

At Home in History: How were Various Popular Tendencies in Feminist Thought
Reflected in U.S. Women's History Writing?

Elizabeth H. Pleck

University of Illinois/Champaign, Urbana

Paper for Women's History Revisited: Historiographical Reflections and Women and
Gender in a Global Context, 20th International Congress of Historical Sciences, Sydney,
Australia, 8 July, 2005

“I have one reservation about your treatment of your subject: you address yourself solely to the problems of middle class, college-educated women. This approach was one of the shortcomings of the suffrage movement for many years and has, I believe, retarded the general advance of women. Working women, especially Negro women, labor not only under the disadvantages imposed by the feminine mystique, but under the more pressing disadvantages of economic discrimination. To leave them out of consideration of the problem or to ignore the contributions they came make toward its solution, is something we simply cannot afford to do. By their desperate need, by their numbers, by their organization experience (if trade union members), working women are most important in reaching *institutional* solutions to the problems of women.¹

Gerda Lerner to Betty Friedan, 1963

In the fall of 1971 the history department responded to the growing demand for U.S. women’s history by creating a tenure line for it. I kept teaching the course while they kept searching for someone (else) to fill the position. In 1973, with my book in press at Yale, they hired a person who had barely begun her dissertation.²

Kathryn Kish Sklar, 2000

Writing in U.S. women’s history in the 1970s began with the study of woman’s place or status, then moved in the direction of consciousness and identity. Similarly, Betty Friedan in *The Feminine Mystique*, published in 1963, launched a critique of the view that woman’s place was in the home; by the late 1960s Friedan’s views were at the conservative end of the spectrum, but many varieties of feminism nonetheless shared with Friedan a belief that men and women had to transform many aspects of their lives to realize equality and or personal fulfillment. In sum. the women’s movement drove the intellectual agenda of U.S. women’s history. The time, place, and topic where the present and past seemed to converge in the historiography on U.S. women was in the study of the ideology of domesticity, a highly influential belief system about the home and woman’s place within it that arose in the middle of the nineteenth century.³ What was so prominent and promising for two decades was attacked as reactionary and as a

result, fell into disrepute. Historian Linda Kerber in the best of the U.S. essays on this subject pronounced this whole line of investigation merely metaphor in 1987.⁴ The concept was even more important to U.S. literary criticism than to U.S. women's history since these scholars understood domesticity not as a description of reality but as a trope. Nonetheless, in 2002 *American Literature* published a special issue, "No More Separate Spheres."

Nonetheless, historians in many developed countries found separate spheres applicable in the 1980s.⁵ In that decade and the next historians analyzed the relationship between missionaries who often conveyed ideas about home to peoples around the world and the impact of their work. Such ideas were not simply imposed from without but taken in and reconfigured. Imagining the home became a theme in postcolonial women's history of India.⁶ Even in the U.S. the ideology of domesticity stirred back to life as part of exploring the relationship between the U.S. home and the world outside continental U.S. borders.⁷ In the 1990s U.S. women's historians recognized imperial as well as economic origins for the ideology of domesticity: the empire of the woman arose at the same time as Manifest Destiny.⁸ This topic also found favor because domesticity was rarely celebrated but instead was seen in a highly critical manner.

While many historians were thus rediscovering the salience of the ideology of domesticity, a decided legacy of hostility still hung over the topic within U.S. women's history. The ideology of domesticity had placed the white middle-class woman as the central subject of the field. One source of hostility was related to the class, regional, and racial biases of the work; a second source was the conservative uses to which such research was put. Lawyers for the Sears company, defending themselves against charges

of sex discrimination, cited this line of investigation in women's history to justify company policies.⁹ Expert witness and historian Rosalind Rosenberg defended the retailer Sears in court against charges of sex discrimination. She argued that women enjoyed their place in the home and had as a result developed nurturing, caring values incompatible with an interest in competitive sales positions. Sears won in a lower court and on appeal but in other cases a year and a half later judges ruled for the plaintiffs and essentially nullified the Sears ruling. Most women's historians were shocked to see their research used against opening up job opportunities for women. Historian Ellen DuBois writes, "the sorry truth was that the defense's use of history in its case was consistent with the emphasis women's historians had placed on nineteenth-century women's role in creating their own, distinct "sphere" and the satisfaction it had provided them."¹⁰

