

Matthaei, Julie; Brandt, Barbara

Working Paper

From hierarchical dualism to integrative liberation : thoughts on a possible non-racist non classist feminist future

Wellesley College Working Paper, No. 2001-03

Provided in Cooperation with:

Department of Economics, Wellesley College

Suggested Citation: Matthaei, Julie; Brandt, Barbara (2001) : From hierarchical dualism to integrative liberation : thoughts on a possible non-racist non classist feminist future, Wellesley College Working Paper, No. 2001-03, Wellesley College, Department of Economics, Wellesley, MA

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/23226>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.


WORKING PAPER

From Hierarchical Dualism To Integrative Liberation: Thoughts On A Possible Non-Racist Non Classist Feminist Future

**By
Julie Matthaei and Barbara Brant
Wellesley College Working Paper 2001-03**

May 2001

COMMENTS WELCOME!



**Department of Economics
Wellesley College
Wellesley, Massachusetts 02481-8203**

*FROM HIERARCHICAL DUALISM
TO INTEGRATIVE LIBERATION:
THOUGHTS ON A POSSIBLE NON-RACIST NON-CLASSIST FEMINIST FUTURE*

Julie Matthaei and Barbara Brandt¹

May 2001

COMMENTS WELCOME!

ABSTRACT: This article is a wide-view thought piece which analyzes the interconnections between race, gender, and class, their transformations in recent U.S. history, and their future. It begins by analyzing the process of hierarchical dualism which underlies the economics of race, gender and class. It then discusses the transformation of race, gender and class in recent U.S. history as a progression through three semi-historical stages of hierarchical dualism: Stage 1, the Traditional Stage; Stage 2, the Modern Stage; and Stage 3, the Integrative Stage. Equality Liberation and Difference Liberation, which characterize feminist and anti-racist organizing during the present Modern Stage, are evaluated and critiqued. Then, the four Integrative Transformation Processes which characterize the emergent, Stage 3 are discussed and documented: the Gender Integrative Process, the Multicultural Integrative Process, the Social Responsibility Integrative Process, and the Anti-Inequality Integrative process.

What is the future of race, gender, and class? Current movements striving to eliminate race and gender oppression – “equality” and “difference” movements – have conflicting visions and strategies. While making valuable contributions, neither movement has proven adequate, as we argue below. We have developed a third vision, a vision of a non-racist, non-classist feminist future, which we will sketch out below, showing how the seedlings of such a future are, in fact, beginning to sprout in the United States today. This possible future – and the individual healings, social processes, and political movements that are building toward it today – is based on the integration, both within individuals and within economic institutions, of qualities and ways of being that have been polarized in our current racist classist patriarchal capitalist economic system.

While many observers see Modernism as “the end of history,” we see it as a transitional stage that is slowly being transformed into the next, Integrative Stage. Through an emerging Integrative process which we call “**Integrative Liberation**,” people are transcending the racial-ethnic, gender, and class divisions which have kept them divided from one another, and allowed them to be victimized by exploitative, undemocratic, hierarchical economic structures. And they are creating and seeking to institutionalize healthy and socially responsible ways of being which can provide the foundation for just, loving, mutually respectful, and cooperative economic practices and institutions.

The central focus of this article is to analyze the interconnections between race, gender, and class; their transformations in recent U.S. history; and their future. Doing this, especially within the length limits of an article, requires a large degree of abstraction and generalization. One huge abstraction we are often forced into in this article is to lump all non-white racial-ethnic groups – e.g. African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, etc. – into one group, which we call “people of color.”

Further, we realize that because race, gender, and class are interconnected processes, the way that any one of them affects a particular individual depends upon that individual's relationship to the other two processes. For example, the gender process of womanhood has a different meaning for a Black working-class woman than it does for a white middle-class woman; the race process of whiteness has a different meaning for a white middle-class woman than it does for a white upper-class man; and the class process has a different meaning for a white middle-class man and a Black middle-class woman (bell hooks 1984; --- Elizabeth Spelman 1988). However, we still find it useful to discuss race, gender, and class in the abstract, as distinct processes, and to describe the polarization of human qualities which accompanies each of these processes.

The organization of this article is as follows. First, we discuss the process of hierarchical dualism which underlies the economics of race, gender and class, and abstractly present our three-stage historical framework of the transformation of hierarchical dualism. Then we discuss each of the three stages in more detail, emphasizing the third, presently emerging Integrative Stage.

We recognize that we have ambitious goals for a single journal article. We are in the midst of writing a book, tentatively entitled *Healing Ourselves, Healing Our Economy: Gender, Spirituality, and the Birth of the Integrative Self*, upon which this article is based. Here we will present some of the central working concepts of the book, as well as some key examples of the process of Integrative Liberation. We want to emphasize that the conceptual framework which we are presenting here is very much a work-in-progress. And we regret that, given space constraints and the stage we are in with the book, we are not able to fully discuss and document the process of Integrative Liberation.

This said, our hope for this article is to make visible some of the exciting, progressive forces of economic and social change existing in the present moment which are often overlooked or viewed in isolation from one another. We hope that this article will inspire some of our readers to align themselves and their life choices more fully with these liberatory forces. We also hope that our article will stimulate and inform future research in the area of race, gender, and class, and very much welcome our readers' feedback.

THE PROCESS OF HIERARCHICAL DUALISM

As a number of feminist and anti-racist analysts have pointed out (John Hodges, Donald Struckmann, and Lynn Trost 1975; Rhonda Williams 1993; Ann Jennings 1993), race and gender processes are part and parcel of a larger, hierarchical "dualistic" point of view that has been central to Western culture for centuries. Hierarchical dualism was developed by members of the dominant political, economic, and cultural group – middle- and upper-class European and European American men – and it both motivated and justified this group's domination of others (Oliver Cox 1959). It built on earlier dualistic

polarizations, in particular, the historically all-pervasive polarization of males and females into genders: masculine-only men and feminine-only women. The construction of the hierarchical dualist standpoint and theoretical framework was a multi-faceted, complex process, which evolved over many centuries. We will not discuss this intellectual history in any detail here. Rather, we will focus on elucidating the relationship of hierarchical dualism to race, gender and class.

The hierarchical dualist framework was developed by educated, middle- and upper-class European and European American men. It justified the dominance of middle- and upper-class European and European American men because of their supposedly superior innate qualities. It involved racist, sexist, and classist theories – theories which associated certain attributes and personality traits with race-ethnicity, biological sex, and even class position – which “scientifically proved” the superiority of middle- and upper-class European and European American men. They constructed two dualistic racial attributes, “whiteness” and “Blackness/of coloredness,” which supposedly made those people possessing “whiteness” superior in ability, motivation, and character to all other people, who were characterized by “Blackness” or “coloredness.” They also affirmed and further polarized two dualistic gender attributes, “masculinity” and “femininity,” which supposedly made men (who were seen as possessing masculinity by virtue of their biological maleness) different from and superior to women (whose biological femaleness was seen as conferring femininity).

Educated middle- and upper-class European and European American male intellectuals also constructed the concept of genetically-inherited class attributes that they claimed made their families inherently superior to working-class and poor white families. Finally, as feminist historians of science such as Carol Merchant and Val Plumwood (1993) have pointed out, they constituted their species, *homo sapiens*, as a distinct, nonnatural and cultural form of life -- “Man” --which was distinct from other, inferior, hostile, and unconscious species -- “Nature” -- and therefore destined to rule over them.

In all these ways, educated middle- and upper-class European and European American men articulated a superior set of attributes which they associated exclusively or predominantly with their racial-ethnic-gender-class group. All other beings were characterized by one or more inferior attributes – being a woman, being of color, being lower class, and/or being nonhuman -- which made them need domination by white middle- and upper-class European and European American men. This process was dualistic in that it created pairs of attributes which were polarized and seen as mutually exclusive, and hierarchical in that it valued one attribute in each pair over the other.

Further, hierarchical dualism involved the polarization and ranking of traits associated with these unequal groups. Since it was generated from the standpoint of educated, middle- and upper-class European and European American male intellectuals,

those traits that this group associated with themselves – that is, white, middle- and upper-class, masculine traits – were seen as the most valued ones. For convenience, from here on we will refer to this group of traits and values as “WMUCM traits,” (that is, “white middle- and upper-class masculine traits”); and we will refer to the group made dominant by hierarchical dualism as “WMUCM” (that is “white middle- and upper-class men”).

