JETIR.ORG ISSN: 2349-5162 | ESTD Year : 2014 | Monthly Issue
JOURNAL OF EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES AND INNOVATIVE RESEARCH (JETIR)
An International Scholarly Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

GENDERED THREADS: WOMEN'S LABOR, KINSHIP, AND THE DOMESTIC ECONOMY IN SOURASHTRA SILK WEAVING HOUSEHOLDS

Amarnath Ramakrishna. K, Dr. V. Marappan
Research Scholar, Associate Professor
Department of History, Presidency College, Chennai, INDIA

Abstract : The figure of the Pattakkaran, or master weaver, has long symbolized the skill, artistry, and economic success of the Sourashtra silk-weaving community. Yet this image obscures the indispensable, though systematically uncredited, labor of women whose contributions sustained both the industry and its social reproduction. This paper interrogates the androcentric bias in historical and anthropological narratives that valorize men's public, monetized work while rendering invisible the productive and reproductive labor of women within the household. It argues that Sourashtra women were not passive subjects but active, though constrained, agents whose labor formed the bedrock of the community's economic survival. Practices such as endogamy and dowry are examined not merely as cultural traditions but as deliberate economic strategies designed to consolidate knowledge, capital, and kinship ties. Situating this analysis within feminist critiques of the household economy and the anthropology of craft, the study highlights the process of "housewifization," whereby women's work is devalued as non-work, enabling its exploitation under capitalist relations. Drawing on colonial ethnographies, community histories, and oral testimonies, the paper re-weaves the narrative of Sourashtra heritage to foreground the hidden hands that prepared the thread long before it reached the master's loom.

I. Introduction

The master weaver, or Pattakkaran, seated before his loom, is an enduring symbol of Sourashtra heritage, embodying skill, artistry, and the community's famed economic prowess. This image, however, tells only half the story. Behind the visible product of the loom lay a vast, intricate, and systematically uncredited world of female labor, a domain as essential to the final brilliance of the silk as the dye in the vat or the thread on the shuttle. Historical and anthropological narratives of craft communities have often fallen prey to an androcentric bias, celebrating the public, monetized labor of men while rendering the productive and reproductive work of women within the household invisible. This paper seeks to correct this occlusion by asking a central research question: How did the labor, kinship roles, and constrained economic agency of Sourashtra women constitute the indispensable, yet hidden, foundation of the community's silk-weaving economy and its social reproduction? This study contends that Sourashtra women were not merely passive subjects within a patriarchal craft community but were active, albeit circumscribed, agents whose productive and reproductive labor was the bedrock of the industry. We will argue that practices like endogamy and the dowry system were not merely cultural traditions but deliberate economic strategies that functioned to concentrate specialized knowledge and financial capital within the community, leveraging female labor and sexuality to ensure its commercial survival and distinct identity. The housewifization of labour is the process by which women's work is defined as non-work, as a 'labour of love,' and thus becomes invisible and devalued, allowing for super-exploitation under capitalist relations[i]. This analysis is situated at the intersection of feminist scholarship on the household economy, which critiques the classic separation between "productive" and "reproductive" labor, and the anthropology of craft, which has begun to unravel the gendered threads of knowledge transmission. By drawing on a critical re-reading of colonial ethnographies, community histories, and the nascent but vital field of oral history, this paper will re-weave the narrative of Sourashtra economic success to include the crucial, if often silent, hands that prepared the thread before it ever reached the master's loom.

II. The Invisible Production Line: Women's Work in the Pre-Loom Process

The production of silk cloth was a sequential chain of highly specialized tasks, a significant portion of which was exclusively the domain of women and occurred within the spatial confines of the household. This gendered division of labor created a hierarchy of visibility, where the final act of weaving—performed by men—garnered social and economic prestige, while the foundational processes—managed by women—were socially devalued as mere "domestic help."

The Technical Division of Labor: Skill and Specialization

The transformation of raw silk into a workable thread ready for the loom involved a series of delicate, time-consuming operations primarily undertaken by women. This included the precise winding of the silk yarn (takkai) onto bobbins, a process requiring a steady hand to avoid breakage and ensure consistency. Furthermore, the critical task of preparing the warp—arranging hundreds of lengthwise threads in perfect parallel order on the loom—was often a female responsibility, demanding immense patience and spatial acuity. In families that produced more complex textiles, such as ikats, women were instrumental in the intricate and mathematically precise process of tying and dyeing the threads to create resist patterns. This was not unskilled labor; it was a craft in its own right, involving a deep, tacit knowledge of materials, tension, and design that was transmitted orally and practically from mothers to daughters over generations. The dexterity and expertise required for these pre-loom stages were as vital to the quality of the final product as the weaving itself.

