

On the Socialist Construction and International Career  
of the Concept "Bourgeois Feminism"<sup>1</sup>

Introduction

"Not much has changed since 1907," writes Kristen Ghodsee in a 2004 essay on feminism in post-communist Eastern Europe. She then quotes Clara Zetkin's famous speech at the Stuttgart conference of the Second International: "There cannot be a unified struggle for the entire [female] sex....No, it must be a class struggle of all the exploited without differences of sex against all exploiters no matter what sex they belong to." According to Ghodsee, Eastern European women today fear that, like the "bourgeois feminism" of pre-1989 ideology, the new "cultural feminism" that has accompanied international aid in the post-socialist era will operate "in the interests of transnational capital....Western feminists must ask if gender on its own really matters as a discrete category of analysis in postsocialist Eastern Europe."<sup>2</sup>

Criticism of feminism today draws energy from many sources. Defined as "bourgeois" by socialists prior to World War I (as Françoise Picq long ago pointed out), and denied for decades in communist countries on that ground, it now also elicits disdain for its association with the former regimes.<sup>3</sup> It was recognizing that feminism as a political movement advocating equal rights and justice for women is dismissed by the right as a socialist or communist idea after a century of rejection by the left as "bourgeois" that led me to undertake this study.

To raise this question now is to challenge trends in women's history as well as historiography more generally. In recent years interest in political subjects, along with the topic of class, has diminished in favor of biography, representation, and culture.<sup>4</sup> A recent article describes socialism and feminism as "outmoded movements," part of an "unrealizable radical democracy" superceded by a "turn to ethics."<sup>5</sup> While a recent collection of essays on the "socialist feminist project" opens with the assertion that socialist feminism is "alive and well today" and not merely "an artifact of the 1970s," it defines the topic so broadly as to include virtually every

cause associated with leftist politics.<sup>6</sup> Since about 1990, identity politics has eclipsed class as a central focus of feminist theory and women's history.

Why then review the historiography of the socialist-feminist relationship? For several reasons: to reconsider what may be misleading or incorrect interpretations of an "unhappy marriage"<sup>7</sup> that have infused histories of women, feminism, and socialism, as well as other disciplines; to highlight the widespread and long-lasting effects on feminism of an under-analyzed concept that uses the word "bourgeois," a term with multiple, diffuse meanings that has come to serve as a kind of all-purpose pejorative; to ask what role second wave feminist and leftist politics and historians of women played in sustaining this concept; to consider how a comparative analysis that draws on recent work by historians of Scandinavia, Eastern Europe, China, and elsewhere affects earlier interpretations; and to offer suggestions for research that might provoke a new engagement between feminist and socialist history.

#### Origins of the Concept "Bourgeois Feminism"

Both Marx and Engels portrayed the working-class woman as a victim of (industrial) capitalism, Marx offering a detailed portrait of the death of a twenty-year-old milliner from overwork, and Engels reporting his observation in England that "most of the prostitutes of the town had their employment in the mills to thank for their present situation." However, although Engels famously declared that "within the family, he is the bourgeois and the wife represents the proletariat," neither man showed sympathy for organized feminism. Marx declared that "German [feminists] should have begun by driving their men to self-emancipation." Engels wrote to an American correspondent in 1891 that, thanks to efforts to organize socialist women, "the antiquated semi-bourgeois women's rights asses will soon be ordered to the rear."<sup>8</sup>

The most widely-read of the male socialists on the woman question, however, was the German leader August Bebel. In the introduction to his classic work, Woman Under Socialism (1883), Bebel noted that "the hostile [feindliche] sisters have...a number of points of contact, on which they can, although marching separately, strike jointly [with socialists]."<sup>9</sup> While the extent

of Bebel's support for non-socialist women's movements is disputed, early in his career he assisted Louise Otto-Peters in organizing a women's emancipation movement, and he also stated that "working-class women have more in common with bourgeois women or aristocratic women than do working-class men with men of other social classes."<sup>10</sup>

Other socialist leaders also acknowledged the injustice of women's condition and some collaborated with non-socialist women. But during the early organizational efforts of European socialist parties, theory gave way to practical politics where the advancement of women's rights might be what one French socialist called "an encumbering thing" in the search for working-class men's support.<sup>11</sup> Beginning in 1889, socialist women, led by Clara Zetkin, provided their colleagues with a strong rationale for ignoring feminist claims. One great obstacle to cooperation across class lines on feminist issues was the "theory of bourgeois feminism" developed by Marxist-socialist women. Zetkin articulated what would become the Marxist-socialist position on women's rights movements. "Women workers who aspire to social equality do not expect emancipation through the bourgeois women's movement, which claims to be fighting for women's rights," she argued. "This structure is built upon sand and has no basis in reality....The emancipation of women...will take place only with the emancipation of labor from capital."<sup>12</sup>

While this view did not necessarily preclude cross-class collaboration on specific issues, Zetkin further prescribed a clean break between the proletarian movement and other political movements. Despite supporting some feminist goals, she expressed "extreme animosity" to the idea of sisterhood, using derisory language such as "women's libbers' stupid dreams about harmony" to describe feminist politics, calling feminists "muddle-headed, wishy-washy, weak" as well as "naïve, deranged and hysterical"; and she set in motion a world-wide movement to pillory non-socialist women's rights efforts. Her biweekly journal, as Jean Quataert has put it, "untiringly differentiated between socialist and bourgeois women, socialist and bourgeois tactics." Her rejection of "bourgeois feminism" was "ostentatious," said French socialist and feminist activist

Madeleine Pelletier. Historians have termed it "savage" and "vicious." It was also enormously effective.<sup>13</sup>

Who were these people who posed such an alleged danger to working women? Marriage and property laws assured that bourgeoises rarely enjoyed the privileges and power of the capitalist bourgeois. They might even reject the values of the marketplace.<sup>14</sup> Many worked for wages. As teachers, postal or sales clerks, and low-level administrators, they in no way fit the image of the workers idealized by the socialists of laborers in "the great virile trades...heroes who brought about the second industrial revolution," as Michelle Perrot puts it.<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, they were assumed to be, in Rosa Luxemburg's inimitable phrase, "the parasites of the parasites of the social body."<sup>16</sup>

Today it is easy to see that Zetkin's position rested less on any clear socioeconomic distinction among women than on ideology, and perhaps on political strategies and personal rivalries as well.<sup>17</sup> It ignores the extent to which many members of the reviled class stood closer in social background and political outlook to the socialists than to the "parasites. But Zetkin refused all invitations to collaborate; in one notable incident in 1895, she even engaged in a published dispute with her socialist colleagues after declining to serve on a proposed cross-class commission--a "mishmash commission" she said--to study working conditions for women factory workers, a project they thought she should support.<sup>18</sup>

In her efforts to avoid collaboration, Zetkin moved away from Bebel and his criticism of the limits imposed on women by motherhood and domesticity.<sup>19</sup> As the primary voice on women's issues of German Social Democracy (the SPD), Europe's largest and most important socialist party, founder and leader of the socialist women's international, and founder and longtime editor (1891 to 1917) of the socialist women's journal, Equality, Zetkin had broad and profound influence. Like Zetkin, working-class leaders everywhere were "haunted," in Quataert's term, by concern lest "their" women "be intimidated by their bourgeois sisters to pursue purely feminist goals"; and they strove incessantly to repudiate those who sought to breach the class

divide.<sup>20</sup> Zetkin's ideas recur in the works of well-known socialist women in several other countries, notably Eleanor Marx in England, Alexandra Kollontai in Russia, and Louise Saumoneau in France--the latter two of whom became Zetkin's devoted younger followers, and each of whom exerted significant influence in her own country. All agreed on the importance, in Marx's words, of "organis[ing] not as 'women' but as proletarians; not as female rivals of our working men but as their comrades in struggle."<sup>21</sup>

Kollontai's major contribution to the theory of "bourgeois feminism," a lengthy "antifeminist polemic," was written expressly to undermine potential class collaboration. Under her influence, socialist women attacked women suffragists aggressively, appearing at "classless feminist" meetings to harass speakers and disrupt proceedings. Although her personal history served to contradict her words, Kollontai wrote, "Between the emancipated woman of the intelligentsia and the toiling woman with calloused hands, there was such an unbridgeable gulf, that there could be no question of any sort of point of agreement between them." One biographer describes Kollontai as the "scourge of the bourgeois feminists."<sup>22</sup>

In France, the first published call to establish a separate female constituency for Marxist socialism, which appeared in 1899, initially expressed ambivalence toward feminism. The convenors, who termed themselves "socialist feminists," acknowledged the "legitimacy of [feminist] claims, regarding them as reforms whose realization would improve the situation of women," declaring, "we will defend them as such."<sup>23</sup> This call to meeting reappeared without change for at least five years, but its authors, who included Saumoneau, soon dropped the f-word and increasingly emulated Zetkin's strident opposition to "bourgeois feminism." Aiming "to tear socialist and proletarian women away from feminist confusionism," Saumoneau "adhered to the letter" of the caution against cross-class cooperation.<sup>24</sup> Charles Sowerwine states that "Saumoneau not only broke with the feminist movement, but also prevented the socialist women's movement from putting any emphasis on the struggle for equality between the sexes and even from taking into account the problems of women in recruiting them to the party. Women would

come into the socialist party as citizens, like the men, or they would not come at all."<sup>25</sup> In France after the war, "socialist women simply continued to repeat Saumoneau's argument," says Paul Smith. "Saumonisme" prevailed, says Christine Bard. In 1936, with a socialist government in power, socialist women opted not to press for the right to vote. Even after she left her post as secretary of the French committee of socialist women, Saumoneau "continued as a destructive power behind the scenes," says Helmut Gruber.<sup>26</sup>

A fourth socialist woman of this era who voiced similar suspicion of non-socialist feminists in equally strong language was the Dutch leader, Henrietta Roland-Holst-Van der Schalk. In 1898, when Dutch feminists organized a national exhibition on women's work, Roland-Holst urged working-class women to boycott it, publishing a pamphlet in protest.<sup>27</sup> In hostile language that vied with Zetkin's invective, Roland-Holst called the exhibition leaders "hypocritical, fork-tongued, cowardly...middle-class feminists"; she expressed "great anger, the speaker stamping her feet and her eyes 'ablaze with hatred and scorn,' while she shouted insults at the president herself."<sup>28</sup>

How much influence these women leaders had outside leadership circles and beyond major cities is uncertain.<sup>29</sup> But numerous other socialist parties adopted the Second International's and SPD's party line. Other leaders, often despite personal ambivalence, divorced themselves from non-socialist feminist groups, although few expressed their opposition in such vituperative language as Zetkin, Kollontai, Saumoneau, and Roland-Holst. In fact, many socialist women distinguished between formal, organizational collaboration and cooperation among individuals and worked across class lines.<sup>30</sup> The "clean break" policy advocated by Zetkin, however, forced many left-leaning women to choose. A Dutch internationalist lamented in 1911 that "The SD [Social Democratic] women refuse to take a leaflet from the hands of a woman with the badge of the suffragists, although it is an appeal written by Bebel himself."<sup>31</sup> The socialists' ardent castigation of "bourgeois feminism" persisted through the interwar period, despite male socialists participation in so-called bourgeois governments during the Popular Front of the 1930s. It was

exacerbated by debates over protective legislation, and appeared as far away from its source as China in the 1920s and Viet Nam in the 1930s. It was, of course, affected also by the rise of the welfare state, with support from non-socialist and socialist advocates for women; and by varying communist policies and political strategies. "Feminism," however, had come to signify "bourgeois feminism," as it does in some circles to the current day.

