

Shahina Parvin*

Women's Subjectivities and Resistance: An Overview

Introduction

Female subjectivity and their resistance are central to the debate on feminist philosophy. Feminists have consistently theorized female subjectivity in ways that define or seek to define an identity that contests the subordinated position of women in the normative scenarios of psychoanalysis or institutionalized power relations (Brooker 2003). They have different arguments about the ways as well as the processes of female subjectivity. To analyze the constructing processes, many of them explain that women are in subordinate position as women do not construct or can not identify their subjectivities by themselves as well as they can not resist against their subordination processes. Many others claim women can identify themselves and resist a small scale which can not bring a significant change to their lives. This article intends to examine different types of explanations regarding the formation of women's subjectivities which is the reason of women's subordination. Consequently, this article intends to analyze the explanations relating to women's resistance which is also linked to understand women subjectivities. This article also attempts to present an overview of Bangladeshi women's perspectives to understand Bangladeshi women subjectivities and their resistance. The article is primarily divided into three sections. In the first section, feminists' explanations concerning women subjectivities are analyzed. In the second section, different feminists' explanations in regard to women's resistance are reviewed and finally in the third section, Bangladeshi women's perspectives are presented to understand Bangladeshi women's subjectivities and resistance.

* Lecturer, Department of Anthropology, Jahangirnagar University, Dhaka.
Email: shahinamoni@yahoo.com

Feminists' Explanations Concerning Women Subjectivities

Feminists' explanations for women subjectivities mainly stand on two different positions. One is humanist and another is anti-humanist. Humanism has been a prevailing commitment to philosophical and political theories since the Renaissance. It is committed to privilege the human being over the Divine and the Nature, the individual over the social and its structure, conscious over unconscious, freedom and agency over determinism and causality, knowledge of self over knowledge of others to the world, what is experienced over what is objectively known. On the other hand, anti-humanism has criticized the self evidence and transparency of consciousness and the aspiration of human agency to the ideals of self-creation and unmediated access to the world and knowledge of it, focusing instead on the social and historical production of consciousness. The actual term 'Subjectivity' is usually employed by the anti-humanist position (Gatens 1991). However, humanist wing of feminists have arguments regarding women's subjectivities.

The main arguments of feminists from humanist position are that women are misrepresented under patriarchy and the images of women, which appear in literature, media and else where, are often false and misogynistic. Women find it difficult to give expression to their true selves and can feel invisible or marginal in a male-dominated culture. Mary Wollstonecraft, John Stuart Mill, Zillah Eisenstein and many other feminist who belongs to liberal feminist thought, argue women subordination is rooted in a set of customary and legal constrains that blocks women's entrance or success in the so called public world. Because society has the false belief that women are, by nature, less intellectually or physically capable than men, it excludes women from the academy, the forum, and the market place. As a result, this policy of the exclusion affects their subjectivities and causes subordinate status in society. The liberal feminist school believes if men and women get the same educational opportunities and civil rights, they can prove their

intellectual and physical capabilities (Tong 1992: 12). But women can not get 'justice' (Wollstonecraft 1975) as well as women could not establish their existence (Beauvior 1997). In the exploration of women's subordinate position in society, Simon de Beauvior tries to explain women's position. She argues women are represented very negatively by male. She quoted a number of philosophers' opinions regarding women. For instance, Aristotle views that the female is a female by virtue of a certain lack of qualities. St. Thomas's comment is "we should regard the female nature as afflicted with a natural defectiveness" and he also mentions "women to be an imperfect man, an incidental being". Beauvior argues this is symbolized in the Genesis where Eve is depicted as a make from what Bossnet called 'a supernumerary bone of Adam'. Beauvior shows the subjectivity of woman is constructed by men as a relative to him, but woman is not regarded as an autonomous being. Woman is not essential whereas man is essential. He is the subject, she is the other. In proving woman's inferiority, the anti-feminists not only draw upon religion, philosophy and theology, also upon science-biology, experimental psychology. Thus, women can not establish themselves as subject. Beauvior argues "a woman seems to be the inessential which never becomes the essential; it is because she herself fails to bring herself as subject". Women do not say 'we' except at some congress of feminists or similar formal demonstration. Men say 'women' and women use the same word in referring to themselves. They have gained only what men have been willing to grant. Women's lack of completeness means for organizing themselves into a unit which can stand face to face with the collective unit. They live disparate among the males and through residence, housework, economic condition and social standing, women are attached to certain men-father, husband or son- if they belong to the bourgeoisie, they feel solidarity with men of that class, not with proletarian women, white women do alliance with white men, not to Negro women (Beauvior 1997: 16, 18-19). In this way, the feminist, who belongs to humanism position believe that it is possible to determine the self and they like to struggle and support women in creating new, valid images of themselves, a sense of wholeness and a more authentic representation of what it means to be a woman. In this endeavor, emphasis is given to the centrality of personal