Educated WMUCM thus constructed a second set of hierarchical dualisms, based on pairs of traits. They associated the first trait in each pair with themselves and designated it as superior, while associating the second trait in each pair with one or more “inferior” groups and designating these second traits as inferior. Thus, educated WMUCM set objectivity vs. and above subjectivity, mind vs. and above body, rationality vs. and above emotionality, rationality vs. and above intuitiveness, competitiveness vs. and above nurturance, cultural vs. and above natural, independent vs. and over dependent, active vs. and over passive, etc., associating the first trait in each pair with themselves, and the second with women, lower- class people, and/or people of color.

In many cases, hierarchical dualism involves a process of internal polarization, repression, and projection. For example, WMUCM are supposed to be centered in their minds, and use them to control their bodies; to focus exclusively on reason, and to suppress their emotions. In turn, the qualities suppressed within WMUCM are projected onto women, people of color, and lower-class white men, who are considered more emotional, more embodied, and closer to nature than the “standard” WMUCM individual, and hence inferior to them. We want to emphasize that both sets of traits are in fact essential for an individual’s health and wholeness. The polarization and ranking of these traits leads to their distortion, and to the distortion of the individuals and groups associated with either set of traits.

We want to note here that the race polarization created by hierarchical dualism has also been based on actually existing differences between the cultures and economies of different racial-ethnic groups. In particular, in the processes of colonization, slavery, and genocide, Europeans characterized the more egalitarian, communitarian, and nature-valuing cultures of Africans and Native Americans as uncivilized and savage, in need of domination or even extinction by “civilized” whites, whose culture and economy were based on the “superior” values of hierarchy, individualism, competition, and the control of nature.

How does class fit into hierarchical dualism? The class structure of our capitalist economy is not a simple duality of capitalists and workers, as Marx once conceived it. It always has been and is still composed of a hierarchical ladder of differentially valued economic positions. A person’s wealth, occupational status, earnings, and consumption style (or, for a Traditional economically-dependent wife, those of her husband) all combine to define one’s class status, giving individuals more or less class status and power relative to others. Capitalist economies are permeated by classism, which says that one’s worth and

value as a human being is determined by one's position on the class ladder, with those above being better than those below them. At the same time, race and gender processes crucially affect individuals' class positions, allocating higher class positions to people who are men and/or white.

We want to note that there have always been exceptional individuals from the dominant WMUCM group who have actively rejected the racist sexist classist dictates of hierarchical dualism, both in terms of their own behavior, and in terms of their stances towards, and treatment of, "others." And that such overt or covert rebellion has been common among members of subordinated groups. We do not mean here to overstate the power of WMUCM, or to be reductionist, i.e. to imply that race-class-gender differences are in any way natural or innate or inevitable. We do, however, want to emphasize the strength and pervasiveness of the hierarchical dualist framework in our current economy and society.

In sum, hierarchical dualism is a conceptual and institutional process which places WMUCM, and the qualities associated with them, on top. It places whites, and qualities associated with whiteness, above people of color and the qualities associated with them. It also places men, and qualities viewed as masculine, above women and qualities viewed as feminine. It also creates a class hierarchy, in which middle- and upper-class people are seen as superior to working- and lower-class people. This class hierarchy is interpenetrated by race and gender hierarchies, and race and gender hierarchies also interpenetrate one another (see Figure 1).

Integrative Liberation problematizes hierarchical dualism in two ways: not only its ranking of one set of people and the qualities associated with them above others, but also its polarization of human beings into differentially ranked genders and races. It argues that human qualities are distorted when they are separated into polarized pairs, with the supposedly inferior aspects projected onto other, subordinated groups. And it views the road to liberation as the process of transcending hierarchical dualism, both through integrating within all individuals those pairs of qualities which have been polarized, and by transforming economic and social institutions beyond hierarchical differentiation, so as to cultivate, support, and engage the energies and creativity of all people.

THE STAGES OF TRANSFORMATION OF HIERARCHICAL DUALISM

We have developed a three stage semi-historical model of the transformation of hierarchical dualism since the mid-1800s to gain insight into the conditions and promise of the present state of race, gender, and class processes. Our three stages are Stage 1, the Traditional Stage; Stage 2, the Modern Stage; and Stage 3, the Integrative Stage. Each stage is characterized by a way of organizing work and allocating it according to individuals' race, gender, and class background, as well as a set of generally accepted values and beliefs about the proper roles of various groups of people. While the stages appear sequentially, they also

overlap each other; like a wave, each emerges, increases in prevalence, becomes dominant, and then falls off as the next stage takes off.

All three stages coexist at the present time. The Traditional Stage was dominant in our recent past and still defines the values and beliefs of many Americans. The Modern Stage is predominant in the mainstream culture today, although Modernists continue to compete with Traditionalists for economic, political, and cultural power. The Integrative Stage, which embodies a future which is qualitatively different from both previous stages, is currently emergent on a grass-roots level, and is increasingly influential, although largely unrecognized by mainstream leaders and the media. While these three stages have resonance and relevance for other Western countries and can also be useful for analyzing transformations in non-Western countries, we have constructed them to help make sense of the U.S. historical experience, and we discuss them vis a vis this experience.

THE TRADITIONAL STAGE:
THE ECONOMIC EXPRESSION OF HIERARCHICAL DUALISM
(dominant from the mid-1800s through 1950s)

Hierarchical dualism pervades our capitalist economy. It was built into our economic practices and institutions through race and gender divisions of labor. Colonization, slavery, genocide, and immigration were the central racial processes at work in the economy during the Traditional Stage. At the core of the gender process was the separation of market-based production and paid work from the unpaid sphere of the home, with the organization of the paid, market economy as masculine and the unpaid, familial economy as feminine, so that men became “bread-winners” and women, “homemakers.” Peoples of color were gradually brought into positions at the bottom of the paid work hierarchy; men of color were excluded from family-wage jobs, making it difficult for their families to reproduce the dominant white-middle-class defined gender roles of male as sole bread-winner and woman as full-time homemaker. This was also an issue for white working-class families (Joan Scott and Louise Tilly 1978; Heidi Hartmann 1979; Rhonda Williams 1987; Teresa Amott and Julie Matthaei 1996).

Figure 1 illustrates the effects of race and gender on people’s class positions in the Traditional Stage. The vertical dimension of the figure represents higher or lower class positions. Each race-gender group has an internal class hierarchy. Some white women, men of color, and women of color were above some white men in the Traditional Stage class hierarchy, but white men in general were on the top, and whites and men were in general higher than women and people of color.

In the Traditional Stage, these race and gender hierarchies were explained as the result of supposedly innate traits inhering in each group. Men were assumed to be

inherently rational and independent, while women were inherently emotional, caring, and dependent upon men. It was seen as only natural to assign men and women to the different and mutually exclusive economic roles of breadwinning and homemaking. In the same way, white people were assumed to be innately different from and superior to Black people and other people of color. White people were seen as inherently intelligent and competent, while people of color were considered stupid and incompetent, in need of white people's direction and civilizing influence. These supposedly inherent differences, again, were seen as explaining why white people as a group held higher economic positions and had more wealth than people of color. In these ways, the processes of race and gender produced hierarchical dualisms throughout the economy.

Hierarchical dualism, as we have seen, not only ranks individuals according to race and gender, it also ranks the traits associated with these race and gender groups. Thus, in the Traditional Stage, WMUCM traits of independence, rationality, and competitiveness were valued more than the feminine traits of connectedness, emotionality, and caring, although these latter traits were valued for women. Likewise, the various traits associated with whiteness, such as individualism, ambition, and self-control, were considered superior to traits supposedly characteristic of peoples of color, such as community orientation, passivity, and sensuality. Further, because those who organized and controlled economic institutions and monopolized the best jobs were WMUCM, these institutions were organized according to WMUCM traits such as disembodied intellectuality, competitive focus, and lack of caring – and WMUCM traits were designated as the prerequisite for economic “success” in the class hierarchy.

Table 1 summarizes the basic aspects of the Traditional Stage.

**THE MODERN STAGE: CIVIL RIGHTS, ANTI-RACIST,
AND FEMINIST ATTACKS ON HIERARCHICAL DUALISM**
(increasingly dominant from the 1960s through the present)

During the Modern Stage, Civil Rights, anti-racist, and feminist movements successfully challenged a key aspect of hierarchical dualism in the economic system: the exclusion of people of color and women from the better-paying, higher status jobs which had been previously reserved exclusively for white people and men. People of color and white women won the legal right of “equal opportunity,” and a small share of these previously subordinated groups achieved entry into positions in the top tiers of the economic hierarchy. This challenge to job segregation was connected to women's growing rejection of their restriction to Traditional full-time homemaker roles, and the massive entry of married women into the paid labor force (Matthaei 1982). However, equal representation of

white women and people of color throughout the economic hierarchy is far from having been achieved. Entrenched patterns of discrimination are proving difficult to eradicate.

