



## International Labor and Working-Class, Inc

---

Labor History after the Gender Turn: Transatlantic Cross Currents and Research Agendas

Author(s): Laura L. Frader

Source: *International Labor and Working-Class History*, No. 63, Labor History after the Gender Turn (Spring, 2003), pp. 21-31

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of International Labor and Working-Class, Inc

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27672841>

Accessed: 30/11/2009 08:29

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



Cambridge University Press and *International Labor and Working-Class, Inc* are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *International Labor and Working-Class History*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# Labor History after the Gender Turn: Transatlantic Cross Currents and Research Agendas

*Laura L. Frader*  
Northeastern University

## *Abstract*

The examination of the cultural and linguistic production of gender and of gender relations in society has had a serious impact on the study of labor history over the past twenty years. Work on the role of gender has linked culture and ideas to politics and policies and has shown how ideas about masculinity and femininity shaped notions of the wage, skills, and work, as well as labor and employer practices, union strategies, and labor struggles. But this important methodological move and the new knowledge it has produced has had a limited impact on the field. The tendency to think of gender as a synonym for women has obscured the more radical potential of gender as an analytical tool. The problematic status of gender outside of North America and some parts of Western Europe, as well as the role that labor history itself plays in national histories, has also limited its impact. New research on the intersection of race and ethnicity with gender (including masculinity) and class—instead of treating gender, race, and class as distinct variables—has the potential of moving these investigations forward, especially in the European context.

Since the mid-1980s, labor historians in the United States have attempted to introduce gender as a category of historical analysis into the study of labor history, with reference to the labor histories of both sides of the Atlantic. These efforts were shaped by feminist theory and scholarship; they were profoundly influenced by the linguistic turn or cultural turn.<sup>1</sup> Many of them shifted from merely acknowledging the gender division of labor and/or chronicling the exclusion of women to critiquing how the categories of class, work, skill, and the wage, for example, were constituted on the basis of perceptions of masculinity and femininity. Many of them have interrogated how workers' own understandings of what it meant to be a worker rested on the meanings of sexual difference. These same studies have investigated how ideas about masculinity and femininity shaped class, wages, notions of skill, and notions of who could be considered legitimately a worker. They have shown how gender also determined who would be hired, for what jobs, how performance would be assessed, who would be retained and who would be fired. Additionally, studies have illuminated the ways that gender structured mechanisms of exclusion and inclusion in the labor movement and have shown how race operated alongside gender in shaping the meanings of class and class practices.<sup>2</sup> The very best work of this kind not only pointed to the ways that gender inflected and constituted key categories, but also showed how labor's gendered taxonomy and gendered meanings made a differ-

ence in labor and employer practices, union strategies, and labor struggles “on the ground,” at the point of production.<sup>3</sup> Other scholars looked at the meanings of gender and race both at work and in labor movement activism and showed how gender and sexuality shaped workers’ identities and understandings of class.<sup>4</sup> Linking the discourses, ideas, and rhetorics of sex and gender to practice and policy in labor history, this work has produced a major methodological shift. But looking back at these important and, in some cases, pathbreaking interventions, one is still left with the question, how far have we really come? That is, have the introduction of gender and the rich and productive interrogation of the old categories of analysis, with the new knowledge it has produced, really rattled the old paradigms? To what extent has it moved the field as a whole forward? Are historians of gender and labor principally talking to themselves?

At some level, there is cause for pessimism. One reason has to do with the status of gender as a subject of inquiry and as methodology. In the United States, despite widespread claims to the study of gender, there has been some reluctance to accept gender in its more radical incarnation as the cultural construction of masculinity as well as femininity. Much of the work on gender that has appeared over the past fifteen years has really been about women; gender at most levels of academic and intellectual enterprise is most often used as a code word for women.<sup>5</sup> Inquiry into how knowledge about sex and gender are produced has been left to the cultural historians, but has less often entered the domain of social history or labor history.<sup>6</sup> Part of this reluctance has been reflected in the criticism that analyzing the production of knowledge, or the production of cultural and linguistic meanings given to sexual difference, amounts to abandoning the central aim of social and labor history: the study of the lives of ordinary people—particularly women—who have been excluded from the historical canon. Thus, in the debate about gender versus women as the subject of investigation that began in the 1980s in the United States some scholars rejected claims about the important role of language as a key to understanding culture and therefore gender, particularly in labor history. They opposed cultural analysis to social history and argued that social history provided the most useful methodologies for the study of women. These scholars worried that giving attention to culture and language meant ignoring the material realities and struggles that shaped the lives of historical actors.<sup>7</sup> Such disagreements had international repercussions, even as scholars in Europe and elsewhere were attempting to take the crucial first step of legitimating the study of women in the academy.<sup>8</sup> They had particular repercussions in France, for example, as I shall discuss. However, beyond disagreements about the importance of culture and language versus material conditions in the lives of our historical subjects, it has become clear that gender itself does not have universal meaning everywhere.