experience and to the requirement to find one's own voice to give an account of one's inner self. On the other hand, feminists for anti humanism position oppose the account of inner self. They argue it is not possible to determine inner-self in any straightforward way (Andermahr and et al. 1997: 11).

The anti-humanist wing of feminism has been influenced by a number of theoretical discourses, the psychoanalytical theories of Jacques Lacan, theories of ideology developed by Louis Althusser, and also influenced by the development in post-structuralist thought particularly in the area of language and the discourse theory of Michel Foucault. Many of the roots of postmodern feminism are found in the work of Simone de Beauvoir, why is the women second sex? Post modern feminism takes Beauvoir's understanding of otherness. Woman is still the other, but rather than interpreting this condition as something to be transcended, the post modern feminists proclaim its advantages. The condition of otherness enables women to stand back and criticize the norms, values and practices that the dominant culture (patriarchy) seeks to impose on everyone, including who live on its periphery. Thus, otherness, for all of its associations with oppression and inferiority is much more than as oppressed, inferior condition (Tong 1992: 219). Like humanist feminists, anti-humanist feminists agree that under patriarchy, women are oppressed and marginalized and also need some sense of wholeness for women. But they argue when women function on a daily basis, they face different experiences. Thus, there is no such thing as a single coherent identity. They mention that subjectivity is not single but multiple, there is not one true I, but lot of different 'I's'. Subjectivity is not complete and resolved but in a process, never fully realized. The subject does not create the world but is the product, the effect of language and culture. The subject does not control his/her world but subject has certain available position in the culture.

Two major lines in anti-humanism direct relevance to feminism, primarily Marxist of ideology i.e. belief systems, representations of reality and accounts of corporeality-such as those developed by Nietzsche, Foucault and Delenze- which tend to oppose the psychoanalytic emphasis on the interior of subjectivity by focusing mainly on the subject as an object of social inscription (Gatens 1991).

Two French philosophers are associated with anti-humanism after 1968, Marxist Louis Althusser and psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan. Althusser postulates an ideological process generating individuality and reason according to its (historical) requirements. For him, ideology must be understood as a distorted reflection of man's (his word) real material relations. It is a system that distorts and obscures the real operations of power leading individuals to accept values and practices not necessarily in their own interest. It is a belief system as well as a system of everyday practices, institutions and social structures which functions to rationalize and justify prevailing social values and conventions (Althusser 1971). He argues it is not subject who produces ideology rather ideology produces individuals as subjects of particular kind. So, particular forms of subjectivity are always historically and culturally specific (Foucault 1976). In a feminist version, ideology refers to the patriarchal system of representation of gender and to the myth and images that construct femininity subjectivity is conceptualized therefore as a process which encompasses simultaneously the material (reality) and the symbol (language) (Braidotti 1999: 2). Althusser's notion of ideologies and category of subject is strongly influenced by Lacan's notion of the split subject. On the one hand, Lacan's account of subjectivity is located at the conjunction of his notion of the ego, the mirror stage and the imaginary order and his notion of the unconscious and symbolic order is on the other, (Lacan 1977). The mirror stage introduces a sense of identity and separateness from the material body and the world of others. The identity of the subject is always modeled on another with whom it confuses it, the ego being set up as an alter ego. The identity posed for the subject through its identification with its own image in a mirror has no stability or internal cohesion. The ego is thus, Lacan claims, always produced as constitutively alienated and the subject is produced by this as the alienation. The self is modeled on an other. The self is thus intersubjective, the ego is always an other. The subject divided between an image of itself as a unity and the perception of itself as a site of fragmentation and disorganized experience. The split is augmented and transformed with the child's entry into and resolution of Oedipus Complex which is the reason of child's first repressions. In order to resolve, the child must abandon its desire for the mother as a

love object and transfer at least part of its attachment to the father. Figure, the body does this through identification with the father's authority, the girl through taking on the father as a substitute love-object for the mother, although in her case, this separation is much more tenuous and protracted (Lacan 1977).

