In Daly's case, her erasure of the cultural and historical specificities of *suttee*, both as an act and as something significant in British colonial policy, and as a Hindu religious-cultural tradition rife with its own complicated history, turns Third World women into objects of studies rather than agents of their own histories. As a cultural feminist, she sees "masculinity" itself as a threat, and a turn to an "essential female" as one that would "validate undervalued female attributes."⁶ It is in the focus on femaleness where Daly's work fails: she neglects to recognize that women throughout the world encounter a simultaneity of oppression that comes about by living in multiple patriarchal systems. Hence, the diversity of the material conditions of women's lives gets lost in Daly's work since it relies upon the premise of an essential female subject and a universal patriarchy. Constructed in and written about in this framework in Daly's book, then, non-Western women are caught in a double bind of silence.

Daly turns to Katherine Mayo, an early twentieth-century American journalist and self-proclaimed crusader for women's rights, as the authority in speaking about Indian women's continued victimization by Hindu men during the Victorian period. Interestingly enough, while *suttee* is the ostensible topic of Daly's chapter, Daly's topic was not given any space by Katherine Mayo in her often cited and famous book, *Mother India* (1927).⁷ The conflation of *suttee* with the topics Mayo did write about in *Mother India*—child brides and the unhygienic practices of Hindu *dhais* (midwives)—underscores with clarity critiques made by postcolonial and transnational feminists about how (mis)representations of cultural practices in non-Western countries "replicate some common and unproblematic Western understandings of Third-World contexts and communities."⁸ Indian women find no voice of their own in the writings of either Mayo or Daly, even as Hindu religious traditions are deployed in this "invitation . . . to undertake the perilous and arduous journey of self-becoming." What

is clear, first and foremost, is that the invitation is not extended to all women across the world; rather, the universal category of womanhood within which Daly operates has already demarcated boundaries between Western women (as scholars and as activists) and their non-Western counterparts (as victims of their own traditions). This method and act of talking about and working with non-Western women can be coded as what Barbara Ramusack has called "maternal imperialism."⁹

The notion of cross-border kinship, very much part of Victorian cultures, is most notable on the part of Victorian Christian women's desire to understand and to collaborate with Indian women. Yet, Victorian women failed to do either in their insistence on portraying and analyzing Indian women's lives through "Victorian ideals that reflected Christian influence"¹⁰ and by speaking of themselves in relation to India within a fictive kinship of family, specifically in referencing themselves as "mothers" of their more downtrodden daughters in the East.

In her book, *Home and Harem: Nation, Gender, Empire and the Cultures of Travel*, Inderpal Grewal adds yet another dimension to this encounter between European and Indian women in the Victorian era. She discusses the socialist Sylvia Pankhurst, whose "concerns reveal a trajectory that connects the struggle for women's rights and freedom with other struggles for freedom. It suggests that some feminists in England could construct a historiography that connected 'East' and 'West' by showing connections between patriarchal power in England and colonial practices."¹¹ Grewal suggests that in spite of such radical readings of the connections between patriarchal and colonial structures of power, even Pankhurst "could not see Indian women in terms outside discursive practices of colonial discourses."¹² In a later work, an introduction to transnational feminism coauthored with Caren Kaplan, Grewal asserts that "for us, there has never been any question that the history of modern imperialism bears directly upon the condition of women and relations of gendered power in the modern period."¹³ Thus, white women's work in the colonies was also a way to shore up their positions at home in their fight for citizenship and suffrage.

Drawing upon a transnational feminist framework laid out by Grewal and Kaplan, I examine Mayo's reincarnation as "feminist" in Daly's book. I explore what we can learn about what constitutes feminism, feminist inquiry, and feminist epistemology through an analysis of Daly's use of Mayo to describe what she perceives are Indian women's experiences of patriarchal victimization. The question of Mayo's rebirth as a feminist during the second wave feminist movement (via Daly) is one that builds upon Uma Narayan's critique of Daly, as she thinks through Daly's "representations of Third-World traditions." An important point of note here is that Mayo's rhetoric of Indian-women-as-victims permeates Daly's book, coded, however, within the larger discourse of gynocentric histories. Mayo's book gives an entry point to second wave feminist scholars such as Daly to claim Mayo as a "feminist," the results of which are twofold: (1) Mayo's project in the late 1920s comes to define what a model of global sisterhood could look like; and (2) within this model, Indian women are once again robbed of their subjectivity and agency and trapped within particular rhetorical registers that render them helpless in the face of history. They have, as Amrita Chhachhi has put it, "a forced identity"¹⁴ imposed upon them. Nira Yuval-Davis has also pointed out: "Since the rise of second-wave feminism in the West, during the 1970s and 1980s,

there has been a recurrence of non-dialogue between women from 'First' and 'Third Worlds'.¹⁵

While colonial discourse analysis has been incredibly useful in untangling some of the complexities of the intersections of race, class, and gender during the time of empire, I wish to reexamine both Mayo's and Daly's projects through the lens of transnational feminism which recognizes, and indeed highlights, historical power imbalances wrought by colonial projects and challenges utopian aspirations of global sisterhood. Transnational feminist inquiry insists upon challenging the homogeneity of the nation and the national and, instead, draws upon the interdisciplinary study of women in diverse cultures in order to analyze the unevenness and complexity of relationships of women across borders. In that sense, it challenges our assumptions about shared and monolithic experiences, both historical and geographical, and addresses larger questions about power, privilege, and intersectionalities of women's experiences and their translation within academic settings. All women do not suffer similar oppressions simply by virtue of our sex. All knowledges are situated and all epistemologies are bound up in uneven power relations. Yet, the recognition of such does not preclude feminist modes of discovery. Transnational feminism, then, is an important theory and method that enables an opening in the accepted feminist discourses since it foregrounds the history of Western colonization and its impact upon native populations, with a focus on gendered experiences.

In the case of Daly's writing on Mayo, the following questions arise: What does it mean for Daly to have concentrated her inclusion of Mayo in *Gyn/Ecology* only on specific passages that fossilize Indian women within Hindu religious traditions and to have ignored the larger historical and geopolitical contexts of Mayo's overall project? How does the birth of Mayo as a contemporary feminist affect the ways in which Indian culture gets translated and understood?

