"BOURGEOIS FEMINISM" IN FRANCE

A THEORY DEVELOPED BY SOCIALIST WOMEN BEFORE WORLD WAR I

Françoise Picq

Translated by Irene Ilton

In the late nineteenth century, much like today, it was commonplace to hear that feminism was a bourgeois movement. Then, as now, it was taken for granted; it was hardly a matter for discussion. But those who dismissed feminists for their class background were no different from the people they disdained. It was not working-class women who insulted Maria Pognon at the 1896 Feminist Congress in France; "collectivist students" did,[1] a fact that made no impression on Charles Sowerwine, who blithely joined those who criticized with the disparaging remark: "She [Maria Pognon] earned her pocket money managing a boarding house."[2] According to Sowerwine, it went without saying that a feminist did not have to make a living. She was only earning a little pocket money on the side, even if, as in the case of the widowed Maria Pognon, she was forced to support herself and her children and would finally end up dying in poverty.

Did the class origins of feminists in the Third Republic make this women's movement particularly bourgeois? Or was it bourgeois because of the place these women occupied in the system of production? Did feminism really pursue conservative or reactionary ends by seeking to integrate women into capitalism? Or did it help capitalism "survive by ridding it of its most glaring inequalities"?[3] Did feminism represent a danger to the triumph of socialist objectives?

While it is difficult to answer all of these questions, asking them is often enough to show that the notion of bourgeois feminism does not fall within the realm of socio-political analysis but of ideology. It is not

predicated on sociological fact, but political condemnation. To label feminism as bourgeois is, in a certain way, to challenge its legitimacy and to identify it with social conservatism, with the maintenance of class privilege.

This kind of name calling causes all sorts of problems. Women in the Third Republic had no legal status at all; consequently it is not surprising that feminists began by insisting that women be granted the basic rights of human dignity. Certainly many of their goals seem reformist to us today, but many of them also echo our own struggle. Feminists then were no more content than we are now to demand their place in society as it existed; they cast a vitriolic eye on what they call "sexualism" or the "masculinist organization."[4] And they came to have no more respect for socialist dogma than the dogma of church or state. Were they so different from many of ourselves, we, the intellectual petit bourgeois women who have come out of the revolutionary movement of the 1960s?

The condemnation of feminism as a bourgeois movement began in the early years of the twentieth century among socialists, particularly socialist women. Becoming part of the discourse, it gradually took on the importance of theory, unchallenged, taken for granted, familiar to all. Yet how could this have happened when Engels had given women a place in the revolutionary struggle and had clearly identified the "world historic defeat of the female sex"? How was it possible that several decades after the publication of *The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State*, women, in the name of the same revolutionary ideal, would be kept from demanding their basic rights as a necessary step toward true equality?[5]

Bourgeois and Proletarian Women

> What is a bourgeois woman? One who, devoting herself to the emancipation of working-class women is guilty of having been born into a family of comfortable means? The student putting the full force of her education at the service of the working class woman? The woman who, while leading a productive life, does not compromise the care and tastefulness with which she dresses? By calling them "bourgeoises" you commit an injustice, creating a regrettable confusion between the designation bourgeois and the moral condition which we must fight against with all our strength: the bourgeois mentality.
>
> Fanny Clar, *L'Equité*, 1919

All too often the marxist analysis of the modes of production and class antagonism has entered the discourse of politics in summary and

reductive forms. Lacking in subtlety and without any specific treatment of women's position in the system of production, an abbreviated interpretation has been imposed on the world of women where it is singularly out of place.

According to marxist analysis, bourgeois men are those who own the means of production. Because of their sex, females of the bourgeoisie are denied the majority of their class's privileges and, when married, are not only dispossessed of all their property but become themselves private property and a means of reproduction. As a result, *bourgeoise* is not the feminine equivalent of *bourgeois*. At best she is the wife of a bourgeois. Feminists, therefore, who spent their lives trying to escape the fate of the women of their class understandably felt insulted by an analysis which defined and then condemned them not for what they were, but for the man to whom they supposedly belonged.

"You reproach us for being 'bourgeoise,'" protested Maria Pognon. "I don't know where you draw the line between bourgeois and working-class women, because there are no idle women among us. We are all working women."[6]

Idle or working, for Maria Pognon that was the dividing line along which feminists clearly placed themselves. Feminists struggled for the right to work, de jure and de facto, for opening up to women career opportunities, for free use of their wages, for the forming of professional organizations. They were neither working-class women selling their labor power nor bourgeois women exploiting the labor power of others.