From the beginning, Civil Rights, anti-racist, and feminist organizing has tended to polarize into two visions: “Equality Liberation” and “Difference Liberation.” We expect that our readers are basically familiar with these two camps (see Alice Kessler-Harris 1987, Nancy Fraser 1997, Ch. 1; Joan Williams 2000). These polarized visions serve as archetypes around which not only feminist and anti-racist political strategies, but also individual life plans, have coalesced. Each vision has strengths and limitations. Their strengths and weaknesses, as well as the tension between the two visions, are central to understanding the contributions and contradictions of the Modern Stage. Further, these limitations and tensions are generating the emergent Integrative Stage. For these reasons, we explore them in some detail below.

Equality Visions of Liberation

The primary goal of the equal-opportunity or equality vision of liberation is equal representation of women/people of color throughout the job hierarchy – e.g. if women constitute 50% of the labor force, they would hold 50% of the jobs in each occupational category, including and especially in the elite jobs traditionally monopolized by white men. “Equality” – defined as equal average earnings between genders or racial-ethnic groups – would result. Equality advocates challenge the hierarchical economic positioning of whites above people of color, and of men above women, two key aspects of hierarchical dualism. The vision of Equality Liberation can be roughly represented by Figure 2.

The Equality Liberation goal of breaking down race and gender divisions of labor is, in our view, definitely laudable, and one towards which both anti-racist and feminist equality movements have made major strides. While race and gender discrimination are far from banished, Equality Liberation movements have succeeded in problematizing them, such that the principle of non-discrimination/equal opportunity is now widely accepted and expressed in federal and state law -- a major achievement.

We want to point out here the implicit position of Equality Liberation advocates in regard to class. Because Equality Liberation defines equality as equal representation across the unequal class hierarchy, it is implicitly built upon acceptance of class differences. (Indeed, because Equality Liberation organizing has succeeded in raising the glass ceiling for women and people of color, it has actually increased the degree of economic inequality among people of color and among women over the past 40 years.) This implicit acceptance of class hierarchies and the processes which reproduce them is problematic for those seeking racial equality, because class processes play a major roles in reproducing racial inequality (William Julius Wilson). The large racial disparities in income and wealth which are being passed down from parents to children today, along with enormous, class-associated racial

disparities in neighborhood and schooling opportunities, continue to give the average white person a huge advantage in the competition for higher-paid jobs, even in the absence of overt racial discrimination.

Because of their goal of equal representation across the existing job hierarchy, Equality Liberation movements have also taken on a second, if less fully articulated strategy which is, in our view, problematic. Since Equality Liberation advocates accept the existing job structure and economic institutions as given, they also inadvertently end up enshrining the socialized roles of whiteness and masculinity – and the qualities associated with them -- as standards to be emulated, along with upper- and middle-class values. For example, they accept the WMUCM goal of trying to achieve the highest-status, most well-paid position in the economy. This puts them in the position of encouraging their constituencies to “fit in” and act like WMUCM.

The process of trying to act like a WMUCM involves taking on and “owning” many positive human qualities which were historically denied to subordinated groups – such as economic independence, self-actualization, intellectual development, and self-discipline. But, as we will discuss in more detail below, these positive human traits, as lived out by WMUCM and structured into the economic hierarchy, are distorted due to their polarization from those positive traits associated with women and people of color. Thus, women and people of color also end up taking on negative WMUCM traits and behaviors required for “success” in today’s WMUCM-structured economy, such as narrow self-centeredness, competitiveness, disembodied and heartless rationality, lack of concern about others, and willingness to prioritize service to one’s employer over the well-being of oneself and one’s family (Betty Harragan 1977).²

In this process, equality advocates end up inadvertently devaluing those qualities which have been historically associated with, and socialized into, people of color and women. For example, many women still hold onto aspects of their Traditional role, and thus are more committed to caring for their children, and less willing to sacrifice their parenting relationships and time in exchange for job advancement, than most men. From the Equality Liberation viewpoint, this greater commitment is a barrier to women’s achievement of equality, and hence should be eliminated, through resocialization of women towards WMUCM norms, along with the extensive use of day care and the commoditization of housework.³ Indeed, to equality feminists, women who quit high level managerial professional jobs in order to spend more time with their children are viewed as “traitors” to the feminist cause. Because such women do not exhibit the complete dedication to their jobs that successful men traditionally do, their actions are seen as fueling sex discrimination by employers, and hence holding back women’s achievement of “equality.”

A similar problem affects movements for racial equality. As many cultural observers from both inside and outside such groups point out, people of color – particularly

African Americans and Native Americans— have traditionally been less competitive and less individualistic, more community centered, and less willing to separate head from heart than white people (Don Locke 1992). Employers hiring for traditionally white-masculine jobs view these qualities as barriers to advancement and “success,” and expect employees of color who aspire to these jobs to give up their “inferior” cultural values and qualities.

Equality Liberation advocates correctly argue that even though people of color have been raised differently than whites, and many may have not had the educational and other advantages that most whites had, in reality all groups have the same basic intelligence, abilities, and potential, and therefore people should not be subjected to job discrimination because of their race or ethnic background. However, Equality Liberation advocates do not question the supposed superiority of the traits required for economic success; in other words, Equality Liberation advocates implicitly accept as superior the typical WMUCM standards of behavior, and assume that everyone can – and should want to – act just like the WMUCM. And a small minority of conservative people of color actively devalue their traditional cultures and openly advocate taking on WMUCM standards of values and behaviors.

In other words, Equality Liberation implicitly or explicitly ends up advocating that people of color and women should espouse WMUCM values and take on the behaviors traditionally associated with WMUCM. “We can all become like white men,” they urge.

The Modern Stage has become increasingly shaped by WMUCM values such as isolated individualism, narrow self-centeredness, competitiveness, and the devaluation of caring and community. The end result is that acquiring money – and the things it buys – has become a central value of Modernism. Equality advocates have succeeded in undermining race and gender as the primary determinants of one’s economic and social superiority or inferiority. So in the Modern “Equal Opportunity” Stage, one’s material success in the economic competition has become the measure of a person’s value. And this materialistic competition is, in theory, open to people of all races and genders. Table 1 summarizes these aspects of the Modern Stage.

Difference Visions of Liberation

This devaluation of the qualities traditionally associated with people of color and women has worked to strengthened Difference Liberation views and groups during the Modern Stage. Difference Liberation advocates – a heterogeneous collection of cultural feminists, nationalists, Third World lesbian feminists, and others – assert, and affirm as good, the values and behaviors that distinguish their historically subordinated groups from WMUCM. Cultural feminists such as Carol Gilligan (1982) and Jean Baker Miller and her colleagues at the Stone Center argue that there is a distinct, relational, caring women’s ethic which, rather than being suppressed as advocated by Equality Liberationists, instead needs

to be affirmed and valued. And cultural nationalists have described and explored as distinct and laudable the traditional views and values of cultures of color, such as awareness of the importance of a healthy community for individual well-being; sharing economic success or “lifting as we climb”; understanding wisdom as the integration of heart, mind, and spirit; and seeing human beings as interdependent with nature (Alfred Pasteur and Ivory Toldson, 1982; Henry Rosemont 1998).

Similarly, a key contribution of feminist economics has been to point out the value of women’s traditional unpaid work. Marilyn Waring (1988), Nancy Folbre (1994 and 1995), and many other feminist economists have worked to visibilize women’s invisible, unpaid or low-paid caring work. They show how crucial it is to social reproduction, note the long-term social costs of its devaluation, and advocate both its inclusion in measures of GNP, and the creation of family policies that support it.

A key contribution of Difference Liberation is its affirmation of the important human values and traits traditionally associated with people of color and women, traits which have been ideologically dismissed and economically devalued for centuries. The Difference Liberation stance also offers an implicit and sometimes explicit critique of WMUCM values, and hence of the individualistic and materialistic competition that organizes our present economic system and its class hierarchy.