Mayo's foundational text about India, *Mother India*, first published in 1927—after Mayo spent only three months in India—has been the topic of study of postcolonial nationalism and feminism by critics located in various disciplines, reaching into schools of criticism that are far-ranging in scope: from colonial discourse analysis, to women and empire, to women's history and policy studies. Both incendiary and infamous, the book, and its subsequent and multiple sequels, regurgitated the tropes that kept India bound to the British Empire. It did so by centralizing its arguments around equating the health of Indian women's domestic lives to the health of the nascent nation-state. Its critiques of child marriage and the unhygienic practices of *dhais* (Hindu midwives) were significant in reducing mainstream Americans' support for Indian independence. Existing scholarship on the book takes Mayo to task for her complicity with both British and American states and for its sole focus on the victimization of Hindu girls, both at the hands of their alleged rapist husbands and the uncaring midwives.¹⁶ Moreover, as will be discussed in the next section, Mayo's project was not as simple as it may appear; she went to India at the request of British and American officials as well as with the blessing of Indian nationalists. Thus, her subsequent writing about India, captured mostly in *Mother India*, but also continued in later works, should be seen within the larger framework of colonialism and national anxieties of different varieties that both India and Western nations felt during the

interwar period. The painstakingly detailed and important work of historian Mrinalini Sinha has awakened fresh interest in Mayo's text.¹⁷

At the same time, an interesting element of Mayo's book that has barely been given mention by critics is how the politics of representation of women and of India as woman/mother in *Mother India* came to have a particular salience well into the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries, both in India and abroad. When I first began graduate school in 1993, a required reading for many women's studies majors was Elisabeth Bumiller's 1990 tome, *May You Be the Mother of a Hundred Sons: A Journey into India*.¹⁸ An award-winning book, written by a *Washington Post* reporter, its popularity rested upon Bumiller's position as an insider/outsider who spent three years in the subcontinent, speaking with women from various walks of life. Bumiller's book both praises Mayo for paving the way for radical readings of Indian women and builds upon arguments that Mayo first made in 1927 and makes them palatable for a late twentieth-century audience. Moreover, the rhetorical linkage between Bumiller and Mayo also draws attention to the shifting subject position of Mayo herself. She becomes part of a discourse on global sisterhood by Western women that maps her into the cultural and political landscapes of second wave feminism. By uncritically adopting Mayo, academic feminism failed to acknowledge the intersection of gender and imperialism. This is why the analysis I undertake of Daly's use of Mayo and Mayo's work on India is an important intervention into how we come to understand, interpret, and theorize women's experiences across borders and across multiple histories of oppression.

Daly's interpretation of Mayo and *Mother India* in *Gyn/Ecology* serves as a springboard for addressing questions about border crossings that take place when women in different geographical and historical spaces come to be defined as "women" within the framework of global sisterhood, popularized by scholars such as Robin Morgan in *Sisterhood is Global* (1991) and in her more recent *Sisterhood is Forever: The Women's Anthology for the New Millennium* (2003), both of which extend Daly's vision of universal womanhood. For example, in her discussion of rape in *Sisterhood is Global*, Morgan elides the cultural specificities and localized histories that enable diverse violent masculinities that condone rape. In her analysis of rape, Morgan's non-Western women are not heard in their own voices; instead, Morgan translates and subsumes cultures of rape under the umbrella of Western feminist discourses about sexual violence against women, much as Daly did in 1978. Also like Morgan, Mayo contends that as a woman, she could see and speak more clearly than men about the victimization of Indian women. In doing a close reading of Daly's work, I hope to reveal the palimpsestic inscriptions of cross-cultural exchanges by Western and non-Western women that get folded into a larger history of "maternal imperialism"—an idea that haunts both Mayo's and Daly's texts and that is based on the backwardness of the colonized subjects vis-à-vis material ritual practices such as child brides and *suttee* in the case of India.

For Western feminists, combatting these issues in the nineteenth century—for example, through missionary work—was situated within frameworks of post-Enlightenment notions of morality and responsibility. Partly because cross-cultural feminist struggles were defined by and through the lens of Victorian morality, the results were often the erasure of the histories and voices of non-Western women as

they became victimized by the rhetorical practices of Western feminism during the colonial and the postcolonial periods. Both Kumari Jayawardena and Inderpal Grewal have historicized encounters between Western and non-Western women during the colonial era and demonstrated with acuity that, for Victorian women, their "missionary position" was part and parcel of larger concerns about gaining citizenship rights at home and that Victorian cultural morality was central in the work they undertook to uplift women in the colonies.¹⁹ The same lens of morality creeps into Daly's work in the late twentieth century, a morality that is blind to, as Audre Lorde puts it trenchantly in the epigraph to this chapter, "recognizing" non-Western women as sources of their own knowledge production.

Mayo, *Mother India*, and Indian nationalism

During the First World War, the Indian Gaddar party in the United States fueled the Indian nationalist movement and spirit through financial support as well as by gaining American support for Indian independence.²⁰ By the end of the war, nationalist agitation in India traveled into the United States. Along with the India Home Rule League of America, founded by Lala Lajpat Rai, and the Gaddar party, "a new organization called the Friends of Freedom for India was launched in New York in March 1919."²¹ At the same time, the international community noted that the nationalist movement in India was no longer Hindu in nature; rather, Muslims also joined in the agitation owing to the "dismemberment of the Turkish Empire at the end of the war."²² This is a significant point in that Mayo's book deliberately set out to pitch Hindus against Muslims in the second edition of the book, where she changes "Indian" men to "Hindu" men, in line with her negative perspective on Indian nationalism, in which Muslims are victimized in the national imaginary. In his book, *Katherine Mayo and India*, Manoranjan Jha explains in great detail the cultural politics of the events that led up to the writing of *Mother India* and the subsequent controversy surrounding it. He argues that, "[i]n tune with the British policy of pitting one against another, Mayo highlights the passionate monotheism of Islam and the vitality, sturdiness and practical-mindedness of the Muslims against the 'degenerate materialism' of the Hindus which 'masquerades' as spiritualism."²³ In addition, Mayo encouraged translations of her book into Urdu "with a view toward driving a wedge between Hindu and Muslim public opinion of *Mother India*. In private communications about the book, for example, she admitted to changing the Muslim names of characters in the original stories in order to deliberately make Hindus of them."²⁴

Daly, however, does not mention this shrewd move on Mayo and her publisher's part, designed to continue the colonial policy of "divide and conquer," the resulting communalism of which continues to haunt South Asia to this day. Instead, in *Gyn/Ecology*, the Hindu practice of *suttee* is collapsed onto the *entirety* of Indian cultural practices. India, then, is moved outside of time and history, much as Edward Said theorizes the Orient in the Western imagination in *Orientalism*.²⁵ India then is more of an *idea*, rather than a place, with its politics steeped so deeply in myths that progress seems impossible. As a concept, India and its many diverse cultures can then be

distilled into a set of Hindu religious and cultural rituals in which women, regardless of their religious, class, or caste memberships, ultimately suffer the most. It would appear that it is always easier to fight an essentialized notion of Indian patriarchy than to tease out the cultural differences that would develop a nuanced understanding of the subcontinent.

