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Marcuse, the Women's Movement, and Women's Studies

The United States is on the verge of a counterrevolution, and the women's movement and women's studies are two of its prime targets. Herbert Marcuse's writings in *An Essay on Liberation* and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* are particularly useful in understanding this impending counterrevolution and also in developing an effective theory and practice to combat it. Although Marcuse made few direct comments about feminism, his writings provide important insight into the forces behind a counterrevolution directed at women. Equally important, and perhaps less obviously, Marcuse's movement in *Essay on Liberation* and *Counterrevolution and Revolt* from a traditional, objective, class-based analysis of revolution to a privileging of subjective factors leads him to articulate an identity politics that closely resembles the orientation of much of contemporary American feminism.

Identity politics, for Marcuse, was meant to supplement rather than replace class struggle. For feminism, however, identity politics has become an end in itself, and has, in effect, turned in against itself, making the women's movement and its academic arm, women's studies, particularly vulnerable to the counterrevolution. The radical possibilities of the women's movement and women's studies can be retained, however, if identity politics is reconnected to class struggle and feminism directs its attention to issues confronting women as workers. Marcuse's thoughts on the relationship between identity politics and class struggle are important for reconnecting feminism to class-based politics and helping the women's movement and women's studies to respond to the threat of the counterrevolution.

According to Marcuse, the counterrevolution in the West is based on fear and is "altogether preventive," since there is no revolution to be undone and none imminent. Susan Faludi's *Backlash*, a richly detailed account of "the undeclared war against American women," illuminates the
kind of threat that feminism poses to American life. For Faludi, like Marcuse, the backlash of the 1980s is “a preemptive strike,” linked not to the achievement of women’s full equality “but [to] the increased possibility that they might win it.” According to Faludi, gender increases in meaning for individuals as class decreases. In a country such as the United States, where class often has little meaning for individuals, gender becomes more status-laden. “If the American man can claim no ancestral coat of arms on which to elevate himself from the masses,” Faludi writes, “perhaps he can fashion his sex into a sort of pedigree.” There are class differences among men who create the backlash and women who accept it.

For Faludi, several key myths, including the “man shortage,” the “infertility epidemic,” the “divorce revolution,” “cocooning,” and professional women’s “burnout,” have been promulgated by a hostile or lazy media and supported by those threatened by women’s drive for equality. Faludi details the incredible power of a system to mobilize the forces of science, politics, language, philosophy, and religion on the side of oppression. The real problem, according to Faludi, is not women’s demand for equality but the continued inequality that taxes women’s emotional, physical, and financial resources. Unfortunately, the system uses the tools of mass media and mass marketing to seduce women into believing that feminism is the enemy.

Faludi argues that the backlash has always been a part of women’s history in the United States. But the contemporary version is based on mass marketing and mass media, “two institutions that have since proved more effective devices for constraining women’s aspirations than coercive laws and punishments,” and is ominous because it is not nearly as recognizable. The “repulsive unity of opposites,” to use Marcuse’s term, camouflages the backlash. Women are led to believe they have it all and are unhappy because of it when in reality they have very little. The backlash is not organized, nor is there a “single string-puller.” But this is one of the reasons for its power. “A backlash against women’s rights succeeds to the degree that it appears not to be political, that it appears not to be a struggle at all. It is most powerful when it goes private, when it lodges inside a woman’s mind and turns her vision inward, until she imagines the pressure is all in her head, until she begins to enforce the backlash too—on herself.”
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Clearly, oppression organized around gender cannot be overcome solely through class struggle. Historically, a women’s movement independent of the Left was necessary to address the specifics of women’s oppression and to give women a voice in constructing their own identity.16 Likewise, it is important to remember that the declining significance of class in American culture has shaped American feminism and led to an emphasis on identity politics disconnected from class. An examination of An Essay on Liberation and Counterrevolution and Revolt, with their shift from class analysis to identity politics, provides a context for a more detailed examination of the consequences of this emphasis. Although Marcuse never developed a full theory of identity politics, his ideas parallel many of those involved in the formation of the contemporary women’s movement.