In France in 1900 there was one woman lawyer and thirty women doctors, hardly enough to constitute a female bourgeoisie. But how many of them rushed to become secretaries, elementary school teachers, postal clerks—respectable for them, but which were difficult to identify with the ruling class?[7]

Given their professional activities, many so-called bourgeois women might be classified with the "petite bourgeoisie," the social class Marx believed wavered between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, depending on the political climate, and which had to be won over to the revolutionary cause at all costs. Then again, one might have thought, as did Bebel, that their sexual status would ally them with the proletariat. As women, Engels himself said, they constituted a class enslaved by monogamy; they "represented the proletariat" within the family. Thus one might have expected French socialists, claiming kinship with marxism, to support feminist demands and consider women—all women—as their potential allies. This point of view seemed at first to be winning, but rapidly the reverse thesis developed and triumphed in socialist theory and practice.

The "theory of bourgeois feminism" drew an unbreachable class line around women. All feminists, without differentiation, were considered *bourgeoises,* while socialists put themselves forward as proletarians, whatever their class origin or way of life. Most socialist leaders did not (and do not) come from the working class. But that did not stop them from calling attention to the bourgeois social background of feminists and to reject the "objection whereby, for all intents and purposes one [could] . . . say the same thing about [members of] the socialist movement."[8] The place of socialist leaders in the workers' movement has never been questioned: "the workers did not exclude from their organized ranks people like Vaillant, Jaurès, or Guesde under the pretext that they did not come from proletarian stock."[9] Their background did not keep them from "organizing under the banner of the proletariat," as Suzon explained it, for the criterion was and remains to be "able to see in social chaos deep-seated class antagonism."[10] This requirement, this ideological perception, subordinated all other considerations (particularly those of sex).

Materialism notwithstanding, for the socialists it was not one's class which determined consciousness, but consciousness which determined class. To organize as proletarians was not to affiliate oneself on the basis of class reality, but according to a real referent. One was not born proletarian. One became proletarian by adherence to the ideals and the party of the proletariat. Marxism, a doctrine forged by the intelligentsia for the use of the working class, whose conscience they claimed to be, magically transformed its heralds into proletarians. Men (or women) who did not profess their faith in it must, conversely, be bourgeois.

When socialists looked at feminists, it was another matter. Women and the proletariat became mutually exclusive. "We will organize," said Eleanor Marx, "not as women, but as proletarians, not as the feminine competitors of our worker husbands, but as their comrades in arms."[11] A bipolar opposition emerged, explicitly identifying the proletarian as male (which corresponded to the reality of socialist organization)[12] and, implicitly, identifying the bourgeois as female. While the struggle between the sexes still resembled a class struggle, contrary to Engels's thesis, by the early twentieth century the socialist analysis had assimilated the role of women into the bourgeoisie.

Feminism in France, 1878–1914

Feminism developed in the Third Republic as a movement of opinion and social reality, affecting, albeit unequally, the different strata of society. Driven by economic necessity, women from the lower classes

and from the petite bourgeoisie flooded the salaried work force. It was under these circumstances that organized feminism grew. At first, however, feminism attracted mostly intellectual women. "[T]his is a critical period for the intellectual woman," wrote Charles Turgeon, who, noting the discrepancy between the education of young girls and the prospects open to them, feared that they would be "enlisted into the revolutionary army" which, at that time, was called the "intellectual proletariat of women."[13]

Feminism is neither a single unified doctrine nor a structured organization. It is a movement made up of many different groups holding conflicting ideas. The much proclaimed solidarity of the female sex masks political opposition and prevents the formulation of any splits within the ranks, but many of those who have spoken in the name of feminism have little in common. Calling it *bourgeois* further obscures the reality of a social movement which draws its strength from the fact that it cuts across class lines. The priorities, objectives, and modes of action vary from one feminist group to another; and it is necessary to separate the various tendencies in order to understand what feminism is or has been in relation to other social movements at a particular time.

