

Macalester International

Volume 10 *International Feminisms: Divergent Perspectives*

Article 12

Spring 2001

Feminism and Women's Livelihood Protests

Sheila Rowbotham
Manchester University

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl>

Recommended Citation

Rowbotham, Sheila (2001) "Feminism and Women's Livelihood Protests," *Macalester International*: Vol. 10, Article 12.
Available at: <http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl/vol10/iss1/12>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Institute for Global Citizenship at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Macalester International by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

Feminism and Women's Livelihood Protests

Sheila Rowbotham

I want to begin by outlining two elements in women's assertion of emancipation historically: the idea of self-determination and the idea of the legitimacy of claims of livelihood. I will refer to the interaction between these two aspects of emancipation in popular movements mainly in France, Britain, the United States, and India from the late eighteenth to the early twentieth century. This historical perspective provides a useful and frequently neglected dimension in considering contemporary discussions of "feminisms." In the latter part of the essay, I consider the circumstances in which these two elements have converged or separated by thinking through the history of the recent women's movements from the late 1960s. My main focus here will be on Britain because that is the place I know in sufficient depth.

I. Social Tension

The French Revolution — that extraordinary, quite unprecedented moment of upheaval in all known systems of social hierarchy — threw up a dramatic, though isolated, assertion of women's right to self-determination in Olympe de Gouges' "Declaration of the Rights of Woman and the Female Citizen," which appeared in 1791, just one year before Mary Wollstonecraft's better known "Vindication." "Woman, wake up," demanded de Gouges, a butcher's daughter and playwright who had written the first French play against slavery in 1782. She declared, "The tocsin of reason is being heard throughout the whole universe; discover your rights. The powerful empire of nature is no longer surrounded by prejudice, fanaticism, superstition, and lies."¹

Speaking from the standpoint of a constitutional monarchist, Olympe de Gouges, who was to be overtaken by the political course of the Revolution, argued for an extension of the civil rights of women. Limited civil rights were to be granted, but women were excluded from political rights. Though the Revolution presented the idea of the sovereignty of the "people," this was in practice circumscribed. Along with poorer working men and servants, women remained passive, rather than active, citizens who could participate in the shaping of laws.

Nonetheless, during the Revolution, poor women's sense of a social responsibility legitimated by custom could overlap into the public political sphere. Poor women had, of course, taken action around consumption long before the Revolution. However, their targets had usually been the bakers. During the French Revolution, they began to hold the king or the head of state responsible for supplying bread.

Prices rose dramatically amidst civil turmoil and war. In 1792, the women of Lyon seized control of the city government and raided shops for bread and meat, demonstrating through their action a moral vision of an economy of goods distributed at prices they regarded as fair and just, as well as an alternative view of sovereignty as legitimated through its power to meet the needs of the poor.

So there appeared a startling new assertion, which, though based on time-honored domestic activity, transcended women's allotted sphere. This was not self-determination in the sense of asserting an autonomous identity as *women*, but a collective expression of control over daily life. Because of the exceptional conditions of the Revolution, the customary realm of domestic provision and care took on an extraordinary dimension, which began to impinge on political decision making. In the course of the Revolution, poor women can be seen taking new historical spaces through their collective participation in crowd action. A shadowy counternotion of what the state should do and be is documented in February 1793. A group of poor women went to the National Convention to protest the price of basic provisions. They were told the Convention was about to adjourn for two days and would not hear their case. They were heard in the corridors angrily criticizing the unresponsive people's state, which prevaricated over the needs of their families: "When our children ask for milk we don't adjourn them until the day after tomorrow."²

It was the mobilization of poor women around livelihood rather than Olympe de Gouges' claim to the rights of citizenship which

involved large numbers of women during the French Revolution. Action arose not from an autonomous definition of *woman* but from the experience of being women in relation to the family. As Olwen Hufton points out in *Women and the Limits of Citizenship in the French Revolution*, "The issue of women's equality with men... can be allotted only a small space in the big history of the Revolution."³