Like Freud, Lacan concentrates mainly on the boy's symbolic development. In accepting the father's law, exemplified in the castration threat, the boy identifies with paternal authority by identifying with his father. He establishes a superego and primal repression of the desire for the mother and the unconscious is formed. The boy thus becomes a subject, and is able to function within a symbolic order. The corresponding processes in the case of the girl are considerably more obscure. It is never clear that she becomes a subject in the same way, the boy does (Grosz 1992). Although Althusser advocates Freud and Lacan, Marxist feminists especially Mitchel Juliet (1974) turn to psychoanalysis in order to seek terms by which Marxist analyses of class may be integrated with feminist analysis of personal and sexual relations. By providing the bases of an account of the social production of subjectivity, psychoanalysis as it were officiated at the union of Marxism and feminism. It provides the intermediary links between the social and individual. They argue concepts like 'the personal sphere', 'experience', 'the self' needed to be contextualized in order to see the contributions that ideological and power relations have invested in them (Gross 1992).

The feminists, who follow the French theorists of sexual difference, criticize Lacan. Irigary points out that Lacan refuses any specificity to the female subject and re-essentializes the feminine as lack or symbolic absence. She argues that woman is not representable in that she defies the system of representation based on Phallogocentric promises. Woman is the mark for another system. Irigary defends the idea of a female symbolic as a radically different system of theorizing of the subject. She argues the complexity of female sexuality and eroticism does not fit into male notions of just one fixed erogenous zone, of just obvious kind of pleasure; that as female sexuality is diffused and plural rather than singular it is 'as none' as lack. She says that most women

allow themselves to be assimilated into male fantasies and discourses because other avenues have not been explored (Irigary 1985).

Foucauldian approach reconsiders the term 'materialism' in contrast to the Marxist definition. Foucault stresses the corporeal materiality of the subject as the site of struggles over both knowledge and power that is disciplining, controlling and naming. Foucault develops a notion of discourse in his early work. Lara Lessa summarizes Foucault's definition of discourse as 'systems of thoughts composed of ideas, attitudes, courses of action, belief and practices that systematically construct the subjects and the worlds of which they speak. (Lessa 2006). Foucault traces the role of discourses in wider social process of legitimating and power, emphasizing the construction of current truths, how they are maintained and what power relations they carry with them. Foucault theorizes that discourse is a medium through which power relations produce speaking subjects. He argues power and knowledge are inter-related and therefore every human relationship is a struggle and negotiation of power. Discourses are not bounded and not even visible. They are historical and transient and are continually produced and reproduced (Foucault 1976).

Post-structuralism feminist Judith Butler locates the construction of the gendered, sexed, desiring subject within what she borrows from Foucault's discipline and punish regulative discourses. These are also called frameworks of intelligibility or disciplinary regimes. Regulative discourse includes within it disciplinary techniques which by coercing subjects to perform specific stylized actions maintain the appearance in those subjects of the core gender, sex, sexuality the discourse itself produces. Butler explicitly challenges biological accounts of binary sex, reconceiving the sexed body as itself produces. Reconceiving the sexed body as itself is culturally constructed by regulative discourse. The sexed body once established as a natural and unquestioned "fact" is the alibi for construction of gender and sexuality. On Butler's account, it is on the basis of the construction of natural binary sex that binary gender and hetero-sexuality are likewise constructed as natural. The concept of gender performativity¹ is at the core of Butler's work. It extends beyond the doing of gender and can be understood as a full fledged theory of subjectivity. Post-structuralist feminists identify several ways of

constructing subject. It is constructed by language and language offers discourses of identity within which subjects may position themselves. Subjects are simultaneously positioned in multiple but intersecting discourses so that identities are not unitary but rather contradictory and shifting. There is no true self to which these identifications or subjects correspond (Moheney and Yngvesson 1992). They argue the construction of gender role is always in flux (Bruner 1968) and Lughod argues women as product of intersecting systems of power and knowledge (Lughod 1990). Mohoney and Yngvesson raised questions on these system points of intersection are rightly seen as sites of struggle for woman. But there is no explanation of how this struggle constructs women's desires, thus enabling her active participation in either supportive or resisting relations of power (Moheney and Yngvesson 1992). By analyzing the different feminist views of constructing process of women's subjectivities, it is a matter of question, in prevailing process whether women resist. What are their resistance strategies? Feminists nowadays emphasize to locate women's resistance from difference approaches. Now I like to analyze how different feminist explains women's resistance.