During the historical period of interest to us here, there was in France a Conservative-Catholic feminism and a "respectable" Protestant feminism. In 1900 these factions organized the Catholic Congress of Women's Institutions (Congrès catholique des Institutions féminines) and the Congress of Women's Charitable Organizations and Institutions (Congrès des Oeuvres et Institutions féminines). In addition there was a third faction, often called the feminist left, which organized the Congress on the Condition and Rights of Women (Congrès de la Condition et des droits des femmes); and this is the faction which is of particular concern to us, for it was "the largest, the most active and the most revolutionary."[14] Our interest cannot be explained by political preference alone; it reflects as well the politics of the times. It is with this feminist faction that the socialists had the most trouble. Having expressed a commitment to working-class women, the feminist left entered into direct competition and conflict with the socialists.

Within the feminist left faction, as represented by the Congress on the Condition and Rights of Women, there were several different groups: Women's Suffrage (Le Suffrage des femmes), led by Hubertine Auclert; Women's Solidarity (La Solidarité des femmes), organized by Eugénie Potonié Pierre, Caroline Kauffmann, and Madeleine Pelletier; and the League of Women's Rights (La Ligue du Droit des femmes), headed by Maria Pognon and Marie Bonnevial.

Each group published its own newspaper, but they all supported as well the feminist daily, *La Fronde*, edited by Marguerite Durand and under whose auspices the Congress on the Condition and Rights of Women met. The feminist left came together in 1892, 1896, and 1900; and in congress after congress their platforms made such social demands as equal work, equal pay, the abolition of special laws for women, and the end to the competition of unpaid labor performed in convents and prisons. They also called for the appointment of women as labor inspectors, for equal working hours for both sexes, for the inclusion of domestic work in the same category as factory or office work, and for six-weeks' paid maternity leave.

Most observers of the period — writers or journalists — saw virtually no differences among those on the feminist left, all of whom they summarily called socialists. Within the feminist left, however, the socialist women made sharp distinctions. They drew "class lines" according to whether a feminist group had affiliations with a working-class organization or not, and according to their vision of the class struggle. There was a clear split between the proletarian feminists on the one side and the bourgeois on the other.

Consciously or not, the "theory of bourgeois feminism," which emerged from the split among feminists on the left, reversed the marxist position on the woman's question. One must explain, therefore, not merely describe, the historical and theoretical development of such an anomaly. It is far from self-evident.

Women and Socialism at the Dawn of the Third Republic

At different moments in history, especially in France, feminism and socialism have met, confronted each other, and frequently clashed. The definitive establishment of the Third Republic is one of those times when the deep-seated aspirations and contradictions of the two social movements came into conflict.

In 1879, Hubertine Auclert was invited to speak at the Congrès Socialiste in Marseilles, "not because she [was] a worker, but because she [was] a woman, i.e., exploited, a slave representing nine million other slaves."[15] In the name of socialist principles, she demanded justice and equality for women and an end to privilege based on sex and class. In the name of all women, she offered to all proletarians an alliance against their common oppressors and succeeded in having the demand for the complete equality of the sexes written into the socialist program. Socialism declared itself in favor of women's suffrage even before feminism called for it.

Thus, feminism and socialism, the two social movements which were just beginning to take shape and to organize themselves, decided to join forces: "Women and proletarians of all countries, unite," wrote *L'Egalité*.[16] No doubt ulterior motives played a small part on both sides of that alliance and the feminists soon could judge its limitations. Having given their support to women, the socialists, in return, expected women to show their confidence in socialism. Women were asked to settle for a declaration of principle and to put aside their own demands while awaiting the revolution which would put an end not only to legal inequality, but also to its cause—economic dependency. Demanding women's rights in a capitalist society was to believe such a society capable of mending its ways. It was to demand nothing more than bourgeois rights, the same as those proclaimed in the bourgeois revolution of 1789. To put it bluntly, socialists saw any attempt to improve the lot of women under capitalism as an act of defiance toward the workers' movement, the only movement capable of resolving the woman's question. In other words, it was bourgeois feminism.

The latter part of the nineteenth century saw the creation of two feminist-socialist groups, the Women's Alliance (L'Union des Femmes) and Women's Solidarity (La Solidarité des femmes). Founded in 1880, the Women's Alliance called for civil and political rights of women as well as the right to work. The group contended that these rights would only become a reality through socialism. Ten years later, in 1890, Women's Solidarity came into being, proclaiming a feminist and socialist program. Both of these socialist groups rejected the so-called conservatism of feminism and of feminist pressure groups which had been challenging socialists to live up to socialist words in socialist deeds. Assuming that they could work within socialism and despite some success, both of these groups finally ran up against the same obstacle: the refusal of socialists to give concrete support to women's demands. Neither Léonie Rouzade's candidacy in the municipal elections of 1881 nor that of Paula Minckin in the legislative elections of 1893 received the backing they sought, and these socialist women saw themselves forced to wage the struggle for women's rights in the arena of feminism alone.[17]