With hindsight, we can note that two perspectives had arrived by the late eighteenth century, which were to have profound implications in the history of women's emancipation. One is this fragile sense of women's individual rights. The second is the concept-through-action, in a revolutionary context, of a legitimate collective claim of poor women to shape policies relating to the livelihood of their families. In a fascinating and prescient remark, Olympe de Gouges, commenting on the sexual power to which women had to resort in the Old Regime, glimpsed how, through the Revolution, despite its denial of women's rights, a chink had opened: "In this sort of contradictory situation, what remarks could I not make! I have but a moment to make them, but this moment will fix the attention of the remotest posterity."⁴

After the defeat of revolutionary hope, it was to take some time for a new radicalism to develop. However, the mid-1820s saw a perceptive synthesis of issues of self-determination and livelihood concerns in "Appeal of One Half the Human Race" (1825). This was the work of an Irish landlord with progressive views named William Thompson. It was written to refute the Utilitarian James Mills' view that women's interests could be included "in that of their fathers and that of their husbands."⁵ In rejecting this assumption that women's persons could be the property of their male kin, Thompson was influenced by a remarkable woman, Anna Wheeler, whose own life had been scarred by an unhappy and brutal marriage. Thompson argued that women's rights as individuals should be the basis for reforms which should be enacted immediately. However, he also had a longer-term perspective. Thompson and Wheeler were part of a radical circle in London who saw cooperation and association as an alternative and preferable form of development to the harshness of competition. Thompson applied this transformatory vision of mutuality to women's economic dependence, linking his recognition of rights to an awareness of their needs.

In her study of women in the Owenite cooperative movement *Eve and the New Jerusalem*, Barbara Taylor shows how both these aspects of women's emancipation were taken up by the cooperative movement which developed in the 1830s among radical workers.⁶ Several women

among the Owenites were lecturers and writers. These practitioners of Robert Owen's "New Moral World" consciously challenged the culture of the Church and their secular rulers. The Owenites' awareness that domination was not necessarily just about physical control, but also a matter of values and beliefs, had an obvious significance for women.

The socialists of the 1830s were internationalists, carrying ideas back and forth. Bonnie J. Anderson, in *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women's Movement, 1830 – 1860*, charts the transmission of these international links. For instance, she records how, in 1832, a small band of French utopian socialist women, calling themselves "New Women," wrote a "Call to Women" in a French newspaper, asking, "Is our condition as women so happy that there is nothing left for us to desire and demand?"⁷ Rejecting male property rights over women, they asserted, "One half the human race cannot be made the servants of the other."⁸ They called on women of all classes to unite for "... the free and equal chance of developing...all our faculties."⁹

Bonnie J. Anderson notes how their "Call" was translated by Anna Wheeler and appeared in the Owenite journal *The Crisis* in 1833. Read by John Stuart Mill, among others in Britain, it "circulated to radicals in North America and Europe."¹⁰ In 1836, a Polish Jewish American, Ernestine Rose, circulated a petition for married women's property rights in the U.S., which Judith Wellman says was the first time that women in North America had taken "public action for legal reform."¹¹ Rose had emigrated to the U.S. from Britain as an Owenite colonist, critical of the personal paternalism of Owen himself.¹²

These connections have been missed by historical accounts of feminism, which focus exclusively on gender or women's networks. The idea that feminism can be seen apart from other political currents was, of course, the viewpoint that more conservative late nineteenth century feminists, embarrassed by any association with Mary Wollstonecraft or Anna Wheeler, would have wished to convey. However, as Bonnie Anderson remarks, "This international women's movement did not arise because aggrieved feminists in different nations independently decided to band together. Rather it emerged from the matrix of international socialism."¹³

Of course, this new view of society—socialism—came into being in response to the massive transformations being wrought by capital, and in its inception interacted with other movements such as anti-slavery,

liberal nationalism, religious dissent, radical protests against censorship, or for a freer sexuality.