Additionally, the rise in Mohandas K. Gandhi's popularity in the West, especially in the United States, led to an anxious alliance between the United States and the British. Earlier, the United States had remained steadfast in its support for Indian Home Rule. So, how did the United States go from this position of alignment with the Indian peoples to the imperialist position that Mayo espoused? Manoranjan Jha suggests that it was the surging economic interest in the United States about the Indian market and the prominent role of Gandhi which contributed in part to the change that was to come.²⁶ The British were alarmed at the rate at which Americans were becoming sympathetic to the Indian cause. As a way of countering propaganda about India in the West, the British authorities decided to "educate" Americans about India. Thus, they suggested that an American "writer who commands the largest number of readers"²⁷ be sent to India to study the country and its ability for self-rule, and that they would defray the costs for a three-month visit.

Enter "writer and journalist" Katherine Mayo who, in the postwar years, fought to promote good relations between the United States and Great Britain.²⁸ In a move that is quite ironic in retrospect, she founded a group called "The British Apprentice Group" with herself as the leader. Her "apprenticeship" was to begin soon after the founding of the club whose aim was to promote "World Peace" through the friendship of the "two great English-speaking nations."²⁹ Her alliance with the British authorities in the conception and writing of *Mother India* was soon to follow. The British were particularly pleased with her high antinationalist and pro-British stance.³⁰

Mayo first arrived in India in 1925 at the behest of both American and British officials, and was met with excitement and interest by Indian nationalist leaders, who hoped her "study" would finally show to the West India's capacity for self-rule. Upon her arrival in India, Mayo describes herself as a "foreign stranger, prying about India ... I would like it to be accepted that I am neither an idle busybody nor a political agent, but merely an ordinary American citizen seeking test facts to lay before my own people."³¹ The test facts that she references ultimately found their voice in *Mother India*. The controversy surrounding the book after its publication yielded multiple responses, mostly decrying Mayo's arguments about India's incapacity for self-rule and charging her with self-interest that was closely aligned with the United States' anxiety about the role it would and should play on the global stage, economically and culturally. The ostensible topic of Mayo's study of Indian culture was an examination of the daily lives of men and women in India; in particular, she studied the issue of child brides and the unhygienic practices of Hindu *dhais*. The public health argument she levied in relation to India's backwardness hinged directly on women's victimization by Hindu men. The underlying text, however, because it offered an "objective" account for the potential for Indian self-government, sought to undermine any real possibilities for self-rule in postindependence India, in part by suggesting that Hindu men exercised a sexual tyranny over women. These arguments bear striking

resemblance to her book on the Philippines and the buildup on her books to revamp the Pennsylvania patrol system.

Both Mayo's personal history and her motivations for undertaking this project determined, in large part, the major arguments she presented in the book. Her personal background was one of class privilege deeply rooted in American history (she traced her lineage back to the Mayflower). A self-proclaimed social reformer and crusader for women's rights, Mayo wrote herself into American history when, in 1917, she authored a book entitled *Justice to All*.³² The book, along with her other volumes like *The Standard Bearers* (1918) and *Mounted Justice: True Stories of the Pennsylvania State Patrol* (1922), "expressed her concern for law and order and her moral indignation at the sexual indignities imposed on women by drunken husbands, ruffians, and rapists."³³ These early themes are significant in that they continued to resonate in her subsequent texts. *Justice to All* so impressed Theodore Roosevelt, who wrote the introduction for it, that he used it as a model for rethinking state patrol systems throughout the United States and successfully legislated the establishment of police force systems similar to that of Pennsylvania. Thus began Mayo's career as a crusader. Mayo's reformism crossed national boundaries. As a champion for women's rights and seeker of truths, her 1925 book *Isles of Fear: The Truth about the Philippines* can be read as a dress rehearsal for the widely acclaimed *Mother India*.³⁴ This book, like *Mother India*, argued that "Britain and the USA shared a common responsibility for the 'backward' peoples of the colonies and must resist native demands for independence."³⁵

She felt a deep sense of responsibility to voice the concerns of "backward peoples," and to help them by ensuring that they continued to benefit from colonial rule, Mayo followed with great interest a political event that directly affected Indians in the United States and sparked her interest in India: an immigration case which came before the US Supreme Court during the debates in the British parliament about the appointment of a Commission to adjudicate political reform and independence struggles in India. The landmark case was that of "Bhagat Singh Thind in 1923 ... in which the Supreme Court upheld the denaturalization of forty-two of the approximately seventy to a hundred Indians who had been naturalized as US citizens between 1907 and 1923." According to Sinha, Mayo was also concerned about the "introduction in the US Senate of the Hindu Citizenship Bill,"³⁶ or, as it is more widely known, the Copeland Bill, which sought to classify Indians in the United States as white persons, based on racial genealogy.³⁷

Mayo, at that time, was fearful that "expatriate Indians in the United States were a source of potential threat to the dominant religious and cultural fabric of the nation,"³⁸ a fear that increased with the growing popularity of East Indians such as Nobel Laureate Rabindranath Tagore and Mohandas Gandhi. Mayo felt deeply that there was a dangerous influence of Eastern spirituality that "saw itself as superior to the materiality of the West."³⁹ The succumbing of Americans to the "superficial charms" of these speakers and visitors led her to criticize "the activities of expatriate Indians in the United States both on behalf of their struggle against British rule in India and for citizenship rights for Indians residing in the United States."⁴⁰ She became one of the many who advocated for the Asian Exclusion Act in the United States and thus

followed Thind's case very closely.⁴¹ These reasons motivated her to discover the "real" India and, most significantly, share her views with the world. On a personal note, Mayo claimed that she was deeply invested in Indian politics and culture because, while she was living in Guyana, an Indian man saved her from drowning.⁴²

However, many of Mayo's critics have correctly pointed out that her complicity with the British and American governments was not as innocent as it may have appeared. For example, Liz Wilson emphatically writes that Mayo was not an advocate for women's rights and an objective seeker of truths. "Even if Katherine Mayo was not a conscious advocate of colonialism, as I believe she was," she states, "but rather a politically neutral observer, it probably does not, in the final analysis, *really matter*."⁴³ Wilson argues that ultimately the harm that this book did for views on India and Indians worldwide had severe implications for the "geo-political uses of feminist critique."⁴⁴ Jha's book and the more recent work by Sinha provide political, social, and theoretical tools to flesh out the interconnections between Mayo and her larger Western audience as well as the reception of Mayo and her book within India.