Thus, a second reason for pessimism has to do with the meaning of the term *gender* outside of Western Europe and North America: the concept of gender has different valences in different cultural contexts. The term *gender* does not exist either in Chinese or in Japanese, and even the concept is often contested as a Western notion that is not meaningful to feminists’ efforts in these countries

to place the history of women on the agenda.<sup>9</sup> Moreover, there is a real and legitimate concern about the meaning of the term that surfaced in debates over common resolutions at the 1995 Fourth UN World Conference on Women in Beijing.<sup>10</sup> In many parts of the globe Western feminist debates about gender seem irrelevant to historians who are still struggling to be able to write about women or find a job in a university. As the Beijing conference showed, they also seem irrelevant to feminist activists who are struggling for women's human rights and basic legal equality. These differences and different definitions of what constitutes a feminist agenda point to the limits of our own analytical tools to have meaning beyond issues primarily of interest to women in the Western academy.<sup>11</sup> But they also point to the importance of culture and language, along with material life, in defining the interests of women (and also of men) and hence to the plausible cultural contingency of gender meanings. However, there are other reasons for pessimism about the extent to which gender has changed the ways we look at labor history.

The status of gender in France provides an example of the difficulties of integrating this analytical lens into historical scholarship and particularly into the study of labor history. When one scholar recently published an article in a French journal, although *gender* appeared throughout the article, in the published version the word was omitted from the title. The editors substituted the term *les rapports sociaux de sexe* as though the only way of thinking about sexual difference was through the concept of "social relations between the sexes." This shift in terms obscures the project of understanding how knowledge about sexual difference and its social meanings is created in different historical contexts. Likewise, it obscures the problem of the production and enforcement of difference implicit in *gender*. But this experience is only symptomatic of a larger resistance. In her survey of women's history, *Ecrire l'histoire des Femmes*, Françoise Thébaud devoted some attention to gender's problematic status in France, where it had been interpreted as the "history of representations."<sup>12</sup> This, indeed, has been one of the difficulties in the French reception of the term, where scholars have viewed representations and culture as separate from political practice and where there seems to be some reluctance to acknowledge that language and representations can shape social and political practices. But this has been only part of the problem.

In France, the status of gender as a subject of inquiry has been problematic for several reasons. First, although there has been much excellent work on women in France, writing the history of women has been highly contested within the French academy. This has much to do with the prominence of male historians and intellectuals who act as gatekeepers both in the university and in publishing historical scholarship. As Gerard Noiriel pointed out, the two are linked. The centralization of hiring is one factor: the government defines the major priorities and directions of university development and the Ministry of Education controls the labor market in universities, publishing available jobs in the *Bulletin officiel* and fixing salaries.<sup>13</sup> Although there are increasing numbers of women in the academy and in departments of history (at Toulouse, Aix, Paris VII, Paris

VIII, Lyon, Angers, and Rouen, for example), the reluctance to acknowledge women's history as a legitimate field of inquiry has meant that feminist historians of women are few and far between. As of February 2001 there was only one full professor historian of women in the entire Paris university system officially able to direct theses. Moreover, as Noiriel pointed out, unlike historians in Britain and the United States, French historians have remained dependent on commercial presses for the publication of their work. "Historians have adapted to this situation by attempting to occupy important positions both in the large publishing houses and within the state institutions that control the discipline."<sup>14</sup> These men regulate and control the diffusion of "acceptable" knowledge. To be sure, this is changing. There is now a respected journal of women's history, *Clio*, published by the Presses universitaires de Mirail at Toulouse, and houses like Albin Michel have begun to publish works on women's history with some regularity.<sup>15</sup> But the problem of how key institutions regulate the production and diffusion of knowledge remains.