The "new women" of the 1830s, drawn to the ideas of mutuality, cooperation, and association (articulated by such thinkers as Owen, Saint Simon, and Fourier), combined the radical demand for ownership of their own persons with a romantic desire for self-development, through education, personal freedom and choice, and public action. In these early texts on women's condition, there are also repeated references to women's "slavery" and the use of the word "emancipation." The movement for the emancipation of the slaves thus not only directly inspired the American women's movement, it also provided a concept which could express an aspiration for individual self-determination, along with social, economic, and political change. It differs from the more static idea of rights because it contains the notion of active personal transformation in the process of changing the old order.¹⁴

During the 1840s, though the free love aspect of self-ownership tended to be played down because of scandal, the connection between self-emancipation and social emancipation persisted. In the French Revolution of 1848, both were to surface through women's clubs and working women's journals where equal political and civil rights, divorce, voluntary motherhood, male attitudes, and women's feelings of inadequacy and ignorance are discussed along with cooperative households and child care. Among the demands in 1848 were a social fund so women need not be dependent on men, free medical service and state support for midwives, public restaurants, wash houses, meeting rooms, libraries, and public space for recreation. Working women in the 1840s also developed a set of demands around paid work. They wanted equal pay; an end to women's low pay, long hours, and exclusion from certain trades; payment of home workers at the same rate as people in the workshops; and the sharing of work in times of unemployment. Alternative employment for prostitutes; restaurants and crèches in all workshops; training centers for women workers including midwives; and centers for domestic workers to meet and organize were also demanded. The conviction that workers should determine their own working conditions and alter the organization of production is evident in the demand for equal participation of women on workers' committees in the National Workshops created to solve unemployment. The women of 1848 also drew up their own schemes for associations or cooperatives as producers and consumers.

In order to comprehend these demands, we have to place them in the context of the pressures on working conditions and the impetus the Revolution of 1848 gave to a new vision of society (which was to remain unrealized). Working women's protests arose from a specific experience of class and gender but at a time when the sense of general transformation fed the hope that new social relationships could evolve. The writing of the women who voiced this new hope is infused with a sense of becoming, and of making an alternative culture of equality, freedom, and cooperation. The year 1848 thus saw the fullest expression of an associationist idea of women's emancipation in which transforming oneself and transforming collective social existence combine.¹⁵ The defeat and repression that followed resulted in a splintering of this concept of women's emancipation. The wider hope of radical change was also shattered. In a poignant letter, two revolutionaries of 1848, Jeanne Deroin and Pauline Roland, wrote from prison in 1851 to the Convention of the Women of America:

Sisters of America! your socialist sisters in France are united with you in the vindication of the right of woman to civil and political equality. We have, moreover, the profound conviction that only by the power of association based on solidarity—by the union of the working-classes of both sexes to organize labor—can be acquired, completely and pacifically, the civil and political equality of woman, and the social right of all.¹⁶

This broad and inclusive vision of "social right" was to be buried in oblivion.

It was evident to contemporaries that 1848 was a turning point. Not only did it send Karl Marx to the British Museum to wrestle with *Capital*, the novelist Gustave Flaubert left us a literary testimony of the submergence of romantic dreams. His first version of *Sentimental Education* was written in 1849; his final version twenty years later aimed at sober realism. To a new generation, the hopes of twenty years before were simply incomprehensible. As Flaubert himself said, "The reaction after '48 dug a gulf between one France and the other."¹⁷ The gulf, of course, extended far beyond France and was to have important consequences for women's emancipation.

II. Feminism

The discovery of social tensions between women is not peculiar to the modern women's movements. Women mobilized with very different priorities during the nineteenth century, and conflicts of race and class can be found then, too. As Dorothy Thompson notes in her essay "Women and Nineteenth Century Radical Politics: A Lost Dimension," "Historians of the women's emancipation movement have observed the considerable gulf that existed between the aspirations of the middle class emancipators and those of women lower down in the social scale in Victorian society."¹⁸

Even if we look at white, middle class feminism in Europe and the U.S., we can see several different political assumptions and aims. In other words, the existence of "feminisms" is not a new phenomenon either. In fact, very familiar disputes predate the arrival of the term *feminism*, which Karen Offen found being first used in the early 1880s in France and arriving in the U.S. and Latin America in the late 1890s.¹⁹ Arguments about equality and difference, for instance, can be observed in the 1830s and '40s, while the question of whether women as a group have distinct needs and desires from men is evident from the 1830s.²⁰