Yet another group, the Feminist-Socialist Group (Groupe féministe-socialiste) was formed in 1899, but it was very different from its predecessors. While they kept both terms in their name, the women here showed a decided preference for the orthodox socialist agenda. They tried to organize working-class women whose low degree of consciousness, they believed, was slowing down the struggle waged by men. The achievement of women's rights was not an end in itself, but a "means of preparing for the socialist education of women." Willingly

subordinating the special concerns of women to the needs of various socialist groups, the Socialist-Feminist Group stated that there "can be no antagonism between men and women of the working class."[18] When conflicts did arise, they backed the men, deeming the interests of the Party always to be more important than any one specific problem. Despite its obvious good will, even this group could not convince the socialists of its usefulness. Unable to gain recognition within the newly unified Party in 1905, it rapidly vanished.

After a few years, during which there were no women's organizations within the party, the Socialist Women's Group (Groupe des femmes socialistes) was formed in 1913 in accordance with international directives.[19] As Madeleine Rebérioux points out, "Tainted with bourgeois overtones, the feminist reference disappeared" from the group's name.[20] However, a certain number of feminists did participate, and four of them—Marie Bonnevial, Hélène Brion, Marguerite Martin, and Maria Vérone—were elected to the first executive committee on March 6, 1913.

It was through the activities of the Feminist-Socialist Group and, later, the Women's Socialist Group that the arguments forming the framework of the theory of bourgeois feminism were articulated. In 1900 socialist feminists confronted the "bourgeois feminist" organizers of the Congress on the Condition of the Rights of Women. In 1913, the confrontation took place within the Socialist Women's Group itself. Feminists and mediators alike were subsequently excluded from positions of leadership. To protect itself from feminist deviations, the Group adopted statutes forbidding the recruitment of women from outside the Party. Ironically, these devoted supporters of socialism had backed themselves into the position whereby they could no longer bring in new members to the Party. Their fear of feminism had grown to the point where it had shut them off to all women's issues, including those of women workers.

Socialism and/or Feminism: The Terms of the Debate

For the socialist Louise Saumoneau, feminism was bourgeois in that it placed sexual solidarity in opposition to the class struggle. As an example of the conflict between the two movements, Saumoneau singled out Maria Pognon's closing speech at the Congress of 1900 in which Pognon called for friendship between bourgeois and working-class women by saying: "I know that there is a party which preaches class struggle, well I disown that party, we must demolish the barrier that you want to erect between us."[21] This was the kind of "diatribe

against socialism," observed Louise Saummoneau, "that ends all self-respecting bourgeois assemblies.[22] In 1913, the socialist Suzon spoke in a similar vein: "We want no part in a movement that is doing its utmost to cast a veil over the class struggle. We reject the pathetic compromises of Lamourette, who stirs into one melting pot of lies the many irreconcilable interests of millionaires and wage earners, of royal and republican princesses and the victims of the sweating system gnawed by hunger."[23]

The confrontational rhetoric of Maria Pognon did not mean that all feminists opposed the formation of women's groups within the Socialist Party. In the name of sexual solidarity, many feminists in 1900 rejoiced over the creation of the Feminist-Socialist Group: "Socialist feminism, primarily economic, will make a great contribution to the cause, by complementing, as it were, those devoted to legislative reforms."[24] These feminists encouraged working-class women to form unions, seeing in them women's only means of emerging from their isolation. By fighting against their exploitation, they would gain dignity in work. "Unity is essential, associations, cooperative systems, trade unions; women must be admitted everywhere and they must work everywhere with their brothers in adversity; men must learn where their duty lies and open their ranks to their sisters."[25]

But the Feminist-Socialist Group unilaterally broke with feminism in the name of the class struggle. When "bourgeois women," for example, supported a strike of working-class women, far from applauding the sexual solidarity expressed through this action, Louise Saumonneau criticized the women who accepted the support. For her, it was the mark of a lower form of class consciousness. She was against women forming their own unions when men refused to admit them into theirs because it "would favor the bourgeois influence." In her view, *feminist* was synonymous with *bourgeois* and what she feared most was seeing "the women of the people being led astray" by feminism.[26]

Class affiliation created a sharp division between socialist women and "bourgeois feminists," argued the Feminist-Socialist Group. There could be no common interests between them. Having drawn the lines in this way, working-class women became the stakes in the rivalry between this group and other feminists on the left. Those progressive feminists who did not belong to the Feminist-Socialist Group and who took an interest in working-class women consequently became the "natural adversaries" of Louise Saumonneau.