Marcuse’s flirtation with identity politics came as a result of his pessimism concerning the working class. Although the latter would remain for Marcuse the objective agent of revolution, its lack of revolutionary consciousness and imagination disqualified it as the subjective agent.15 In fact, Marcuse argued that the working class was now a “conservative, even counterrevolutionary force.”16 Indeed, if the laboring class were to achieve control of society’s wealth-producing resources without a transformation in its consciousness, the results would perpetuate rather than eliminate domination and exploitation.16 Marcuse, moreover, had few illusions that the working class could become the subjective agent of revolution, since it was so tightly integrated into society. This integration, for Marcuse, was as much psychological as it was economic and political. Advanced capitalism, he argued, engendered among the workers a set of needs the satisfaction of which could only occur within the context of the historical circumstances that created them.17 The workers believe themselves happy with the “Establishment” because it delivers the goods.18

As a consequence of his rejection of the working class, Marcuse turned to those who were not or should not be as satisfied with the existing state of affairs, individuals he referred to collectively as the “Great Refusal.” The Great Refusal had two main components. The first comprised those who rejected the way of life promoted by the Establishment. Students, for Marcuse, constituted a significant faction of this group. They were part of the Great Refusal by dint of their revolutionary political con-
consciousness and their identity based on a “radical transvaluation of values.”

Because of structural changes within capitalism, he argues, this group poses a unique threat. Although they are potential members of the working class, they will be selling their mental rather than their physical labor. Ironically, the space created for them to develop as mental workers, the universities, actually served to distance them from integration into the Establishment. Students, he contends, have developed a “new sensibility” that signals a break in the domination of advanced capitalism, a domination that has created a “second nature of man which ties him libidinally and aggressively to the commodity form.” Those who possess this new sensibility have reached down into their second nature and have discovered new needs for freedom. Unlike the traditional working class, whose domination extends to their “instinctual structure,” the students have free instincts that cause them to react differently than those who give the system their peaceful and willing cooperation. In Marcuse’s words, these rebels “want to see, hear, feel new things in a new way: they link liberation with the dissolution of ordinary and orderly perception.”

It is their desire to take the humanist values of the universities and transform them into humane living conditions for all, thereby fulfilling the promise of their education. They have rejected the roles society has planned for them and have embarked on the task of defining themselves and creating their own understanding of who they are and what their role will be in a liberated society. The fact that they take this emerging identity and connect it to the need for radical political change gives them a revolutionary consciousness.

The second component of the Great Refusal included those whose marginalization by the Establishment prevented their integration; and it is here that Marcuse makes the move to identity politics. These individuals have revolutionary potential as a result of their race and sex and not as a result of revolutionary political consciousness. Marcuse, in effect, assumes that their politics are radical because they are blacks or women. Marcuse was attracted, for example, to the revolutionary potential of black ghetto-dwellers. The black population, for Marcuse, is more “expendable” to capitalist society than the white population because it is not as tied into the production process. But this expendability contributes to its revolutionary potential. Marcuse did not believe, however, that the black ghetto population in the United States had a revolutionary political
consciousness. “Cruel and indifferent privation,” according to Marcuse, “is now met with increasing resistance, but its still largely unpolitical character facilitates suppression and diversion.” What is more, class and racial differences separate the ghetto population from the mainly white, middle-class students who do have revolutionary political consciousness. The black ghetto population, therefore, shares with the students a rejection of the system, but not the consciousness of how and in what direction to change it.

Women, he argues, as a consequence of their marginalization, were free from much of the destructive repression experienced by males. For Marcuse, two processes affecting women occur simultaneously: their marginalization and their identity formation. Although women are more oppressed by men, they are less brutalized and remain “more human than men.” Again, as in the case of blacks in the United States, women’s revolutionary potential is linked primarily to their marginalization in the production process and the reduced levels of integration: “This isolation (separation) from the alienated work world of capitalism enabled the woman to remain less brutalized by the Performance Principle, to remain closer to her sensibility: more human than men.” A free society, the definite negation of the male principle, would be a female society, involving the “femalization” of the male.