#### Revival in the 1960s

After World War II, the socialist women's construction of "bourgeois feminism" was obscured by overwhelming concern for human rights, until it became visible again in the era of second wave feminism.<sup>32</sup> Enough interest in socialism's position on the "woman question" had survived on the left, however, to justify the publication in 1951 of a short collection of excerpts from writings by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, under the title, The Woman Question. It offered as an appendix a selection by Zetkin from her famous 1920 interview with Lenin, including Lenin's counsel to "draw a clear and ineradicable line of distinction between our policy and feminism." Reprinted in 1970, this publication appeared that year on the reading list of the first course in women's history taught in the first women's studies program in the United States.<sup>33</sup>

By the time that feminism reappeared as an active movement, many of its demands had been achieved in the countries where first wave feminists had been most active. Believing, mistakenly, that their predecessors had limited their quest to the vote, or to what they dismissively called "equal rights," some of the new feminists distinguished between what they called "equal rights feminism" and "women's liberation." Their new demands included elimination of many restrictions on women's lives they associated with "bourgeois" society, including "bourgeois morality" and sexual repression. Given the experience of many of the new leaders in the New Left and related movements of the 1960s, it is no surprise that dichotomous thinking about the relationship between feminism and socialism re-emerged, along with criticism of the "bourgeois character" of the woman suffrage movement.<sup>34</sup>

Class issues infused the politics of women's liberation from its beginnings. In England, where the new feminism was closely related to the labor movement, two of the earliest and most influential activist-scholars, Juliet Mitchell and Sheila Rowbotham, both emerged from leftist groups. The new women's movement on the left is sometimes dated from the appearance in 1966 of Mitchell's article, "The Longest Revolution," in the New Left Review. What held women back, in Mitchell's analysis, was the "traditional," that is to say, the "bourgeois" family. But Mitchell also cautioned against too early a class division among the new feminists. "Perhaps in the future, the biggest single theoretical battle will have to be that between liberationists with a socialist analysis, and feminists with a 'radical feminist' analysis. But that future has come too soon. The conflict is premature because neither group has yet developed a 'theory.' The practice which is that theory's condition of production has only just begun." Mitchell avoided using the term "bourgeois feminism."<sup>35</sup>

Sheila Rowbotham, a "worker student" whose pioneering 1972 book, Women, Resistance, and Revolution, linked women to the cause of socialist revolution, employed the term "bourgeois feminist" only in the penultimate sentence of her introductory chapter. But she intends it in no derogatory sense, simply as an attribute of women who early challenged the status quo in women's roles. She also offers a revisionist reading of socialist policy.

Many women in women's liberation are not revolutionaries, But the demands they make for their own improvement require such a fundamental change in society that they are completely inconceivable without revolution..... [T]hese changes will not follow a socialist revolution automatically but will have to be made explicit in a distinct movement now, as a precondition of revolution, not as its aftermath.

Rowbotham concluded with the admission that "the connection between the oppression of women and the central discovery of Marxism, the class exploitation of the worker in capitalism, is still forced. It is still coming out of the heads of women like me as an idea."<sup>36</sup>

Writing retrospectively, Rowbotham noted the extent to which the leftist movements of the earlier era had caricatured feminists and made feminism into a "dreaded bogey." These "over-simplified caricatures of 'bourgeois feminism' which concertina-ed several kinds of feminism into one grotesque creature...have been taken too much at face value by socialist women writing history." She herself had failed, she said, to problematize the relationship between socialism and feminism sufficiently, or to challenge an "uncritical acceptance of a simple polarity between socialism and feminism." "It was not," she wrote in a subsequent book, "a simple question of reactionary middle-class feminists versus enlightened working-class socialists."<sup>37</sup>

Both Mitchell and Rowbotham had studied with E. P. Thompson, the famous British activist-scholar who helped to bring about new perspectives on working-class and socialist history; but who also, by neglecting women in his classic work, The Making of the English Working Class (1963), sensitized female "worker students" and activist-scholars to the "cult of masculinity" fostered by British authors greatly admired by the left and their activist followers. In a perceptive account of Thompson's influence and the difficulties arising from it, What's Left?, Julia Swindells and Lisa Jardine state the problem: "What is admissible within the Thompson enterprise of retrieving working-class consciousness as a 'suitable' topic for historians is going to be a problem for subsequent radical history, particularly when social history belatedly remembers the women. The 'value' of working-class men's experience is authorized by culture, and in that account the women provide the 'virtue' via the family. But in that case, the women will always appear in the account as bourgeois."<sup>38</sup> As Swindells and Jardine point out, "as soon as gender becomes an issue, the bond with socialism's language of class is inevitably broken." For her role in this development, Mitchell was forced off the New Left Review editorial board.<sup>39</sup>

Similar conflicts arose in radical movements in North America, France, Germany and elsewhere. As the personal thus became political in the politics of 1960s radical movements, some women found themselves shoved aside and belittled, "treated as bourgeois feminists, irrespective of the political position taken," Dorothy E. Smith, a Canadian Marxist feminist

activist-scholar, recalls. "If you are working-class, they'll humiliate you with your sex and class ignorances, if you're middle-class, they'll call you a petty bourgeois deviationist," complained Rowbotham. This rejection of leftist women's perspectives contributed substantially to shaping the new women's movement.<sup>40</sup>

Two developments of the 1970s brought increased prominence to the assumption of a deep class division among activist women, in which use of the word "bourgeois" to describe feminists continued. One was a self-identified socialist feminist movement whose adherents began a search for new theory to fill gaps and remedy flaws in the work inherited from nineteenth-century socialists. The second movement, also heavily influenced by nineteenth-century socialist thought, was the academic field of women's studies. The terminology and the legacy of disdain for "bourgeois feminism" appears often in the literature of both movements.

Socialist feminists drew on Engels to legitimize women's claims; some cited Mitchell; all assumed a socialist revolution essential to women's liberation.<sup>41</sup> While attacking anti-feminism, Marxist feminists also inveighed against "bourgeois feminism. "Today we polemicize with 'bourgeois' and 'petty-bourgeois' feminists," said Mary-Alice Waters in 1972. "Many of us are dissatisfied with a strict bourgeois feminism," wrote Marnie Guettel in 1974." "Bourgeois and proletarian women confront each other in the labor market, and bourgeois women are one of the instruments used to undercut the wages of proletarian women," wrote Marlene Dixon in 1977.<sup>42</sup> Like their predecessors in the Second International, these women assured their male colleagues of their commitment to socialist revolution and of their rejection of non-socialist women's movements.

Seeking to apply Marxist concepts such as surplus value and proletarianization to women workers, some feminist theorists challenged the term "petty bourgeois," especially as applied to women.<sup>43</sup> Aiming to recuperate Marxism for feminism, Lise Vogel noted that Zetkin, in a 1896 speech, did not propose a simple dichotomy but divided women into several groups, separating out the "ruling class women of the Upper Ten Thousand" from the lower and middle bourgeoisie

who constituted the core of the bourgeois women's movement, and whose demands she considered "entirely justified." Zetkin's later intransigent opposition to all non-socialist women, Vogel argues, reflected her opposition to the growth of reformism within the socialist movement as well as her pragmatic politics. ("Most revisionists and at least some reformists in the SPD were, in fact, closely allied to bourgeois feminism," states Richard Evans.)<sup>44</sup>

If rarely in this literature does one find feminists termed "liberal" or "bourgeois" attacked in language as angry as that of Zetkin, Kollontai, Roland-Holst, and Saumoneau, perhaps it was because, as the Marxist-Leninist Dixon charged, "Socialist feminism was just bourgeois feminism under a different name; grounded in an "ideology of sisterhood" and belief that "men are the enemy." In her unreconstructed voice, socialist feminism represented another form of "petty bourgeois class collaboration."<sup>45</sup>

#### New Life in the Academy

While activist writers and scholars sought to develop an inclusive theory for socialist feminism, feminist practice gradually disappeared from the streets and reappeared in the halls of academe, in women's studies. From the beginning, the influence of socialist thought was strong. At San Diego State, where the first integrated program in women's studies was launched in 1970, the first chair encouraged to take the job was Marlene Dixon, who didn't want it herself but personally solicited the socialist feminist who did take it.<sup>46</sup> The initial curriculum included a course entitled, "Status of Women under Various Economic Systems" that highlighted communist societies. But after "three years of struggle," working "inside the beast" (their term for the university), the early San Diego State women's studies faculty asked themselves if it was "a waste of our time...to be teaching and working with petty bourgeois students." The following year they decided it was, and, embattled with the administration over governance issues, they resigned en masse.<sup>47</sup>

Early women's studies programs drew heavily on the literature that informed the radical movements of the 1960s and early 1970s. Whatever the course discipline, reading lists included

works where students encountered discussion of socialism's relationship to feminism. Beauvoir, Engels, and Millett appear repeatedly; likewise essays by Margaret Benston, Marlene Dixon, Roxanne Dunbar, and similar statements on socialist revolution and women's liberation. The first women's studies textbooks, which generally included some effort to explain the origins of women's "oppression" and the solutions envisioned by several varieties of feminism, tended to define women's movements using an over-simplified set of borrowed terms. As Michèle Barrett and Anne Phillips write, "1970s feminism assumed one could specify a cause of women's oppression...[one which] lay at the level of social structure....In the taxonomies so beloved of the period--as of many commentators subsequently--feminisms were divided into their liberal, socialist, and radical varieties." The notion of "bourgeois feminism" (also termed "liberal feminism") found a place alongside socialist feminism and radical feminism as one of the "Big Three" frequently cited by historians and feminist theorists. But, as feminist theorist Donna Haraway once remarked, "Any...taxonomy is a re-inscription of history."<sup>48</sup>

Not only did this practice confuse class origins and class outlook and tend to ignore the complicated question of how to fit women into a taxonomy based on men's occupations, it defied the reality that feminism's constituency cut across alleged class borders. It obscured the fact that feminism also transcended racial lines. Even though, as Zillah Eisenstein points out, "The 'bourgeois' woman has not really been identified yet in terms of a class analysis specifically pertaining to women," she was readily targeted for dismissal. In 1974, when the Combahee River Collective, identifying its politics as socialist, published the first book on "black women's studies," it rejected support for a leading black feminist group, the National Black Feminist Organization (NBFO), for its "bourgeois-feminist stance."<sup>49</sup>

#### Recovery by Historians

While feminist activists and theorists struggled with issues related to women's economic class, historians set out to recover the heritage of socialist women and feminist socialists. As a research topic, the relationship of feminism and socialism offered several attractions. Newly

legitimized as a research topic, it provided entrée to the popular subfield dubbed the "new social history." It offered attractively untrodden ground, including virtually untouched archival materials. The historiography of this period also reflects the personal and political backgrounds of the historians and their desire to find an intrinsic linkage between socialism and feminism, perhaps in the bargain contributing to the wider movement for social change. History, at least, on the left, seemed to allow for "making a statement." Perhaps it also offered what Virginia Woolf described as "the glamour of the working class and the emotional relief afforded by adopting its cause."<sup>50</sup> No one snickered at the idea of working-class history, which was popular on the left, and, of course, no one wanted to be "bourgeois." Like the feminists of the earlier age who applauded the socialists for their stance on women's rights, we also appreciated the recognition they had afforded women's causes--"the first in all countries," as Mme. Avril de Sainte-Croix declared in 1907.<sup>51</sup>

Starting out in the history of socialism at that time, however, one could read basic texts without encountering a single reference to women.<sup>52</sup> Its focus was on ideology and organizations, political parties and trade associations; its rhetoric was dominated by the language of class; and the working class was embodied in the male artisan, factory hand, or miner. Labor history told of men and organizations; to borrow and broaden the context of Beatrix Campbell's formulation, "The socialist movement ...[was] swept off its feet by the magic of masculinity, muscle and machinery," and its history failed to challenge this trend.<sup>53</sup>