Feminists' Explanations Regarding Women's Resistance

One of the central problematic issues in the human science is the relationship of resistance to power. Resistance includes such acts or activities which question and challenge the power. In the past, most of the scholars intended to explore the collective movement, peasant revolution and insurgency to locate people's pattern of resistance. Scholars (Paise 1976, Scott 1975, Wolf 1969) in recent years like to locate small-scale individual bases resistance instead of likely forms of peasant revolution and insurgency (Lughod 1990: 2). Feminists' interests have been changed from collective revolution to individual resistance with the help of post-modernist power analysis (Nasrin 2008: 39). James Scott tells us about the weapons of the weak. He depicts peasant's resistance against their owner. James Scott's argument influences feminist thought. Like Scott, many feminists nowadays locate women's space, agency, and resistance in their daily life. Lila Abu Lughod is one of them. Her exploration regarding women resistance is considered

significant in feminism for understanding women's resistance and power relations. Lughod has worked on Ali Bedouin's women and shows the forms of Bedouin women's resistance within the historically changing relations of power in which they are enmeshed. She says all forms of resistance of Bedouin's women are signs of the ineffectiveness of system of power and the creativity of human spirit in its refusal to be dominated. Lughod argues the rendering way of the forms of resistance would collapse us to distinct between forms of resistance and foreclose certain questions about the working of power. In such dilemma, Lughod has shifted slightly the way of looking at resistances. She wants to use resistance as a diagnostic of power. She takes cue from Foucault regarding this issue. Lughod emphasizes Foucault's theories of power specially Foucault's most explicit discussion of power in the first volume of the history of sexuality. Lughod says Foucault's explanation of power raises question about the previous understanding of power as always and essentially repressive. A part of his project of deromanticizing the liberatory discourse of our 20th century is so-called sexual revolution. Lughod says Foucault's interested to show power is something that works not just negatively, by denying, restricting, prohibiting or repressing but also positively, by producing forms of pleasure, systems of knowledge, goods and discourses. He adds what some have viewed as a pessimistic point about resistance by completing the sentence just quoted as follows "where there is power, there is resistance and yet, or rather consequently this resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power". Here, Lughod says Foucault's explanation about power is both less problematic and potentially more fruitful for ethnographic analysis because it enables us to move away from abstract theories of power towards methodological strategies for the study of power in particular situations. We could consider non-trivial all sorts of resistance, but instead of taking these as signs of human freedom. Lughod argues by using those modes of thinking strategically to identify more about forms of power and how people are caught up in them. In her ethnography by applying Foucault theories of power, Lughod describes various forms of power as well as the resistance. She depicts historically transformed power relations and resistance with a view to modern state and capitalist economies. She

indicates the significance of the ideology of sexual difference itself as a form of power on the one hand, and on the other, she explores four types of resistance against the power. She says women resist male power by Folktales, Songs, Jokes and Lyric poetry. Lughod argues that after transformation of Bedouin community's social and economic life under the capitalist state, women seem to be losing access to this mode of resistance. From Lughod's argument, we should learn to read the various local and everyday resistances and the existence of a range of specific strategies and structures of power. Attention to the forms of resistance in particular societies can help us become critical of partial theories about resistance. We respect everyday resistance not just by arguing for the dignity or heroism of the resisters but everyday resistance teaches us about the complex inter-working of historically changing structure power. Lughod argues "where there is resistance, there is power". Although the everyday form of resistance opposes, criticizes the power relation, can not deconstruct structure, rather they are transformed by new form of social structure (Lughod 1990).

Butler also argues "agency is a function of discourse," and denies the relevance of self conscious experience. Although Butler avoids the problems of self-determined awareness by looking to discourse as the source of agency, her extended example of subversion, a description of the construction of lesbian butch and femme identities, ironically suggest a more complex process of invention. One in which resignification of "masculine" and "feminine" identities are produced in a powerful emotional content that impels actors who "like (their) boys to be girls" or by contrast "prefer that girls to boys" (1990). Here Yngvesson and Mohoney argue the dissonant "female body" in this exchange becomes the object of lesbian feminine desire, acted out by subjects who have preferences, likes and wants rather than discursively dictate "compulsion to repeat" and whose preferences are shaped in emotionally laden exchanges with others (Mohoney and Yngvesson 1992).