Another reason for gender's problematic status as a category of analysis has to do with the place of history and the particular foundational historical narrative that has marked definitions of "French identity." It is a narrative in which the founding myth of the Republic, one and indivisible, takes center stage, and where the republican myth of equality requires the submersion of difference in universal rights. To argue that women have been poorly served by this myth, as scholars Joan Landes, Michel Riot-Sarcey, Joan Scott, and many others have done, or to raise the possibility of difference is to challenge the foundational status of the myth. This is a problem that is not confined to the history of women but to all those who claim separate or disparate histories on the basis of difference. But in labor history the resistance seems even stronger. In this very male-dominated field, if we look only at the labor history that has appeared in France over the last four years, only three works examine women (one, an extremely detailed and useful exploration of women, labor markets, and professional trajectories during the 1920s and 1930s); none look at gender.<sup>16</sup> Sociologists have been more successful in publishing on women, and some very interesting contemporary studies have appeared over the past ten years, so there may be some disciplinary differences here, although even among sociologists gender seems virtually absent. But there are other reasons that may account for the difficult history of gender in France.

Some of that difficult history has to do with reluctance to engage gender's more radical interrogation of masculinity (as well as femininity). Despite the fact that the labor movement in France is currently in decline, the history and the memory of a heroic past still carry weight. The corporate foundations of French labor, based in the experience of a relatively homogeneous class of skilled French men, constituted a powerful legacy. The legacy of masculine skill was able to endure through much of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth century, owing to the relatively small size of French firms and the persistence of skill traditions. This legacy remained powerful in discursive terms, even as the French industrial male workers who were at the forefront of organized labor be-

came progressively less skilled and as immigration in the 1920s dramatically altered the ethnic, national, and racial contours of the “working class.” But thinking about difference and about how difference has come to be constituted, as historians of gender have done, poses some uncomfortable challenges to the myth of the unitary working class, challenges that French labor historians have been unwilling to take up. Additionally, I want to hypothesize that labor historians’ resistance to gender may be linked to the role the labor movement played in the constitution of French masculinity itself. This, in turn, may have something to do with how scholars identify with the subjects whose stories they tell and with the emotional work of scholarship to which American historian Kathleen Blee recently called attention.<sup>17</sup> To study labor history on the basis of a universal and unquestioned model of masculinity is to reaffirm a familiar and comfortable model of manhood as part of national history. To analyze gender, however, is to interrogate the production of masculinity (or of femininity) and simultaneously to interrogate the stability of the concept. This is arguably a potentially more threatening move, but one which is precisely the power of gender analysis. Finally, it may be that the staying power of the French myth of the male working class may reside in politics: the ability of a powerful Communist labor movement in the pre-war and immediate post-war years to maintain itself through its appeal to male workers. Eric Weitz pointed to the relative stability of the masculine worker as a trope of the Communist labor movement in which masculinity appeared as a standard, a model, and symbol of labor’s strength. Indeed, one is struck by the representation of men in the illustrations on the mastheads of French labor press—square-jawed muscular men with shirtsleeves rolled, biceps bulging, often triumphantly raising their fists—or the photographs of the virile working men that appeared in the illustrations of magazines like *Le Regard* in the 1930s.<sup>18</sup> These representations not only reflected prevailing visions of masculinity but also helped to create the model of the masculine worker. Indeed, in France this would have been a tough model to question: despite the Communist labor movement’s efforts to mobilize women workers, women counted for only a small minority of union members in the interwar years and only one percent of Communist Party membership.<sup>19</sup>

On this side of the Atlantic the study of gender can still produce important historical knowledge even if the full analytical potential of gender has not been entirely realized. It may be true that by dichotomizing sex and gender we have reduced sex to a “biological” category and placed sex on the shelf as an already assumed “given.”<sup>20</sup> Reintegrating the study of sex, and particularly the question of how sexualities are constituted in the study of gender, may yield valuable historical insights for feminist historians.<sup>21</sup> However, more broadly, studying the production of all forms of difference still offers the most radical potential for historical analysis. There are several lines of inquiry that feminist labor history might pursue. These are not new areas of investigation, but it seems to me that we can do more.

The first has to do with race. Feminist labor history, justifiably, has placed much emphasis on the problem of exclusion, notably the exclusion of women.