Despite New Left influences, and the attractiveness to many younger scholars of the "engaged intellectual" model, the general challenge to consensus history did not initially extend to women's interests.<sup>54</sup> French labor historian Michelle Perrot, who became one of the founders of French women's history, tells a revealing story of resistance by Trotskyist, Maoist and other radical students when, in 1973, sociologist Andrée Michel introduced analysis of the family into the first women's history course in France. The sociologist "was reproached....They did not want to hear about family models; the family was bourgeois."<sup>55</sup> But the historiography also reflects the

long dominance in the academy of structuralism. In this heyday of the "longue durée," not only was biography all but banished from the historical profession, it was doubly suspect on grounds of elitism (in women's history, the term "women worthies" took on a pejorative cast).<sup>56</sup>

While Rowbotham introduced her readers to Anna Wheeler, Flora Tristan, Eleanor Marx, Alexandra Kollontai, Angelica Balabanoff, Emma Goldman and many other socialist women,<sup>57</sup> in the new histories of socialism and feminism Clara Zetkin and her German party gained early prominence. Werner Thönnessen, tracing the theory and practice of the SPD in its stance toward women, charged "the [bourgeois] women's movement...[with its] problem-ridden aim of legal equality" with responsibility for society's ability to "liquidate the proletarian women's movement."<sup>58</sup> Quoting Zetkin's view of sisterhood as "sentimental simpering about harmony," Amy Hackett wrote, "The deepest split in German feminism was between Social Democratic and bourgeois women."<sup>59</sup>

Although France had a much lower profile in the story, as the nation whose history had long attracted more Anglophone historians than any other non-English-speaking country, it gained considerable notice. Russia's revolutionary history and the prominence of its radical women also drew attention to links between socialism and feminism. In addition to several unpublished dissertations completed in 1975 and 1976, between 1976 and 1979 at least seven monographs and collections of essays appeared in English, all of which focused on socialist women and highlighted the division between "bourgeois feminism" and socialist feminism.<sup>60</sup> Generalizations based on three three national histories, featuring Zetkin, Saumoneau and Kollontai--all of whom violently opposed the possibility of a unified feminism-- soon found their way into history courses and classroom materials, and greatly affected interpretations and evaluations of women's movements in women's history and women's studies classes.

Important works of this period include Berenice Carroll's 1976 anthology, offering chapters on Engels (and Marx) and on the "bourgeois" women's movement in Germany.<sup>61</sup> The same year The Socialist Register published an aptly titled article, "Marxist Women versus

Bourgeois Feminism," that included in translation important primary sources by Bebel (including his reference to "the hostile sisters") and Zetkin as well as Rosa Luxemburg, and also brought Eleanor Marx into the "war" fought by German Marxist women "to counteract the influence of bourgeois feminism."<sup>62</sup> That year also, Evans published the first of a series of works through which he helped establish Germany as the paradigmatic case of socialist relations with feminism. Taking as a starting date 1894, the year that marked the formation of a national federation of German women's organizations and their (contested) vote not to include socialist women's groups, Evans called attention to the class antagonism that prevailed, despite what he calls their "wide agreement of aims."<sup>63</sup>

Studying the socialist-feminist connection in France, Sowerwine in 1978 also pointed to signal events in the formative years. In 1880, at the founding meeting of the French workers' party, a struggle for dominance among socialist factions erupted, in which the feminist leader Hubertine Auclert (who the previous year had led efforts to ally with the socialists and influenced them to adopt a far-reaching statement in favor of women's social and political equality), chose to support a Proudhonist-influenced, mutualist group over their Marxist-oriented, collectivist, and theoretically more feminist, rivals. Sowerwine attributes Auclert's choice to the power of private property over feminist claims in her personal scale of values (and generalizes from it to "bourgeois feminists"). Other readings of the event suggest alternative explanations, however, including personal rivalries and loyalties along with the differing definitions of socialism and feminism that divided factional leaders and their followers. Auclert's biographer points out that even before the contentious meeting, the collectivist group had already rejected allying with the feminists.<sup>64</sup>

A second allegedly determining event in relations between socialist and feminist women occurred during the International Congress on the Condition and Rights of Women in Paris in 1900. In a debate over the scope of proposed labor legislation, a dispute arose over whether to include domestic servants. The argument itself, while brief, led to an extended, bitter, and highly

personalized argument between the founders of the newly-formed "socialist feminist" group and a non-socialist feminist leader of the conference, and it supposedly soured relations between the groups permanently. But a re-reading of the conference minutes raises the question of whether this confrontation outweighs the proposals--termed "minor" by Sowerwine--by the "bourgeois" journalist and conference convenor Marguerite Durand that called for minimum piecework rates, female labor inspectors, extension of labor legislation to domestic workers and commercial employees (categories that included the vast majority of women workers). Such interpretations assume that "bourgeois feminists" represented only their class interests. This history could also be written, perhaps more accurately, to stress the efforts of "bourgeois" women to improve conditions for working-class women.<sup>65</sup>

"Bourgeois" women, for example, were not always as dismissive of domestic servants as this incident suggests. Just two years earlier, at the week-long exposition on women's work organized by Dutch "bourgeois" women at The Hague, servants were offered free entrance and included as speakers in an extensive, embedded conference on domestic service. Lily Braun, cast out of German Social Democracy as too bourgeois, suggested organizing a domestic servants union, and called on servants "to strike against the semi-feudal relationship under which they work." In 1899, when she formally proposed including female servants in the labor legislation then under consideration at the Reichstag, "her party comrades discouraged her, arguing that maids were not genuine proletarians." Braun's efforts on behalf of household workers even elicited the charge that she was "deflecting the working class from its struggle for power."<sup>66</sup> In Russia, following the Revolution of 1905, so-called equal rights feminists organized a union for domestic workers; they also encouraged peasant women to claim access to land and voting rights, and drew many working women into their suffrage efforts.<sup>67</sup>

These complexities notwithstanding, in 1978 when Jean Quataert and I published a collection of essays about socialist women in five European countries, we also contributed to the revival of categorical thinking about feminism. In our introduction, we defined the terms

"socialist feminism" and "bourgeois feminism" primarily in terms of ideological heritages. Our rhetoric, including a statement that the collection "deals with working-class women and their feminist struggles" was misleading. Although we described many of the socialists as artisans or employees of small shops, even as intellectuals, rather than as prototypical proletarian factory workers, and we noted that the feminists called bourgeois included teachers and white-collar workers as well as leisured women, we did not delve further into class identity. Nor did we criticize the solidly "bourgeois" (if not upper class) origins of most of the socialist leaders. We tended to categorize our subjects just as the socialists of that era had done.<sup>68</sup>

The unexamined definition of "bourgeois feminism" and the alleged gulf that lay between its adherents and the socialists found their way into women's history also through textbooks. The first, and for a decade the only, text designed specifically for survey courses in European women's history, Becoming Visible, offered chapters on modern France, England, Russia, Germany, and Spain, all with a leftist slant; and in its second and third editions (1987, 1998) included a chapter by Sowerwine on socialism and feminism. While admirably summarizing the origins and significance of the socialist response to the socioeconomic changes wrought in working-class women's lives, it also exaggerates the depth of the division between women's groups, as well as the success of socialist parties in attracting women workers.<sup>69</sup>

Hindsight and more recent work in women's history and feminist theory suggest limitations linked to sources, to conceptual and theoretical frameworks, and to political bias in much of this work. What, for instance, if the non-socialists had been described by historians not as "bourgeois" but only as "equal rights feminists" or "suffrage feminists," or, as Carolyn Eichner and Florence Rochefort have done recently, as "republican feminists"? What if instead of emphasizing organizational structures and leaders, the focus had been women's political consciousness? Or women's efforts to revise socialist agendas toward a more woman-oriented politics? But for socialists and some historians of the 1960s and 1970s, to quote Rochefort, "the

[feminist] movement was just as pejoratively 'bourgeois' as it had been for their predecessors near the end of the nineteenth century."<sup>70</sup>

The emphasis on socialist women and their opposition to "bourgeois feminism" served a political purpose for the generation of activist-scholars who began professional careers in the early 1970s. Claire Moses observes that these "constructions" of women's history allowed the new feminists "to stake out a position more radical than that of [their] grandmothers...[and their] mothers." "We therefore reclaimed the Socialist women for feminism, denying their self-naming," she adds.<sup>71</sup> "The dichotomies...Women and Labour, Sex and Class, Feminism and Socialism have been the intimate inhabitants of both my psyche and my intellectual work (if the two can be separated)," Sally Alexander recalls.<sup>72</sup>

By the mid-1980s, following Joan Scott's influential challenge to apply gender analysis to historical studies, the flowering of cultural studies, and the introduction of the "new biography," new perspectives on individual identity and class consciousness began to dissolve the old dichotomies. Where the 1982 English edition of Sowerwine's book bore the title Sisters or Citizens, with its divisive conjunction, Evans' 1987 study of feminism, socialism, and pacifism in Europe features an inclusive conjunction in its title, Comrades and Sisters. In this work, Evans notes that the doctrine of a sharp separation between working women and "bourgeois feminists" promulgated by Zetkin, Saumoneau, and Kollontai was "by no means an inevitable extrapolation of the fundamentals of Marxism."<sup>73</sup> Evans' point reappears with emphasis in a recent work on Bebel. Examining Zetkin's ascendancy over Bebel in shaping Marxist thought on collaboration with non-socialist women, Anne Lopes and Gary Roth note, "Until Zetkin, no one had implied [that to 'cross class'] was unmarxist. The marxian legacy, as it has come to be known in the subsequent historiography, is largely a fiction created by Zetkin herself...The social democratic outlook already included the gamut of bourgeois feminist interests and mostly did so with greater consistency and fervor."<sup>74</sup>

There was a long history of efforts to link the two causes. In the pre-Marxist era in France, the definition of the "feminine" that shaped romantic socialist conceptions encompassed all women. From the St. Simoniennes of the 1830s, through the revolutionaries of 1848 and the Communardes of 1871, "proletarian" women collaborated with "bourgeois" women. Many women identified as bourgeois feminists considered themselves socialist and participated in socialist organizations.<sup>75</sup> Some women from working-class backgrounds joined the "bourgeois" ranks.<sup>76</sup> Common goals, such as winning the vote, opposing militarism, or resolving the "motherhood dilemma," sometimes elicited collaboration, sometimes "parallel, but separate wars."<sup>77</sup> The alleged "litmus test" of class loyalty, protective legislation, on close examination turns out to be anything but.<sup>78</sup>

Constant warnings to working women and socialists of the "danger" posed by "bourgeois feminism" notwithstanding, the separation was never as sharp as the socialist leaders desired, or as many of us historians of the 1970s suggested.<sup>79</sup> When historians in that era themselves saw feminism and socialism as separate movements, tangential when not antagonistic, they reflected a (post-Marxist, teleological) perspective that slighted the fundamental role played by gender in shaping views of the ideal society in (pre-Marxist) socialism.<sup>80</sup>

#### Expanding the Historiographical Field

Largely since the 1990s, new work has emerged from northern and eastern Europe and far beyond, that shows the global impact of the concept "bourgeois feminism," while also blurring the dichotomous lines it suggests. Historians of Bulgaria, China, Denmark, England, Hungary, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, South Asia, Spain, Sweden, and Ukraine have all contributed new views that document the legacy of the early twentieth century conflict.<sup>81</sup> Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak portrays the Galician Ukrainian Natalia Ozarkevych Kobrynska, who advocated linking the two social movements but rejected the socialist denigration of feminism as "bourgeois" and argued explicitly against Zetkin.<sup>82</sup> Bulgarian historian Krassimira Daskalova describes ideological divisions over class collaboration that split the socialists in 1903 and left