It is in his discussion of the radical potential of the Women’s Liberation Movement, however, that Marcuse’s turn to identity politics becomes problematic. Marcuse, in effect, essentializes women, accepting and advocating an identity for women that was formed, not through a series of autonomous choices, but in opposition to the identity created by the Establishment for men. “That this image (and reality) of the woman has been determined by an aggressive, male-dominated society does not mean that this determination must be rejected, that the liberation of women must overcome the female ‘nature.’” Women, then, are radical only to the extent they accept the definition of other. Marcuse, moreover, fails to see the problem that arises when, based on their personal experiences, women hold a different understanding of the effect of their gender on their lives. He does not discuss how class and racial differences would affect this definition of the other. The political practice was to be founded on a single identity. “The Women’s Liberation Movement,” he writes, “becomes a radical force to the degree it transcends the entire sphere of
aggressive needs and performances, the entire social organization and divi­
sion of functions.” Patriarchy has created an image of women, a “fe­
male counter-force,” which “may still become one of the gravediggers of patriar­chal society.”

Identity Politics

The problematic aspects of his identity politics were unaddressed by Mar­
cuse but were central to the theory and practice of feminism. As noted, Marcuse turned to identity politics because of his rejection of the working class as the subjective agent of revolution. He also believed that his­
torical circumstances dictated a concentration on the development of a new subjective agent. The identity politics he advocated was not intended to replace either the development of revolutionary political consciousness or class analysis. It was intended to complement both and to bring the marginalized groups into the ranks of those who did have the needed con­sciousness, such as the student segment of the Great Refusal. It was his belief that the members of the Great Refusal had to engage in political education to foster the new sensibility and consciousness among all people, including the working class. In the case of the women’s move­ment, however, the focus has been on an identity politics that separates it from the Left and makes it an easy target for the counterrevolution.

Why and how did this happen? Marcuse’s thoughts on women are simi­lar to those that appeared among feminists at the time of the emergence of radical feminism. A comprehensive discussion is provided by Alice Echols in Daring to Be Bad. Echols’s account of the disputes between the “politicos” and the “radical feminists” illuminates the historical roots of the women’s movement and its emphasis on identity politics. During the period covered by her study, 1967 through 1975, debate be­tween the politicos and the radical feminists involved, among other is­sues, the relationship between the women’s movement and the Left. Was women’s liberation a wing of the Left, as thought by the politicos, or an independent movement neither counterrevolutionary nor peripheral to the Left? Radical feminism was a reaction to the “anti-feminism of the left and the reluctant feminism of the politicos.” As a response to what they perceived as the Left’s “dismissal of gender as a ‘secondary contra-
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diction,” radical feminists had a tendency “to privilege gender over race and class, and to treat women as a homogenized unity.” It was radical feminism, according to Echols, that was the “hegemonic tendency” within women’s liberation until 1973. Beginning that year, cultural feminism challenged radical feminism, and after 1975 it dominated the women’s movement. As a result of the ascendancy of cultural feminism, Echols suggests, “liberal feminism became the recognized voice of the women’s movement.” Cultural feminism focused on personal rather than social transformation, and, with the eclipse of radical feminist activism in a political sense, it became the province of liberal feminists interested in obtaining equality for women within the system.

There are a number of similarities between Marcuse and the cultural feminists. Both see women as essentially similar to one another, and both valorize traditional female culture, believing it to be a product of women’s marginalization and oppression. Marcuse and the cultural feminists regard a change in consciousness as preceding economic and political change. In addition, Marcuse’s writings on women, the Women’s Liberation Movement, and cultural feminism all emerged during a period of backlash. By focusing on creating a women’s culture and developing alternative institutions and lifestyles, women could survive the onslaught of the New Right.