Mother India was first published in 1927⁴⁵ to very receptive audiences both in the East and in the West.⁴⁶ Both popular and notorious for its seemingly objective evaluation of India's bid for independence, this book epitomized a Western rationale for legitimating and retaining British colonial rule in India. For example, Sinha points out that the book, in spite of its notoriety or maybe because of it, was made available to a large reading public, was translated into various Indian and European languages, and, in fact, "spawned a mini-industry."⁴⁷ Additionally, she states that "[a] survey of some 350 adults in the United States in the 1950's revealed that *Mother India* was second only to the works of Rudyard Kipling as the most popular source of information in the United States on India."⁴⁸ Interestingly, it shared many stylistic traits with the contemporaneous Indian nationalist mode of returning to Hindu theology and culture in order to rethink a modern model of nationalism in the period following colonialism. Inasmuch as the book itself propagated a colonialist fantasy of India through its emotive and imperialist argumentations, the responses to *Mother India*, both at the time of its publication and in the present, draw attention to the still shaky foundations of postindependence Indian nationalism.

The sociopolitical context in which the book was published and became popular contributes to its orientalist and colonizing reading of India through its women—an idea which had been playing itself out in mainstream Western feminism since the nineteenth century. Additionally, the ambiguous position of women within the Indian nationalist party lent silent support for a project such as Mayo's. Partha Chatterjee characterizes women's positions in the emergent nationalism within the political milieu of the construction of the social order just prior to the prominence of the Indian nationalist struggles. The paradox he presents is one in which nineteenth-century debates about and mobilization for women's issues suddenly "disappeared" toward the end of the century as discourses of nationalism became privileged.⁴⁹ This "disappearance" is most notable in the nationalist slogan "India cannot be free until its women are free" and is one that continues to haunt discussions on the status of Indian women and also that of Indian feminist movements. Women, then, served as nothing more than symbolic representation for India, and Indian nationalists hoped

Mayo's book would show, through an "objective" study of Indian life, India's readiness for sovereignty. Instead, because the active role of Indian women in Indian society was severely de-emphasized in the book, where they were depicted as silenced within any Indian model of true progressive change, the book justified the continuation of Western British imperialism in the early twentieth century. For example, because Indian women were always seen as perpetually victimized, oppressively silenced by Indian men, the backwardness of the country and its inability to project itself into a prosperous future was highlighted.

Mayo's presentation of India does not include Indian voices, and especially those of the Indian women about whom she was writing. Her gaze is one which largely is unreturned since women are ahistorical objects for study. Thus, the consent of Indian nationalists in accepting Mayo as an "expert" to come to India is all the more perplexing. However, Indian feminists were rightfully skeptical, although it was not until the publication of the book that women such as Sarojini Naidu spoke out about the colonialist tropes that were represented in the book and the effects of the book on the lives of Indian women, particularly those who were already fighting to combat violence against women. The bifurcation between nationalist and feminist practices in India was revealed where the nationalist movement attempted to swallow wholesale women's contributions to the new nation; this, then, sustained the imperial discourses on Indian home rule. At the same time, what was also being underscored within India was the conflation of Indian with the Hindu/Brahmin which Mayo would capitalize upon as a way of ensuring a Hindu/Muslim split in India and, thus, the continuation of British rule.⁵⁰

Framed in *suttee*: Requiem for Indian women

In the preface to *Gyn/Ecology*, Daly suggests:

This book can be heard as a Requiem for that "women's movement," which is male-designed, male-orchestrated, male-legitimated, male-assimilated. It is also a call to those who have been unwittingly tokenized, to tear off their mindbindings and join in the Journey. It is, hopefully, an alarm clock for those former Journeyers who have merged with "the human (men's) community," but who can still feel nostalgia for the present/future of their own be-ing.⁵¹

In other words, Daly's aim is not only to critique liberal feminism that can be traced from Mary Wollstonecraft to the suffrage movement and to Simone de Beauvoir, but to develop a radical vision of a liberatory feminism that can be found in gynocriticism, with its emphasis on deconstructing and evaluating male exercise in power and authority over women's bodies and their "be-ing." For Daly, the liberal feminism of the dominating humanist feminism can find ways of be-ing only in and through "male-designed, male-orchestrated, male-legitimated, male-assimilated" modes of knowledge production. It is this notion of patriarchy that Daly tackles in the hopes that women will travel "into feminist time-space [of] Hag-ocracy, a place where we govern."⁵² One

of the best examples in the text can be found in the epigraphs to her chapter on *suttee*, particularly the one referenced to Lynn Caine from her book *Widow*. Caine's quote reads as follows: "'Widow' is a harsh and hurtful word. It comes from the Sanskrit and it means 'empty' ... I resent what the term has come to mean. I am alive. I am part of the world." Caine's attribution to Sanskrit as the root of the word "widow" is hasty; according to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, the word is derived from the Old English, with comparative words in Latin, Germanic, and Indo-European language trees. So why the insistence of rooting it only in the ancient Indo-Aryan Sanskrit? Reading the attribution of the word within the framework of Daly's analysis of *suttee* in the chapter, the reader is already led to the thesis of the chapter: Indian women are "empty" as widows, even as Caine is linked by her status as widow to *suttees*. Widowhood, then, is the bond that unites women. Even though there is already present a cross-cultural difference and hierarchy, women are still a universal category. It is important to note, however, that this is where "maternal imperialism" first begins to seep through the language. Caine says she's "alive" and that Indian women are "empty." In so doing, she establishes a hierarchy of subject positions in which Indian women are robbed of their subjectivity and identity.