"feminism" stigmatized as "bourgeois" and stereotyped as opposing "'traditional Bulgarian values' of love, marriage, and family."<sup>83</sup> In Hungary, where in the early twentieth century socialists "nervously guard[ed] their charges against any 'bourgeois influence,'" Judith Szapor finds "a somewhat distorted picture emerges that emphasizes the differences." In fact, socialists formed alliances with "bourgeois" feminists to campaign for the vote, and even tried to put into practice Lily Braun's proposals to resolve the domestic servants' problem by creating communal households. Andrea Petö also finds echoes of an antifeminist heritage in post-1989 Hungary. "Feminists were considered aliens by conservative Christians, and bourgeois by the labor movement."<sup>84</sup> In Poland, states Jill Bystozyński, "State propaganda successfully managed to belittle the feminist cause and to plant almost unanimous disdain for western feminism presenting it as a bourgeois preoccupation of well-to-do, disaffected, mainly American women." Any emerging feminism today must define itself as neither "western" nor communist.<sup>85</sup>

International socialism brought disdain for feminism to Asia as well. In China, Bebel was translated in the early 1920s, and the Chinese Communist Party adopted the advancement of women as a basic tenet. The word "feminism" itself, however, as Wang Zheng shows, became a negative term, usually accompanied by the adjective "bourgeois" and often qualified as well by "Western." Class issues took the form of distinguishing the socialist position borrowed from Marxism from this "narrow feminism"--that is, any movement for equality between the sexes apart from socialist revolution.<sup>86</sup> Kumari Jayawardena writes that when feminism arose in South Asia in the 1970s, "The Left brought out the old quotations on the Woman Question, while dismissing feminism as a dangerous Western import."<sup>87</sup>

These examples serve to show that, as the editors of a recent globally-ranging collection of essays on women and socialism state,

"The enduring power of these early debates should be underlined. They have resonated through every socialist movement in the twentieth century without exception....From China to Nicaragua, this nineteenth-century model has been consciously adopted, even

when its appropriateness was, at the least, open to question. While other aspects of the Marxist-Leninist program...have been adapted to national conditions, this element has remained remarkably unchanged, whether the country deploying the theory was Asian, Southeast Asian, African, European, or Latin American."<sup>88</sup>

Phrases such as "capitulation to bourgeois feminism," and "knuckled under to bourgeois feminism" were commonly employed, and the term "bourgeois feminism" was used to label behavior deemed to favor "individualism" or to defy traditional strictures about female conduct.<sup>89</sup> The legacy of class conflict persisted, so that, as Mineke Bosch comments on the Dutch women's movement, when feminism re-emerged in the early 1970s, a conflict between a "bourgeois" women's movement and a "proletarian" movement was taken for granted.<sup>90</sup>

#### Class: Contested and Confused

The concept "bourgeois feminism" rested on extreme reductionist, socialist constructions of class status and class. How do women really fit into definitions of class? What was "bourgeois" about "bourgeois feminists"? How useful is a conceptual vocabulary of "class" and "class formation" without gender differentiation?<sup>91</sup>

Inquiry on the significance of rhetoric, which has now influenced two decades of historiography, and the historiographical shift from overemphasis on structures to rediscovery of human agency, provide new perspectives on these questions. Scholars suggest that "the origin of class lay in language...rather than in experience itself."<sup>92</sup> However, in an era when level of skill and control over production served to define male workers' identity, and in turn profoundly affected the ideology and language of class, women were assumed to have no work-derived identity, but one that was ascribed to them on the basis of their family situation and relationships to men. Thus some women became "proletarian" and others "bourgeois."<sup>93</sup> It seems ironic, given women's near exclusion from the "near hegemonic role of the rhetoric of class in the socialist labor movement in its heyday," that historians today find that the identities of both middle-class and working-class men rested on notions of appropriate gender behavior.<sup>94</sup>

Beyond the general difficulty of assigning class status to individuals, the gendered double standard of class ascription also created an obstacle for feminist women. While adopting working-class identities for themselves, socialists failed to challenge men whose views they approved but labeled women of similar background with the term of opprobrium. This unfairness did not go unnoticed. Grever and Waaldijk cite a Dutch journalist who argued that "the proletariat judged rich women more harshly than rich men, while capitalists victimized poor women more than poor men."<sup>95</sup> In 1907, French feminist Nelly Roussel, protested: "It is a mistake to think that the abyss separating the classes is as deep among [women] as among the masculine half of the human species [genre] ..."two women of the opposite classes may have more common interests, more similar sources of revolt, consequently more terrain for entente than have a man and a woman belonging to the same milieu....There are no 'managerial classes' among us."<sup>96</sup> In 1936 Jeanne Bouvier, a working-class Frenchwoman attracted to feminism, also complained. She recalled that "feminists are all treated as 'bourgeoise,' but the husbands of these feminists, if they are members of a political or philosophical party of the left, are not 'bourgeois.'" In contrast, Christine Bard points out, "Economically, teachers, especially when single, belong to the working-class.... [But because] their educational level allowed them to participate in intellectual circles...voire 'bourgeois'," a designation they denied.<sup>97</sup>

Studies of the class backgrounds of socialist women and of non-socialist feminists drawn from British, Dutch, German, and Spanish history highlight the difficulty. Few socialist women worked in industrial jobs; few performed labor that produced so-called surplus value. In Germany, the Netherlands, and Spain, most were wives of socialist men. Many British feminists came from working-class origins, but typically worked in service occupations. Few Dutch feminists were women of leisure.<sup>98</sup> It is not clear that the class backgrounds of socialist women and feminists were "very different," as sometimes alleged.<sup>99</sup> Given a paucity of data, mixed reports, generational shifts, and national differences, as well as multiple varieties of socialism and of feminism, assertions about feminists and women socialists "class" backgrounds seem

premature. In any case, Marxist class definitions offer little insight. In the 1970s and 1980s, extensive analyses of women's domestic labor by socialist feminists led to a "wages for housework" movement. More recently, philosopher Nicky Hart has asked a provocative question: What would women's class position be if they sold the babies they produce as commodities?<sup>100</sup>

### Bourgeoisophobia

What about the word "bourgeois" itself? What does "bourgeois" mean? An "imaginary other," a "negative stereotype," even a mod way to say passé--"so last year."<sup>101</sup> Once a marker of residence or legal order, by the late decades of the nineteenth century it had lost its original meaning and become a pejorative epithet.<sup>102</sup> It was (and is) used to denigrate, trivialize, or dismiss not only individuals, but through a kind of conceptual and linguistic slippage, also the ideas and aims of a political movement, namely, feminism.<sup>103</sup> But this term has long been contested. In 1968 Canadian historian Shirley Gruner, examining its usage in France in the early 1830s, declared, "The word 'bourgeoisie' has never had the good fortune to be defined in any strict sense." It was associated with several social theories including St. Simonianism and Marxism, of course. Definitions at that time ranged from "a small capitalist elite" to "the immense majority of the population." It was used confusingly by Fourierists "both to mean the mass of small craftsmen and artisans and to mean the neo-feudal capitalists." Gruner wondered if it had any further usefulness.<sup>104</sup>

Two decades later, studying the "bourgeois experience" in nineteenth-century Europe, Peter Gay found "a Babel of definitions." It could, he points out, refer to the vast majority who were neither nobility nor peasants; but also that in mid-century, "Parisian proletarians used bourgeoise to designate respectable, sober working-class housewives whose husbands were afraid of them." Penned by writers such as Flaubert, Schnitzler, Zola, the word became an insult. Flaubert, who named himself "bourgeoisophobus," told George Sand, "Axiom: Hatred of Bourgeois is the beginning of all virtue."<sup>105</sup>

More recently, Sarah Maza has located the French bourgeoisie in the "social imaginary." She charges historians of France with hanging on to it as a "security blanket of Marxian terminology." For the French, after its use as a legal category disappeared, the "bourgeoisie" became a negative, a way to describe "what someone else was." It carried a taint inherited from the old regime, implying both "unearned privilege and cultural deficiency."<sup>106</sup> For socialists in the era of the Second International, attaching the label "bourgeois feminism" offered a ready-made way to dismiss politics of which they disapproved. Generations later, some leftist students even initially "dismissed the civil rights movement as 'bourgeois';...since the blacks sitting in at Woolworth lunch counters were college students, it meant that they were middle class and not the workers or share croppers of revolutionary prediction." The founders of women's studies at San Diego State beat up on themselves as well as most others associated with the university for their "petit bourgeois" biases.<sup>107</sup>

For historians of the left, use of the socialist terminology for feminism has also perhaps been a way to avoid using the less politically acceptable term "anti-feminism."<sup>108</sup> Some scholars, but by no means all, have distanced themselves by placing the dubious term "bourgeois feminism" within quotation marks. Many continue to use the old dichotomies, however, and the Big Three taxonomy still appears in academic analyses of feminism.

### Conclusion

Bourgeois feminism was invented by socialist women and never existed as a discrete, identifiable women's movement. It allowed a strategic shift in socialist perspectives on the woman question to take place, from the more collaborative views of August Bebel and others to Clara Zetkin and her followers, who portrayed feminism as if it were the complaint of a special interest group of "bourgeois" women. The socialists, says Quataert, "promoted their own gendered form of identity politics." As a political strategy for rejecting feminism, it helped socialists claim "proletarian" values for themselves, while it masked the motivations of its

formulators and their failure to create a woman-centered socialism that might effectively attract women workers.<sup>109</sup>

If the purpose, conscious or unconscious, of the enemies of "bourgeois feminism" was to squelch the development of a unified women's movement, they succeeded, probably beyond what they could have imagined. With the international purchase of socialist ideas and organizations, the concept spread around the globe; and it persisted for a century as a means to discredit non-socialist women's movements. From a feminist perspective, feminism fell into a double bind, wherein it was suspect as "bourgeois," but also came to be rejected, especially in formerly communist countries, for its association with socialism. In the 1980s, as identity politics and the language of race and ethnicity replaced class as a central focus, "bourgeois" lost its place as epithet of choice, but left behind a divisive residue. The dichotomizing concept also owes its long life to the scholars, including myself, who employed the term, with or without quotes, and failed--until now--to challenge its validity. Today, however, received ideas and inherited dichotomies elicit criticism and require revision.<sup>110</sup> Comparing nineteenth-century women's emancipation movements, the editors of a 2004 volume conclude, "There was more crossing of borders between feminism and socialism than the long-established image of the 'hostile sisters' would lead us to suppose. Historiography has also exaggerated the rift between the two wings of the women's movement for political reasons."<sup>111</sup>

The history and historiography merged as historians became party to the politics of the earlier age. The "most lasting legacy" was not, as Sowerwine asserts, "the development of separate organization for working-class women and a consequent articulation of their distinct concerns." Whether the latter ever happened is debatable. What is certain, in my view, is that the most far-reaching legacy was the socialists' success in preventing the emergence of a broad and unified feminist movement, on the mythological grounds that to be a practicing feminist was to be "bourgeois."<sup>112</sup> The association between socialism and feminism was, as Karen Offen has

declared, "a lethal relationship....From a feminist perspective, organized socialism in Europe--and more broadly, the social democratic left--has a lot to answer for."<sup>113</sup>

Feminist historians might begin to repair the damage by calling attention to the linguistic and conceptual slippage that occur when the ascribed identity of individuals is applied to ideas or to political movements. They might also pursue new studies, all in various national and comparative international contexts, examining differing degrees of collaboration and hostility among women's groups; the rhetoric employed on all sides, including notions of class and gender, reform and revolution; a reconceptualized question that employs gender as a category of analysis and redefines politics to include sexual politics; the contributions of non-socialist feminists to women workers; the impact on socialist politics of concepts of motherhood and the population question; and the effects of replacing organizational approaches with thematic frameworks, while reviewing the relationship of socialism and feminism as a part of intellectual and cultural as well as social and political histories, focused on issues of most interest to most women.