But much of Marcuse’s work is more sympathetic to radical feminism than cultural feminism. The latter, for example, believes motherhood can empower women and eliminate differences of class, race, and sexual preference. Marcuse, on the contrary, is critical of the linkage between women and mothering. For Marcuse, “the image of the woman as mother is itself repressive; it transforms a biological fact into an ethical and cultural value and thus it supports and justifies her social repression.” Like the radical feminists, Marcuse rejects lifestyle politics as an alternative to political activism. Although he does not discuss the subordination of women’s liberation to the Left, he is more comfortable with the radical feminist position of transforming the relationship than with the cultural feminist advocacy of severing it. For Echols, both cultural and liberal feminists share the belief that change is a product of individual effort rather than collective struggle and that it is possible to disregard the “material barriers to women’s liberation.” Marcuse, despite his misgivings
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concerning the future of class struggle, remained committed to collective action and did not consider lifestyle politics a viable substitute.

The ascendancy of cultural feminism and the resulting increase in the influence of liberal feminism in the contemporary women’s movement created the conditions for the dominance of an identity politics divorced from class analysis. The sexism of the Left and its unwillingness to acknowledge gender as a primary source of oppression led to a women’s movement reluctant to reconcile with its former radical partner. As noted, Marcuse intended identity politics to supplement class struggle, but this was not the direction taken by the women’s movement. Liberal feminism was still committed to the system under fire from radicals. Identity politics, although important in empowering and legitimating an oppressed group, became enmeshed in constructing the meanings of identity for the members of the group. Marcuse did not fall prey to this particular difficulty because he accepted the image of women developed by advanced capitalism. His hope was that women would embrace and then act on this identity of “other.” When feminist identity politics attempted to reach out to other women, however, it became engrossed by what is involved in living a woman’s life and being seen by society as a woman. In the case of the women’s movement, outsider status became valuable less for its potential for revolutionary consciousness than for the fact of its existence: rebel in itself but not for itself.

Political Correctness

Within the women’s movement and women’s studies, identity politics has become an end in itself. Too often the discourse is dominated by charges and countercharges of oppression and exploitation, a direct and often necessary result of the use of politics to form identity. The outsider status, consistent with Marcuse’s belief, is assumed to confer a special type of wisdom on the oppressed. Unfortunately, this makes both the women’s movement and women’s studies vulnerable to one of the main weapons of the counterrevolution—the “political correctness” debate—and, without a solid connection to the Left, vulnerable to their own self-destructiveness.

Political correctness, according to Barbara Epstein, “comes out of a
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movement, or a political atmosphere, that is dominated by identity politics. With identity politics there is more orientation “toward moral than strategic thinking; it often seems more concerned with what language is used than with what changes are made in the social structure.” If, as Marcuse argued, outsider status conferred a moral status on women elevating them above men, then the door was opened for those who were even more marginalized to claim higher status. Because of this reasoning, the women’s movement and women’s studies came under attack in the political correctness controversy.

Political correctness has become a substitute for radical politics. For Epstein, identity politics, with its emphasis on what separates one identity from another, makes it difficult to speak and act across the boundaries that identify the identities. Furthermore, people are confronted with the task of trying to make their experience fit into the categories of their identity. Identity, as Epstein notes, “can take on different meanings at different times or can be more or less important at different points in people's lives.” Self-consciousness about language and behavior, sensitivity to diverse backgrounds, and concerns about continually redefining identity become ends in themselves, and their reasons for being become lost and disconnected from a radical political agenda.

The counterrevolution’s use of political correctness to turn feminists against one another and to discredit them by trivializing the accomplishments of the women’s movement and women’s studies is apparent in some recent writing in the Chronicle of Higher Education. An account of the 1992 meeting of the National Women’s Studies Association, for example, displays the traps identity politics is likely to encounter as well as the manner in which legitimate discussions of oppression can be trivialized by the counterrevolution. The headline of the story, “Women’s-Studies Group, Hoping to Heal Wounds, Finds More Conflict,” does little to alert the reader to the scholarly contributions of feminism. The following paragraphs opened the story:

This year’s annual meeting of the National Women’s Studies Association was supposed to heal fractures that crippled the organization after a large group of minority women staged an angry walkout at the 1990 conference.