By the time *feminism* had been coined, Western capitalist society had consolidated. The impermanence and topsy-turvy fluidity of the earlier era had gone. Late nineteenth century middle class feminists focused mainly on education, access to employment, and the vote. The earlier emphasis on cooperation or new social relations of mutuality became a sub-strand. There were, of course, notable exceptions. In the U.S., Elizabeth Cady Stanton, veteran of anti-slavery and early women's rights movements, continued to support "association" and what she called in 1892, "self-sovereignty."²¹

By the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century, it no longer seemed evident that an alternative "mutuality" could evolve from and replace the capitalist economy. The effort to improve women's livelihoods came to focus on trade unions and on state legislation to protect workers or provide welfare. This was the approach of the socialist women who became involved in the reformist and revolutionary wings of socialist organizations.²² It was also to affect the feminists. Alongside individualist traditions of feminism, and frequently interacting with them, went what Karen Offen has called a "relational" feminism.²³ This saw women's emancipation in terms of complemen-

tary equity rather than equality with men. From this perspective in Europe and, to a lesser extent, in the U.S., both middle class feminists and working class labor women made gender-based claims on the state for resources for women as mothers and housewives before World War II.²⁴

Around World War I in many countries, small groups of women had also begun to define themselves as “socialist feminists.” Both egalitarianism and ideas of women’s “difference” are present in the thinking of socialist feminists such as Crystal Eastman, Dora Russell, and Stella Browne along with an effort to combine the idea of self-determination with a wider social project. Self-determination appears in connection with what we would now call reproductive rights and runs parallel with the idea of direct democracy—“workers’ control.”²⁵ Control over one’s body and workers’ direct action thus run in tandem, like the proverbial bicycle built for two. This anti-authoritarian socialist feminist politics had an increasingly bumpy ride during the depression and the rise of fascism and Stalinism.

When the women’s liberation movement emerged again, feminist historians rediscovered many lost and buried strands in the history of women’s emancipation: cooperators like Anna Wheeler, radical feminists like Elizabeth Cady Stanton, campaigners who had struggled to define women’s emancipatory needs in terms of race and class, and the early socialist feminists who sought to link the body to labor power. This history was, of course, to extend far beyond the U.S. and Europe.²⁶ Feminist historians have shown how movements against colonialism during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have raised in very different contexts the connection between the self-determination of the individual and the imagined collectivity of the nation. In *The History of Doing*, Radha Kumar makes this observation of Indian women in the nationalist movement in the early twentieth century: “Not only did they link women’s rights with nationalism, they used nationalist arguments to defend demands for women’s rights to equality with men.”²⁷ In Urmila Debi’s phrase, “swadhinata” meant “the strength and power to fulfil ourselves.”²⁸

The idea of the *nation* could thus be a means of linking individual self-development and a collective project of emancipation. Nationalist women opposing imperialism, like the women of the 1848 French Revolution, had combined women’s self-expression with association. Like them, too, however, women in movements for national liberation in many parts of the world experienced strong pressures to subordinate

to a collective goal their individual self-fulfillment and capacity to determine their own destinies.²⁹

The women's liberation movements that began to emerge in the late 1960s grew out of a new radicalism in which, once again, there was a convergence of self and social emancipation. Moreover, a crucial factor was again a movement for racial equality and liberation in the U.S. in first Civil Rights and then Black Power. In differing ways, both created a political language combining personal and collective liberation. Cultural and psychological attitudes were contested along with economic inequality and political rights. The processes of imposing power through control over space or, less tangibly, through definitions, assumptions, and starting points, were brought onto the agenda of practical politics.