I would end by proposing to eliminate the b-word, but since that is impossible, at least historians might avoid coupling it with feminism, except when quoting the sources. Revisiting the history of socialism as it faced feminism at the turn of the twentieth century, which has mostly been written from a socialist point of view, from a feminist perspective, would be a worthy project. The goal would be to place women at the center rather than on the margins, to recognize national differences and international connections, and to investigate the consequences as well as causes and extent of the underlying conflict. It is time in this pursuit to reassert the importance of feminism's history as political history, and to counter the post-modernist trend away from feminist agency, with new appreciation for how rhetoric, representations and images, identities and cultures affected both leaders and followers as historical agents and ourselves as historians.

Marilyn J. Boxer

San Francisco State University

---

<sup>1</sup> This conference paper represents only about half of the original draft. For a full copy, please email me at mboxer@sfsu.edu. I thank Karen Offen for encouragement to pursue this study as well as her astute and generous reading of the longer draft; and I appreciate helpful readings by Ann Taylor Allen, Naomi Andrews, Krassimira Daskalova, Caroline Eichner, and Wang Zheng. I also want to acknowledge that while I have read many French sources, some German, and a bit of Dutch, this paper draws most heavily on Anglophone literature.

<sup>2</sup> Kristen Ghodsee, "Feminism-by-Design: Emerging Capitalisms, Cultural Feminism, and Women's Nongovernmental Organizations in Postsocialist Eastern Europe," Signs 29, no. 3 (Spring 2004):727-753, quotations on 732, 733, 742, 748.

<sup>3</sup> Françoise Picq, "'Bourgeois Feminism' in France: A Theory Developed by Socialist Women before World War I," tr. by Irene Tilton, in Judith Friedlander et al., Women in Culture and Politics: A Century of Change (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp. 330-343.

<sup>4</sup> For a study of recent trends, see Gerda Lerner, "U. S. Women's History," Journal of Women's History 16, no. 4 (2004): 10-27. For an exception, see Christine Zmroczek and Pat Mahony, eds., Women and Social Class--International Perspectives (London: UCL Press, 1999).

<sup>5</sup> Angela McRobbie, "Feminism and the Socialist Tradition...Undone? A Response to Recent Work by Judith Butler," Cultural Studies 18, no. 4 (July 2004): 503-522, quotations on 503, 505.

<sup>6</sup> Nancy Holmstrom, ed., The Socialist Feminist Project: A Contemporary Reader in Theory and Politics (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2002). See also the range of topics in Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives, ed. Rosemary Hennessy and Chrys Ingraham (New York: Routledge, 1997).

<sup>7</sup> Term borrowed from Heidi Hartmann, "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union," Capital and Class 8 (1979): 1-33.

<sup>8</sup> Karl Marx, Capital: A Critique of Political Economy, tr. from 3<sup>rd</sup> German edition (New York: Modern Library, 1906 [orig. 1867]), pp. 280-281; and idem, Letters to Dr. Kugelmann (New York: International Publishers, 1934), p.82. Frederick Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property, and the State (New York: International Publishers, 1942 [orig. 1884]), pp. 65-66; and idem, The Condition of the Working-Class in England in 1844, tr. Florence Kelley Wischnewetsky (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1952 [orig. 1845]), p. 181; on "asses," Engels quoted by Hal Draper and Anne Lipow, "Marxist Women versus Bourgeois Feminism," Socialist Register (1976): 179-226, quotation on 217.

<sup>9</sup> August Bebel, Woman under Socialism, tr. from German 33<sup>rd</sup> edition by Daniel De Leon (New York: Schocken, 1971), p. 5. "Feindliche" is sometimes translated as "enemy"; see Draper and Lipow, "Marxian Women," p. 189.

<sup>10</sup> On the broader significance of translations and Bebel's pioneering use of "gender-neutral" terms, see Anne Lopes and Gary Roth, "A Note on Translation," in their Men's Feminism: August Bebel and the German Socialist Movement (Amherst, New York.: Humanity Books, 2004), pp. 19-27. On Otto-Peters, *ibid*, p. 90. On Bebel's support of feminist legislative reform, Woman under Socialism, p. 112. For

---

challenge to Bebel's feminism, see Richard Stites, The Women's Liberation Movement in Russia: Feminism, Nihilism, and Bolshevism, 1860-1930 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), p. 236. For his 1878 speech on "more in common," Lopes and Roth, Men's Feminism, p. 199.

<sup>11</sup> Marilyn J. Boxer, "Socialism Faces Feminism: The Failure of Synthesis in France, 1879-1914," in Marilyn J. Boxer and Jean H. Quataert, eds., Socialist Women: European Socialist Feminism in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries (New York: Elsevier-North Holland, 1978), pp. 79-80.

<sup>12</sup> On Zetkin's formulation of socialist theory on women, see Werner Thönnessen, The Emancipation of Women: The Rise and Decline of the Women's Movement in German Social Democracy, 1863-1933 (Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany: Pluto Press, 1973 [orig. 1969]), pp. 39-46; tr. by Joris de Bres. For a portion of Zetkin's 1889 speech, see Susan Groag Bell and Karen M. Offen, eds., Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents II, 1880-1950 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1981), pp. 87-91, quotation on 87 and 90; tr. by Susan G. Bell.

<sup>13</sup> On "clean break," Alfred G. Meyer in The Feminism and Socialism of Lily Braun (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), p. 52." For "extreme animosity," Richard Stites, Women's Liberation Movement, p. 237. On "stupid dreams," in 1895 Zetkin published her response to a new feminist journal as "Women's Libbers' Stupid Dreams about Harmony," in Alfred G. Meyer, eds., Selected Writings on Feminism and Socialism by Lily Braun (Bloomington: Indiana Press, 1987), p. 43. For "muddle-headed," Jean H. Quataert, "Unequal Partners in an Uneasy Alliance: Women and the Working Class in Imperial Germany," in Boxer and Quataert., eds., Socialist Women, pp. 112-145, quotation on 116. For "naïve," Richard J. Evans in Comrades and Sisters: Feminism, Socialism, and Pacifism in Europe, 1870-1945 (Sussex, Eng.: Wheatsheaf Books, 1987), p. 41. For "untiring," Jean H. Quataert, "Feminist Tactics in German Social Democracy 1890-1914: A Dilemma," IWK: Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung 13, no. 1 (March 1977): 48-65, quotation on 56 n. 41. For Pelletier, Richard J. Evans, The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America, and Australasia, 1840-1920 (London: Croom Helm, 1977), p. 172. On "savagely," Richard J. Evans, "The Concept of Feminism: Notes for Practicing Historians," in Ruth-Ellen B. Joeres and Mary Jo Maynes, eds., German Women in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries: A Social and Literary History (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), pp. 247-258, quotation on 248. In this essay, Evans emphasizes the "depth of the divisions" between the socialist women's movement and feminism (p. 253).. For "vicious," see n. 17 below.

<sup>14</sup> On bourgeois women's values, see Bonnie G. Smith, Ladies of the Leisure Class: The Bourgeoises of Northern France in the Nineteenth Century (Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press, 1981). Smith opens her book with the question, "What is a bourgeois woman?"; *ibid*, p. 3.

<sup>15</sup> Michelle Perrot, "1914: Great Feminist Expectations," in Helmut Gruber and Pamela Graves, eds., Women and Socialism/ Socialism and Women: Europe between the Two World Wars (New York: Berghahn Books, 1998), p. 27.

---

<sup>16</sup> Rosa Luxemburg, "Women's Suffrage and Class Struggle," in Selected Political Writings of Rosa Luxemburg, ed. Dick Howard (New York: Monthly Review Press), pp. 216-222, quotation on 220.

<sup>17</sup> Zetkin's adamant refusal to entertain collaboration with non-socialist women and the rivalry for leadership are major themes of a study of feminism and German socialism that predates the resurgence of women's history. Its author terms Zetkin's "anti-feminism" as bordering on "fanaticism" and her presentations "spirited, biting, and not infrequently vicious." See Jacqueline Strain, "Feminism and Political Radicalism in the German Social Democratic Movement, 1890-1914" (unpublished dissertation, University of California, 1964), pp. 67, 81.

<sup>18</sup> On "mishmash commission," Richard J. Evans, "Bourgeois Feminists and Women Socialists in Germany, 1894-1914: Lost Opportunity or Inevitable Conflict?" Women's Studies International Quarterly 3 (1980): 355-376, especially 367-368.

<sup>19</sup> For a relevant analysis of the controversy over contraception within German socialism, including strong statements against it by Clara Zetkin and Rosa Luxemburg, see R. P. Neuman, "Working Class Birth Control in Wilhelmine Germany," Comparative Studies in Society and History 20, no. 3 (1978), pp. 408-428. See also Karen Honeycutt, "Clara Zetkin: A Socialist Approach to the Problem of Woman's Oppression," Feminist Studies 3, no. 3/4 (spring-summer 1976): 131-144, especially 135-136.

<sup>20</sup> On "haunted," Jean H. Quataert, Reluctant Feminists in German Social Democracy, 1885-1917 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979), p. 111.

<sup>21</sup> Kollontai accompanied Zetkin on her 1909 visit to Britain at the invitation of Dora Montefiore; see Karen Hunt, Equivocal Feminists: The Social Democratic Federation and the Woman Question, 1884-1911 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 68 n. 55. For Eleanor Marx, see Draper and Lipow, "Marxist Women," pp. 225-226; emphasis in original.

<sup>22</sup> According to one biographer, Kollontai wrote her book, The Social Bases of the Woman Question (1908) in preparation for the First All-Russian Women's Congress, and held some fifty meetings with working women to coach them, before leading the group to the event, "with clear instructions to disrupt it"; Beatrice Farnsworth, Alexandra Kollontai: Socialism, Feminism, and the Bolshevik Revolution (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1980), pp. 30-34, quotation on 33. For "antifeminist polemic," see Stites, Women's Liberation Movement, p. 437; on "classless feminist," *ibid*, p. 250, on harassment, *ibid*, p. 252; on class makeup of 1908 delegates, *ibid*, pp. 216-217. Stites credits Kollontai with destroying the Russian Women's Union; *ibid*, p. 214. Kollontai wrote that "during the period of the first revolution...the bourgeois women's movement posed a serious threat to the unity of a working-class movement"; in her Selected Writings (New York: W.W. Norton, 1977), p. 50. Her comment on "unbridgeable gulf" is quoted in Stites, Women's Liberation Movement, p. 228. For "scourge," Beatrice Farnsworth, "Bolshevism, the Woman Question, and Aleksandra Kollontai," in Boxer and Quataert, eds., Socialist Women, p. 186.

<sup>23</sup> For the full text and repeat notices, see Marilyn J. Boxer, "Socialism Faces Feminism in France, 1879-1913," (unpublished dissertation, University of California, Riverside, 1975), pp. 188, 191.

---

<sup>24</sup> "Confusionism" quoted in Boxer, "Socialism Faces Feminism," in Boxer and Quataert, Socialist Women, p. 92; on "letter," Christine Bard, Les Filles de Marianne: Histoire des féminismes, 1914-1940 (n.p.: Fayard, 1995), p. 90.