However, even though cultural nationalists, difference feminists, and feminist economists provide a sorely needed counterbalance to the “equal opportunity to be a white man” camp, in our opinion their stances are also problematical in a number of ways. First, difference advocates fail to note that qualities associated with people of color or women have often taken negative forms, largely due to these groups’ historical experiences of subordination to and polarization from whites and men. For example, difference feminists and some feminist economists tend to idealize women’s caring, while often ignoring its subservient and manipulative aspects. And cultural nationalists typically see the power of community as something that is completely positive, ignoring its limitations on individual freedom and repressive group values such as sexism and homophobia (Fran White 198?). Conversely, difference feminists and cultural nationalists typically fail to recognize and affirm the positive aspects of the qualities traditionally associated with whites and men, such as rationality, individuality, freedom of choice, and self-actualization.

Second, Difference Liberation advocates tend to present, as uniquely or inherently “women’s,” “African American,” “Native American,” etc., qualities which we believe can and should be exhibited by all human beings. In doing so, difference advocates strengthen both racial and gender polarization – that is, they seek to reinforce the social differentiation of human beings according to race and gender. And they let both whites and men “off the hook” in terms of not expecting that they too will participate actively in caring labor, building community, and feminist and anti-racist movement.

To summarize, Difference Liberation advocates challenge hierarchical dualism's system of inequality by challenging the ranking of white and masculine qualities as superior to the qualities of people of color and women. However, they tend to accept the hierarchical dualist assumption that these qualities are polarized and inherently attached to the different groups. Equality Liberation advocates, in contrast, challenge gender and racial inequality by detaching people of color and women from the "inferior" qualities associated with them by hierarchical dualism. They assume that everyone can or should be "the same," meaning the same as WMUCM. People who choose not to live or work like WMUCM, and instead hold onto or take on the "inferior values" traditionally associated with people of color and women, are considered losers – by their own choice.

Thus, while both Equality and Difference Liberation challenge aspects of hierarchical dualism, neither is able fully to transcend it. Further, trying to combine the two either simultaneously or sequentially in our lives and activism, as many of us (including the authors) have tried to do, does not provide a full solution either for individuals or to the overall problem of hierarchical dualism in our economy and society.

THE INTEGRATIVE STAGE:
THE TRANSCENDENCE OF HIERARCHICAL DUALISM
(emergent since the 1960s)

Integrative Liberation processes are emerging out of the contradictions of the Modern Stage, including but not limited to the conflicts between Equality and Difference Liberation visions and ways of being. These Integrative Liberation processes have not as yet been named as such, connected to one another, and identified as part of a larger process which has the potential of building a new and liberatory economic future in which race, gender, and class are transcended.

Integrative liberation processes fundamentally challenge every aspect of the hierarchical dualist framework: the polarization of people into race and gender groups; the polarization and ranking of human traits; the association of dualistically polarized traits with race and gender groups, with WMUCM traits as the valued ones; and thus the theoretical positing and economic positioning of WMUCM on top, and of whites and men in general above people of color and women, in the economic and social hierarchy. Table 6 summarizes the key aspects of the Integrative Stage, and Figure 3 illustrates the gradual deconstruction of race, gender and class that accompanies the processes of Integrative Liberation.

The remainder of this article is dedicated to the Integrative Stage. We will first abstractly illustrate the process of Integrative Liberation using a race/gender compass framework. Then we will briefly describe four basic Integrative Liberation processes of economic transformation that are now actively beginning to dismantle race, gender and class processes.

The Race/Gender Compass Framework

To illustrate this process of integration diagrammatically, we use a modified and extended version of the gender compass framework which Julie Nelson first proposed (1996, Ch. 2) to understand the role of gender in economic methodology. We also expand her framework to add a race compass. Our race and gender compasses are illustrated in Tables 2 and 3.

The top row of each compass illustrates the situation under hierarchical dualism. Traits are polarized so that a person is either masculine or feminine, and white or of color. In the hierarchical dualist framework, masculinity and whiteness are valued above femininity and being of color. The bottom row of each compass shows the Integrative Liberation process through which race and gender polarizations are transcended. In this Integrative Liberation process, people begin to combine masculine and feminine traits. They also begin to combine traits which were formerly associated with whiteness and traits which were formerly associated with people of color, making themselves more complete and balanced human beings.

As Julie Nelson (1996) points out, the process of polarization distorts the human qualities that are being polarized, causing negative forms of these qualities to emerge. When the traits are combined through the Integrative Process, more positive forms of each emerge. Table 4 illustrates the polarization/integration process with regard to the positive human traits of directivity and receptivity. When these traits are polarized between men and women by the gender process, they degenerate into the negative-masculine traits of arrogance, insensitivity, and domination, and the negative-feminine traits of self-effacement, oversensitivity, and subservience. Table 5 illustrates the polarization/integration process with regard to the positive human trait of healthy mind/ body awareness. White racist processes polarize this trait, splitting it into two and projecting onto Blacks a fun-loving irrational sensuality, while creating for whites a sober disembodied intellectuality. However, through the Integrative Liberation process, the positive forms of these traits emerge as they are combined with their former opposite. In this way, both the hierarchy and the dualism of hierarchical dualism can be transcended.

In the remainder of this article we will highlight four Integrative Liberation processes now transforming our economy: the Gender Integrative Process, the Multicultural

Integrative process, the Social Responsibility Integrative Process, and the Anti-Inequality Integrative Process.

The Gender Integrative Process: Resolving Work/Family Conflicts

The gender polarization of the Traditional and Modern Stages is being transcended in the Integrative Stage. The main economic force behind this Gender Integrative Process is the efforts of both women and men to resolve Modern work/family conflicts.

In spite of equal opportunity legislation and de-sexed job titles, American jobs and workplaces have continued to mirror and be designed around the old, Traditional model of the family and of gender roles: a male breadwinner with a full-time “at home” female homemaker. Those jobs which pay decent wages and have benefits are still designed for “traditionally masculine” workers (who now can be women or men) who are assumed to have some other person who does the unpaid household labor for them and their family. Those jobs which are designed for “traditionally feminine” workers, who are assumed to prioritize caring for their families, offer less-than-living wages and few if any benefits.

However, few workers today fit either the category of the full-time breadwinner with a stay-at-home housewife, or the part-time working mother out to earn “a little pin money.” The majority of workers today are either men or women living in full-time dual-earner families; single parents who need both to financially support and care for their children; or single adults with no one at home to care for them. Thus, the present job structure does not “work” for most working women or men today, few of whom have full-time homemaker wives to take care of them, and most of whom also have responsibilities to care for others, including children and elders.

The resulting crisis has been called the “double day” (work in the paid workforce, then unpaid work at home), the “second shift,” the “work/family” crisis, or even more generally, the “work/life” crisis. People lack the time and energy to fulfill all their responsibilities, and are becoming increasingly stressed. To make things worse, over the past twenty years the average work-week for full-time workers actually increased by four hours – adding the equivalent of five extra 40-hour work weeks yearly (James Bond, Ellen Galinsky and Jennifer Swanberg 1997: 97; Juliet Schor 1991: 29).

The enormity of the work/family crisis in people’s lives is propelling women, men, workplaces, and public policy makers to create both individual and structural changes. These changes are furthering the Gender Integrative Process, by allowing individuals of both sexes to begin integrating masculine and feminine traits, thereby bringing out the positive aspects of both sets of traits.

One Gender Integrative solution favored by a majority of Americans is to reduce hours at paid work in order to have more time for themselves and their families. In 1997,

63% of all employees said they would prefer fewer hours of paid work (up from 47% in 1992); both men and women would like to reduce their paid work by about 11 hours per week (Bond, Galinsky and Swanberg 1997: 73-4). Seventy percent of working mothers and fathers feel they do not have enough time with their children (Bond, Galinsky and Swanberg 1997: 42). And 65% of professional men and 72% of professional women in two-earner couples would like to "sequence" their careers, working less during "family-focussed stages of life" and then speeding up as their children became more independent, "with no prejudice from their employers" (Shellenbarger 1998b).

For some middle- and upper-class families who have the financial slack to do so, another Gender Integrative response to work/life imbalances and the desire to work less is to reduce their work hours or "downshift" to less demanding, less stressful jobs. A 1995 survey found that within the last 5 years, 28% of Americans "had *voluntarily* [italics ours] made changes in their life which resulted in making less money" (not including regularly scheduled retirements), by reducing their work hours, changing to a lower paying job, or quitting work to stay at home. Both sexes were involved in downshifting, with men comprising 40% of downshifters (Harwood Group 1995: 18; see also Amy Saltzman 1991 and Juliet Schor 1998: Ch. 5).