In the U.S., many of the women's liberation groups had a broad and inclusive scope in the early 1970s. Along with predictable issues such as equality at work, abortion rights, and nurseries, they were also supporting tenants' struggles, welfare rights marchers, low paid hospital workers' strikes, and unionization drives.³⁰ Similarly, in Britain in the 1970s, feminist concerns included housing, prices, the democratization of public health care, the conditions of women in prison and of prisoners' wives, and family allowances (child benefit), along with support for strikes for equal pay and union recognition.

The women's liberation movement of the 1970s was to be erroneously characterized as preoccupied only with "equality." In fact, as in the past, aspirations for equality interacted with assumptions of women's "difference." Women were often assumed to carry alternative caring and cooperative values, for example. Moreover, running parallel with both was a wider vision of social transformation and a commitment to personal change through activity within the movement.³¹

In the British context, it is possible to see an historic turning point by 1976. The International Monetary Fund loan resulted in cuts in state welfare and a much harsher political climate in relation to class and race. In this situation, the women's liberation movement was reluctantly forced onto the defensive and notions of a wider social transformation became harder to sustain even before the advent of Margaret Thatcher's right-wing government in 1979.³²

During the 1980s, feminists mounted a desperate rearguard action to maintain access to social consumption. Faced with "Thatcherism" (welfare cuts and privatization of public services), many grassroots

campaigners shifted to the institutional channels of local government where left Labor local authorities were struggling to complement and even extend the social provision being assailed by the Conservatives. The scope of feminism was to be expanded in certain ways by the newly created women's committees, established by local authorities from the early 1980s. The pioneering Greater London Council's women's committee took on such issues as the design of the built environment, the provision of public transport, women's access to leisure facilities, nurseries, payment by the state to care givers, cash payment for child care to council employees, grants to pay advocates for non-English speaking pregnant women in the National Health Service, centers for child minders, women's training, the conditions of home workers and low paid women, and research through women's employment centers.³³

However, these interesting extensions of the livelihood aspect of feminism tended to shed the self-defining aspect of feminism. Domestic violence did pass into local authority feminism but, in the course of becoming a funding category, the victimization of battered women came to the fore rather than the earlier emphasis on empowerment. Moreover, the early 1980s saw a pessimistic tendency gain ascendancy in the British feminist movement. It focused exclusively on power relations between men and women and regarded other concerns as diversionary. The exception to this narrower definition of feminism was the organization of women of South Asian and Afro-Caribbean descent, which connected to anti-racist campaigns and immigration controls and also retained a wider perspective of social change. As the 1980s drew to a close, it was not clear whether a women's movement could still be said to exist, though groups continued and a feminist awareness had reached many women through the media.

There was, however, an extraordinary movement of working class women around their livelihood. The massive mobilization around the miners' strike of 1984 – 5 led to the formation of women's groups, which interacted with feminists, including the peace demonstrators. Attempts to keep these going after the strike did not succeed, though a nucleus went on to link to women married to striking print workers and seafarers and, in the 1990s, to Women of the Waterfront during the dockers' strike. These groups, formed in response to economic restructuring in defense of the needs of their families, were initially protesting against capital making their customary role impossible. Though they led to the empowerment and self-development also of individuals,

they were always distinct from “feminism.” Their existence has provoked many questions about how to understand women’s movements.

III. Contemporary Struggles

In the 1980s and 90s in Britain and the U.S., the question of livelihood became more important for the growing numbers of women (including many women of color) below the poverty line. In the U.S., this has resulted in a range of grassroots movements around housing, health, environmental dumping, and low pay which have involved significant numbers of women.³⁴ In Britain, women’s action around survival has been much less documented. Yet, working class women have, for example, formed credit groups, run soup kitchens, sorted out welfare rights problems, protested over solvent abuse and drugs, and participated in tenants’ struggles and campaigns around schooling. This kind of action is likely to be defined as voluntary work. It exists in a space apart from politics and bears no relation to what is popularly accepted as feminism in the media, which now tends to mean women’s career concerns or personal lifestyle.