They explain the playful process of cultural invention that Butler describes and the more routine processes of repetition that reproduce conventional forms of gendered identity. Here they raise question why some people are moved to make gender trouble while others are not.

Therefore, their argument is that explanation of resistance must account for how the motivation to resist the desire to act "against the grain" and also the production of selves and meaning at the intersection of overlapping structures of power. They suggest that an explanation of resistance requires a theory of the subject as not being simply produced in relations of power but as making meaning in her relationships with others. They are telling about the subject who is not only complicit but capable as well of resisting relations of domination (Mohoney and Yngvesson 1992).

By analyzing different scholars' explanations relating women's subjectivities and resistance, we can understand how the social systems construct and reconstruct women's subjectivities which causes the subordination to them. In prevailing situation, women also resist against their subordinate position. But since women are not homogenous category, their scope to resist is not same. In Bangladesh, the work in regard to women's subjectivities and their pattern of resistance has not got priority. However, few writers explain Bangladeshi women's subjectivities and their resistance in their writings. Now I like to explain Bangladeshi women's subjectivities and resistance from some of those writings to understand Bangladeshi women's perspectives.

Bangladeshi Women's Subjectivities and Resistance

Women are not homogenous group in Bangladesh, thus it is very difficult to generalize all women's subjectivity and resistance in the same way. However, women as a category, they go through some common experience. Bangladesh is a Muslim dominant and patriarchal society. In Bangladesh, most of women's subjectivity is constructed by Islamic rule and patriarchal ideology. According to the outlooks, women should maintain their veil and should be obedient to their parents as well as husband. Islam mentions about equal status of human being and gives especial honor to women. For instance, offspring is instructed to give their mother a heavenly status. But practically, women do not get equal judgments. Patriarchy system of Bangladesh often misuses religious beliefs to establish male superiority. Women's subjectivities are constructed by patriarchal ideology. Women seem them inferior to men. Women's (especially rich) mobilization to outside home is limited. Poor

women have more access to outer place than rich women. Poor women go outside because they need to earn for their families. Rich women also can not continue their formal education due to limited access of going outside (White 1992, Arens and Burden 1980). This was the prevalent situation for the women before 1980. Some scholars argue that after 1980, a significant socio-political change has been occurred in Bangladesh. The change is directly connected with the global political economy (Kabeer 2000). During that time, women's decade (1975-1985) was celebrated. Four world conferences have been held for women on the theme of women's equality, peace and development. Later, women's productive and reproductive roles have been made and they have increasingly been recognized as agents of development. Today practically every national, international or multi-lateral agency feels obliged to include women in their development discourse (Hossain 1997: 31-32). Many development projects have launched for incorporating women into development agendas. The activities of NGOs are highly criticized by the people, especially by few religious groups because they feel threatening to their power. But gradually the development discourses have tried to counsel various community leaders, religious leaders and also every household head. Consequently, women's access to outer sphere has changed remarkably which affects their subjectivity. Women's social and economic mobilization brings change to gender relations as well affect women's subjectivity. But this change does not remove women subordination status. Within patriarchal society, women's new activities have been adding by various developments discourse. Many women become economically independent but this could not uproot patriarchal ideology. Women's positions as subordinate in society have not been resolved. Therefore, many scholars (White, Kabeer, Guhathakurata, Hossian, Akhter and so on) are very much critical of the development projects. They argue that in the guise of the development, the development organizations in Bangladesh have been establishing western hegemony because most of the development agendas are regulated by the western countries directions which are linked to the expansion of the western market economy. As a result, women are used here as a way to fulfill their desires. Women's development and interests are not considered. Even

to establish their agendas, they abuse women (Akhter 1992). Naila kabeer uncovers global political economic reasons of incorporating women as cheap labours in garments factory and explores women bitter experience in job market in Bangladesh (Kabeer 2000).