This has meant that much of our work has called attention to how the meanings of “the feminine,” of femininity, of the female body, reproduction, and social reproduction have colluded in the exclusion of women from jobs, from unions, from politics. Historians are increasingly looking at how exclusionary mechanisms operated on the basis of race. The work of Laura Tabili on Britain and Eileen Boris, Jacqueline Dowd Hall, and Dolores Janiewski on the United States are several examples that have illuminated the “intersections and collision courses” of race, ethnicity, and gender at work and in labor struggles.<sup>22</sup> Indeed, we need to pay attention also to how complicated our categories really are. Arguably, those of us who work on Europe have to be careful about importing American categories: “race” does not have the same valence in France as it does in the United States. Until very recently, it has been very difficult to talk about race in France. Although the term and the concept certainly existed and were used rather abundantly and loosely throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the experience of Vichy, which employed racial classifications in carrying out racist policies, made the category impossible to use. It is still illegal to specify “race” on the census in contrast to common practice in the United States. Here again, the Republican myth of inclusion and integration and the flattening of difference also made it impossible to consider how race figured in social policy or in citizenship. Even historical studies of immigration in France, although they have explored ethnicity and the constitution of difference through nationality, have rarely examined race.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, few scholars have examined how race operated along with gender as a foundation of differential treatment or exclusion in the French working class.<sup>24</sup> For labor historians of France, a potentially rich field of inquiry to explore is how the meanings of racial difference are produced and what their significance is in class terms.

A second area of investigation that might be fruitfully explored in the French context is masculinity, fundamental to the meaning of gender. Recently, labor historians working in the United States and Britain have looked at the way masculinity has shaped the meanings of work, skill, and citizenship and has defined the terms of workers’ struggles for citizenship.<sup>25</sup> I believe that we could devote more attention to how ideas about wages, work, and labor activism reflect masculinity as well as to how they are constitutive of masculinity. The work of Mrinalini Sinha, although it is not labor history, stands as an example of how one might study, first, the construction of masculinity through the law and state policies in the context of an imperial social formation and, second, the ways in which institutions and cultural and social practices produce different versions of masculinity even as they attempt to reify it.<sup>26</sup> It has not just men but masculinity as a cultural construct and as a shaper of cultural practices that have contributed to the problem of exclusion that labor historians have been grappling with. And here there are important nuances. Masculinity and femininity are not, nor have they been, stable concepts. Nor does gender mean only one thing. If sex and gender are inseparable, both in their usage and in their meanings, then we need to look at the multiple meanings of gender as well as the multiple meanings of sex, rather than assume maleness or femaleness as clearly defined, universal binary

opposites. Labor historians need to avoid adopting these categories as though we already know what they mean and to do that means paying attention to the intersections of these different components of subjective identity and making their production a problem for study.

A third area of investigation concerns intersections. Are gender, sex, race, and class ever really separate? Are sex and race ever separate? Tyler Stovall's work on racial tensions between colonial workers and white French workers during World War One has shown that racial violence erupted over fears of mixed-race coupling and the corruption of French women workers. Stovall showed how those tensions were neither about class alone, nor about race alone, but about gender, sex, race, and class. On a more global level, studies of colonial policy and the relations between colonial subjects and whites have suggested provocative ways of thinking of these intersections in social relations as well as in colonial legislation.<sup>27</sup> We can learn much from them about how nation states produced femininity and masculinity even as their policies drew on concepts of gender already embedded in the culture. When French ergonomists performed studies of work and fatigue in the 1920s and 1930s, they developed a taxonomy of racial difference among male workers that reflected racist thinking about the "inferiority" of Asian and Southeast Asian immigrant workers or Arab workers. Their conclusions also helped to produce racial difference in relation to masculinity and to constitute the "masculine" as a function of racial difference.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, the political and institutional dimensions of difference are tremendously important. Over the past few years much labor history, in an effort to capture the lives and actions of ordinary workers, broadened the scope of what could be considered "politics." It shifted the focus from the history of organizations and institutions, including the state, to the labor process, "collective action," and popular resistance. There were good reasons for this. The institutional history that decades earlier had passed for "labor history" foreclosed the possibility of telling the stories of women as well as of men and certainly did not allow for excavating the cultural dimension of those stories. Now that we have honed our analytical tools, it is time to return to the state as an interlocutor in the constitution of gender and to institutions as the places in which policies that incorporate gendered assumptions are made and implemented. New work on the politics of gender, the family, and employment in Eastern Europe has reminded us of just how important the state could be under both the postwar socialist and in postsocialist regimes.<sup>29</sup> And recent work on the development of labor legislation in Britain, France, and Germany in the nineteenth century is one example of how labor historians might understand the gender and class dimensions of state policies.<sup>30</sup> But there are other ways in which we might consider state policies, and this leads to a more comparative question: how do different political regimes produce differently gendered effects and what are the consequences for workers? Here the question of rights surfaces, social as well as political: how are these protected—or not. The question of whether rights are gendered and raced also has implications for labor history. In France during the Depression, for example, unemployed women living with men who were