My own previous work has already touched on the relationship between feminism and women's history. Nancy Cott and I reviewed the state of U.S. women's history in 1979. In the introduction to *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women*" we wrote that "the characteristic approach of the new women's history is to extend to the past questions raised by and essential insights derived from the contemporary women's movement."¹¹ We identified three influential branches of the movement, liberal, Marxist, and radical feminist, omitting cultural feminism and lesbian feminism, two permutations of feminism emerging out of radical feminism. As the subtitle of the anthology suggests we thought recent writing about U.S. women originated in the new social history, in contemporary feminism, and in the growth of women in higher education. In terms of writing about the theme of domesticity I would expand that argument. Branches of feminism, personal biography, and epiphanies in the archives all

all led to the focus on domesticity. As to biography, we will be able to relate fully the biographies of the authors and their feminist involvements to the history they were writing when the Living Women's History oral history project opens at Smith College in the Fall of 2006. Most of the women's historians discussed in this talk were interviewed for this project. Until these transcripts become available I offer some preliminary comments about the connection between feminism, personal biography, and writing about domesticity.

The initial interest in the ideology of domesticity arose as a means of discovering the origins of Betty Friedan's The Feminine Mystique. There were probably two alternative books that might have inspired historical investigation. DeBeauvoir's The Second Sex was widely owned by women in the United States and argued for the social construction of womanhood. Mary Beard's Woman as a Force in History had clearly influenced historians Gerda Lerner in part because Beard also emphasized the role of capitalism in widening the class differences between groups of women. Beard's book lead in many directions, although in emphasizing the legal loopholes by which colonial women had access to property, her work seemed to beckon in the direction of legal research, at the time disparaged by adherents of the new social history.¹² Neither of these two books provided a clear question to be investigated. Friedan was easier to read and understand than deBeauvoir or Beard and could be shaped into this historical question. If the feminine mystique did not begin in the 1950s, when and why did it begin?

"The Cult of True Womanhood" by Barbara Welter appeared in 1966 just three years after Friedan's book was published. The writing was witty or what Mary Louise Roberts characterizes as sarcastic; often the sarcasm was pointed at biblical references,

apparently a nod in the direction of the secularism of the 1960s, and the word cult was deliberately chosen to insult.¹³ “The Cult of True Womanhood” was unclear as to who or what caused the cult (sometimes it was men, sometimes, industrialism) but with 117 footnotes, most of them to fiction and articles in women’s magazines, the article had a scholarly apparatus thick with quotations. As historian Linda Kerber points out, Welter was using the same types of sources Friedan had relied on, popular fiction about women, often published in women’s magazines, written by women, but mostly by men.¹⁴ The main argument of the article was functionalist, that the cult provided a stable belief system about womanhood for a time of flux.

Although the time of flux described was the era of Jacksonian democracy, the article gestured in the direction of a transformation in ideals of womanhood throughout the nineteenth century. Welter argued that the True Woman eventually became the New Woman because of a long list of forces of change, from “the movements for social reform, westward migration, missionary activity, utopian communities, industrialism, the Civil War [which] contributed to the demise of the cult.”¹⁵ She was not particularly interested in causation, but instead intent on finding common themes in texts written about the same time. Nonetheless, Welter anticipated later work on women and moral reform by acknowledging that the idea of female moral superiority encouraged women to leave the home to reshape the world, thus, contradicting the view that women were cloistered in the home. She was at her most clever in identifying four ideal qualities of womanhood (piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity) repeated somewhat as a mantra. In the second to the last paragraph of the article she signaled that she had located the origins of the feminine mystique. She wrote, “And yet the stereotype, the ‘mystique’

if you will, of what woman was and ought to be persisted, bringing guilt and confusing in the midst of opportunity.” In the footnote to this sentence she wrote, “Betty Friedan ‘The Feminine Mystique (New York, 1963) challenges the whole concept of True Womanhood as it hampers the “fulfillment” of the 20th-century woman.” Fulfillment was put in quotation marks because Welter was critiquing the ideal of fulfillment and applauding Friedan for arguing that women could not find the fulfillment they were seeking by embracing the home, marriage, and motherhood.