Feminists are also critical of development projects because it enhances women's exploitation. The development projects mobilize women which affect their subjectivity but are not threatening to the patriarchy. Rather women are remodeled within patriarchal state. Nasrin in her research argues that in the context of Bangladesh, development discourses play an intermediate role to relate global capitalism and patriarchal state in women issue. As a result, this kind of approach does not change their subordinate positions rather it is nurtured by the patriarchal state (Nasrin 2008). We can see how women's role has been remodeled in regulative discourses. The discourse of beatification, consciousness, empowerment accounts with previous discourse of ideal women which nowadays regulates women's subjectivity. Dannecker explains the context of women's entrance into garment factories and the changes of women's subjectivities after working there. She also presents the working condition of the factories and various patterns of subordination and liberation accompany women's access to and their employment in the formal sector. She also explores the interfaces between formal sector employment and household composition. She argues usually two different types of argumentations can be drawn from the literature. It is either argued that the women workers must remit most of their earnings to their families and are thus exploited by their own families or that women gain autonomy through the income they obtain, which may also improve their bargaining power within the family and their household. This position reflects the assumption predominant in discussions on women and development that income will improve the negotiating position of women and strengthen their bargaining power in the households. Including two lines of arguments, Dannecker also identifies other several implications. She develops three categories of garments' working women according to the contributions to household income. The first of the three groups is the women from well-off families, the second group consists of women whose income is said to be part of a broader income-earning strategy of the respective

households and finally the third groups, mainly married women who use their wages often very strategically in negotiation processes with their husband. She argues although women express their autonomy such as women spend money for themselves and use part of their money to strengthen their negotiating power within their household. But many women have desire to save money for their dowry. She also depicts economic individuation developed through formal sector employment.

The negative images of the working women also are prevailing. Women also resist under this situation which can be understood by the Scott's explanation about resistance. Women at home and in their working sphere use to cry which is the tool of bargaining. Women also criticize male as well as supervisors and their criticism and crying often bring a bit opportunity for them. Women garment workers also resist the worse situation of the working sphere collectively. They make ties with few women's organizations. Dannecker explains diverse situations which construct women's subjectivities and their resistance (Dannecker 2002: 147-150). Naher in her research depicts women in Bangladesh are targeted by two different groups. The non-government organizations (NGOs) target women to establish their various agendas on the one hand and the fundamentalist groups also interfere women's ways of lives on the other. The development organizations try to empower women. They think veil is an obstacle for the empowerment of the women. Conversely, fundamentalist groups strongly oppose the activities of those NGOs' programs. As a result, women's subjectivities are constructed by two different ideologies which often create vulnerable status of women in the society. But Naher argues under the stated circumstances, women also resist in a small scale. She argues women's resistance can be understood by their daily activities. They do not follow the patriarchal rules and regulations always. She also elaborates women's collective resistance. Therefore, she argues that women in the development literature are represented passively and that is not sufficient to understand women condition in the society. She also mentions that various activities of women should be explored to understand women (Naher 1999: 103-106).

Nasrin in her article shows two different generations of married women's gentle resistance against their husband with examples. She says

women of both generations have power to negotiate with patriarchal domination but this is not a direct resistance (Nasrin 2008). We can also get a picture of previous generation women's agency in Sarah White's ethnography "Arguing with the crocodile". In her book, she portrays one woman's struggle which indicates the women resistance. The name of the woman is Sofura. After her marriage, she faces a lot of sufferings caused by the members of her husband family as well as by her husband. In that condition, she has been adamant to get a job. She has tried and finally has got a job although all of the family members are against Sofura. This symbolizes women resistance. Although Sofura is a successful woman, and she helps her husband economically but her husband feels ashamed (White 1992). Sufura's mobilization brings change to her life but it does not resolve her subordinate status in the society. This picture is similar to even contemporary women. Women today enter into job market. It is said it brings women's emancipation but researches show that women are rather facing paradoxical situations. Women previous role and new role fall them into deep trouble. Lila Abu Lughod depicts in her writing how capitalist state remodels Bedouin women lives. In Bedouin society, new generation women like to wear western dresses and this liking causes tension between two generation's women. Previous women together resist against male domination but after penetration of capitalist state women ties have become lesser. Lughod argues Bedouin women are living in a profound transformation of their social and economic lives. Due to the commercialization of their life, women seem to lose access to this mode of resistance (four types of resistance which I have mentioned above) (Lughod 1990). Like Bedouin society, women in Bangladesh also are living in a profound transformation.