The 1992 meeting, whose theme was “Enlarging the Circle: The
Power of Feminist Education,” started on a promising note: the screen­
ing of “I Am Your Sister,” a video depicting a successful multicultural conference. In opening remarks, Deborah Louis, the association's leader, then urged members to find common ground despite their different backgrounds and agendas.

It soon became clear how difficult that would be. Within half an hour, the keynote speaker, Annette Kolodny, dean of the University of Arizona's Faculty of Humanities, had offended lesbian women by making what were described as “heterosexist” remarks. Other women complained that a white woman should not have been selected to start a conference aimed at opening the association up to minority women.

Then, meeting organizers apologized to Jewish conferees who had been inconvenienced by the scheduling of the Friday-night session, which interrupted Shabbat.

Complaints about Meals

Later that evening, some “eco-feminists”—scholars who believe in a feminist approach to environmental issues—complained that every meal served at the conference included meat.

Finally, one conferee complained that participants should be asked in the future to forgo hair spray and perfume, which allergy sufferers might find irritating.

And so it went at the 15th annual meeting of the NWSA, an academic meeting unlike most others.57

For those in and out of academia, the image of women and women's studies promoted by this story supports rather than confronts the stereotype. If, for example, individuals who had little direct contact with women's studies were to gain most of their information from the Chronicle, a major source in the field of higher education, what would be their impression? Women's studies scholars are unable to overcome women's innate pettiness; they are bitches first and foremost, and no amount of education can change them. Certainly people attending the conference operated with a heightened awareness of oppression. Those who turn to women's studies and feminism to seek their identity and to create an environment compatible with that identity discover other aspects of their lives—their racial or ethnic heritage, for example—that are also involved in their sense of who they are. Charges of oppression are not uncommon
in a sympathetic environment because they have a good chance of being heard and because, in the act of speaking the charge, the accuser experiences a sense of power. Obviously, these kinds of controversies do exist and should not be dismissed, but neither should they dominate the work, or the image, of the conference. The vulnerability of the women's movement, however, opens it to attacks by counterrevolutionary forces.

Another example of how identity politics feeds into the political correctness distraction appears in the pages of the Chronicle. In the January 15, 1992, issue, philosopher Christina Hoff Sommers writes critically of many academic feminists. In her words, “These women think of themselves as victims, yet they have huge salaries, they run programs and departments.” Sommers, who identifies herself as a “liberal feminist” in the tradition of John Stuart Mill and Mary Wollstonecraft, distances herself from the majority of feminist philosophers, whom she terms “gender feminists.” This group “want[s] to eradicate wherever possible the differences between men and women and to abolish the traditional family.” It is the gender feminists, she goes on to argue, who dominate women's studies departments, academia, and feminist scholarship.

Not surprisingly, the profile of Sommers in conjunction with an ongoing discussion of political correctness resulted in a torrent of commentary. The debate escalated with the publication in the February 5, 1992, issue of an opinion piece by Daphne Patai, a professor of women's studies and Portuguese. Patai, writing as one “exercised over ideological policing within feminism,” is critical of identity politics and its assumption that “a person's racial or ethnic identity and views are one and the same.” Although Patai urges that her comments not be used to attack feminism or women's studies, she is clearly alert to the possibility. “I began to realize that we were confronting a new dogma sanctifying a reversal of privilege: Instead of the old privileges accompanying the status of ‘white,’ truth, righteousness, and automatic justification in the world of women's studies now reside with ‘women of color.’” Patai argues that this is a duplication of an old injustice and cannot be a way of creating a more just world. Feminism, she contends, has run rampant and has attacked knowledge, standards, and qualifications. “The intellectual and political questions posed by feminism were developed to challenge unfair stereotyping and exclusion of women, not to exempt them from evaluation.” She is afraid that feminists who criticize these kinds of actions are
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seen as hostile to feminism and marginalized. "Feminism is hurting itself with identity politics."