While I know nothing about Welter’s political affiliations, those of Aileen Kraditor, who had previously written a book about the changing ideas of the woman’s suffrage movement, are much clearer. Along with several other prominent women’s historians, such as Eleanor Flexner and Gerda Lerner, she was a former member of the Communist Party. Aileen Kraditor’s *Up from the Pedestal* (1968) was an anthology of writings about American feminism, which ended with the NOW Statement of Purpose in 1966. It was organized around the theme of male and female writers and activists debating the question of spheres. Kraditor was the first historian to refer to the “cult” as a question of spheres, thus, broadening ideals about women into a question of the split between the masculine public sphere and the feminine private sphere. As a former Communist, she was trained to pay attention to the significance of race and class. She thus referred to the woman’s rights movement as a “white, middle-class movement” and sought to explain the reasons for the racial and class base of the movement. Other women wanted equality, she argued, but such women gave higher priority to “their needs and grievances as Negroes and workers first and as women second.” (Ironically, in this language black women were not seen as workers). She also acknowledged that such

women did not become more active in part because of the prejudice they faced from white women in the women's movement. Nonetheless, she seemed to rationalize exclusion rather than insist upon inclusion because none of the documents she published were written by or about white working-class women or women from any racial minority.¹⁶

In 1969 Gerda Lerner published "The Lady and the Mill Girl: Changes in the Status of Women in the Age of Jackson." Her multivalent title conveyed her interest in class difference, changes in the "status" of women, and the use of traditional periodization.¹⁷ The status of women question derived from English historian Alice Clark and colonial North American historian Elizabeth Dexter. Clark and Dexter argued that women's status declined with industrialization as women's activities became concentrated in a narrower range of domestic pursuits. In 2004 when Gerda Lerner visited my campus she told a seminar of graduate students she wrote her article to refute the absence of class analysis in Welter's "Cult of True Womanhood."¹⁸ Lerner, unlike Welter, criticized Friedan for being ahistorical, which only added to her earlier criticism that the book emphasized too much the problems of women who were white, middle class, and did not belong to trade unions. In 1979 in an introduction to *The Majority Finds its Past*, a collection of previously published articles, she wrote, "the essay was in part an outgrowth of my research in ante-bellum reform movements, in part a response to the a-historical analysis of women's place in society in a book like Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* and in some of the early pamphlets of the women's liberation movement."¹⁹ The pamphlets she identifies are *No More Fun and Games: A Journal of Female Liberation* and "Notes from the First Year," *Journal of New York Radical*

Women. Without much more evidence to go on, we have to assume that radical feminist literature was also dating the origins of the feminine mystique to the 1950s. She saw herself attacking several types of feminist writing, but in print at least she did not make explicit her complaint with Welter. Moreover, she was the only women's historian comfortable enough with the relationship between women's history and women's liberation to cite radical feminist pamphlets in her footnotes.

In "Lady and the Mill Girl" Lerner made clear she was tracing the origins of the feminine mystique. She wrote, "The ideology still pervasive in our present-day society regarding women's "proper" role was formed in those decades. . . In fact, however, it was in mid-nineteenth century America that the ideology of "woman's place is in the home" changed from being an accurate description of existing reality into a myth. It became the "feminine mystique"- a longing for a lost, archaic world of agrarian family self-sufficiency, updated by woman's consumer function and the misunderstood dicta of Freudian psychology."²⁰ Lerner, who left the Communist Party in the 1950s and could best be characterized at this time as a Marxist feminist, applied a Marxist feminist analysis to the emergence of the ideology of domesticity. She argued that "publishers and mass media writers" were part of a capitalist plot to strengthen gender stereotypes and class distinctions as a means of exalting the class status of wealthy men. Taking a page from Thorstein Veblen she then argued that these men used their wife's idleness as a means to display their wealth. She further claimed that the ideology of domesticity strengthened race and class distinctions in two regions of the U.S. She wrote, "Just as the cult of white womanhood in the South served to preserve a labor and social system based on race distinctions, so did the cult of the lady in an egalitarian society serve as a means

of preserving class distinctions.” She pointed out that the cult of womanhood entirely ignored lower class women because manufacturers wanted to exploit such women as cheap labor. The article ended with the lady and the mill girl joining hands in starting the woman’s rights movement as “they learned to cooperate, each for her own separate interests.”²¹