It is important to point out that this desire to reduce paid work is not a desire to return to the polarized gender roles of the Traditional Stage. As recent polls of women show, the large majority is committed to having paid jobs (and indeed, labor force participation rates of women have continued to increase). Women today want to be able to work fewer hours, not quit their jobs altogether; they want jobs that are compatible with active and committed family lives (Women's Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor 1994: 10-11, 15, 21-32; Families and Work Institute 1995: 40-42).

Meanwhile, men's labor force participation rates have been declining gradually since 1945, mostly among older and younger men. In fact, the difference in the overall labor force participation rates of the sexes has declined from 52 percentage points in 1945 to 15 percentage points in 1997, making men today more similar to women. (Blau, Ferber and Winkler 1998: 80, and U.S. Bureau of the Census 1998: 404). The vast majority of Americans of both sexes between the ages of 24 and 64 are now in the labor force, and plan to stay there.

While their paid work hours have been declining, men have been increasing the amount of time they spend on childcare and household responsibilities. Between 1977 and 1997 the average amount of time that the average working father spent with his children increased 6 hours per week, and his time at other household chores also increased (Bond, Galinsky and Swanberg 1997: 40-44). A 1997 CBS poll found that in 31% of families interviewed, husbands and wives said they shared childcare equally (CBS 1997).

In order to achieve better work/family and work/life balance, employees have increasingly been pressuring their employers to accommodate these new goals. And since the mid-1980s, a small but growing share of firms have begun to respond to these demands with Gender Integrative "family-friendly policies." On-site or near-site day care, flextime, and flexplace can be seen as the beginning of the Integrative Stage in the workplace. They reflect two key Gender Integrative shifts in the structuring of jobs: first, an acknowledgement that workers have lives and responsibilities outside of their jobs (i.e. have both masculine and feminine values and traits), and second, the view that workers should be able to structure their job hours and location around these outside responsibilities (i.e. work in the masculine, paid work sphere should accommodate work in the feminine, unpaid sphere). In 1997, an estimated 11% of employers provided an on-site or near-site childcare center for their workers' use (Bond, Galinsky and Swanberg 1997: 94). 28% of full-time workers had flexible schedules, and 18% of people working for pay did some work at home (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1998: 413).

Such "family-friendly" responses are supported by extensive research which documents that when workers' needs and lives outside of work are supported, employers benefit through higher worker morale and performance and reduced absenteeism and turnover, which translate into higher productivity, lower costs, and, ultimately, higher profits (Radcliffe Public Policy Institute 1998; Bond, Galinsky and Swanberg 1997: pp. 12-13 and Chs. 8 & 9). Some employers are even beginning to experiment with the really radical solution of reducing work hours while maintaining pay levels and benefits. Pressured by a tight labor market and by workers who are increasingly vocal about wanting to "have lives" outside of work, some companies are realizing that workers who work less can actually get more done, because being less stressed out and having more balanced lives allows them to be more productive overall (Kaufman 1999). And some employers are beginning to offer their employees part-time jobs with good pay (hourly pay the same as that of full time workers), full benefits, and opportunities for promotion (Bravo 1995: 62-3).

Labor unions, too, are increasingly putting forward Gender Integrative work/family provisions in their contract negotiations, demanding and winning child-care and elder-care support, paid parental and family leave, flexible work schedules, compressed workweeks, and part-time return to work after childbirth or adoption (Grundy and Firestein 1997). In recent years, some unions have also begun to seek reductions in mandatory overtime; as one union official said, even time-and-a-half overtime pay doesn't compensate for the fact that workers feel "they don't have a life" (Kaufman 1999).

Through these Gender Integrative Processes, the sexes are slowly becoming more similar both in terms of their attitudes toward and their behaviors in paid work hours and home responsibilities. A new kind of Integrative individual is coming into being, one who—whether female or male—wants both a job to support her/himself financially, and

time outside that job for the "unpaid work" of family care, leisure, community participation, and just being. And our economic institutions are gradually changing to accommodate this new, masculine and feminine being.

The Multicultural Integrative Process

In the Integrative Stage, a shift is also taking place from exclusive valuation of standard WMUCM traits and values, to the recognition that each and every racial/ethnic/cultural group, including whites, has a unique and important contribution to make. All of these contributions are enhanced when the polarization and hierarchy of traits which characterized the Traditional and Modern Stages are transcended through the Multicultural Integrative Process. This new stance, often called "diversity" or "multiculturalism," is now emerging in the economy in a variety of ways.

One source of the Multicultural Integrative Process in the economy is the realization of American businesspeople that in order to do business with people other than white middle-class Americans, they must become more sensitive to the cultural differences. Many educational programs and publications today are designed to help American businesspeople understand that each group or nation has its own cultural style and values; to be economically successful, one cannot simply impose standard WMUCM American values and behavior, but must instead learn and respect the values of the group or nation with which one wishes to do business. (Terri Morrison, Wayne Conaway and George Borden 1994).

A second source of Multicultural Integration is the entry of people of color into the upper echelons of firms, which were formerly WMUCM enclaves. We have discussed earlier how people of color were pressured to adopt WMUCM values and traits. But, because their presence, along with diversity training programs, has introduced new values and points of view into the nerve centers of organizations, it has helped bring about the gradual emergence of a constructively critical perspective on WMUCM organizational values and practices. For example, the organization CHANGEWORK has identified "white supremacy [organizational] culture" as characterized by perfectionism, a sense of urgency, defensiveness, quantity over quality, worship of the written word, the sense that there is only one right way, paternalism, either/or thinking, power hoarding, fear of open conflict, individualism, a view that the only progress is linear, objectivity, and the right (of those in power in the organization) to comfort; they list a set of "antidotes" for each to help organizations work out of these problems (Okun 199x). Before the presence of people of color in positions of power within organizations, such problems which were more or less invisible to WMUCM, just as the ocean water is invisible to the fish swimming in it.

Constructive criticism of WMUCM workplace values and practices is also a positive by-product of the growing participation of women into traditional male work enclaves.

Deborah Kolb and her co-authors at The Center for Gender in Organizations (CGO) have identified a four-stage process for promoting gender equity in organizations which also can apply to multiculturalism. Following “equip the women(/person of color),” and “create equal opportunity,” the last two stages express Integrative processes: “value difference” (feminine or “of color” traits and ways of doing things) and “re-vision work culture.” Kolb and her co-authors give as an example of the latter the challenging of the gendered assumption that “time spent at work, regardless of productivity, is a measure of commitment, loyalty, and organizational worth [and that] the most valuable worker is one who is able, willing, and eager to put work first.” They point out how this WMUCM assumption can lead to “ineffective, costly, or inefficient work practices, such as a self-perpetuating crisis mode of operating” (Deborah Kolb et al 1998: 1-3).

Another important part of the Multicultural Integrative Process is a re-visioning of values, which takes the form of Americans’ increasing questioning of the standard WMUCM assumption that money, careerism, materialism, and consumption are the central sources of happiness, identity, fulfillment, and “success.” The Gender Integrative work/family conflicts described above play a central role in stimulating this questioning.. However, another key source is Americans’ increasing exposure to the diverse cultures of this planet. Americans who were raised to unquestioningly accept Modern WMUCM values are discovering that not only can human beings in other cultures find happiness and meaning with less materialistic lifestyles; but also that other cultures embody essential human values which mainstream Americans sorely lack.

As a result, Americans of all races and ethnic backgrounds are increasingly looking beyond Traditional or Modern WMUCM standards for new values and new models of health, fulfillment, and meaning. These new models come from all around the globe: from pre-industrial tribal peoples on all continents, including Native Americans; from the traditional cultures of Asia and Africa; and from the unique cultures of Latin America and African-Americans. They introduce ways of life that differ notably from standard Modern WMUCM ideals: more people- and community-centered values; philosophical and spiritual systems which integrate mind and body; lifestyles that are materially simple but rich in art, celebration, and spirituality; worldviews which see humans as part of the spiritual web of Nature; and much more. These cultures and values increasingly strike responsive chords among Americans of all backgrounds.

These two trends—Gender Integrative responses to the lack of work/family balance in our lives, and Multicultural Integrative Process which recognize that cultures “of color” offer many positive values—are combining to fuel the growing interest, especially since the 1990s, in downshifting and simpler living, and in revaluing family, community, spirituality, and Nature. (Harwood Group 1995; Barbara Brandt 1995; Paul Ray and Sherry Anderson 2000).