A split occurred once again in 1913, but this time within the Socialist Women's Group. As if by contagion, those women among the socialists who proclaimed female solidarity in spite of the class struggle were seen as *bourgeoises*.

Were feminism and socialism really mutually exclusive? Did they have to fight against one another? Was there no way to support the same objectives? Did the class struggle rule out all solidarity among women? Points of view diverged on the subject and confronted each other on the pages of *L'Equité, La Bataille syndicaliste,* and *La Voix du peuple.*[27]

For Marguerite Martin, "true feminism is based solely on the egalitarian principle . . . it is perfectly compatible with the socialist ideal." She called for the emancipation of women and encouraged socialists to seek allies beyond the movement when it made sense: "[S]ide by side with bourgeois women every time their demands concern a specific point on the socialist agenda."[28]

The feminist faction within the Socialist Women's Group and the unions did not deny the class struggle, but they insisted that it affected women, excluded as they were from social power, in a very particular way. What is more, they claimed there existed "as a result of the male [bias in the] organization of the world, [the need for] feminist solidarity."[29] They also stressed the conflicts which divided the working class: "Like it or not, the woman wage earner owes it to herself to add to class exploitation the grievous misunderstanding between the sexes."[30] Recalling the "bourgeois law invoked at times by working men" against female labor, they denounced "the male instinct, [which] for centuries [has been] accustomed to subjugating women and which is terrified at the thought of their emancipation." They decided it was necessary to "continue the feminist struggle alongside and on the fringes of the socialist struggle."[31]

Antifeminist socialist women, on the contrary, "let everything which is not the proletarian struggle fall by the wayside." According to them, "women should not wage battle against the omnipotence of mustaches and beards," but should devote themselves generously, bring "whole reserves of enthusiasm, courage and cheerful hope," submit themselves unquestioningly to the ideals and "masculine thinking" of the party. No autonomy was tolerated; the socialist struggle dominated all others.[32]

Denying any solidarity among women, antifeminist socialists claimed allegiance instead to the alliance between men and women of the working class which, they believed, nothing could shake. Evidence to the contrary, they stated that the woman's question had been resolved and equality of the sexes achieved. Since the Party promised that "in the society of the future, women will have the same rights as men, the feminist issue does not even arise. We have resolved it by abolishing its grounds for existence, the inequality of rights."[33] This was a magical proclamation which masked the reality behind that

image of the world of the future and ruled out all present and real dissent: a waking dream of a mythical class solidarity, compulsively ignoring the war between the sexes which seems so obvious to us today.[34]

Women's Right to Work

The question of women and work did become a crucial issue in the workers' movement. If many unionists were committed at that time to Proudhon's principle that women should be housewives, the socialists took a stand in favor of work for women. According to Engels, emancipation would come about "through the reintroduction of the entire female sex into public industry."[35] All the same, the socialist press, like the trade union press, showed little interest in the problems of female labor. It was in the feminist newspapers that women socialists spoke out about the conditions of working women.[36]

One might have expected that militant women socialists would have been particularly interested in developing among members of the working class the "socialist" ideal of the woman "comrade [in the] economic and political struggle for the raising of wages and the emancipation of work."[37] In June 1902, the Feminist-Socialist Group did intervene during a strike of cabinet makers who were demanding "the exclusion of women from cabinetmaking," in order to emphasize that it "would be deeply unjust to prevent women from earning a living for themselves and for their families" and that "there is only one way for workers to avoid competition: make them understand that it is in their interest to unionize and then to demand a salary [for women] equal to that of men doing the same work."[38]

But that was the only time socialist feminists took a stand. To distinguish themselves from feminists, and out of fear of a confrontation with the men, socialist women usually refused to support the right of women to work.

To fill the gaps left by unions, nonsocialist feminists promoted the creation of women's unions. Some of these organizations clashed with men's unions that were defending their male sexual monopoly.[39] Marguerite Durand, however, was not about to tolerate any insult to feminist dignity in the name of the class struggle and was not afraid to challenge those in authority.