<sup>25</sup> Charles Sowerwine, Sisters or Citizens? Women and Socialism in France since 1876 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), p. 186; see also idem, Les Femmes et le socialisme (Paris: Presses de la fondation nationale des sciences politiques, 1978).

<sup>26</sup> Paul Smith, Feminism and the Third Republic: Women's Political and Civil Rights in France, 1918-1945 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), p. 80; Bard, Les Filles de Marianne, p. 345; Gruber, "French Women in the Crossfire of Class, Sex, Maternity, and Citizenship," in Gruber and Graves, eds., Women and Socialism, pp. 279-320, quotation on 283.

<sup>27</sup> Henriëtte Roland Holst-Van der Schalk, Een Woord aan de vrouwen der arbeidende klasse naar aanleiding der nat. tentoonstelling van vrouwen-arbeid (Amsterdam: J. A. Fortuijn, 1898), p. 19.

<sup>28</sup> Maria Grever and Berteke Waaldijk, Transforming the Public Sphere: The Dutch National Exhibition of Women's Labor in 1898. Tr. Mischa F.C. Hoyick and Robert E. Chesal (Durham, NC.: Duke University Press, 2004), pp. 48-49.

<sup>29</sup> While we know rather little about how class relations affected activist women outside the major urban areas, Patricia Hilden and Christine Bard offer some insight into the situation in the north of France and the southeast, respectively. Bard suggests that Saumoneau and the party line had some influence at Lyon; Les Filles de Marianne, p. 241. Hilden indicates that in the major textile cities in the north, the early leaders Léonie Rouzade, Paule Mink, and Louise Michel were effective; also that "In general, the national SFIO's campaign against bourgeois feminism found few echoes in the Nord Federation"; in her Working Women and Socialist Politics in France, 1880-1914: A Regional Study (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), quotation on 256. Hilden argues that working women lost interest in socialism because socialists showed little interest in women workers; see her "Re-Writing the History of Socialism: Working Women and the Parti Ouvrier Français," European History Quarterly 17 (1987): 285-306. Richard Evans cites a Hamburg pub-goer reported to have said that "bourgeois feminists...are basically in favour of suppressing women workers"; in his Proletarians and Politics (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990), p. 165. Ute Frevert indicates that despite the leadership, women sometimes acted in concert at the local level; Women in German History: From Bourgeois Emancipation to Sexual Liberation (New York: Berg, 1989), p. 146.

<sup>30</sup> This point was recognized explicitly and positively in 1900 at the first conference of German socialist women, which agreed to leave it to individuals to decide whether to "occasionally or temporarily work alongside legalists and other bourgeois elements." See Ute Frevert, Women in German History, p. 146. For a similar decision by Swedish Social Democrats in 1905, see Evans, The Feminists, p. 169.

<sup>31</sup> Leila J. Rupp, Worlds of Women: The Making of an International Women's Movement (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 35. On suffrage as a divisive issue among internationalists, see *ibid.*, pp. 135-139.

---

<sup>32</sup> On this point, see Karen Offen, European Feminisms, 1700-1950: A Political History (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 2000), pp. 386-387.

<sup>33</sup> The Woman Question: Selections from the Writings of Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V.I.Lenin, Joseph Stalin (New York: International Publishers, 1951), p. 89. Also translated as "strong, ineradicable line against the bourgeois movement for the 'emancipation of women'" in The Emancipation of Women: From the Writings of V. I. Lenin (New York: International Publishers, 1966), p. 110.

110. For the women's studies syllabus, see Florence Howe, ed., Female Studies II (Pittsburgh, PA.: KNOW, 1970), p. 89.

<sup>34</sup> Judith Hole and Ellen Levine, in their 1971 book on the "rebirth of feminism" in the U.S. traced the influence of the left, old and new, through the beginnings of women's liberation, and noted that the new feminist analysis was grounded in socialist theory; Hole and Levine, Rebirth of Feminism (New York: Quadrangle, 1971), p. 120. Shulamith Firestone's The Dialectic of Sex, which blazed a meteoric path through the radical women's movement and appeared on many early women's studies course outlines, set out to perform the task left undone by the masters, to apply the dialectic method to the "sex class," women; Shulamith Firestone, The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution (New York: Morrow, 1970). See also the reflective essays in The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation, ed. Rachel Blau Duplessis and Ann Snitow (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998). For England, Sheila Rowbotham has provided a close analysis of the rebirth of feminism among women active in the New Left. See especially her Promise of a Dream: Remembering the Sixties (London: Verso, 2001) and "Appreciating Our Beginnings," in her Threads through Time: Writings in History and Autobiography (London: Penguin, 1999), pp. 73-83. On "bourgeois character," see Kate Millett, Sexual Politics (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1970), p. 84.

<sup>35</sup> A 1968 strike by factory women helped spur organization by leftist women; see Sheila Rowbotham, Threads through Time, pp. 80-81. Mitchell also noted, "The liberation of women remains a normative ideal, an adjunct to socialist theory, not structurally integrated into it....The family as it exists at present is, in fact, incompatible with the equality of the sexes"; Juliet Mitchell, "Women: The Longest Revolution," New Left Review 40 (November-December 1966): 11-37, quotation on 15, 36. On future battle, see idem, Woman's Estate (New York: Pantheon, 1971), p. 91. On the influence of Mitchell and Rowbotham, see, e.g., Anna Coote and Beatrix Campbell, Sweet Freedom: The Struggle for Women's Liberation (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1982), pp. 8-9.

<sup>36</sup> Sheila Rowbotham, Women, Resistance, and Revolution: A History of Women and Revolution in the Modern World (New York: Vintage, 1974 [orig. 1972]), quotations on 35, 246-247. Rowbotham opens with protests by seventeenth-century aristocratic and bourgeois women, whom she calls "impudent lasses."

<sup>37</sup> On "bogey," see "Introduction," in The Daughters of Karl Marx: Family Correspondence, 1866-1898. Tr. Faith Evans (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), xvii-xl, quotation on xxxv; on caricatures, Rowbotham, "The Women's Movement and Organizing for Socialism," in Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal and Hilary Wainwright, eds., Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism (London:

---

Merlin Press, 1979), pp. 63-64 and 151 n. 19; on conventional stereotype, Rowbotham, Hidden from History: Rediscovering Women in History from the 17<sup>th</sup> Century to the Present (New York: Pantheon, 1974), p. 79.

<sup>38</sup> Julia Swindells and Lisa Jardine, What's Left? Women and Culture in the Labour Movement (London: Routledge, 1990), pp. 12, 68; emphasis in original. On broken bond, *ibid.*, p.3. "Cult of masculinity" is quoted from Beatrix Campbell, Wigan Pier Revisited: Poverty and Politics in the 80s (London: Virago, 1984). Joan Wallach Scott also points to the difficulty of including women in the language of class; see "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History," in her Gender and the Politics of History (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 53-67, especially pp. 64-65.

<sup>39</sup> Swindells and Jardine state that for challenging Marxist interpretations of women's role in the family, Mitchell "was promptly excommunicated by the NRL fraternity"; What's Left?, p. 70.

<sup>40</sup> Dorothy E. Smith, Feminist Marxism--A Place to Begin, A Way to Go (Vancouver, B. C., Canada: New Star Books, 1977), p. 33; Sheila Rowbotham, Woman's Consciousness, Man's World (London: Penguin, 1973), p. 38. Statements that both helped launch the new feminism and connected it to Marxism grew out of women's protests at meetings of SDS, including widely-distributed and much-anthologized essays by Roxanne Dunbar, "Female Liberation as the Basis for Socialist Revolution" (1968), and Margaret Benston, "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation" (1969). See also, Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism, ed. Lydia Sargent (Boston: South End Press, 1981), and Sheila Rowbotham, "Appreciating Our Beginnings," in her Threads through Time, pp. 73-83, and *idem*, Promise of a Dream. A historian of the American left, James Weinstein, states, "Initially, the women's movement saw itself as entirely outside of, or even opposed to, the organized socialist movement, largely because socialist parties and groups had traditionally seen 'the woman question' as secondary to trade union or political electoral activity, but also because of the social conservatism of much of the socialist movement. Radical feminism grew up in opposition to the socialist movement in much the same way as black cultural nationalism emerged in reaction to the politics and social relations of the white left."; Ambiguous Legacy: The Left in American Politics (New York: New Viewpoints, 1975), p. 165.

<sup>41</sup> The literature is huge. See, e.g., Batya Weinbaum, The Curious Courtship of Women's Liberation and Socialism (Boston: South End Press, 1978); Annette Kuhn and AnnMarie Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism: Women and Modes of Production (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1978); Zillah R. Eisenstein, ed., Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism (New York; Monthly Review Press, 1979); Michèle Barrett, Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis (London: Verso, 1980); Lydia Sargent, ed., Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism (Boston: South End Press, 1981).

<sup>42</sup> On "polemicizing," Mary-Alice Waters, Feminism and the Marxist Movement (New York: Pathfinder Press, 1972), p. 35. On "dissatisfied," Charnie Guettel, Marxism and Feminism (Toronto: Hunter Rose,

---

1974), p. 1. On 'instruments," Marlene Dixon, "Left-wing Anti-Feminism: A Revisionist Disorder," Synthesis: A Journal of Marxist-Leninist Debate 1, no. 4 (spring 1977): 31-43, quotation on 33.

<sup>43</sup> See Zillah R. Eisenstein, "Developing a Theory of Capitalist Patriarchy and Socialist Feminism," in idem, ed., Capitalist Patriarchy, pp. 5-40; and Jackie West, "Women, Sex, and Class," in Kuhn and Wolpe, eds., Feminism and Materialism, pp. 220-253.

<sup>44</sup> Lisa Vogel, Marxism and the Oppression of Women: Toward a Unitary Theory (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press, 1983), pp. 108-109. For revisionists as feminist allies, Richard J. Evans, Proletarians and Politics, p. 96.

<sup>45</sup> Marlene Dixon, The Rise and Demise of Women's Liberation: A Class Analysis (1977); posted as one of "Classic Feminist Writings," on CLWU Herstory Website Archive (cwlherstory.com).

<sup>46</sup> Catherine Margaret Orr, "Representing Women/Disciplining Feminism: Activism, Professionalism, and Women's Studies (unpublished dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1998), p. 9; and Roberta Salper, "Introduction," in idem, ed., Female Liberation: History and Current Politics (New York: Knopf, 1972), p.22.

<sup>47</sup> Engels' Origin of the Family appeared on many of the first syllabi in women's studies, along with Simone de Beauvoir's The Second Sex (1952) and Kate Millet's Sexual Politics, both of which rely on Engels. See compilations of course outlines in Female Studies I and Female Studies II. For a discussion of the early conflicts in women's studies, among groups of women as well as with academic regulations, see Ellen Messer-Davidow, Disciplining Feminism: From Social Action to Academic Discourse (Durham, NC.: Duke University Press, 2002). For early San Diego State women's studies conflicts, Women's Studies Program: Three Years of Struggle (California State University, San Diego: Inside the Beast, May 1973) and Women's Studies and Socialist Feminism (San Diego, CA.: Fanshen Printing Collective, April 20, 1974).; also my When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America (Baltimore, MD.: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), pp. 164-166.

<sup>48</sup> Michèle Barrett and Anne Phillips, Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), pp. 2-3, emphasis in original. On "Big Three," Mary Maynard, "Beyond the 'Big Three': The Development of Feminist Theory in the 1990s," Women's History Review 4, no. 3 (1995): 259-281. On "reinscription," Donna J. Haraway, Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature (New York: Routledge, 1991), pp. 159-160.