The Social Responsibility Integrative Process

As we have seen above, in the Traditional and Modern Stages the U.S. economy has been structured as a "dog-eat-dog" system, organized by traditionally masculine profit-motivated, self-interested entrepreneurs and competitive bread-winning workers, and shaped by values of materialistic consumption. Caring about the well-being of others was restricted to men's caring for their families through bread-winning, and to women's unpaid work within the feminine sphere of the family.

The many inhumanities resulting from this exclusion of caring from the larger realms of economic life have generated numerous oppositional movements over the past century and a half, including union and cooperative movement, Civil Rights and multicultural movement, community development movement, ecology movement, anti-war movement, counter-cultural movement of the 1960s, feminist movement, and lesbian and gay movement. These many oppositional movements are an important source of the Social Responsibility Integrative Process: the extension of the values and practices of "social responsibility" into all aspects of our economic activities.

In addition to the movements listed above, two other major developments are furthering the spread of the Social Responsibility Integrative Process in the economy: the growing revaluation of the "feminine" value of caring, and the growing influence of multiculturalism and the diverse cultural values described above. Both of these newly influential sets of values challenge the competitive, money-centered, materialistic, bottom-line-focussed WMUCM economic standard of behavior for consumers, workers, investors, and firms.

As people increasingly begin to combine the feminine principle of caring for others with the masculine principle of having an independent self who only cares about oneself, they are realizing that these two principles are not necessarily opposed, but rather can be integrated in positive ways. This new integration brings about a shift to an empowered version of femininity: a view of caring and service which does not involve subordination of oneself to others, but rather allows for the fullest and best expression of the self. It also redefines and humanizes masculinity toward greater self-expression of one's unique identity, not in competition with others, but in order to realize and express one's unique gifts. This new integration also leads to the realization that we are not isolated and independent, but rather interdependent with other people and with nature, and thus that the well-being of each individual is enhanced when the well-being of other people, and of the planet, are supported through socially responsible action.

At the same time, the Multicultural Integrative Process discussed above is causing a growing share of Americans to question the ways in which they live their economic lives, as well as the values and goals of firms. In particular, cultures of color are often less

materialistic; more honoring of human relationships, cooperation, and community; and often see humans as part of a spiritual world which includes the rest of Nature. These values are helping Americans challenge the materialistic, competitive, bottom-line mentality which has guided their own economic behavior, as well as that of corporations, in the Traditional, and especially Modern, Stages.

As these newly respected values become increasingly integrated into our lives, they are leading people to introduce the concepts and practices of social responsibility into the ways we work, invest, consume, and do business. As a result, more and more Americans are becoming "socially responsible selves:" individuals who are aware of the impacts of their actions on others and who seek -- in their use of money, through their jobs, and by their political actions -- to promote health, well-being, and security not only for themselves and their own families, but also for the broader society.

One innovative and powerful way that the Social Responsibility Integrative Process is transforming our economic institutions is through socially responsible consumption and investment (really "voting with our dollars," as depicted by mainstream economists). Movements for socially responsible consumption and investment urge people to use their purchasing power and investment dollars to pressure firms to be socially responsible, by purchasing from or investing in firms that are "green" (environmentally friendly), family-friendly, pro-labor, worker-friendly, feminist, anti-racist, worker-owned, not involved in military, cigarette, or alcohol production, etc. (Co-op America 1999; Hutton, D'Antonio and Johnsen 1998). Because these movements encourage consumers and investors to act on criteria other than merely the competitiveness of the price or the profitability of the investment, they in turn motivate firms to organize their production around goals other than only "the bottom line." The power of these movements is already evident in the growing number of firms, both traditional and alternative, which advertise their products as green or socially responsible. Socially responsible investment has sky-rocketed from \$40 billion in 1984 to \$2 trillion in 1999; currently, one of every eight dollars under professional management is part of a socially responsible portfolio (Social Investment Forum 1999).

Gender and Multicultural Integration are also leading people to view their paid work in new ways. In stark contrast to the WMUCM view of paid work as a way to earn as much money as possible through individualistic, narrowly self-centered competition with other WMUCMs, Integrative individuals are finding that what is meaningful to them is work, paid or unpaid, which develops and expresses their special abilities while making a contribution to helping others and advancing society at large (Everett 1999). This view of work, which integrates positive masculine self-actualization with positive feminine caring-for-others, is expressed by futurist Barbara Marx Hubbard as the "impulse to express our unique creativity in such a way that we evolve ourselves and our world" (1996; see also 1998). Besides motivating a search for socially responsible jobs, it also bringing a positive

reevaluation, among men as well as women, of the work of raising children, and of community and political work.

Socially responsible consumption, investment, and work -- combined with new, socially responsible forms of entrepreneurship -- is gradually beginning to transform firms from the solely profit-motivated organizations of the Traditional and Modern Stages into Integrative "socially responsible businesses." In the latter, the WMUCM profit motive coexists with or occasionally is even replaced by the positive masculine cum positive feminine goal of self-actualization through service to others, and the new multicultural goal of honoring all those with whom the firm interacts or which it affects, including consumers, workers, suppliers, the larger community, and the environment (Harman and Hormann 1990; Bollier 1996). Production and profits are reframed as a means to the end of serving the firm's many, diverse "stakeholders" -- workers, consumers, suppliers, the local community, and the local and global natural environment. Such entrepreneurship is behind household names like Ben and Jerry's ice cream, Tom's of Maine's toothpaste, and Paul Newman's range of products.

The Anti-Inequality Integrative Process

Class is a key economic aspect of hierarchical dualism. We said above that one's class position is determined by a combination of four criteria: occupational status, earnings, wealth, and consumption style. In the Integrative Stage, competitive individuality, which seeks inequality, is being transformed to a cooperative, caring form of individuality, which respects others and seeks greater equality with them. Integrative people are beginning to challenge the Traditional and Modern assumptions, values, individual choices, and institutional structures which create or maintain class hierarchy and inequality in regard to each of the four criteria listed above. These four prongs of the Anti-Equality Integrative Process are challenges to competitive careerism, challenges to earnings inequality, challenges to wealthy inequality, and challenges to competitive and conspicuous consumption. We present each of these four kinds of challenges briefly below, and describe a few of the most promising examples of each.

Challenges to Occupational Hierarchy

Anti-Equality Integrative challenges to occupational hierarchy take two forms: the rejection of competitive careerist values by individuals, and the movement of some corporations to flatten occupational hierarchies in the workplace.

Competitive careerism is a key classist WMUCM value. It makes obtaining the highest-paying, highest-status job possible a person's primary occupational goal, and determines the worth of a person by their job status. As the Integrative Stage grows in prevalence, a significant share of Americans, both women and men, are choosing to reject career advancement and instead are taking "lower-status" jobs, either because they are less

stressful and leave more time for family and personal life; or because sometimes such occupations are actually more fulfilling. (Saltzman, 1991; Susan Wittig Albert, *Work of her Own*, 1993; Linda Pierce, *Choosing Simplicity*, 2000.)

Partly in response to Gender Integrative and Multicultural Integrative challenges, a growing number of organizational development specialists have begun to argue that workplace structures which minimize hierarchy and competition amongst workers are superior to traditional hierarchical competitive workplaces structures. Flattened structures which are more cooperative increase employee communication, motivation, creativity, and productivity, they argue. This new view of organizational structure represents a substantial and promising challenge to the occupational inequality and hierarchy which have characterized Traditional and Modern firms.

Challenges to Earnings Inequality

A very important form of economic justice activism today unites broadly diverse groups, overtly including people from middle and upper classes, to support decent wages and working conditions for those at the lowest levels of the class hierarchy. This multiclass form of anti-inequality activism is gaining in prevalence and power with the overall growth of Integrative values.

“Living Wage” Campaigns, which began in the 1990s, organize community-labor alliances, which include upper- and middle-class people from religious congregations and other groups, to push municipal governments to require that their subcontractors pay employees a decent wage, considerably higher than the minimum. Such campaigns have been waged in cities all over the country, and have succeeded in having Living Wage Ordinances passed in a number of cities, including in New York and Los Angeles (Robert Pollin and Stephanie Luce 1998). In another form of Integrative economic justice activism, the recently organized National Interfaith Committee for Worker Justice has done remarkable work in bringing upper- and middle-class people of all faiths into labor activism. They organize and support a wide range of struggles throughout the U.S. for people at the very bottom of the economic hierarchy, such as janitors, nursing home aides, hotel, food service, poultry, and farm workers.⁴ Another recent example of multiclass anti-inequality organizing is the now widespread campus organizing to protest conditions of sweatshop workers. Some students have also been participating in Living Wage Campaigns in support of janitors, cafeteria staff, and others who constitute the lowest paid workers on their own campuses.