As Linda Kerber points out, Lerner’s analysis of the female sphere was a gloss on Friedrich Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State. Marxist feminists took from Engels the argument that the subordination of women arose because men not only controlled the public world but also took control over the private space of the home as the wife became the private servant of her husband. Engels argued that the division between the public and private served the interests of the capitalist class and was thus central to the maintenance of capitalism. Marxist feminists were particularly interested in the transition from agrarian to industrial capitalist society because they believed that the growth of wage work in industry led to a new form of exploitation of women, as surplus labor rather than (or in addition to) as unpaid laborers in the home. Lerner was drawn to the study of the “lady and the mill girl” not only for these reasons but also because she sought to show how the antebellum woman’s rights movement emerged out of abolitionism. She and her husband had become active in the civil rights movement and her biography of the Grimke sisters presented them as alienated intellectuals and antiracist heroines of abolitionism and woman’s rights. Lise Vogel, a red diaper baby who belonged to Marxist feminist women’s history reading group at the time, recalls that Lerner was read as a “striking challenge” to Welter because of its class analysis.²² She writes that “what distinguished Lerner’s article, and made it part of the

emerging new women's history, was precisely its insistence that class matters in the experience of women's sphere. For those embarking on the study of the history of women, Lerner's essay served as an important confirmation of the utility of taking class as a fundamental analytical category."²³

Kathryn Kish Sklar's biography of the doyenne of Victorian domesticity, Catherine Beecher, departed from Lerner and other women's historians in writing about a woman who was not an abolitionist heroine. She moved the field away from an analysis of widening class distinctions and back toward the origins and development of the cult of domesticity. This swing of the pendulum occurred not because of Sklar's political leanings, but despite them. Sklar married while in college, dropped out of school, and left the U.S. for Germany in 1959, thinking the move was permanent exile because of "disillusioning insights into our own culture. . .," which included awareness about racial injustice. By the middle of the 1960s she and her husband decided to return to the U.S. and school in the Boston area. As an undergraduate at Radcliffe College she joined the civil rights organization, CORE (Congress on Racial Equality). She recalls, "I had experienced CORE's requirement that its white members reflect upon and accept the bitter truth of their own racism. I had learned to understand how much identity as a white, middle-class student was part of the problem."²⁴

Nonetheless, Sklar did not end up writing whiteness into history but instead chose a biography of a woman intellectual beset with personal conflicts. Sklar was drawn to biography as a way of understanding the classic feminist issue, the relationship of the private and the public. While a faculty wife at the University of Michigan, Sklar pursued her interest in intellectual history. She defined herself as a left intellectual and her

feminism developed in a consciousness-raising group in Ann Arbor while she was revising her dissertation. In an oral history interview she tells about her sense of self split between her identity as an intellectual, graduate student and scholar and her love of her two young children and desire to be home with them. She was able to reconcile the two halves one summer when she drove in an unairconditioned car to archives while taking a babysitter and her children with her. Beecher, a single woman with no real home of her own, also had a split identity, torn between her desire for personal autonomy and desire for a home.²⁵

Carroll Smith-Rosenberg has also written about the origins of her now classic article “the Female World of Love and Ritual” in an anthology of her articles, *Disorderly Conduct*. An interview with her is part of the oral history project available at Smith in two years, which will no doubt shed additional light on her biography at the time she was writing this article. In her anthology she describes “a series of serendipitous events” by which she “rediscovered women’s voices” that led to the discovery of the female world.²⁶ The manuscript librarian at Stanford University showed her the 40 year correspondence between another librarian and her close female friend. Smith-Rosenberg then describes a dogged search for the private papers of ordinary women. Smith-Rosenberg, who had previously studied moral reform in antebellum Philadelphia, was not writing the *Feminine Mystique* into history. This article and others she published during this period contained no references to Friedan or to women’s liberation pamphlets. Instead, the impact of radical feminism and the transition from radical feminism to cultural feminism is an unacknowledged influence on her writing.

It is reductionist to read Smith-Rosenberg's highly original article as her own personal coming out story. She was a social historian who read widely in anthropology and she was interested in critiques of Freud. Like many works of art, her article took on a life of its own for its readers. Teachers could offer the article as reassurance about the acceptability of female homoeroticism, stopping short of genital contact while at the same time lesbian activists and scholars recognized in it the first tentative steps toward the writing of lesbian history.²⁷ Smith-Rosenberg describes the way her work was read as quite different from her intentions. She writes, "Some scholars saw in it ["Female World"] evidence of a Garden of Eden of mother-daughter intimacy and trust; others, a female utopia of support and empathy. Still others saw evidence of a lesbian world, while their critics used this same essay to deny the existence of lesbianism in nineteenth-century America. Some scholars even attacked the essay as "seductive," accusing me of ignoring the repressive reality of women's lives and of failing to put this world within a larger, social-structural perspective. The issues that were raised were not the ones I initially sought to address when I conceived the essay." She sought to analyze the Victorian "female friendship" but in so doing, wrote that "women, however, did not form an isolated and oppressed subcategory in male society."²⁸ In the next sentence she argued that "women's sphere had an essential integrity and dignity that grew out of women's shared experiences and mutual affection. . ."²⁹ Her statement that women did not form an oppressed subcategory was not followed up or developed and must be taken more as a transition to her point about the integrity of women's sphere rather than as a wholesale critique of the field of women's history for its interest in inequality and the victimization of women by men.