<sup>49</sup> Zillah Eisenstein, "Developing a Theory," p. 38 n. 27; "The Combahee River Collective, "A Black Feminist Statement," in Gloria T. Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, and Barbara Smith, eds., But Some of Us Are Brave (Old Westbury, New York: Feminist Press, 1982), pp. 13-20, quotation on 20.

<sup>50</sup> For a sample "statement," see the following: "History --least of all labour history is not an abstract intellectual pursuit. It is also a political statement, a personal choice about the past....It is to Labour History's credit that it continues to provide a forum for 'activist' as well as academic, the young and innovative as well as the privileged and professional elite"; Labour History 61 (November 1991): x. For Woolf, Three Guineas (San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1938), p. 177 n 13.

---

<sup>51</sup> Mme. Ghénia Avril de Sainte-Croix (writing as "Savioz"), "L'Indépendance économique de la femme," L'Humanité, (Jan. 17, 1907); she was co-founder of the National Council of French Women and an international feminist activist. I thank Karen Offen for this reference; on Sainte-Croix, see Offen, "Frances's Foremost Feminist' or Who in the World is Madame Avril de Sainte-Croix?" paper presented to Society for French Historical Studies, Stanford University, March 18, 2005.

<sup>52</sup> Exceptions include George Lichtheim's 1969 survey, which offers a brief discussion of Tristan, as the "first socialist to have lived the connection between the emancipation of her sex and the ending of wage slavery"; The Origins of Socialism (New York: Praeger, 1969), p. 69. G.D.H. Cole includes a six-page chapter on "Socialism and the Rights of Women, 1914-1931," in Socialist Thought (London: Macmillan, 1953).

<sup>53</sup> Beatrix Campbell, Wigan Pier Revisited: Poverty and Politics in the Eighties (London: Virago, 1984), p. 97. For an elaboration of this point as well as a corrective, see Laura L. Frader and Sonya O. Rose, "Introduction: Gender and the Reconstruction of European Working-Class History," pp. 1-33, and other essays in idem, eds., Gender and Class in Modern Europe (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1996).

<sup>54</sup> Although her focus is not on women, Carole Biewener's "Class and Socialist Politics in France," Review of Radical Political Economics 19, no. 2 (1987): 61-76, is useful for understanding how basic class concepts served to eclipse women's roles as workers. See also the interview with Michelle Perrot about resistance to women's history by gauchistes, in Radical History Review 37 (1987), pp. 27-38.

<sup>55</sup> Michelle Perrot, "Twenty Years of Women's History in France: Preface to the English Edition," in Perrot, ed., Writing Women's History (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1992 [orig. 1984]), pp. viii-ix.

<sup>56</sup> For the focus on socialist women's attempts to integrate their private and public concerns, the editors and authors of essays in Socialist Women, of whom I was one, received a scathing review by Richard J. Evans; we were charged with defining feminism according to the values of the second wave feminists that we were. For our biographical approach and investigation into motivations, we were accused of presentism, and worse, of emphasizing our subjects' personal experiences and interpreting feminism "as a creed of the emancipation of private life." See Evans, "Women's History: The Limits of Reclamation," Social History 5, no. 2 (1980): 273-281, especially 276-277. His other criticism may be better grounded.

<sup>57</sup> Rowbotham, Women, Resistance, and Revolution.

<sup>58</sup> Werner Thönnessen, The Emancipation of Women: The Rise and Decline of the Women's Movement in German Social Democracy, 1863-1933, tr. Joris de Bres (London: Pluto Press, 1973 [orig. 1969]), quotation on 10. Thönnessen sees the socialist turn to reformism, which he says favored "proletarian anti-feminism," as responsible for the failure of German socialism; see *ibid*, 164-165.

---

<sup>59</sup> Amy Hackett, "The German Women's Movement and Suffrage, 1890-1914: A Study of National Feminism," in Robert J. Bezucha, ed., Modern European Social History (Lexington, MA.: D.C. Heath, 1972), quotations on 355, 356. See also Clara Zetkin: Selected Writings, ed. Philip S. Foner (New York: International Publishers, 1984).

<sup>60</sup> For dissertations, see Karen Honeycutt, "Clara Zetkin: A Left-Wing Socialist and Feminist in Wilhelminian Germany" (Columbia University, 1975), Amy K. Hackett, "The Politics of Feminism in Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1918" (Columbia University, 1976), and Boxer (1975), n. 23 above.

<sup>61</sup> Ann J. Lane, "Women in Society: A Critique of Frederick Engels," pp. 4-25 and Amy Hackett, "Feminism and Liberalism in Wilhelmine Germany, 1890-1918," pp. 127-136, both in Berenice A. Carroll, ed., Liberating Women's History: Theoretical and Critical Essays (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976). It is interesting to note that Lane, in her essay dating from 1972, criticizes the absence of women workers in E. P. Thompson's revisionist work.

<sup>62</sup> Hal Draper and Anne G. Lipow, "Marxist Women versus Bourgeois Feminism," Socialist Register (1976): 179-226, quotations on 180, 189. Draper and Lipow trace the split back to a struggle for primacy within the German workers movement between Lassalleans and Marxists.

<sup>63</sup> Richard J. Evans, "Bourgeois Feminists and Women Socialists in Germany 1894-1914: Lost Opportunity or Inevitable Conflict?" Women's Studies International Quarterly 3 (1980): 355-376, quotation on 359. Reasons for the vote included not unfounded feminist fears of legal repercussion: in 1894 a women's "educational club" was dissolved after sending a representative to a socialist meeting; see Quataert, "Feminist Tactics," p. 51.

<sup>64</sup> See Sowerwine, Sisters or Citizens, pp. 26-28; Sowerwine, "The Socialist Women's Movement from 1850 to 1940," in Renate Bridenthal, Claudia Koonz, and Susan Stuard, eds., Becoming Visible: Women in European History, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987), pp. 399-426, especially 405-406; Boxer, "Socialism Faces Feminism (1975), pp. 103-113. Claire Moses follows Sowerwine on this, in French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century (Albany: SUNY Press, 1984), pp. 223-224. On factionalism among French feminists, see Wynona H. Wilkins, "The Paris International Feminist Congress of 1896 and Its French Antecedents," North Dakota Quarterly 43, no 4 (Autumn 1975): 5-28. For biographer, Steven C. Hause, Hubertine Auclert: The French Suffragette (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), p. 67.

<sup>65</sup> Sowerwine, Sisters or Citizens, pp. 75-77. For the compte-rendu, see Congrès international de la condition & des droits des femmes tenu les 5, 6, 7 et 8 septembre 1900 (Paris: Imprimerie des arts et manufactures, 1901), pp. 73-79.

<sup>66</sup> On Holland, Grever and Waaldijk, Transforming the Public Sphere, pp. 195-200. On Braun, Meyer, Lily Braun, quotations on 63, 64, and 142. Evans also follows Sowerwine on this, Comrades and Sisters, p. 40; Stites states that servants constituted a "blind spot" for feminists; Women's Liberation Movement, p. 223.

<sup>67</sup> Rose Glickman, Russian Factory Women: Workplace and Society, 1880-1914 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 243-244.

---

<sup>68</sup> Boxer and Quataert, eds., Socialist Women, quotation on 3, emphasis in original. Exceptional work that did examine women's class status included Gerda Lerner, "The Lady and the Mill Girl: Changes in the Status of Women in the Age of Jackson," Midcontinent American Studies Journal 10, no. 1 (spring 1969): 5-15, and two essays in Carroll, ed., Liberating Women's History: Hilda Smith, "Feminism and the Methodology of Women's History," pp. 368-384 and Sheila Ryan Johansson, "'Herstory' as History: A New Field or Another Fad?", pp. 400-430. It was, in fact, the realization that this work did not deal as much with working-class women as with educated daughters of the middle-classes that led me to stop working in socialist history and to shift my research to the lives of Parisian women artisans.

<sup>69</sup> Sowerwine writes, "Even in the countries where the socialist women's movement was weakest, it reached more women than the bourgeois feminists ever hoped to reach"; Sowerwine, "Socialist Women's Movement," p. 421. If doubtful in other cases as well, this statement wholly ignores mass religious women's movements that attracted large numbers in several countries. Picq writes that "socialist women abandoned working women"; "'Bourgeois Feminism' in France," p. 341.

<sup>70</sup> See Carolyn J. Eichner, Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), pp. 5, 47-50, and Florence Rochefort, "The French Feminist Movement and Republicanism, 1868-1914," in Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, eds. Women's Emancipation Movements, quotation on 78. Developing a different, women-oriented framework is one of the goals of a recent study of socialism and feminism in England; see June Hannam and Karen Hunt, Socialist Women: Britain, 1880s to 1920s (London and New York: Routledge, 2002), especially pp. 202-206.

<sup>71</sup> "Debating the Present, Writing the Past: 'Feminism' in French History and Historiography," Radical History Review 52 (1979): 79-94, quotation on 84. In Moses's view, the grandmothers evoked "the National Woman's Party, seen as associated with the Republican Party" and the mothers, the "members of the National Organization for Women, associated with the Democratic Party."

<sup>72</sup> Sally Alexander, "Women, Class and Sexual Differences," History Workshop Journal 17(Spring 1984): 125-149, quotation on 127.

<sup>73</sup> Evans, Comrades and Sisters, pp. 59-63, quotation on 59. On women in the interwar SFIO as "neither comrades nor sisters," see Gruber, "French Women in the Crossfire," p. 280.

<sup>74</sup> Lopes and Roth, Men's Feminism, p. 222.

<sup>75</sup> See, e.g., Jeanne-Victoire [Jeanne Deroin], "Call to Women" in La Femme libre 1, no. 1 (1832) in Susan Groag Bell and Karen M. Offen, eds., Women, the Family, and Freedom: The Debate in Documents, Vol. One, 1750-1880 (Stanford, CA.: Stanford University Press, 1983), p. 146; also Claire Goldberg Moses, French Feminism in the Nineteenth Century (Albany: SUNY Press, 1984), pp. 136-142; Carolyn J. Eichner, Surmounting the Barricades: Women in the Paris Commune (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004), passim; and Florence Rochefort, "The French Feminist Movement and Republicanism, 1868-1914," in Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker, eds., Women's

---

Emancipation Movements in the Nineteenth Century: A European Perspective (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004, p. 86.

<sup>76</sup> For example, Jeanne Bouvier and Henriette Coulmy; see Bard, Les Filles de Marianne, pp. 184-186.

<sup>77</sup> On motherhood as an issue crossing "class" lines, see Ann Taylor Allen, Feminism and Motherhood in Western Europe, 1890-1970: The Maternal Dilemma (Palgrave-Macmillan, in press); for "parallel wars," Ida Blom, "Modernity and the Norwegian Women's Movement from the 1880s to 1914: Changes and Continuities," in Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, eds., Women's Emancipation Movements, p. 138.

<sup>78</sup> The term "litmus test" is used by Claire Moses, "Debating the Present", p. 84 and by Sheila Rowbotham in Women in Movement: Feminism and Social Action (New York and London: Routledge, 1992), p. 14. For a comparative anthology on the debate including case studies of nine European countries (plus Australia and the United States) which provide evidence that the argument over protective legislation was no simple debate between socialists and trade unionists who supported it and "bourgeois" feminists who opposed it, see Ulla Wikander, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Jane Lewis, eds., Protecting Women: Labor Legislation in Europe, the United States, and Australia, 1880-1920 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1995).

<sup>79</sup> Florence Rochefort argues that the "'women designated by socialists as 'bourgeoises' were for the most part situated well to the left on the political spectrum" and she also declares that the socialist attack on feminism in the Second International "did not bring about a major schism within the feminist movement; for feminists it remained possible to have a twofold commitment"; see her "The French Feminist Movement and Republicanism, 1868-1914," in Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, eds., Women's Emancipation Movements, pp. 77-101, quotation on 86.