Clearly, there is a place for identity politics on the Left, but not as a replacement for a radical vision. What is a more useful relationship between identity politics and radical politics? As Marcuse indicates, identity politics is crucial to the formation of revolutionary consciousness. Feminism, for Marcuse, was a sign that a counterrevolution was imminent even if there were no immediate signs of revolutionary consciousness, much less action. In this respect, it was a symptom, albeit an important one, of a broader malaise. When proposed as a substitute for a radical political agenda, identity politics can play into the hands of the counterrevolution. The interests of feminism and the Left would be best served by reestablishing their alliance and pursuing an agenda focused on issues of women, family, and work. These issues have historically divided feminists and have muted the feminist voice in policy debate.

This strategy has much to recommend it. It would reconnect identity politics to a radical political agenda without diminishing the feminist voice, and it would reestablish the link between subjective and objective factors, a point on which Marcuse offered little guidance. It would also do much for children, the group forgotten by both pursuers of identity politics and the Left. Such tactics would push the Left to address the isolation Marcuse saw as a threat to its effectiveness. "Allergic to its factual separation from the masses, not ready to admit that it is expressive of the social structure of advanced capitalism and that its separate character can be overcome only in the long struggle to change this structure," he wrote, "the movement displays inferiority complexes, defeatism, or apathy."

The involvement of women in the workplace is a part of changes in the structure of capitalism, part of what Marcuse refers to as the "qualitative rupture." No one is immune from the consequences of the twentieth century's major social revolution, the changes in women's social roles. The Left, guided by a feminist consciousness, can lead the way. The material conditions are right for the development of a revolutionary political consciousness among men and women that originates in feminism. The details of such a process are discussed by Ethel Klein in Gender Politics.

Klein links the development of feminist consciousness to the completion of a three-stage process: affiliation with the group, rejection of the traditional definition of the group's status, and acceptance of the idea
that discrimination against the group rather than individual failure is responsible for the status of the individual and other members of the group. Women, according to Klein, come to feminism through the experience of nontraditional roles arising from work, divorce, and reduced childbearing. Men, in contrast, develop feminist sympathy rather than feminist consciousness. This appears as "an abstract, ideological commitment to equality" rather than the "internalized political perspective derived from personal experience" that characterizes feminist consciousness.

Women's changing social roles have spurred changes in the lives of men and women. Boys and girls may well spend some portion of their childhood in single parent homes. In all probability, their mothers will be in the workforce at some point in their childhood, and this could occur before their first birthday. What will this mean? As more males experience nontraditional roles, will they develop a feminist consciousness? For Klein, the different paths of childhood produced men with a lessened commitment to feminism. With more and more children involved in nontraditional experiences, however, the paths might converge, fostering feminist consciousness in both men and women. This could be the basis of a newly invigorated radical politics.

The women's movement and women's studies are threatened by a counterculture. To stave off the assault, they need to reconnect to radical politics. Much has transpired since Marcuse wrote *An Essay on Liberation* and *Counterrevolution and Revolt*. The women's movement has accomplished much, and women's studies have had an impact on scholarship and academic life. Although the working class remains committed to the Establishment, there are signs that this integration is disintegrating. However, the students whom Marcuse embraced so passionately are now some twenty years older, and there are few indications that the current generation of students see themselves as part of the Great Refusal. Even Marcuse was unable in 1972 to sustain his 1969 optimism. His work does remind us, however, of the need to think in terms of the potential inherent in historical circumstances. It also causes us to revisit the specter of a counterculture. The ability of the women's movement and women's studies to construct a strategy to combat the counterculture in all its facets, including political correctness, will depend on the ability to reconnect with the Left. Feminism has the potential to reinvigorate the Left.
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What were once thought of as "women's issues" are now the potential basis for the development of a radical political consciousness. Marcuse lives!
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