Smith-Rosenberg originally intended to study the female world with attention to a “broad sample of collections” stratified by region, class, ethnicity, and age. The collections she used described the female world of white women from various regions and different strata in the middle class. Smith-Rosenberg in 1975 argued that it was because of the availability of “private correspondence, diaries, and commonplace books, filled with comments on behavior and feelings” that we can examine the “emotional quality of the lives of middle class women “not possible to the historian of the working classes.” Because of the difference in the kind of source material available, she argued that “we can begin to construct analytic models far more complex than those presently possible in the study of working-class women.”³⁰ In 1995 Karen Hansen, herself white, wrote an article about the homosocial relationship between two African American women discovered in their correspondence. There were thus female worlds to be found among black women but it took more than 20 years after the initial development of the concept for a researcher to come across an example.³¹

In light of Smith-Rosenberg’s subsequent interest in the “linguistic turn” and attention to the close reading of the language of texts, her assumption that “the words of women” constituted an authentic female voice unmediated by literary conventions of the time appears hard to explain, even naïve.³² The linguistic turn, however, occurred after this article was written. At the time Smith-Rosenberg wrote this article was invested in the transparency of the language of these women for two reasons. The first was because she was influenced by the new social history. Many social historians of the time from E. P. Thompson to Herbert Gutman saw themselves as documenting the voices of the

subordinate as a means of showing the oppositional consciousness of the oppressed and their hidden forms of resistance.

The second was that radical feminists often withdrew from male-dominated organizations because they were shouted down and interrupted when they tried to speak. In all-female consciousness raising groups women could give voice to feelings they had previously never discussed with others and in so doing formulate generalizations about women's condition. Women had to bond together in "sisterhood" both to heal the wounds they had suffered from men and to formulate a plan of action. In public forums radical feminist women organized speak outs against abortion, rape, and prostitution. Unlike Welter who distanced herself from a cult she disliked through sarcasm, Smith-Rosenberg drew physically closer to her female subjects. She wrote of "love, sensuality, and sexuality"; the women she quoted described in their diaries and letters longing, passion, kisses, and bodies touching.

In "Female World of Love and Ritual" Smith-Rosenberg turned the ideology of domesticity from a male conspiracy into a form of women's culture and erotic sensibility and shifted the evaluation of domesticity and the female sphere from largely negative to exceedingly positive. She argued that women's homosocial sexual experience was sustained by a separate female emotional space, even while most women shared the same physical space with the men of their family. Her female world then became reified into the shorthand term, "women's culture," adjunct to but separate from the ideology of domesticity. As a result of her article, the subject of domesticity became as much about sexuality as much women's status and place. In her 1975 essay review Smith-Rosenberg asked "What did sexuality mean to women? To examine this question we must broaden

our definition of sexuality to include experiences far beyond that of heterosexual intercourse.”³³ The “Female World of Love and Ritual” not only broadened the definition but made the study of sexuality central to the study of gender by showing that sexual identity had a history.³⁴ Subsequently the field of Queer studies arose and influenced by Foucault, began to question the definition of what is normal and investigate the origins and development of concepts of sexual normality. Smith-Rosenberg accepted the idea of sexual normality but argued that the Victorians had a different and better definition of the normal than in modern times.

The topic of domesticity became so central to women’s history because the U.S. women’s movement was comprised of different ideological camps, all of which identified a stake in what was usable about the history of domesticity. They converged on the idea that the private, the home, the personal, and the sexual as sources of female subordination and/or solidarity. These historians saw in the mid-nineteenth century the moment of transition from exploitation of women in the home to exploitation in the factory and the origins of the woman’s rights movement. Most read the present into the past, while Smith-Rosenberg worked from the past to the present, using the archives as a tool for developing her feminist consciousness.