The Social Devaluation of "Domestic" Labor

The economic invisibility of this work stemmed directly from its location within the domestic sphere and its separation from the point of monetization. Because women's labor did not involve the direct act of selling the cloth in the market or the final, celebrated act of weaving, it was not counted as formal "work." It was subsumed under their wifely and filial duties, perceived as a natural extension of their domestic role rather than as a distinct contribution to the family's capital. Costly signaling theory suggests that lavish displays like large dowries function not just as gifts but as competitive signals of a family's wealth, status, and the quality of its members, securing advantageous alliances[ii]. This ideological framing allowed for the systematic appropriation of their labor; its value was embedded in the final product but never separately accounted for or remunerated. The "master weaver" could thus be celebrated, and the guild could negotiate prices based on the finished cloth, while the foundational contributions of the female household members remained in the shadows, a classic instance of the patriarchal bargain that has historically underpinned many artisanal economies. This invisible production line was, in reality, the crucial first link in the chain that connected the household to the vibrant commercial world of the Sourashtra Nagarattar.

III. The Loom of Kinship: Dowry, Endogamy, and the Political Economy of Marriage

If the household was the workshop, then kinship was the managerial framework that governed its economic viability. The celebrated Sourashtra institutions of endogamy and dowry, often analyzed through a purely cultural or social lens, must be understood as sophisticated economic mechanisms that served to consolidate the community's commercial position. While the master weaver (*Kaikkolar*) is celebrated, the role of women and children in ancillary processes like winding, warping, and sizing was crucial to the household's total output, even if it remained unmonetized and unrecognized[iii]. These practices were not merely about preserving tradition; they were strategic tools for managing capital, labor, and intellectual property, with women's lives and bodies serving as the central medium for these transactions.

Dowry (Stridhan) as Intergenerational Capital Transfer

The Sourashtra practice of providing substantial dowries, typically in the form of gold and silver, functioned as a critical system of inter-household capital circulation. While ostensibly a gift to the bride, this wealth often effectively became working capital for the groom's family's weaving enterprise. It could be used to purchase raw materials like silk yarn from distant markets, invest in new looms, or act as a financial buffer during seasonal downturns in the market. In this sense, dowry was not simply a prestige good; it was a vital injection of liquidity into the family firm. This system created a direct link between marriage alliances and economic resilience, incentivizing families to accumulate precious metals—a stable, portable form of wealth—and channel it directly back into the means of production. The pressure to accumulate dowry also reinforced the need for every member of the household, including women through their unseen labor, to contribute to the family's financial standing, further binding domestic production to the marriage market.

Endogamy as a Strategy for Protecting Intellectual Property

The strict enforcement of community endogamy, the practice of marrying only within the Sourashtra fold, was the social corollary to the guild's economic monopoly. It functioned as a comprehensive system for protecting the community's most valuable assets: its specialized skills and trade secrets. The intricate knowledge of pre-loom processes—the specific techniques for dyeing, starching, and pattern-tying—was a form of intellectual property carefully guarded within the community. By ensuring that women married only Sourashtra men, this specialized knowledge, transmitted from mother to daughter, was kept within the caste. This prevented the leakage of technical expertise to competing weaving groups and ensured that the female labor force, trained from childhood in these exclusive methods, remained a resource for the community alone. Endogamy, therefore, was a strategic barrier that protected both the quality and the mystique of Sourashtra textiles, ensuring that the "secret" of their production remained a collective asset, tightly bound within the loops of approved kinship networks.