Iris Marion Young, in her essay "Humanism, Gynocentrism and Feminist Politics," contrasts humanist feminism to gynocentric feminism by making the observation that while humanist feminism "revolts" against femininity, gynocentric criticism "argues for the superiority of the values embodied in traditionally female experience, and rejects the values it finds in traditionally male dominated institutions."⁵³ In the interest of uncloaking gendered power imbalances, Daly turns to real material practices such as *suttee*, or widow-burning, in India, foot-binding in China, and female genital mutilation in Africa. What is important for our analysis here is that Daly codes these practices as barbarous and comprising what she calls the "Sado-ritual Syndrome." Moreover, she is quick to point out that "those who claim to see racism and/or imperialism in my indictment of these atrocities can do so only by blinding themselves to the fact that the oppression of women knows no ethnic, national, or religious bounds."⁵⁴ The truth of Daly's statement can only be realized as long as these "barbarous rituals" can be thematized: "There are variations on the theme of oppression, but the phenomenon is planetary."⁵⁵

It should come as no surprise then that she would be effusive about Mayo, who, according to Daly, was a "startling exception among women who have written about India."⁵⁶ Never mind that Mayo was, at best, a journalist who spent only three months in India! What is important about Daly's choice of words is that it completely occludes the geopolitical context that enabled Mayo to be invited to study India, per the discussion in the preceding section. Moreover, there is no mention of the ways in which *Mother India* is part of a national story, even as a symbol. Mayo's project was transparent in her attempts to address the question of nationalism in India through her blatant use of Hindu girls/women as helpless victims in the face of rituals and history, and yet, Daly sees no reason to explore these facets of Mayo's projects.

Mayo first shows up in Daly's book as part of a larger discussion of female sacrifice focused on *suttee*. Daly links *suttee* to the practice of child brides, saying, without any references, that "brahmans have what has been called a 'strange preference for children

of very tender years.'"⁵⁷ In making the above, unsubstantiated claim, Daly conflates Brahmin—which is the high Hindu caste—with Indian. It is not surprising then that Mayo would become her "expert" on India, since Mayo herself deployed terms like "Indian," "Hindu," "Muslim" as political tools through which to garner support from her readers on the question of Indian independence. Moreover, the verbiage of "brahman" also holds significance since Brahmins are perceived to be the spiritual leaders and guides of Hindus (not Indians). As holding the highest rank in the Hindu caste system, they also exemplify the ultimate expression of patriarchy and, if they have the proclivities toward "children of very tender years," their power is completely suspect.

The chapter begins with an introduction to *suttee*, which, according to Daly, "might at first appear totally alien to contemporary Western society, where widows are not ceremoniously burned alive on the funeral pyres of their husbands."⁵⁸ Even though this opening sentence is meant as a way to usher in what Daly calls "connectedness" with our rituals, the chapter begins by reinforcing the Manicheanism that underwrites so much of the relationship between the West and the rest. Moreover, the use of the present tense occludes the history of the outlawing of *suttee* by British officials in 1829, which was the source of contestation between the Hindu nationalists and British officials. As Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak has summarized the legislating of *suttee* in India: It was the case of the "white man saving the brown women from brown men."⁵⁹ But, in Daly's opening of the chapter, the readers are not told about *suttee*'s illegality, but rather informed of its continued practice.

As Daly moves through the arguments she wishes to make, she falls into the same trap rhetorically as her predecessor, to whom she will then turn as her primary source on India: Katherine Mayo. Like Mayo, Daly recounts "facts" about Indian kinship structures: "Since it was common practice for men of fifty, sixty, or seventy years of age to marry child-brides, . . . we should also realize that in some cases—particularly if the widow was an extremely young child before her husband's unfortunate (for her) death—there was the option of turning to a life of prostitution, which would entail premature death from venereal disease."⁶⁰ Who is the source of this information? Mayo, whose anecdotal observations and, admittedly, second- and thirdhand information make up much of *Mother India*. However, where Mayo's words were criticized as participating in a culture of sensationalist journalism through her reliance upon conversations and lack of scholarly sources, those same words later became part of academic feminism as scholarly citations in the undertaking that is *Gyn/Ecology*. Thus began Mayo's rebirth as "feminist" and as "scholar."

The remainder of Mayo's presence in Daly's book is centralized on *Mother India*, the title of which is "appropriately ironic" to Daly.⁶¹ Clearly, she draws upon Mayo's text as a way to paint a patriarchal system in which multiple layers of victimization take place, so much so that any violation of the girl or woman is "natural." For example, in her discussion about the rite of *jauhar*—mass ritualistic self-immolation—that Rajput women would undergo when faced with rape by their enemies, Daly's punch line is that these women did it for their masters: "Their masters could not bear that they should be raped, tortured, and killed by foreign males adhering to 'different' religious beliefs, *rather than by themselves*"⁶² (emphasis mine). The inclusion of the last clause paints Indian

women—and in Daly's case, the conflation of Hindu (Rajput) with Indian is notable—as already having been victimized, in this case, by Hindu men. *Jauhar*, then, is already framed within a Hindu masculinist notion of honor in which there are no individual women, but instead collective victims. Ultimately, in her analysis, *jauhar* is a battle fought between men and their honor, with women as the vehicles through which the violence of patriarchy is spectacularized. This reading of Indian women also reinforces the inability of non-Western women to fit into a model of the self and moral individualism arising from the Enlightenment. Thus, they cannot be "recognized" as human beings invested with agency and power; instead, they are bereft of the ability to make moral and reasoned choices. It is all too easy to see the replication of Mayo's work in Daly's.

In the next few pages, Daly continues to rely upon the anecdotal evidence that Mayo had presented in *Mother India*. The ensuing discussion is replete with images of girls who have been internally fouled with maggots and other creatures as a result of being raped by their elderly Hindu husbands, even though they may be from "well-to-do families."⁶³ By addressing the high class position of these families, both Mayo and Daly underscore the "backwardness" of Indian culture itself, particularly if the liberal, higher-class, and cosmopolitan Indians, who would be expected to take on the mantle of governmental control once independence was achieved, continued to fall prey to their "traditions."