still employed or who received unemployment benefits lost the right to such benefits as individual workers. How the state created these policies and the assumptions about who had the right to work and the right to be considered a family provider revealed the gender bias of state policy and helped to reinforce the position of men in the family. However, the state's understanding of masculinity in its intersections with race or ethnicity proved more complicated. Many immigrant men living in France who found themselves unemployed in the 1930s had no right to benefits, even though they may have been family providers, thus revealing the contradictions of the male-breadwinner thinking in interwar France.<sup>31</sup>

Many of us doing labor history from a feminist perspective have seen it at least partially as a political project. It has been a way to make visible the struggles for rights of men and women that had been invisible in the institutional histories and histories of great men. It was a project that sought to identify the grounds of exclusion and to expose the contradictions between the logics of exclusion and the reality of most working peoples' lives. It was a project that was stimulated by the utopian claims of left politics around the world. But our project was not to accept the terms of debate or the categories that had defined the field previously. In the age of globalization, when neoliberal and "third way" politics are flourishing, the labor movement in many European countries is on the decline. But I would argue that this is not a reason to give up the project. We need to redefine and relocate our subjects of analysis. The working class has not disappeared, but its contours and composition have changed dramatically. It is no longer overwhelmingly white, male, and heterosexual; it is female, black, and brown: its members' sexuality is not always already defined. It is by incorporating into our work the intersections of these differences that we can create more powerful analytical tools for understanding the past and perhaps also the present.

## NOTES

1. See Frader, "Dissent Over Discourse: Labor History, Gender, and the Linguistic Turn," *History and Theory* 34 (1995): 213–230, and "Bringing Political Economy Back in Gender, Culture, Race, and Class in Labor History," *Social Science History* 22, 1 (Spring 1998): 7–18; see also contributions by Carole Turbin, Sonya O. Rose, Evelyn Nakano Glenn, and Elizabeth Faue to the "Roundtable on Gender, Race, Class, Culture, and Politics: Where Do We Go From Here," in that issue.

2. For a review of some of this literature, see Laura L. Frader and Sonya O. Rose, "Introduction: Reconstructing European Working-Class History," in *Gender and Class in Modern Europe*, eds. Frader and Rose (Ithaca, 1996), 1–33. See, for example, Laura Tabili, "We Ask for British Justice: Workers and Racial Difference in Late Imperial Britain" (Cornell, 1994); Tyler Stoval, "The Color Line Behind the Lines: Racial Violence in France During the Great War," *American Historical Review* 103 (June 1998): 737–769, and "Color Blind France? Colonial Workers and the First World War," *Race and Class* 35 (1993): 35–55.

3. On the European and British side, the following work has been exemplary: Kathleen Canning, *Languages of Gender and Labor Female Factory Work in Germany, 1859–1914* (Ithaca, 1996); Tessie Liu, *The Weaver's Knot: The Contradictions of Class Struggle and Family Solidarity in Western France 1750–1914* (Ithaca, 1994); Laura Downs, *Manufacturing Inequality: Gender Division in the French and British Metalworking Industries* (Ithaca, 1995); Sonya O. Rose, *Limited Livelihoods. Gender and Class in Nineteenth Century England* (Berkeley, 1992); and Tabili.

4. See Mary Jo Maynes, *Taking the Hard Road: Life Course in Workers' Autobiographies in the Age of Industrialization* (Chapel Hill, NC, 1995); and Frader and Rose. For the United States, see Ava Baron, ed., *Work Engendered. Towards a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca, 1991); Eileen Boris, *Motherhood and the Politics of Industrial Homework in the United States* (Cambridge, 1994), and "You Wouldn't Want One of 'em Dancing With your Wife," *American Quarterly* 50 (March, 1999): 77–108, and "The Racialized Gendered State: Constructions of Citizenship in the United States," *Social Politics* 2 (Summer 1995): 160–180.