The contrast is obvious with countries where the possibility of wider social change persisted into the 1990s, such as South Africa or Brazil. Indeed, in several Latin American countries, an interaction between what has variously been called “working class feminism” or “popular feminism,” focusing on empowerment and livelihood, and forms of feminism emphasizing issues of sexual identity and reproductive rights, was to continue, albeit not without conflict.³⁵ This important difference in the history of women’s movements, along with the concentration of resources and communicative power in the U.S., Europe, and other rich countries, contributed to a division between Western and Third World feminism.

But this obscured the fact that there have been differing traditions of feminism in both the North and the South as well as social divisions between differing groups of women historically and in the present. It also eradicated the action of poor women in the rich countries.

When Swasti Mitter and I were gathering contributions for a book on new forms of workplace organizing, which we called *Dignity and Daily Bread*, we consciously sought to overcome this division.³⁶ Over the last decade, I have tried to learn about the movements around livelihood which have been appearing in so many different guises, as

well as trying to follow the fortunes of feminism internationally. The trickle of books has increased now and it is hard to keep up and to span the globe. There is, however, talk of counterhegemonic globalization, and it seems evident that the ingenious forms of resistance and survival devised by millions of poor women in many lands must be recognized as a vital part of any new emancipatory project.

An equally pressing question is how ideas of self-determination and self-fulfillment, featured in differing contexts in the history of feminism, might connect again to global movements against capitalism, reconnecting the self and the social again.

I do not want to suggest that these two aspects of women's emancipatory struggles encompass all forms of women's resistance which in recent times have also involved, for example, mobilizations for peace or against dictatorship. However, by recognizing that women have been moved to act for broadly emancipatory aims from very different starting points historically and in the present, it enables us to look at movements within their own terms rather than imposing a checklist of ideal demands upon them. In order to understand the confusing present we are living within, it is vital that we develop a means of distinguishing differing kinds of rebellion without abstracting them into misleading and abstract models which fail to catch the dynamic processes of how consciousness interacts and develops.

Looking backwards can reveal some unexpected kinds of illumination and, by making us aware of forgotten interconnections, shift the dimensions of how emancipation can be conceived. And for the future, there is a pressing need to comprehend the sources of discontent that will trigger forms of rebellion from which might come a wider sense of new definitions and contexts of human emancipation. ●

Notes

1. Olympe de Gouges, "Declaration of the Rights of Woman," in *Women in Revolutionary Paris, 1789 – 1795*, eds. Darline Gay Levy, Harriet Branson Applewhite, and Mary Durham Johnson (Urbana, Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1979), p. 92. On Olympe de Gouges, see also Joan Wallach Scott, "French Feminists and the Rights of 'Man': Olympe de Gouges' Declaration," *History Workshop*, no. 28 (Autumn 1989); and M.J. Diamond, "Olympe de Gouges and the French Revolution: The Construction of Gender as Critique," in *Women and Revolution: Global Expressions*, ed. M.J. Diamond (Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1998).

2. "The Women of Paris Respond to the Delaying Tactics of the National Convention," in *Women in Revolutionary Paris, 1789–1795*, eds. Darline Gay Levy et. al., p. 132. On the role of women in the crowd, see also Olwen H. Hufton, "Women and Politics," in *Women and*

the Limits of Citizenship in the French Revolution, ed. Olwen H. Hufton (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1992); Louise A. Tilly, "Women and Collective Action in Europe," in *The Role of Women in Conflict and Peace*, ed. Dorothy G. McGuigan (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Center for Continuing Education of Women, 1977); Darline Gay Levy and Harriet B. Applewhite, "Women of the Popular Classes in Revolutionary Paris, 1789–1795," in *Women, War and Revolution*, eds. Carol R. Berkin and Clara M. Lovett (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980); and Jane Rendall, *The Origins of Modern Feminism: Women in Britain, France and the United States, 1780–1860* (London: Macmillan, 1985).

3. Olwen H. Hufton, p. 23.

4. Olympe de Gouges, "Declaration of the Rights of Woman," in Levy et. al., p. 93.

5. James Mill, article on government, quoted in Richard Pankhurst, *William Thompson (1795–1833) Pioneer Socialist* (London: Pluto Press, 1991), p. 57.