What is most interesting in regard to my project is Daly's use of passages from Mayo's text and a complete absence of quoting any Indian historian or feminist scholar. Instead, Mayo once again gets the final word. Daly quotes Mayo at length, from the narrative to the index. One of the most highly criticized elements of Mayo's book was its anecdotal narrativization of girls' and women's lives. Everyone from Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi to feminist independence fighter and renowned poet Sarojini Naidu, to several authors who wrote books in response to *Mother India*, all agreed that while the topics Mayo discussed were important issues for India, she nevertheless had no substantiations for the claims she made. Mayo herself said that some of her information had been acquired second- or third-hand. And, yet, Mayo's presence in *Gyn/Ecology* ignores these previous critiques and, instead, Daly, as a renowned feminist scholar, can then give us Mayo's words which we unquestioningly translate into facts about the Indian women "over there." Thus, Mayo, whose knowledge of India was limited by the amount of time she spent there and whose work had been established as part of both British and American imperial projects in the early twentieth century, is reincarnated as a legitimate feminist historian of India. However, this does not stop Daly from asserting that Mayo belongs to the "few women in 'advanced' countries who have some idea of the facts of sexism and some knowledge of 'women's history,' [and that] far fewer glimpse the continued massacre that is masked by the rituals of research which repeatedly re-cover the interconnected crimes of planetary patriarchy."⁶⁴

Notes toward transnational futures

Perhaps it was the recognition of double colonization of third-world women in Daly's book as well as a desire to use that as a space to begin a progressive dialogue that

inspired Audre Lorde to write to Mary Daly. Written as a reflection not only upon the book but also upon a racist trajectory of women's history in the West, Lorde appeals to the indices of religiosity that the two share: the goddess figure and the turn to a gynocriticism that places women in the center of history. Lorde points out that, even with these commonalities, the book has a continued lack of dialogue between white women and black women, and this is "discouraging ... and painful."⁶⁵ Lorde notes the glaring absence of women of color in the text, other than as objects for Daly's case studies. To disregard the common histories shared by white women and black women is tantamount, according to Lorde, to "deny[ing] the fountain of non-european female strength and power that nurtures each of our visions. It is to make a point by choice."⁶⁶ As an example, she cites the absence of African goddess Afrekete as striking in the model of gyn/ecology that Daly presents. Among the very astute observations that Lorde makes to Daly about *Gyn/Ecology* and its use of black and brown women is her description of them as "victims and preyers—upon each other,"⁶⁷ whereas, for Daly, white women "celebrate [their] differences as a creative force toward change."⁶⁸ These comparisons invoke the colonialist trope of the "barbarism" of non-Western cultures.

Moreover, Lorde asks why it is, when nonwhite women are topics of study, that they are never the cited scholars? Why do they go by unrecognized, particularly when racism is such a reality in the daily lives of women of color? She chastises Daly for remaining silent on these topics and, indeed, being unaware of these realities. She concludes her letter by stating that "the oppression of women knows no ethnic nor racial boundaries, true, but that does not mean it is identical within those differences ... To deal with one without even alluding to the other is to distort our commonality as well as our difference. For then beyond sisterhood is still racism."⁶⁹ These are chilling words that come from the voice that had decided to break a self-imposed silence about talking to white women about race. To break from that and respond to Daly was an act of courage and stemmed from a deep desire to connect and to forge bonds with white women. This makes Daly's brusque, and late, reply all the more bizarre.

Daly wrote a brief letter in which she elided the real questions at the heart of Lorde's letter and, instead, said that there was "no simple response" to Lorde's letter and that she had used only the "commonly available sources" when writing about myth. The use of the word "commonly" is particularly telling in that it functions to reinforce the cultural and historical borders that Lorde wants to break down. If women's history is to turn to beginning with women, those people who are "uncommon" when it comes to androcentric history, would it not make sense to find "uncommon" sources that would highlight the bonds women have forged with each other across time and space? Instead, Daly's response reflects the very dismissiveness that Lorde accuses white women of doing.

In many ways, Daly's curt and brief response parallels Mayo's lack of awareness of her own position in relation to Indian women. In her article, "Who is Authorized to Speak? Katherine Mayo and the Politics of Imperial Feminism in British India," Liz Wilson focuses on the racially charged controversy surrounding Mayo's book and on the value of doing cross-cultural feminist research. She argues:

[T]he feminist rhetoric used by Mayo and by many of Mayo's supporters has an opportunistic quality typical of much nineteenth- and early twentieth-century

imperial discourse on the status of women among "the subject races" (those groups who are ostensibly in dire need of the West's civilizing mission). The argument over Mayo's book quickly turned into a referendum on Indian Home Rule that left the issue of women very much on the sidelines.⁷⁰

The omission of "the woman's question" in the widespread discussions about Indian national agency and also the failure to address the opportunism of Western women's sovereignty require a counterhistory that takes into account that "gender is not a monolithic category, deployed universally; rather, it changes according to class/caste, nation, and sexuality."⁷¹ Women are, in this sense, positioned by these very categories. Examining this within the "wider set of social relations," we see that inasmuch as middle-class Western women were positioned by a very specific patriarchal structure, they also positioned themselves in their relationship to their downtrodden sisters in the East in order to obtain agency for themselves. For example, "feminist sentiments were used in British India to justify maintaining social distance between the ruling class and the subject races."⁷² At the same time, "English women saw the 'oriental' woman as an example of submission that symbolized what they were fighting against . . . the immobile women, in seclusion at home, without any rights that brought them to the public arena."⁷³ The benevolent racism couched in an earlier iteration of global sisterhood structured Euro-American feminists and women's groups' responses to Mayo's book. They charged in to fight against the social injustices foisted upon Indian women by their male counterparts. Most of these groups focused on marriage reform legislation in India. Even the conservative Daughters of the American Revolution started collecting funds for the "helpless child-brides of India" in a benevolent gesture which was intended to signal a politics of global sisterhood.⁷⁴ Ultimately, when marriage reform laws were enacted in India in 1928, the work done by all-India feminists and other local women's groups, who had been working since 1924 to implement these laws, was erased as Mayo's supposedly "brave exposé . . . had shamed Indians into supporting legislative reforms for women."⁷⁵ Therefore, by offering a mythic view of India and particularly one which *Mother India* represents, Mayo's text obscures the real work of actual Indian women, a topic completely disregarded by Daly decades later. Postcolonial and transnational feminists have critiqued how, within radical feminism, the histories of non-Western women have been uncovered only as they were subsumed within the larger framework that Western academics espoused; there was very little wriggle room for difference.

Urvashi Butalia has brilliantly traced the divergences and silences of history in her article "Domestic Murder and the Golden Sea," in which she notes that the *Vintage Book of Historical Feminism* points to "Seneca Falls—New York, in 1848 [as the birth place of the] first organized movement for freedom for women."⁷⁶ Butalia, like Kumari Jayawardena before her in *Nationalism and Feminism in the Third World*, points out that there is no monolithic women's history and that women's histories have many, differing, trajectories. "Uncommon" sources could have been Daly's starting place for unraveling the historical binds that tie up women's national and international solidarities. This is a topic that could have been developed to write a more inclusive history of women around the world. Women in non-Western worlds were just as

involved in making real change in their communities and had parallel histories to those of Western women. The result of this exclusion would lead to the self-imposed silencing by women of color, as Lorde had done, in response to the continued disregard for making space for women of color and non-Western women.