5. See Joan W. Scott, "Preface to the Revised Edition," *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York, 2000), xii. Some of my comments here parallel portions of Scott's critique of the status of gender as a useful category of analysis.

6. For an example of how knowledge about gender shaped the work culture and class consciousness of nineteenth-century workers, see Leora Auslander, "The Problem of Beauty and the Problem of Consciousness: Parisian Furniture Makers," in *Rethinking Labor History*, ed. Leonard Berlanstein (Urbana, IL, 1993), 149–181.

7. See Joan W. Scott, "On Language, Gender, and Working-Class History," *ILWCH* 31 (1987): 1–13, and responses by Brian Palmer, Anson Rabinbach, and Christine Stansell. Scott pointed to the intimate link between workers' differentiation between masculine and feminine and the languages of class and argued that the connections between language and gender were particularly pertinent to the study of labor history in Europe and North America. This debate was one site of the disagreement between labor and social historians reluctant to interrogate the linguistic (alongside the material) production of sexual difference. See Louise A. Tilly, "Gender, Women's History, and Social History," *Social Science History* 13, 4 (1989); and Eleni Varikas, "The Tilly–Scott Debate: Language, Experience, and Subjectivity," *New Left Review* 211 (May–June 1995): 89–101. More recent critiques of gender as a category of analysis from different perspectives include Mary Hawkesworth, "Confounding Gender," *Signs* 22, 3 (Spring 1997): 649–685; and Robyn Wiegman, "Men, Masculinity, and the Sign, *Women*," *Signs* 26 (Winter 2001): 355–388.

8. See, for example, Cecile Dauphin et al., "Culture et Pouvoir des Femmes," *Annales. Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 2 (March–April 1986): translated as "Women's Culture and Women's Power: Issues in French Women's History," in *Feminism and History*, ed. Joan W. Scott (Oxford, 1996), 568–596.

9. Even the word *woman* is subject to multiple meanings. See, for example, Tani Barlow, "Theorizing Woman: *Funiü, Guojia, Jiating* [Chinese Women, Chinese State, Chinese Family]" in Scott, *Feminism and History*, 48–75. The problem to which I am referring here is not so dissimilar to the problem of translating gender in European languages. In French the term *genre* refers most often to the gender of nouns or is understood as "type" or "sort," although in its Anglo-Saxon usage *genre* as the social/cultural meaning of sexual difference is making headway. See, for instance, "Le Genre de l'Histoire," special issue of *Les Cahiers du GRIF* 37–38 (1988). On the problems of translating gender in German, see Gisela Bock, "Women's History and Gender History: Aspects of an International Debate," *Gender and History* 1, 1 (Spring 1989): 24. As Bock pointed out (footnote 14), "The German *Geschlecht* means sex, grammatical gender, sexual physiology, but also 'generation' and 'lineage' or 'kinship' and, as *Menschengeschlecht*, 'human race' or 'humankind.'" Bock argued for the context specificity and context dependency of the category gender: "... the perception of male and female scholars ... is profoundly shaped by the gender relations of their own culture, by widespread ethno- or Eurocentrism and by differing assumptions about the status and emancipation of women. ... The sexes and their relations must be perceived as social, political, and cultural entities" (11). For African examples, see Oyeronke Oyewumi, "Deconfounding Gender: Feminist Theorizing and Western Culture, a Comment on Hawkesworth's 'Confounding Gender,'" *Signs* 23, 4 (Summer 1998): 1049–1062.

10. Joan Scott addresses this issue in "Preface to the Revised Edition" and pursues the question of the cross-cultural relevance of gender in Chapter 10, "Some More Reflections on Gender and Politics." See also Charlotte Bunch and Susana Fried, "Moving Women's Human Rights from Margin to Center," *Signs* 22, 1 (Autumn 1996): 202. As Scott, Bunch, and Fried observed, the use of gender has revealed numerous differences in understanding, ranging from the Vatican's insistence on the biological meanings of gender to several Latin American countries' understanding of the term as referring exclusively to male and female.