6. See Barbara Taylor, *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (London: Virago, 1983).

7. "Call to Women," quoted in Bonnie J. Anderson, *Women's Joyous Greetings: The First International Movement, 1830–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), p. 67.

8. *Ibid.*

9. *Ibid.*

10. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

11. Judith Wellman, "The Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention: A Study of Social Networks," in *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, eds. Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sherron De Hart (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

12. On Ernestine Rose, see Bonnie J. Anderson, pp. 51–66.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 68.

14. On emancipation, see Jacques Ranciere, "L'emancipation et son dilemme," in *Emancipation des Femmes entre Prive et Public Silence*, ed. Michelle Perrot (Paris: Les Cahiers du CEDREF, La Revue des Etudes Feministes a la Universite Paris VII, CEDREF UFR. Sciences Sociales, 1989).

15. On women and personal, social, and political radicalism in France in the 1840s, see Bonnie J. Anderson; Jane Rendall, *The Origins of Modern Feminism*; Claire Goldberg Moses, *French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Albany: State University of New York, 1984); Joan Wallach Scott, "Work Identities for Men and Women: The Politics of Work and the Family in the Parisian Garment Trades in 1848," in *Gender and the Politics of History*, ed. Joan Wallach Scott (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988); and Sheila Rowbotham, "Dear Dr. Marx: A Letter from a Socialist Feminist" in *The Communist Manifesto Now*, *Socialist Register*, eds. Leo Panitch and Colin Leys (Suffolk: Merlin Press, 1998).

16. Jeanne Deroin and Pauline Roland (1851), in *Women the Family and Freedom: The Debate in Documents*, Volume I, 1750–1880, ed. Susan Groag Bell and Karen M. Offen (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1983), p. 289.

17. Anthony Goldsmith, "Introduction to Gustave Flaubert," *Sentimental Education* (London: J. M. Dent, 1941), p. xii.

18. Dorothy Thompson, "Women and Nineteenth-Century Radical Politics: A Lost Dimension," in *Outsiders: Class, Gender and the Nation*, ed. Dorothy Thompson (London: Verso, 1993), p. 77.
19. Karen Offen, "Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach," *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14, no. 11 (1988): 126–127.
20. On these early debates in the U.S., France, and Britain, see Sheila Rowbotham, *Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Action* (New York: Routledge, 1992), pp. 144–53, 59–63, 67–70.
21. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, quoted in Karen Offen, *Signs*, p. 136.
22. See Sheila Rowbotham, *Women in Movement*, pp. 122–150; Richard J. Evans, *Comrades and Sisters: Feminism, Socialism and Pacifism in Europe 1870–1945* (Brighton: Wheatsheaf, 1987); Patricia Hilden, *Working Women and Socialist Politics in France, 1890–1914, A Regional Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986); Karen Hunt, *Equivocal Feminists: The Social Democratic Federation and the Woman Question 1884–1911* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996); and June Hannam, *Isabella Ford* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1989).
23. Karen Offen, *Signs*, pp. 134–157.
24. See Pamela Graves, *Labour Women: Women in British Working-Class Politics, 1918–1939* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); Gillian Scott, *Feminism and the Politics of Working Women: The Women's Co-operative Guild, 1880s to the Second World War* (London: UCL Press, 1998); Gwendolyn Mink, *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality in the Welfare State, 1917–1942* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995); Molly Ladd-Taylor, *Mother-Work: Women, Child Welfare and the State, 1890–1930* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1994); Joanne L. Goodwin, *Gender and the Politics of Welfare Reform: Mothers' Pensions in Chicago, 1911–1929* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1997); and in relation to African American women, Anne Meis Knupfer, *Toward a Tenderer Humanity and a Nobler Womanhood: African American Women's Clubs in Turn-of-the-Century Chicago* (New York: New York University Press, 1996).
25. See Blanche Wiesen Cook, ed., *Crystal Eastman on Women and Revolution* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978); Dora Russell, *The Tamarisk Tree: My Quest for Liberty and Love* (London: Elex Pemberton, 1975); and Sheila Rowbotham, *A New World for Women: Stella Browne Socialist Feminist* (London: Pluto Press, 1977).
26. See, for example, Cheryl Johnson-Odim and Margaret Strobel, eds., *Expanding the Boundaries of Women's History: Essays on Women in the Third World* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992); and John D. French and Daniel James, *The Gendered Worlds of Latin American Women Workers: From Household and Factory to the Union Hall and Ballot Box* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1997).
27. Radha Kumar, *The History of Doing: An Illustrated Account of Movements for Women's Rights and Feminism in India, 1800–1990* (New Delhi: Kali, and London: Verso, 1993), p. 66. On Indian nationalism, see also Kumkum Sangari and Sudesh Vaid, eds., *Recasting Women: Essays in Indian Colonial History* (New Delhi: Kali, 1989, and New Brunswick, N.Y., 1990); and Mrinalini Sinha, "Locating the Indian Woman," in *Feminism and History*, ed. Joan Wallach Scott (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
28. Urmila Debi, quoted in Radha Kumar, p. 66.
29. See Kumari Jayawardena, *Feminism and Nationalism in the Third World* (London: Zed Books, 1986); Kumari Jayawardena, *The White Woman's Other Burden: Western Women in*