Uma Narayan develops this idea further in her stunning reading of Daly. She argues that a "colonialist stance" keeps being replicated by white women when attempting to explain or represent "Third-World traditions."⁷⁷ Like Lorde and other women of color, Narayan challenges the notion of feminism as something rooted in Western cultures, and that feminism in non-Western cultures is derivative of mainstream Western feminism. The scope of her research in her chapter, in *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third-World Feminism*, complements the work of my chapter while its aims differ from mine. In it, she is highlighting how "third-world traditions" and their representations in Western feminist texts need to go beyond cultural essentialist notions of what constitutes "tradition" and calls for analyses that see tradition more as "historical and political."⁷⁸ Her analyses of both *sati* (*suttee* in Daly's book) and of Daly's representations of it reinforce Lorde's critique of the power and privilege that underwrite Daly's work. Narayan's method of analysis is clearly inspired by anthropologist Clifford Geertz's notion of a "thick description," in which behaviors and practices are analyzed through various contexts. She painstakingly traces the conflicted history of *sati* both for nationalists and for British officials. She discusses the place of *sati* within larger discourses of honor and tradition in Hindu families and as a practice that is more nuanced than Daly would have us believe.

The claims of orientalism that saturate both Lorde's letter to Daly and Wilson's article noted above are expanded upon by Joanna Liddle and Shirin Rai in their essay, "Feminism, Imperialism and Orientalism: The Challenge of the 'Indian Woman.'" In the article, they take the orientalist image of the Indian woman and consequently Indian culture as "uniformly uncivilised and barbarous, and of Indian women as backward and lost in darkness," and they apply the power relations set into place by this production to second wave feminist inquiry. They use Daly's *Gyn/Ecology* to trace a trajectory between Mayo and Daly. They argue that Daly

repeats the errors of the past by presenting a universal picture of the Indian woman as victim, failing to reveal the resistance that women offered to the horrifying ritual of suttee, child marriage, or any of the other patriarchal abuses visited on women in the name of Hindu religion.⁷⁹

Because Daly defends Mayo in *Gyn/Ecology* and "regards her as a true feminist researcher and presents Mayo's work uncritically,"⁸⁰ Liddle and Rai see as dangerous Daly's plea that feminists "search out and claim such sisters as Katherine Mayo."⁸¹ The kind of sisterhood that Daly envisions has some serious and negative consequences for feminism's call for global justice. In her refusal to recognize "how gender is used to mediate imperialism,"⁸² Daly reinforces uneven structures of power that, ultimately, offer a zero-sum game for women of color and non-Western women. In fact, Daly addresses this in counterargument:

I have chosen to name these practices for what they are: barbaric rituals/atrocities. Critics from western countries are constantly being intimidated by accusations of "racism," to the point of misnaming, non-naming, and not seeing these sado-rituals. The accusations of "racism" may come from ignorance, but they serve only the interests of males, not of women.⁸³

By naming these practices as part of a universal (read Western) discourse on what constitutes the civilized and the barbaric, Daly herself projects a "maternal imperialism" in the name of a true feminist approach. In choosing not to read these "rituals/atrocities" in their historical and cultural specificities, she short-circuits any chance of agency on the part of the third-world woman and of transnational collaborations based upon an inclusive women's history. Instead, she goes as far as to accuse these women of fueling a patriarchal agenda if they point to the racism inherent in her work. Liddle and Rai see this as a move to both "draw from and feed into the hierarchical global positioning of these countries, but in a relocated context of radical political opposition, the impact of which is to erase the history of the women's movement in the non-Western world and to elevate American women as the leaders of global feminism."⁸⁴

Upon a closer examination of the two feminist texts as well as the historical contexts in which they were written, we see how historical agency is denied Indian women and to developing multiple and parallel histories of women. Ramusack's idea of "maternal imperialism," imposed upon the non-Western all-India feminist movements and Indian women, both in the past (through Mayo and some of her contemporaries) and through Daly's work, comes to question the notion of second wave feminism. To refuse to essentialize women and to reject readings of third-world "traditions" as timeless, and thus, historical, is to embrace an authentic politics of transformation that feminism espouses. This kind of politics acknowledges what Yuval-Davis characterizes as transversal feminism which, much like the second wave feminist standpoint theory, "aims to be an alternative to the universalism/relativism dichotomy which is at the heart of the modernist/postmodernist feminist debate. It aims at providing answers ... to questions of how and with whom we should work if/when we accept that we are all different."⁸⁵ Transversal politics can be used as a way to unthink ideas of global sisterhood espoused by second wave feminists such as Robin Morgan, Mary Daly, and others because it structures work within nodes of difference and the membership that women hold in many cultures and collectivities simultaneously. The promise of knowledge as historically and culturally situated exposes and interrupts how women of color and third-world women internalize oppression, domination, and dehumanization, thus, changing the way we *do* feminism.

Notes

- 1 Audre Lorde, "An Open Letter to Mary Daly," in *Audre Lorde, Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches* (Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press, 1984), 66–71.
- 2 Mary Daly, *Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978).