11. This is, of course, not entirely new. Well before Beijing, Chandra Talpade Mohanty called attention to the problematic reading of the category of "Third World women" in "Under Western Eyes"; see Mohanty, "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial

Discourses" *Feminist Review* 30 (Autumn 1998): 61–88. See also Trinh T. Minh-ha, *Women, Native, Other* (Bloomington, IN, 1989), especially Chapter 3 "Difference: 'A Special Third World Women Issue.'"

12. Thébaud, *Ecrire l'histoire des femmes* (Fontenay/St. Cloud, 1998), especially 111–161. Two recent conferences, "Genre et Histoire" at the Université de Paris VII, June 28–29, 2002 and "Recherches Féministes Francophones" at the Université de Toulouse le Mirail, September 17–22, 2002, suggest that French and francophone feminist scholars are becoming more comfortable with the concept.

13. Noriel, *Sur la "Crise" de l'Histoire* (Paris, 1996), 14–15.

14. Noiriél, 15. My translation.

15. Notably Michelle Riot-Sarcey, *La Démocratie à l'épreuve des femmes* (Paris, 1994); Cécile Dauphin and Arlette Farges, eds., *La Violence et les Femmes* (Paris, 1997); and Dauphin, ed., *La Séduction* (Paris, 2001), among others. Albin Michel also published a French translation of Joan Scott, *Only Paradoxes to Offer* (Cambridge, MA, 1998): *Que des paradoxes à offrir* (Paris, 1999).

16. See, for example, Françoise Battagliola, *Histoire du Travail des Femmes* (Paris, 2000); Catherine Omnès, *Ouvrières parisiennes. Marchés du travail et trajectoires professionnelles au XXe siècle* (Paris, 1997); and Sylvie Schweitzer, *Les Femmes ont Toujours Travaillé* (Paris, 2002). See also Daumas, Cazals, Ellerkamp, and Fowler, "Le syndicalisme dans les villes et bassins textiles," in *L'Invention des Syndicalismes*, eds. Jean-Louis Robert, Friedrich Boll, and Antoine Prost (Paris, 1997), 97–127. I exclude several articles I have published over the past few years, including "Femmes, genre, et mouvement ouvrier en France au XIXe et XXe siècles," *Clio. Histoire, Femmes Sociétés* 3 (1996): 223–244, and "Définir le droit au travail: Rapports sociaux de sexe, famille, et salaire en France au XIX et XX siècles," *Le Mouvement social* 184 (juillet–septembre): 5–22.

17. Blee, "Entangled Emotions: Studying the Underbelly of Women's History," a talk delivered at the Social Science History Association Annual Meeting, Pittsburgh, PA, October 28, 2000. Although I focus on the French case here and believe there may be a plausible argument for the power of class identity to reinforce gender identity in this context, it is not at all clear that similar masculine identities did not appear in Britain or in the United States. But this issue lies outside the scope of this article.

18. See Eric Weitz, "The Man Worker and the Ever-Changing Woman," in Frader and Rose, 311–352.

19. Frader, *Difference at Work: Gender, Race, and Class in France Between the Two World Wars*, forthcoming.

20. On this point, see Bock, 14–15.

21. Scott, *Gender and the Politics of History*, Revised edition, 200.

22. See the work of Eileen Boris, cited in footnote 4. Jacqueline Dowd Hall, *Like a Family: the Making of a Southern Cotton Mill World* (Chapel Hill, 1987); Dolores Janiewski, *Sisterhood Denied: Race, Gender and Class in the New South Community* (Philadelphia, 1985). I have borrowed the term "intersections and collision courses" from the title of a symposium: Iris Berger, Elsa Barkley Brown, and Nancy A. Hewitt, "Intersections and Collision Courses: Women, Blacks, and Workers Confront Gender, Race, and Class," *Feminist Studies* 18, 2 (Summer 1992): 286–326. For other examples, see Boris and Angélique Janssens, eds., *Complicating Categories: Gender, Class, Race and Ethnicity. International Review of Social History* (Cambridge, 1999).