South Asia during British Colonial Rule (New York: Routledge, 1995); Deniz Kandiyoti, ed., *Women, Islam and the State* (London: Macmillan, 1991); Margaret Ward, *Unmanageable Revolutionaries: Women and Irish Nationalism* (London: Pluto Press, 1982); and Margaret Ward, *Hanna Sheehy Skeffington: A Life* (Cork: Attic Press, 1997).

30. See Rosalyn Baxandall and Linda Gordon, *Dear Sisters: Despatches from the Women's Liberation Movement* (New York: Basic Books, 2000).

31. See Sheila Rowbotham, *The Past is Before Us: Feminism in Action Since the 1960s* (London: Pandora, 1989).

32. See Sheila Rowbotham, *A Century of Women: The History of Women in Britain and the United States* (London: Penguin, 1997), pp. 398–433.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 470–505; and Maureen Mackintosh and Hilary Wainwright, eds., *A Taste of Power: The Politics of Local Economics* (London: Verso, 1987).

34. See Sheila Rowbotham, *A Century of Women*, pp. 483–485, 539, 577–581; Temma Kaplan, *Crazy for Democracy: Women in Grassroots Movements* (London: Routledge, 1997), pp. 15–124; Nancy A. Naples, *Grassroots Warriors: Activist Mothering, Community Work, and the War on Poverty* (New York: Routledge, 1998); and Nancy A. Naples, ed., *Community Activism and Feminist Politics: Organizing Across Race, Class and Gender* (New York: Routledge, 1998). On the uneasy relation of African American women to feminism, see also Shirley A. Jackson, "'Something About the Word': African American Women and Feminism," in *No Middle Ground: Women and Radical Protest*, ed. Kathleen M. Blee (New York: New York University Press, 1998). On workplace and community struggles which have included low paid women workers, see Andrew Ross, ed., *No Sweat: Fashion, Free Trade and the Rights of Garment Workers* (New York: Verso, 1997); and Ruth Milkman, ed., *Organizing Immigrants: The Challenge of Unions in Contemporary California* (Ithaca: ILR Press, Cornell University Press, 2000).

35. See Amrita Basu, *The Challenge of Local Feminism: Women's Movements in Global Perspective* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press). On South Africa and Latin America, see Temma Kaplan, pp. 125–178; Lynn Stephen, *Women and Social Movements in Latin America: Power from Below* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1997); Elizabeth Jelin, ed., *Women and Social Change in Latin America* (London: Zed, 1990); Sonia E. Alvarez, Evelina Dagnino, and Arturo Escobar, eds., *Cultures of Politics, Politics of Cultures: Re-visioning Latin American Social Movements* (Boulder, Col.: Westview Press, HarperCollins, 1998).

36. Sheila Rowbotham and Swasti Mitter, *Dignity and Daily Bread: New Forms of Economic Organising among Poor Women in the Third World and the First* (London: Routledge, 1994).