- 3 Ross S. Kraemer, "Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism," *Signs* 5, 2 (1979): 354–6.
- 4 Josephine Payne-O'Connor, "Comment on Kraemer's Review of 'Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism,'" *Signs* 6, 2 (1980): 340–2.
- 5 Margo Moore, "Gyn/Ecology: The Metaethics of Radical Feminism," *Australian Left Review* 76 (1981): 42–4.
- 6 Linda Alcoff, "Cultural Feminism Versus Post-structuralism: The Identity Crisis in Feminist Theory," *Signs* 13, 3 (1988): 406.
- 7 Katherine Mayo, *Mother India* (New York: Blue Ribbon Books, 1927).
- 8 Uma Narayan, *Dislocating Cultures: Identities, Traditions, and Third World Feminism* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 45.
- 9 Barbara Ramusack, "Cultural Missionaries, Maternal Imperialists, Feminist Allies: British Women Activists in India, 1865–1945," *Women's Studies International Forum* 13, 4 (1990): 309–21.
- 10 *Ibid.*, 319.
- 11 Inderpal Grewal, *Home and Harem: Gender, Empire, and Cultures of Travel* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1996), 78.
- 12 *Ibid.*, 76.
- 13 Inderpal Grewal and Caren Kaplan, "Postcolonial Studies and Transnational Feminist Practices," *Jouvert* 5, 1 (2000): 1.
- 14 Amrita Chhachhi, "Forced Identities: The State, Communalism, Fundamentalism and Women in India," in *Women, Islam and the State*, ed. Deniz Kandiyoti (Basingstoke and London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1991), 144–75.
- 15 Nira Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation* (London: Sage Publications, 1997), 117.
- 16 C. F. Andrews, *The True India, a Plea for Understanding* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1939); Nupur Chaudhuri and Margaret Strobel, *Western Women and Imperialism: Complicity and Resistance* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992); William Emilsen, "Gandhi and Mayo's 'Mother India,'" *South Asia: Journal of South Asian Studies* 10, 1 (1987): 69–81; Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India* (New Delhi: People's Publishing House, 1971); Rai Lajpat, *Unhappy India, Second Edition* (New York: AMS Press, 1972).
- 17 See Mrinalini Sinha, "Reading Mother India: Empire, Nation, and the Female Voice," *Journal of Women's History* 6, 2 (1994): 6–44. Also, see Mrinalini Sinha, *Specters of Mother India: The Global Restructuring of an Empire* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006).
- 18 Elisabeth Bumiller, *May You Be the Mother of a Hundred Sons: A Journey Among the Women of India* (New York: Random House, 1990).
- 19 Grewal, *Home and Harem*; Kumari Jayawardena, *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women and South Asia during British Rule* (New York: Routledge, 1995).
- 20 Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India*, 4.
- 21 *Ibid.*, 6.
- 22 *Ibid.*, 7.
- 23 *Ibid.*, 31.
- 24 *Ibid.*
- 25 Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1978).
- 26 Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India*, 32.
- 27 *Ibid.*, 32.
- 28 *Ibid.*, 19.
- 29 *Ibid.*, 20.

- 30 The British were not the only group to endorse Mayo's project. It held mass appeal to American groups as well. There is evidence that links the Rockefeller Foundation to Mayo's project. Additionally, the Standard Oil Company was equally interested in the results of Mayo's work. See Sinha, *Specters*; and Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India*.
- 31 Katherine Mayo, *Mother India*, 13.
- 32 The book came about as a result of a murder involving a foreman on the country estate she shared with her companion, Moyca Newell. Apparently, "although he identified two of his assailants before he died, the local police and county sheriffs were incapable of prosecuting the offenders." For more details on these earlier works by Mayo, see Emilsen, "Gandhi and Mayo's 'Mother India,'" 71.
- 33 Ibid., 71.
- 34 See Joanna Liddle and Shirin Rai, "Feminism, Imperialism and Orientalism: The Challenge of the 'Indian Woman,'" *Women's History Review* 7, 4 (1998): 425–519.
- 35 Liddle and Rai, "Feminism, Imperialism and Orientalism," 502.
- 36 Mayo, *Mother India*, 15.
- 37 Ibid., 15.
- 38 Sinha, *Specters*, 15.
- 39 Ibid., 14.
- 40 Ibid., 15.
- 41 The Immigration Act of 1924 severely restricted immigration to the United States for Eastern Europeans and Africans, tightened the policy of excluding immigration for East Asians, and extended some of those exclusions to South Asians.
- 42 *Mother India's* dedication is partly to "the field labourer, who, once by an act of humanity, saved my life." Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India*, 19.
- 43 Liz Wilson, "Who is Authorized to Speak? Katherine Mayo and the Politics of Imperial Feminism in India," *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 25, 2 (1997): 145.
- 44 Ibid.
- 45 This book, according to Sinha, by the 1950s, had a sales figure of 395,678. It eventually was reprinted several times, including a separate Indian edition. More recently, there were reprints in 1970 in Britain, one in 1984 in the United States, and one in 1986 in India. See Mrinalini Sinha, *Mother India: Selections from the Controversial 1927 Text* (New Delhi: Kali for Women, 2000).
- 46 According to Sinha, "the book became somewhat of a cause célèbre in the United States, Britain and India. It was hotly debated on public platforms and journal and newspaper columns in all three countries. It was protested on the streets of New York, San Francisco, London and Calcutta and was burned outside the Town Hall in New York City." See Sinha, *Mother India*, 2.
- 47 Ibid., 2.
- 48 Ibid., 5.
- 49 Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments: Colonial and Postcolonial Histories* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993), 116.
- 50 Manoranjan Jha provides us with a useful background for what may have led to Mayo's eventual alignment with Muslims. He states that during the last days of the First World War, "the Department of State [in the United States], noted that the Muslims in India too were agitated against the British owing to the dismemberment of the Turkish empire at the end of the war and, therefore, they were cooperating with the Hindus in the nationalist movement." Manoranjan Jha, *Katherine Mayo and India*, 7.
- 51 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 4.

- 52 Ibid., 15.
- 53 Iris Marion Young, "Humanism, Gynocentrism and Feminist Politics," *Women's Studies International Forum* 8, 4 (1985): 173.
- 54 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 74.
- 55 Ibid.
- 56 Ibid., 84.
- 57 Ibid., 80.
- 58 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 2.
- 59 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*, ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman (Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994), 93.
- 60 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 2.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 3.
- 63 Daly, *Gyn/Ecology*, 5.
- 64 Ibid., 81.
- 65 Lorde, "An Open Letter to Mary Daly."
- 66 Ibid.
- 67 Ibid.
- 68 Ibid.
- 69 Ibid., 3.
- 70 Wilson, "Who is Authorized to Speak?" 139.
- 71 Ibid.
- 72 Grewal, *Home and Harem*, 66; Wilson, "Who is Authorized to Speak?" 144.
- 73 Grewal, *Home and Harem*, 76.
- 74 Mrinalini Sinha, "Gender in the Critiques of Colonialism and Nationalism: Locating the 'Indian Woman,'" in *Feminism and History*, ed. Joan Wallach Scott (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 492.
- 75 Ibid., 497.
- 76 Urvashi Butalia, "Domestic murder and the golden sea," *New Internationalist* 309 (1999), 19.
- 77 Narayan, *Dislocating Cultures*, 43.
- 78 Ibid.
- 79 Liddle and Rai, "Feminism, Imperialism and Orientalism," 507.
- 80 Ibid., 509.
- 81 Ibid., 509.
- 82 Ibid., 511.
- 83 Ibid.
- 84 Ibid.
- 85 Yuval-Davis, *Gender and Nation*, 125.