Conclusion

Women subjectivity and their resistance are the key issues to the feminists for understanding gender relations as well as women subordination. This paper has incorporated different feminists' explanation mainly based on two philosophical positions humanism and anti-humanism. The explanations from anti-humanism have been analyzed in a big portion. Feminists' explanations in the same

philosophical position also to some extent are distinct from each other. Main distinction between two philosophical positions is that feminist for humanism likes to struggle and support women in creating new, valid images of themselves, a sense of wholeness and a more authentic representation of what it means to be a woman. In this endeavor, emphasis is given to the centrality of personal experience and the need to find one's own voice to give an account of one's inner self. On the other hand, feminist for anti humanist believes that subjectivity is not single but multiple. Subjectivity is not complete and resolved but in a process, never fully realized. The subject does not create the world but is the product, the effect of language and culture. The subject does not control his/her world but subject has certain available position in the culture. In feminist explanation, patriarchal ideology and capitalism are continuously constructing women's subjectivities. Women subjectivities, which cause their subordinations, are modeled and remodeled in this continuum. Women resist against the system but it does not bring significant change to their life as well as the dominant structure.

Note

- 1 Performativist describes the process of discourse production and performance as a specific type of self presentation.

Reference

- Abu- Lughod, , L. 1990. The romance of resistance: Tracing transformation of power through Bedouin women *American Anthropologist*, 41-55 [incomplete]
- Akhter, F. 1992. *Depopulating Bangladesh*. Dhaka: Narigrantha Prabortona.
- Arens, Y. and Burden, J Van 1980. *Jhagrapur*. Dhaka: Gonoprakashani.
- Beauvoir, Simone de 1997. *The Second Sex*. Vintage Classic: Great Britain.
- Danaher, G. Schirato, T. and Webb, J. 2001. *Understanding Foucault*, Deldi: Motalai, Banarsidass Publishers Private limited.
- Dannecker, P. 2002. *Between Conformity and Resistance : women garment worker in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: The university press limited.
- Butler, J. 1990. *Gender Trouble*. London and Newyork: Routeledge.
- Foucault, M. 1978. *The History of Sexuality: Volume 1*. Canada: Penguin Books Canada Ltd.

- Foucault, M. 1976. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Panthion.
- Gatens, M, 1991. *Feminism and philosophy: perspective of difference and equality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Grosz, E. 1992. Subject, In Elizabeth Wright eds. *Feminism and Psychoanalysis: A critical dictionary*, Blackwell Reference.
- Hossain, H. 1997. Beyond WID and GAD: Empowering the Instrument. In Meghna Guhathakurta eds. [????] Dhaka: The university press limited.
- Iskanian, A. 2003. *Is the Personal Political? The development of Armenian's NGO sector during the post soviet period*. Berkely: University of California.
- Irigary, L. 1985. *Speculum of the other women*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Kabeer, N. 2000. *Bangladesh Women Workers and Labour Market Decision: the power to Choice*. New Delhi: Vistaar Publications.
- Khandoker, N. 2008. Resistance or negotiation? Agency within unequal marital experience of urban middle class women, *Nirijnana Patrika* 13.
- Mohanty, C. T. 1991. Introduction: Catagraphics of Struggle. The world Women and the Politics of Feminism. In Chandra Talpade Mohanty and Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres eds. *The third Women and the Politics of Feminism*. Bloomington and Indiana Polis: Indiana University Press.
- Lacan, J. 1997. *Aggressivity in psychoanalysis*, Ecrits, Pp8-29
- Lacan, J. 1997 *The signification of the phallas*, Ecrits, p-281-91
- Lessa 2006. Discursive Struggles within social welfare restaging teen motherhood.
- Mahoney, M. A. and Yngvesson, B. 1992. The construction of subjectivity and the paradox of resistance: Reintegrating Feminist Anthropology and Psychology. *The journal of women in culture and society* 18 (1)
- Mernissi, F.1975. *From beyond the veil: Male Female dynamics in Modern Muslim Society*. Indiana University Press.
- Moore, H. L. 1988. *Feminism and Anthropology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Naz, F. 2006. *Pathways To Women's Empowerment in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: A H Development Publishing House
- Rabinow, P. 1991. Introduction. In Paul Rabinow ed. *The Foucault Reader* London: Penguin Groups.
- White, S. C. 1992. *Arguing with the Crocodile: Gender and Class perspective*. Dhaka: The University press limited.
- শীল. শ্যামলী ২০১০, নারী দিবসের ১০০ বছর পূর্তি এবং শত বছরের বাঙ্গালী নারীর অবস্থান, মুক্তস্বর, সংখ্যা-৩।
- নাহার, আইনুন ১৯৯৯, বাংলাদেশে নারী, উন্নয়ন এবং মৌলবাদ, নৃবিজ্ঞান পত্রিকা, ৪।