<sup>80</sup> Naomi J. Andrews demonstrates how "gender shaped socialism's definition of the good society" in the July Monarchy; Socialism's Muse: Gender in the Intellectual Landscape of French Romantic Socialism (Lanham, MD.: Lexington Books, in press), ms. p. 9.

<sup>81</sup> Class issues also arose in Latin America, in the suffrage movement in Uruguay. Christine Ehrick suggests, however, that the familiar European/North American model does not really suit the Latin American context. See "Madrinas and Missionaries: Uruguay and the Pan-American Women's Movement," Gender and History 10, no. 3 (November 1998): 406-424.

<sup>82</sup> Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, Feminists Despite Themselves: Women in Ukrainian Community Life, 1884-1939 (Edmonton, Alberta: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies, 1988), p. 80, and "Feminism in Ukrainian History," Journal of Ukrainian Studies 7, no. 1 (spring 1982): 16-30, especially 20. See also idem, "Socialism and Feminism: the First Stages of Women's Organizations in the Eastern Part of the Austrian Empire," in Tora Yedlin, ed., Women in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union (New York: Praeger 1980), pp. 44-64.

<sup>83</sup> On split into "broad" and "narrow" socialism, Krassimira Daskalova, "Bulgarian Women in Movements, Laws, Discourses (1840s-1940s)," Bulgarian Historical Review 27, no. 1-2: 180-196, especially 186-188; on stigma and values, idem, "The Women's Movement in Bulgaria after Communism," in Joan W. Scott,

---

Cora Kaplan, Debra Keates, eds., Transitions, Environments, Translations: Feminism in International Politics (New York and London: Routledge, 1997) pp. 162-175, quotations on 163 and 170.

<sup>84</sup> Judith Szapor, "Sisters or Foes: The Shifting front Lines of the Hungarian Women's Movements, 1896-1918," in Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, eds., Women's Emancipation Movements, pp. 189-205, quotations on 199; Andrea Petö, "Hungarian Women in Politics," in Scott, Kaplan, and Keates, Transitions, pp. 153-161, quotation on 159.

<sup>85</sup> Jill M. Bystozyenski, "The Feminist Movement in Poland: Why So Slow?" Women's Studies International Forum 24, no. 5 (2001): 501-511, quotation on 503.

<sup>86</sup> Wang Zheng, Women in the Chinese Enlightenment (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). The book is based on interviews with eight members of the first generation of Chinese feminist activists. For transliterations and definitions of "feminism," see especially pp. 7-9, 133-134, 339-342.

<sup>87</sup> Kumari Jayawardena, "Some Thoughts on the Left and the 'Woman Question' in South Asia," in Sonia Kruks, Rayna Rapp, and Marilyn B. Young, eds., Promissory Notes: Women in the Transition to Socialism (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989), pp. 359-366, quotation on 363.

<sup>88</sup> Kruks, Rapp, and Young, "Introduction," in *ibid.*, pp. 7-12, quotation on 9.

<sup>89</sup> On "capitulation," Elizabeth Waters, "In the Shadow of the Comintern: The Communist Women's Movement, 1920-1943," *ibid.*, pp. 29-56, quotation on 51; ; on "knuckled under," Christina Gilmartin, "Gender, Politics, and Patriarchy in China: the Experiences of Early Women Communists, 1920-1927," in *ibid.*, pp. 82-105, quotation on 101; on individualism and traditional roles, Christine Pelzer White, "Vietnam: War, Socialism, and the Politics of Gender Relations," *ibid.*, pp. 172-192 and Delia D. Aguilar, "Third World Revolution and First World Feminism: Toward a Dialogue," *ibid.*, pp. 338-344.

<sup>90</sup> Mineke Bosch, "History and Historiography of First-Wave Feminism," in Paletschek and Pietrow-Ennker, eds., Women's Emancipation Movements, p. 65.

<sup>91</sup> For a summary of sociological and feminist perspectives on these issues, see Pamela Abbott and Roger Sapsford, Women and Social Class (London and New York; Tavistock, 1987), pp. 1-34.

<sup>92</sup> See Allan Megill and Donald N. McCloskey, "The Rhetoric of History," in John S. Nelson, Allan Megill, and Donald N. McCloskey, eds., The Rhetoric of the Human Sciences: Language and Argument in Scholarship and Public Affairs (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987), pp. 221-238; and Jo Burr Mardagant, "Introduction: Constructing Selves in Historical Perspective," in *idem*, ed., The New Biography: Performing Femininity in Nineteenth-Century France (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), pp. 1-32, quotation on 5.

<sup>93</sup> See Kathleen Canning, "Gender and the Politics of Class Formation: Rethinking German Labor History," American Historical Review 97, no. 3 (June 1992): 736-768.

<sup>94</sup> "Women," argues Diane P. Koenker, faced "exclusion from the male world of class";

"Men against Women on the Shop Floor in Early Soviet Russia: Gender and Class in the Socialist Workplace," American Historical Review 100, no. 5 (December 1995): 1438-1464, quotation on 1463. On

---

"hegemonic role," Jean Quataert, "Socialism, Feminism, and Agency: A Long View," Journal of Modern History 73 (spring 2001): 603-616, quotation on 609. On construction of class and gender, Sonya O. Rose, Limited Livelihoods: Gender and Class in Nineteenth-Century England (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), p. 193. On masculine identity and class formation, Ava Baron, "On Looking at Men: Masculinity and the Making of a Gendered Working-Class History," in Ann-Louise Shapiro, ed., Feminists Revision History (New Brunswick, NJ.: Rutgers University Press, 1994), pp. 146-171.

<sup>95</sup> The journalist, Ida Heijermans, was the sister of a well-known socialist; Grever and Waaldijk, Transforming the Public Sphere, p. 202.

<sup>96</sup> Nelly Roussel, Quelques Lances rompues pour nos libertés (Paris: Giard and Brière, 1910), pp. 47-48.

<sup>97</sup> Jeanne Bouvier, Mes Memoires (Paris: Maspero, 1983), pp. 243-244, also quoted in Bard, Les Filles de Marianne, p. 185; on teachers, *ibid.*

<sup>98</sup> On wives, for Germany, Jean Quataert, Reluctant Feminists, p. 19; for the Netherlands, Ulla Jansz, "Gender and Democratic Socialism in the Netherlands," in Gruber and Graves, eds., Women and Socialism, p. 217; for Spain, Mary Nash, "Ideals of Redemption," in *ibid.*, p. 350. For Britain, Olive Banks, Becoming a Feminist: The Social Origins of 'First Wave' Feminism (Brighton, Eng.: Wheatsheaf, 1986), pp. 11, 16.

<sup>99</sup> Sowerwine states that "the socialist women, if they were not so much of the working classes as they claimed, were themselves from class backgrounds very different from those of the feminists"; Sisters or Citizens, p. 186. Picq also challenges Sowerwine on this point; "Bourgeois Feminism," p. 330.

<sup>100</sup> Nicky Hart, "Procreation: The Substance of Female Oppression in Modern Society, Part One: The True Proletariat," Contention 1 (Fall 1991): 89-108, especially 99; and "Part Two: Feminism and the Spirit of Capitalism," Contention 2 (Winter 1992): 65-88; see also *idem*, "Gender and the Rise and Fall of Class Politics," New Left Review 175 (1989): 19-47.

<sup>101</sup> Sarah Maza, The Myth of the French Bourgeoisie: An Essay on the Social Imaginary, 1750-1850 (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2003); "So bourgeois' [fashion hawk] Hugh mutters after her. 'So last year'"; observation at New York City fashion show described in New York Times, February 11, 2004, p. A26.

<sup>102</sup> On definitions of "bourgeois" in French dictionaries and popular usage, see Adeline Daumard, Les Bourgeois et la bourgeoisie en France depuis 1815 ([Paris]: Aubier, 1987), pp. 35-44.

<sup>103</sup> The ever-astute Madeleine Pelletier once remarked, "What the socialists reprove isn't feminism. It's the feminists"; "Bourgeois Feminism and Socialist Feminism," Le Socialiste, May 5, 1907.

<sup>104</sup> Shirley Gruner, "The Revolution of July 1830 and the Expression 'Bourgeoisie,'" Historical Journal 11, no. 3 (1968): 462-471, quotations on 469-471.

<sup>105</sup> Peter Gay, The Bourgeois Experience: Victoria to Freud. Vol. I, Education of the Senses (New York and Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984), quotations on 20; on writers, *idem*, Schnitzler's Century; The Making of Middle-Class Culture, 1815-1914 (London: Penguin, 2001), quotations on 29.

<sup>106</sup> Maza, Myth of the French Bourgeoisie, pp. 3, 5, 195.

---

<sup>107</sup> Eleanor Hakim, speaking of her cohort of graduate students at the University of Wisconsin; "The Tragedy of Hans Gerth," in Paul Buhle, ed., History and the New Left: Madison, Wisconsin, 1950-1970 (Philadelphia, PA.: Temple University Press, 1990), pp. 252-263, quotation on 256. On San Diego State, "Three Years of Struggle," pp. 33 ff.

<sup>108</sup> Michelle Perrot refers to Zetkin as "antifeminist" in "1914: Great Feminist Expectations," in Gruber and Graves, Women and Socialism, p. 38; Françoise Picq refers to "antifeminist socialists," in "Bourgeois Feminism" in Friedlander et al., Women in Culture and Politics, p. 339. The concept "proletarian antifeminism," was used as a major theme by Werner Thönnessen. Lopes and Roth find that it had weakened by the early 1890s; in their view, "Socialist men proved to be more consistent feminists than bourgeois women"; Men's Feminism, p. 31. It was in the mid-1890s that Zetkin began her strident antifeminist campaign.

<sup>109</sup> On Zetkin's support for traditional gender roles, see Lopes and Roth, Men's Feminism, pp. 200-201. On identity politics, Jean Quataert, "Socialism, Feminism, and Agency," p. 614. On socialist failure, cf. Hunt and Hannam, Socialist Women: Britain, pp. 19, 205.

<sup>110</sup> Cf., Virginia Sapiro, "A Woman's Struggle for a Language of Enlightenment and Virtue: Mary Wollstonecraft and Enlightenment 'Feminism,'" in Tjitske Akkerman and Siep Stuurman, eds., Perspectives on Feminist Political Thought in European History from the Middle Ages to the Present (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 122-123; also Ulla Jansz, "Women or Workers? The 1889 Labor Law and the Debate on Protective Legislation in the Netherlands," in Wikander et al., Protecting Women, p. 189.

<sup>111</sup> Sylvia Paletschek and Bianka Pietrow-Ennker, "Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe in the Long Nineteenth Century: Conclusions," in idem, eds., Women's Emancipation Movements, pp. 301-333, quotation on 326.

<sup>112</sup> On party to old politics, cf. Lopes and Roth, Men's Feminism, p. 45. For Sowerwine, "Socialist Women's Movement," in Bridenthal et al., p. 422.

<sup>113</sup> Karen Offen, European Feminisms, p.11. Olive Banks also sees the effects of socialism on feminism as "quite profound" and finds the decline of first-wave feminism in Britain to have been "in part at least a consequence of its alliance with socialism"; Becoming a Feminist, pp. 105, 160. Richard Evans blames divisions within the German women's movement for its failure to achieve a range of early twentieth century feminist goals, as well as for losing "the biggest battle of all--against the Nazis...almost without a shot being fired"; "Bourgeois Feminists and Women Socialists," p. 356.