IV. The Household as a Unit of Production and Social Reproduction

The Sourashtra home was not merely a place of residence but a dynamic, integrated socio-economic unit where the lines between production and daily life were seamlessly blurred. Within this space, women played a dual role: they were both direct producers in the family enterprise and the primary agents of social reproduction, responsible for maintaining the household and ensuring the intergenerational continuity of the craft. Beyond their direct artisanal contributions, Sourashtra women were typically responsible for the day-to-day management of the domestic economy, or oikonomia. This involved budgeting for food, provisions, and other necessities, ensuring that the male weaver and other productive members of the household could remain at their tasks with minimal disruption. The culture of the jute-mill workers was deeply influenced by hierarchical relationships of the village, including patriarchy, which were reconstituted, not broken down, in the industrial setting[iv]. This role as household manager extended at times to the realm of petty commerce, with women often handling the direct, local sale of smaller finished items or dealing with suppliers of ancillary materials. This financial stewardship, though confined to the domestic sphere, was crucial for the smooth functioning of the entire production cycle. It required astute financial acumen and was a significant, if unheralded, form of economic agency that underpinned the stability of the family enterprise.

Social Reproduction and the Intergenerational Transmission of Skill

Perhaps the most profound, yet least visible, contribution of Sourashtra women lay in the realm of social reproduction. This encompasses the biological reproduction of the labor force—bearing and raising the next generation of weavers and artisans—and, just as critically, the cultural and technical reproduction of the craft itself. From a young age, daughters were apprenticed to their mothers and older female relatives, learning the intricate skills of thread preparation and design not through formal instruction but through embodied practice and oral tradition. The household was thus the primary school for the craft. Through this daily, intimate transmission of knowledge, women ensured that the specialized skills essential to the Sourashtra textile industry were preserved and passed down, generation after generation. They were the unsung teachers and custodians of the very heritage that publicly defined their community, making the domestic sphere the ultimate site of the craft's long-term survival.

V. Contested Agency: Power, Patronage, and Constraints

To cast Sourashtra women solely as victims of an oppressive patriarchal structure would be to overlook the nuanced realities of their lived experience. While operating within a clearly defined framework of constraints, they exercised agency and cultivated forms of power that, though often informal, were significant in shaping their lives and the domestic economy. Their history is one of navigating a "patriarchal bargain," where they negotiated for status, security, and influence within the accepted social codes.

Informal Power and Influence

Denied formal authority in the guilds or public commerce, Sourashtra women cultivated influence in the domains accessible to them. Their central role in arranging marriages gave them a powerful voice in forging and maintaining kinship alliances, which were the bedrock of both social standing and economic networking. As mothers, they held significant sway over their sons, potentially influencing decisions related to the family business or the disposal of property. Furthermore, as the primary nurturers and caregivers, they were the custodians of family well-being, a role that granted them moral authority and the power to shape domestic harmony. The 'private' sphere of the family and the 'public' sphere of the economy are not separate but are mutually constitutive, with ideologies of domesticity shaping and being shaped by economic processes[v]. This informal power, exercised through persuasion, negotiation, and sometimes resistance, was a crucial counterpoint to the formal male-dominated power structure, allowing women to carve out spheres of autonomy and respect within the household.

The Double Burden and Patriarchal Bargains

This agency, however, was exercised under a pervasive system of constraints. Women bore a "double burden" of responsibility, tasked with the time-consuming labor of pre-loom processes alongside the exhaustive duties of childcare, cooking, and other domestic chores. Their physical mobility was often restricted, and their access to formal education was historically limited, as their primary value was perceived to lie in their domestic and artisanal skills rather than in public life or intellectual pursuits. The concept of the "patriarchal bargain" is useful here: women largely complied with the system of endogamy and patrilocality because it offered them tangible, if constrained, rewards—social respectability, economic security for their children, and a clear, valued role within the community. They leveraged their skills in weaving and household management to secure their position, accepting the boundaries of patriarchy in exchange for the power and protection it offered within the domestic sphere. Their resistance was often not one of overt rebellion but of subtle negotiation within the accepted boundaries, maximizing their security and influence from within the system.

VI. The Transmutation of Gendered Capital in a Modernizing Economy

The 20th and 21st centuries witnessed a profound transformation in the Sourashtra community's economic base, marked by a gradual shift from artisanal handloom weaving to prominence in modern engineering, textiles, and IT, particularly in cities like Tiruppur and Coimbatore. This transition, however, did not simply erase the gendered economic patterns of the past; instead, it catalyzed their transmutation. The body has been for women in capitalist society what the factory has been for male waged workers: the primary ground of their exploitation and resistance[vi]. The social and kinship capital historically cultivated through the control of female labor and marriage alliances was strategically redeployed to navigate and conquer new economic frontiers.