Challenges to Wealth Inequality

Another important Integrative challenge to the class hierarchy is being levied by very wealthy people who are using their wealth and power to facilitate greater social and economic justice and equality.

One example is the national network of foundations coordinated by the Funding Exchange, which recruits donations from very wealthy individuals and gives them out as grants to projects working for economic justice and social change. Grant guidelines specify that recipient projects must actively seek to transform systemic problems, and people from economically excluded groups must play major roles in this work. A second example is the anti-inequality work of United for a Fair Economy, and in particular their organizing of the group “Responsible Wealth,” which is made up of several hundred very wealthy people who work on a variety of projects which seek to reduce the legal and structural bases of economic inequality. This group was behind the widely-publicized recent campaign through which multi-millionaires including George Soros, Warren Buffet, and Bill Gates, Sr. publicly opposed President Bush’s proposal to eliminate the Estate Tax. Responsible Wealth members claimed that elimination of the Estate Tax would lead to a hereditary upper class in the U.S. (Mike Lapham 2001)

Challenges to Competitive and Conspicuous Consumption

We have already discussed the growing interest in downshifting and simpler living, and the movement for socially responsible consumption. In addition to their other impacts, these two Integrative Stage movements challenge the Modern Stage assumption that people should try to “keep up with the Jones,” and display their economic and social success by purchasing the most elite, exclusive, expensive products and possessions possible (Juliet Schor 1998). Not only is it becoming more acceptable – even chic – to purchase simply and frugally. There is also growing interest in conscious, socially responsible sustainable consumption: developing a mode of consumption which expresses one’s concern about the social, economic justice, environmental, and even spiritual impacts of the products that one buys.

CONCLUSION

We hope to have made a convincing case, within the confines of a single journal article, for our claim that a new stage of economic and social development is emerging, one which is both building on and moving beyond the current, Modernist Equality vs. Difference Liberation quandry. Through participation in the new, Integrative processes which characterize this stage, individuals, organizations, and movements are working to integrate and transcend the gender, race, and class polarities and hierarchies which have been embedded in our economy for centuries. If, as we hope, the Integrative Stage continues to increase in power and influence, it has the potential to heal the many divisions, irrationalities, and inefficiencies created by hierarchical dualism. We hope to have made these new Integrative processes visible, understandable, and inspiring to our readers, and we look forward to your feedback.

TABLE 1: Comparison of Traditional and Modern Stages

	Stage 1 Traditional Stage (dominant through 1950s)	Stage 2 Modern Stage (dominant 1960s through present)
Dominant Values	Individualism, Competitiveness, Work Ethic	Heightened individualism, Heightened competitiveness, Money and materialism
Dominant View of Race	White Racism: -- Biologically-determined races exist; -- Whites/Europeans are superior and should dominate non-whites; -- Race-typing of jobs with whites on top of hierarchy	Equal Opportunity-to-be-white: -- People of color in U.S. have right to compete economically according to existing (white) rules, and compete for jobs previously monopolized by whites; -- White values and traits are superior and should be adopted by people of color in U.S. (and in non-Western countries)
Dominant View of Gender	Biologically-defined gender roles and sexual division of labor between masculine man/bread-winner and feminine woman/homemaker (who is not in labor force)	Equal Opportunity to-be-a-man: -- Women have right to become career- centered, and to compete for “men’s” jobs; -- Traditionally feminine unpaid caring work is not important, should be commoditized as much as possible
Race/Gender/Class Interactions	White men monopolize “family wage” jobs, excluding women and men of color; white families more able to achieve ideal of full- time homemaker, and hence of manhood and womanhood	White men overrepresented at top of economic hierarchy; women/people of color with class, race, and/or gender privilege “do better” than those without them; women and people of color remain overrepresented at bottom of economic hierarchy; poor women, disproportionately women of color, do career women’s caring work

TABLE 2: The Gender Compass

<p><u>GENDER-POLARIZED</u> <u>INDIVIDUALS</u> (with men dominating women)</p>	<p>MASCULINE MEN</p>	<p>FEMININE WOMEN</p>
<p><u>INTEGRATED</u> <u>INDIVIDUALS</u></p>	<p>INDIVIDUALS WHO COMBINE WITHIN THEMSELVES MASCULINE TRAITS AND FEMININE TRAITS</p>	

TABLE 3: The Race Compass

<p><u>RACE-POLARIZED</u> <u>INDIVIDUALS</u> (with white people dominating people of color)</p>	<p>WHITE PEOPLE</p>	<p>PEOPLE OF COLOR</p>
<p><u>MULTICULTURAL</u> <u>INDIVIDUALS</u></p>	<p>INDIVIDUALS WHO COMBINE WITHIN THEMSELVES TRAITS PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED WITH WHITES AND TRAITS PREVIOUSLY ASSOCIATED WITH PEOPLE OF COLOR</p>	

TABLE 4: An Example of Gender Polarization and Integration: Directivity and Receptivity

<u>GENDER-POLARIZED TRAITS</u>	ARROGANCE, INSENSITIVITY, AND DOMINATION (negative-masculine)	SELF-EFFACEMENT, HYPERSENSITIVITY, AND SUBSERVIENCE (negative-feminine)
<u>GENDER-INTEGRATED TRAITS</u>	DIRECTIVITY AND RECEPTIVITY (positive-masculine combined with positive-feminine)	

TABLE 5. An Example of Racial Polarization and Integration: Mind and Body

<u>RACE-POLARIZED TRAITS</u>	SOBER, DISEMBODIED INTELLECTUALITY (negative whiteness)	FUN-LOVING, IRRATIONAL SENSUALITY* (negative Blackness)
<u>RACE-INTEGRATED TRAITS</u>	HEALTHY MIND/BODY AWARENESS (individuals integrate within themselves positive aspects of traits previously associated with whiteness and Blackness)	

* We find even writing these racist stereotypes uncomfortable, so we want to emphasize that this is a white racist constructed view of Black people, not reality.

TABLE 6: Stage 3, The Integrative Stage

	Stage 3: Integrative Stage (emergent since 1960s)
Forces Bringing Stage 3, the Integrative Stage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Work/life conflicts and the time bind -- Focus on holistic health (involves mind, body, soul, and one's relationships with others and the environment) -- Growing rejection of money-centered and materialist values -- Coming to age of '60s movements (environment, feminist, anti-racist, worker, anti-interventionist, anti-poverty, anti-imperialist) providing alternative set of values for individuals to embody -- Greater awareness of, and respect for, cultures of color
Dominant Values	Emergent Integrative values, including mutuality and cooperation, compassion, respect for others and for the earth, generosity, sustainability, and equality
Dominant View of Race	<p>Multiculturalism:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- All people are created equal; -- All cultures are both valuable and imperfect, needing transformation so as to support shared human values of democracy, equality, freedom, respect for diversity, community, and sustainability; WMUCM culture can benefit from integrating the values and traits associated with people of color -- People of all racial-ethnic backgrounds are healthier and more whole when they combine traits previously ranked and polarized by racism's hierarchical dualism
Dominant View of Gender	<p>Masculinity and femininity combined and redefined so as to transcend dominating/competitive and subservient aspects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Both men and women have masculine (directive, self-assertive, independent) and feminine (receptive, caring, and dependent) sides which are better when combined, and which require expression in paid and unpaid work -- Injection of feminine, caring principles into economy and masculine, self-actualizing principles into family and child-rearing
Integrative Processes Transcending Race/Gender/Class	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- Gender Integrative Processes, especially work/family and work/life integration -- Multicultural Integrative Processes -- Social Responsibility Integrative Processes: the expression of developing Integrative values through socially responsible consumption, investment, work and entrepreneurship -- Anti-Inequality Integrative Processes which strive to "raise the bottom" and "lower the top"

FIGURE 1: Race, Gender, and Class
In The Traditional Stage

The large diamond represents, in a simplified form, the distribution of class positions in the economy. The higher up a person is in the class diamond, the higher the person's class position. The diamond shape reflects very few at the very top, lots in the middle, a few at the very bottom. Race and gender "lines" divide the class hierarchy into four race/gender subgroups. White men as a group are above all the other groups, but some white women and men of color have higher status than some white men. Men of color and white women are, as groups, below white men and above women of color. Women of color, as a group, are at the bottom of the race-gender-class hierarchy, but some women of color are above some white women, some men of color, and even some white men (though the last group is not shown in this simple diagram).