Women writing about domesticity were often highly conscious of class and racial inequalities—not as the stereotype suggests, oblivious to it. Several of the authors, but especially Lerner, were attentive to class analysis. Lerner appears prescient in her statement in “Lady and the Mill Girl” that “to avoid distortion, any valid generalization concerning American women after the 1830s should reflect a recognition of class

stratification.”³⁵ Nonetheless, Welter, Sklar and Smith-Rosenberg, were interested not in class inequalities but rather the subjectivity of the white middle-class woman. For Smith-Rosenberg, this was a simple problem of sources. She believed that the words of women were to be found in the unpublished letters and diaries of literate women, mainly white and middle to upper class. I have argued that her interest in the words of women was in part a code for the emphasis on consciousness raising that had placed on women ending personal silence about taboo subjects. But there was also the question of the growing influence of radical feminism on historical writing. Women trained in the Communist Party such as Lerner and Kraditor were striving to reconcile race and class with gender analysis. But the dominant strain in U.S. feminist thought was radical feminism—that is, thinking of all women as a class—rather than trying to interconnect gender, race, class, and sexuality. Radical feminism posited the primacy of a gender analysis and it emphasized the technique of consciousness raising. Both the method and the analysis led to thinking that the personal was political and doubled back into interest in the origins and development of domesticity at a time when (white middle-class) women were developing a gender group consciousness.

The goal here was not to evaluate this research but instead to evaluate the relationship between the Second Wave in the U.S. and the writing of women’s history. All historians write about the past while living in the present and are influenced by the ideas and circumstances of their own time, not just by the documents they assemble about the past. Women’s historians were writing themselves into history even as they wrote history. What others might call the presentism of the field appears to be a strength rather than a weakness. All of the works considered here were well written, well argued, and

well researched and today constitute the classics of the field. Now however they can be read as feminist history and as feminism. The historians who were writing were implicitly situating themselves in relationship to the kind of feminism they believed in as well as in relationship to their time period and subject matter. Some did so explicitly, others buried the gesture in the footnotes, and still others embedded their affiliations in the documents they chose to analyze. The common theme in the writing of history and the statement of feminist solidarity was a concern with raising women's consciousness as a means of creating a feminist group identity.

I want to thank Estelle Freedman very much for her reading of a previous version of her work. Alice Echols graciously supplied me with her writings on this subject and shared with me her knowledge of feminism in the 1960s.

¹ Daniel Horowitz, "Rethinking Betty Friedan and *The Feminine Mystique*: Labor Union Radicalism and Feminism in Cold War America," *American Quarterly*, v. 48, No. 1 (1996), 22.

² Kathryn Kish Sklar, "The Women's Studies Moment: 1972," *The Politics of Women's Studies: Testimony from Thirty Founding Mothers* (New York: The Feminist Press of the City of New York, 2000), 140.

³ Nancy Hewitt reviewed research outside of the white middle class in the Northeast in "Beyond the Search for Sisterhood: American Women's History in the 1980s," *Social History*, v. 10, No. 3 (October, 1985): 299-321. Paula Baker extended the theme of woman as a moral reformer of the world in "Domestication of American Politics: Women

and American Political Society, 1780-1920,” *American Historical Review*, v. 89 (June, 1984): 620-649.

⁴ Linda K. Kerber, “Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Women’s Place: The Rhetoric of Women’s History,” *Journal of American History*, v. 75, No. 1 (June, 1988): 9-39.

⁵ Martha Vicinus began the British monographic history on this subject with *Suffer and Be Still: Women in the Victorian Age* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977). The first of the French works was Bonnie Smith, *Ladies of the Leisure Class: The Bourgeoises of Northern France in the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981). German work dates from 1989 with Ute Frevert, *Women in German History* (London: Berg Publishers, 1989).

⁶ Karen Tranberg Hansen, ed., *African Encounters with Domesticity* (New Brunswick: Rutgers, 1992); Jean Allman, “Making Mothers: Missionaries, Medical Officers and Women’s Work in Colonial Asante,” *History Workshop Journal*, 38 (1994), 23-47; Deborah. Gaitskell, “Devout Domesticity? A Century of Women’s Christianity in South Africa,” in Walker, ed., *Women and Gender in South Africa to 1945* (Cape Town: D. Philip, 1990), 251-272; Marla Stevens, “Modernizing the Malay Mother,” in Kalpana Ram and Margaret Jolly, eds., *Maternities and Modernities: Colonial and Postcolonial Experiences in Asia and the Pacific* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 50-80; Antoinette Burton, *Dwelling in the Archive: Women Writing House, Home, and History in Late Colonial India* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).