23. See, for instance, Gary Cross, *Immigrant Workers in Industrial France* (Philadelphia, 1983); Ralph Schor, *Histoire de l'immigration en France de la fin du XIXe siècle à nos jours* (Paris, 1996); Gérard Noiriél, *Population, immigration, et identité nationale en France* (Paris, 1992). Among the contemporary studies of immigration and racism that do examine race as a component of immigration, see Pierre-André Taguieff, "Mixophobie et xénophobie. Théorie des races, eugénisme et nationalisme xénophobe: Croisements d'argumentations," *Sexe et Race* 8 (1993): 77–132; Taguieff, *Le couleur et le sang: Doctrines racistes à la française* (Paris, 1998); Etienne Balibar and Immanuel Wallerstein, *Race, Nation, Classe. Les Identités Ambiguës* (Paris, 1988); Alec Hargreaves, *Immigration, Race, and Ethnicity in Contemporary France* (London, 1995); Erik Bleich, "Antiracism Without Races: Politics and Policy in a 'Color-Blind' State," *French Politics, Culture, and Society* 18, 3 (Fall 2000): 48–74; Herrick Chapman and Laura L. Frader, eds., "Race in France," in *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on the Politics of Difference* (New York: Berghahn, forthcoming).

24. The work of Tyler Stovall has been fundamental in opening up research in this regard.

See also Alice Conklin, *Mission to Civilize* (Stanford, 1997); Yael Simpson Fletcher, "'Irresistible Seductions': Gendered Representations of Colonial Algeria around 1930," in *Domesticating the Empire*, eds. Julia Clancy-Smith and Frances Gouda (Charlottesville, VA, 1998), 193–210; Elisa Camiscioli, "Producing Citizens, Reproducing the 'French Race': Immigration, Demography, and Pronatalism in Early Twentieth-Century France," *Gender and History* 13 (November 2001): 593–621.

25. See, for example, Rose, *Limited Livelihoods*; Baron; Anna Clark, "Manhood, Womanhood, and the Politics of Class in Britain, 1790–1845" and Keith McClelland, "Rational and Respectable Men: Gender, the Working Class and Citizenship in Britain, 1850–1867," in Frader and Rose, 263–279 and 280–293, respectively; and McClelland, "England's Greatness, the Working Man," in *Defining the Victorian Nation: Class, Race, Gender, and the British Reform Act of 1867*, eds. Catherine Hall, Keith McClelland, and Jane Rendall (Cambridge, 2000), 71–118. There is a growing body of literature on masculinity in the United States and Great Britain that might be useful for labor historians on both sides of the Atlantic. This includes Michael Kimmel, ed., *Changing Men: New Directions in Research on Men and Masculinity* (Beverly Hills, 1987); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics, and Society. The Regulation of Sexuality Since 1800* (London, 1991); Michael Roper and John Tosh, eds., *Manful Assertions: Masculinities in Britain Since 1800* (New York, 1981); Mark C. Carnes and Clyde Griffen, eds., *Meanings for Manhood: Constructions of Masculinity in Victorian America* (Chicago, 1990).

26. Sinha, *Colonial Masculinity: The Manly Englishman and the Effeminate Bengali* (Manchester, 1996).

27. See Sinha; Lora Wildenthal "Race, Gender, and Citizenship in the German Colonial Empire," in *Tensions of Empire*, eds. Frederick Cooper and Ann Laura Stoler (Berkeley, 1997), 263–283; Ann Laura Stoler, "Sexual Affronts and Racial Frontiers," in Cooper and Stoler, 198–237; Anna Davin, "Imperialism and Motherhood," *History Workshop Journal* 5 (1978): 9–57 remains a classic study of the impact of imperialism on working-class life in Britain. See also articles by Jean Elizabeth Pedersen, Alice L. Conklin, Julia Clancy-Smith, Jeanne M. Bowlan, and Yael Simpson Fletcher in Clancy-Smith and Gouda.

28. See Frader, "'From Muscles to Nerves': Gender, Race, and the Body at Work in France 1919–1939," in Boris and Janssens, 123–147.

29. See Susan Gal and Gail Kligman, *The Politics of Gender After Socialism* (Princeton, 2000).

30. Canning, "Social Policy, Body Politics: Recasting the Social Question in Germany, 1875–1900," in Frader and Rose, 211–237. See also Rose, "Protective Labor Legislation in Nineteenth Century Britain: Gender, Class, and the Liberal State," and Judith Stone, "Republican Ideology, Gender, and Class, 1860–1914," in Frader and Rose, 238–259.

31. Frader, *Difference at Work*.