FIGURE 2: The Modern Stage Equality Vision of Race, Gender, and Class

(vertical dimension represents relative class position)





FIGURE 3: The Gradual Deconstruction of Race, Gender, and Class in the Integrative Stage



BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, Susan Wittig. 1993. *Work of Her Own*.
- Amott, Teresa and Julie Matthaei. 1996. *Race, Gender, and Work: A Multicultural Economic History of Women in the United States*. Boston: South End.
- Bergmann, Barbara. 1986. *The Economic Emergence of Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- Blau, Francine, Marianne Ferber, and Anne Winkler. 1998. *The Economics of Women, Men, and Work*. Third Edition. Upper Saddle River, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Bollier, David. 1996. *Aiming Higher: 25 Stories of How Companies Prosper by Combining Sound Management and Social Vision*. New York: American Management Association.
- Bond, James T., Ellen Galinsky and Jennifer Swanberg. 1997. *The 1997 National Study of the Changing Workforce*. New York, NY: Families and Work Institute.
- Brandt, Barbara. 1995. *Whole Life Economics: Revaluing Daily Life*. Philadelphia, PA: New Society Publishers.
- Bravo, Ellen. 1995. *The Job/Family Challenge*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- CBS News Poll, October 4, 1997, "Major changes in women's status over past 25 years," September 18-20, 1997, cited in Cynthia Harrison, "A Revolution but Half Accomplished: The Twentieth Century's Engagement with Child-Raising, Women's Work, and Feminism," unpublished paper 2000.
- Co-op America. 1999. *Co-op America's National Green Pages 2000*. Washington, D.C.: Co-op America.
- Cox, Oliver C. 1959. *Caste, Class, & Race: A Study in Social Dynamics*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Families and Work Institute. 1995. *Women: The New Providers* (Whirlpool Foundation Study. Part One.) Benton, Harbor, MI: Whirlpool Foundation.
- Folbre, Nancy. 1995. "'Holding Hands at Midnight': The Paradox of Caring Labor." *Feminist Economics*, 1(1): 73-92.
- Fraser, Nancy. 1997. *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the "Postsocialist" Condition*. New York: Routledge.
- Gilligan, Carol. 1982. *In a Different Voice: Psychological Theory and Women's Development*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Grundy, Lea and Netsy Firestein. 1997. *Work, Family, and the Labor Movement*. Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe Public Policy Institute.
- Harman, Willis and John Hormann. 1990. *Creative Work: The Constructive Role of Business in a Transforming Society*. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems.
- Harragan, Betty Lehan. 1977. *Games Mother Never Taught You: Corporate Camsmanship for Women*. New York: Warner.
- Harwood Group. July 1995. *Yearning for Balance: Views of Americans on Consumption, Materialism, and the Environment*. Takoma Park, MD: Merck Family Fund.
- Hartmann, Heidi. 1979. "Capitalism, Patriarchy, and Job Segregation by Sex." In *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism*. Zillah R. Eisenstein (ed.). pp. 206-247. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Harwood Group. July 1995. *Yearning for Balance: Views of Americans on Consumption, Materialism, and the Environment*. Takoma Park, MD: Merck Family Fund.

- Hodges, John L., Donald K. Struckmann and Lynn Dorland Trost. 1975. *Cultural Bases of Racism and Group Oppression: An Examination of Traditional "Western" Concepts, Values and Institutional Structures Which Support Racism, Sexism and Elitism*. Berkeley, CA: Two Riders Press.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston: South End Press.
- Hubbard, Barbara Marx. 1996. "The Universal Human." Interview on New Dimensions Radio Show.
- _____. 1998. *Conscious Evolution: Awakening the Power of Our Social Potential*. Novato, CA: New World Library.
- Hutton, Bruce, Louis D'Antonio and Tommi Johnsen. 1998. Socially Responsible Investing: Growing Issues and New Opportunities. *Business and Society* 37(3): 281-292.
- Jennings, Ann L. 1993. "Public or Private? Institutional Economics and Feminism," in Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson (eds.) *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kaufman, Leslie. 1998. Some Companies Derail the Burnout Track. *New York Times* May 4: A-1 and C-8.
- Kessler-Harris, Alice. 1987. "The Debate Over Equality for Women in the Workplace: Recognizing Differences," in Naomi Gerstel and Harriet Engel Gross (eds.), *Families and Work*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kolb, Deborah, D.J. Fletcher, D. Merrill-Sands and R. Ely. 1998. "Making Change: A Framework for Promoting Gender Equity in Organization." *CGO Insights: Linking gender and organizational effectiveness. Briefing Note 1*.
- Lapham, Mike. Spring 2001. "The Perfect Issue." *Fair Play*. Boston: United for a Fair Economy.
- Locke, Don C. 1992. *Increasing Multicultural Understanding: A Comprehensive Model*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Matthaei, Julie. 1982. *An Economic History of Women in America: Women's Work, the Sexual Division of Labor, and the Development of Capitalism*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Merchant, Carol. *The Death of Nature*.
- Miller, Jean Baker, et al. *Women's Growth in Connection*.
- Morrison, Terri, Wayne A. Conaway and George A. Borden. 1994. *Kiss, Bow, or Shake Hands: How to Do Business in Sixty Countries*. Holbrook, MA: Bob Adams, Inc.
- Okun, Tema. 199x. "white supremacy culture." Published by changework, 1705 Wallace Street, Durham NC 27707.
- Pasteur, Alfred B. and Ivory L. Toldson. 1982. *Roots of Soul: The Psychology of Black Expressiveness*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Pierce, Linda. 2000. *Choosing Simplicity*.
- Plumwood, Val. 1993. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pollin, Robert and Stephanie Luce. 1998. *The Living Wage: Building a Fair Economy*. The New Press.
- Radcliffe Public Policy Institute. 1998. *Work & Life 2000: An Employer's Guide*. Cambridge, MA: Radcliffe Public Policy Institute.
- Ray, Paul H. and Sherry Ruth Anderson. 2000. *The Cultural Creatives*.
- Rosemont, Henry. 1998. "Organizing in the Spirit of Aloha: Discussing Hawaiian Sovereignty with Hayden Burgess." *RESIST*. 7(7): 1-5.

- Saltzman, Amy. 1991. *Downshifting: Reinventing Success on a Slower Track*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Schor, Juliet. 1991. *The Overworked American: The Unexpected Decline of Leisure*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- _____. 1998. *The Overspent American: Why We Want What We Don't Need*. New York: Basic Books.
- Scott, Joan and Louise Tilly. 1978. *Women, Work and Family*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Social Investment Forum. 1999. Report on Responsible Investing Trends in the U.S. www.socialinvest.org/areas/research/trends/1999-Trends.html.
- Spelman, Elizabeth. 1988. *Inessential Woman: Problems of Exclusion in Feminist Thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1998. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1998*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Waring, Marilyn. 1988. *If Women Counted: A New Feminist Economics*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- White, Fran. "Africa on my Mind."
- Williams, Joan. 2000. *Unbending Gender: Why Family and Work Conflict and What to Do about It*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Williams, Rhonda. 1987. A Reconsideration of Racial Earnings Inequality. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 19(2): 1-15.
- _____. 1993. "Race, Deconstruction, and the Emergent Agenda of Feminist Economic Theory," in Marianne A. Ferber and Julie A. Nelson (eds.) *Beyond Economic Man: Feminist Theory and Economics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, William Julius. *The Declining Significance of Race*.
- Women's Bureau, U.S. Dept. of Labor. 1994. *Working Women Count!* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.
-

NOTES:

¹ Julie Matthaei is a Professor of Economics at Wellesley College; Barbara Brandt is an independent writer, consultant, and activist. We can be reached via Julie's email, jmatthaei@wellesley.edu or at her home address, 14 Chalk Street, Cambridge, MA 02139, 617-868-6133.

² Harragan's *Games Mother Never Taught You* was described on its inner jacket as "identify[ing] the traditional feminine attitudes that handicap you, confuse and discourage you."

³ Among feminists, Barbara Bergmann has been most willing to work out the implications of this approach (she argues for the full commoditization of housework); see her *The Economic Emergence of Women* (1986).

⁴ The National Interfaith Committee for Worker Justice publishes a newsletter, *Faith Works*; they can be reached on the web at www.nicwj.org.