⁷ Vincente Rafael, “Colonial Domesticity: White Women and United States Rule in the Philippines,” *American Literature*, v. 67, No. 4 (December, 1995), 639-666; Kristin

Hoganson, "Cosmopolitan Domesticity: importing the American dream, 1865-1920," *American Historical Review*, v. 107, No. 1 (2002): 55-83; Laura Wexler, *Tender Violence: Domestic Visions in an Age of U.S. Imperialism* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).

⁸ Amy Kaplan, "Manifest Domesticity," *American Literature*, v. 70, No. 3 (September, 1998): 581-606.

⁹ To measure the depth of the hostility, see Ellen Carol DuBois, Mari Jo Buhle, Temma Kaplan, and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium," *Feminist Studies*, v. 6, No. 1 (Spring, 1980): 26-64.

¹⁰ Ellen Carol DuBois, "The Last Suffragist: An Intellectual and Political Autobiography," in Ellen Carol DuBois, ed., Woman Suffrage and Women's Rights (New York: New York University Press, 1998), 13.

¹¹ Nancy F. Cott and Elizabeth H. Pleck, eds., "Introduction," in Cott and Pleck, eds., *A Heritage of Her Own: Toward a New Social History of American Women* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1979), 14.

¹² Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex*, trans. H. M. Parshley (New York: 1949; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1952); Mary Ritter Beard, *Woman as a Force in History: A Study in Traditions and Realities* (New York: Macmillan, 1946).

¹³ Mary Louise Roberts, "True Womanhood Revisited," *Journal of Women's History*, v. 14, No. 1 (Spring, 2002), 150; Kerber, 12.

¹⁴ Kerber, 11.

¹⁵ Welter, 151.

¹⁶ Aileen S. Kraditor, Up from the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism (Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1968), 15.

¹⁷ The history of the Lowell mill girls owed a great deal to Hannah Josephson, *The Golden Threads: New England's Mill Girls and Magnates* (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1949).

¹⁸ Perhaps because she studied with Welter, Nancy Hewitt mistakenly assumes appreciation of Welter by Lerner in her statement that “Welter’s formulation thus served as a foundation for such later works as Gerda Lerner’s “The Lady and the Mill Girl” (1969). . .” Hewitt, “Taking the True Woman Hostage,” 159.

¹⁹ Gerda Lerner, *The Majority Finds its Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), XXVI.

²⁰ Lerner, “Lady and the Mill Girl: Changes in the Status of Women in the Age of Jackson,” in Lerner, *Majority*, 29.

²¹ Lerner, “Lady and the Mill Girl,”

²² Lise Vogel, “Red feminism: A symposium—introduction,” *Science and Society*, v. 66, No. 4 (Winter 2002/3003): 498-499.

-
- ²³ Vogel, "Telling Tales: Historians of Our Own Lives," *Journal of Women's History*, v. 2, No. 3 (1991): 89-101.
- ²⁴ Sklar, 134.
- ²⁵ Sklar, 134.
- ²⁶ Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, *Disorderly Conduct: Visions of Gender in Victorian America* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1985), 26.
- ²⁷ Alice Echols, *Shaky Ground: The Sixties and its After Shocks* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 130.
- ²⁸ Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual," in *Disorderly Conduct*, 60.
- ²⁹ Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual," in *Disorderly Conduct*, 60.
- ³⁰ Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The New Woman and the New History," *Feminist Studies*, v. 3, No. 1-2 (Fall, 1975), v. 3, Nos. 1-2 (1976): 171-198.
- ³¹ Karen V. Hansen, "No Kisses is Like Youres': An Erotic Friendship between Two African-American Women during the Mid-Nineteenth Century," *Gender and History*, v. 7, No. 2 (August, 1995): 153-182. For the publication of these documents see Faith Jasmine Griffin, *Beloved Sisters and Loving Friends: Letters from Rebecca Primus of Royal Oak, Maryland, and Addie Brown of Hartford, Connecticut, 1854-1868* (New York: Knopf, 1999).
- ³² Email from Alice Echols, March 18, 2005.
- ³³ Smith-Rosenberg, "The New Woman and the New History," 195.
- ³⁴ Echols, 130.
- ³⁵ Lerner, "The Lady and the Mill Girl," in *Majority Finds its Past*, 28.