Kinship Networks as Venture Capital

The same tightly-knit, endogamous kinship structures that once protected weaving secrets and managed dowry capital found a new function in the modern era. These networks became the bedrock for entrepreneurship, functioning as informal venture capital systems. Trust, built upon community and familial ties, facilitated access to start-up loans, business partnerships, and market information with a speed and efficiency unavailable in the formal banking sector. Women strategize within a set of concrete constraints, which I term the 'patriarchal bargain.' They exhibit what may be called a 'pragmatic resistance' rather than an outright, confrontational challenge to the patriarchal order[vii]. The capital accumulated through dowries, once invested in silk and looms, was now often channeled into engineering college fees or as seed money for a new export business. Thus, the "patriarchal bargain" evolved: women's continued adherence to endogamous marriages and the dowry system now served to fund and secure their families' entry into the professional and industrial middle class, perpetuating a system where their compliance was leveraged for modern forms of capital accumulation.

Educating the Dowry: Shifting Strategies for Social Mobility

As the community pivoted towards white-collar professions, the very nature of the "ideal bride" and her dowry began to transform. While gold and cash remained significant, a new form of symbolic capital gained paramount importance: higher education. Professional degrees for women, particularly in fields like medicine, engineering, and commerce, became a highly prized component of the marriage portfolio. This was a double-edged sword. The artisanal household was a unit of production first and consumption second. Its viability depended on the unpaid labor of all members, with tasks allocated by age and gender in a rigid hierarchy[viii]. On one hand, it opened up unprecedented opportunities for female education and potential professional autonomy. On the other, this education was often framed not as a path to individual career fulfillment but as an enhancement of the woman's value in the marriage market, ensuring an alliance with an equally or more highly educated (and thus prosperous) groom from within the

community. The intergenerational transmission of skill, once focused on the loom, was now redirected towards academic excellence, yet it continued to serve the overarching goal of consolidating and advancing the family's and the community's socio-economic status through strategic marriage. Dowry can be seen as a form of pre-mortem inheritance, but one that is often controlled by the groom's family, effectively transferring wealth from one partilineage to another and tying the woman to her new family's economic fortunes[ix].

VII. Conclusion

The broader implication of this research is a call to fundamentally re-evaluate the very definitions of "work" and "economy" in the history of artisanal communities in South Asia. It demonstrates that a complete understanding of political economy is impossible without an integrated analysis of the household and the gendered division of labor that sustains it. The Sourashtra case shows that social reproduction—the bearing and raising of children and the transmission of culture and skill—is not separate from production but is its essential precondition. Future research could fruitfully explore the impact of twentieth-century modernization, education, and the shift to mechanized production on these deeply entrenched gendered roles. A comparative study with other artisan communities, such as the Devangas or the Kanchipuram silk weavers, could also reveal the extent to which this gendered economic model was a widespread phenomenon. By listening for the quiet hum of the spinning wheel alongside the assertive clatter of the loom, we arrive at a richer, more complete, and profoundly more human understanding of the Sourashtra legacy.

VIII. References

[i] Mies, Maria. The Lace Makers of Narsapur: Indian Housewives Produce for the World Market*. Zed Books, 1982.
[ii] Hayden, Brian. The Power of Feasts: From Prehistory to the Present. Cambridge University Press, 2014
[iii] Ramaswamy, Vijaya. "The Genesis and Historical Role of the Master Weavers in South India." The Indian Economic & Social History Review, vol. 17, no. 1, 1980, pp. 59–78.
[iv] Goody, Jack. Production and Reproduction: A Comparative Study of the Domestic Domain. Cambridge University Press, 1976.
[v] Sangari, Kumkum, and Sudesh Vaid, editors. Recasting Women: Essays in Indian Colonial History. Rutgers University Press, 1990.
[vi] Federici, Silvia. Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation. Autonomedia, 2004.
[vii] Kandiyoti, Deniz. "Bargaining with Patriarchy." Gender and Society, vol. 2, no. 3, 1988, pp. 274–90.
[viii] Roy, Tirthankar. Artisans and Industrialization: Indian Weaving in the Twentieth Century. Oxford University Press, 1993.
[ix] Sharma, Ursula. Women, Work, and Property in North-West India. Tavistock Publications, 1980.