The critical and confrontational action of the feminists proved to be more effective than the devotion of women socialists and union members who saw in that feminist action "an attempt on the part of the bourgeoisie to monopolize the wage-earning woman."[40] Thanks to

the feminists, the C.G.T. (La Confédération générale du Travail")[41] finally had to respond. As Madeleine Guilbert put it, "the first attempt on a national level to promote the introduction of women into the unions of the C.G.T. arose from a clash with part of the feminist movement."[42]

At the time of the "Couriau Affair," again it was the feminists who took up the defense of Emma Couriau and supported this woman typographer who had tried to join the local union in Lyons. In order to "remain a class group" and reassure "their male comrades," the Socialist Women's Group, on the other hand, had refused to take a stand against the trade unionists who opposed the unionization of a female worker.[43]

In conclusion, despite the principles laid out in the Party's program, the "theory of bourgeois feminism" led women socialists to reject the demands of legal and political equality for women. Instead, they spent their energies criticizing the objectives of those they had turned into their political adversaries: "The principle of the feminist is . . . based upon the demand for a 'natural right' like the 'natural rights' invoked by the bourgeoisie in 1789."[44]

Was it political weakness or sexual bias? Whatever the reason, socialist women abandoned working women, dismissing their cause along with the general feminist platform which they neither trusted nor endorsed. They saw the interest feminists took in working-class women as just another indication of the nonproletarian tendencies of the movement. Perhaps it was cultural conservatism, perhaps it was the influence of the clergy, but in spite of their espoused revolutionary vision of the world, socialists did not consider women full-fledged members of the proletariat in whose name the Party spoke and with whom socialist women identified.

Notes

1. *Congrès feministe* (1896).

2. Charles Sowerine, *Les Femmes et le socialisme* (Presses de Fondation des Sciences politiques, 1978). Translated as *Sisters or Citizens? Women and Socialism in France since 1876* (Cambridge University Press, 1982).

3. Marie Hélène Zylberberg-Hocquard, *Féminisme et syndicalisme en France* (Anthropos, 1978).

4. Jeanne Dellou, *Le Sexualisme, critique de la prépondérance et de la mentalité du sexe fort* (1906); idem, *Lutte féministe, organe uniquement et rigoureusement indépendant pour le féminisme intégrale* (1919).

5. Frederick Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*

(1884), Marx-Engels Reader, ed. Robert C. Tucker (Norton, 1978); "the peculiar character of man's domination over woman (in the modern family), and the necessity, as well as the manner of establishing real and social equality between the two, will be brought into full relief only when both are completely equal before the law."

6. Maria Pognon, *Congrès de la Condition et les Droits des Femmes* (1900).

7. In 1900 there were 50,000 state-employed elementary-school teachers, in 1914 there were 155,000 women civil servants; they represented 39 percent of those employed in the service sector at that time. (M. H. Zylberg-Hocquard, *Femmes et féminisme dans le mouvement ouvrier français* [Editions Ouvrières, 1982].)

8. Eleanor Marx, "La question féminine," in *Dialectiques* 8, (1887).

9. Suzon (Suzanne Lacore), *Féminisme et socialisme.* This pamphlet assembles the articles which appeared in *L'Equité* in 1913 and 1914; in it are collected the arguments for "bourgeois feminism." In 1898, the Worker Party of Jules Guesde had only two workers among its deputies. (Claude Willard, in *Le Mouvement social,* October 1960.)

10. Suzon, *Féminisme et socialisme.*

11. Eleanor Marx, "La question feminine."

12. Women made up less than 3 percent of the total membership in the various socialist groups and in the Party before 1914 (Cf. Sowerwine, *Les Femmes et le socialisme*)

13. Charles Turgeon, *Le Féminisme français* (Larose, 1902).

14. Ibid.

15. *Congrès Ouvrier Socialiste de France,* session "De la Femme" (Of Woman), chaired by Hubertine Auclert, (October 22, 1879), "Egalité politique et sociale de l'homme et de femme."

16. *L'Egalité,* (March 31, 1880).

17. The refusal of Guesde's Worker Party to support Léonie Rouzade's candidacy is at the origin of the schism in French socialism which lasted until 1905: *Guesdistes* and *possibilistes* clashed over the issue of women's rights, insofar as that issue "was the concrete center of an abstract question: reform versus revolution over which the party was split." (Cf. Sowerwine, *Les Femmes et le Socialisme.*)

18. *La Femme socialiste* (1901) (from the newspaper).

19. *La Première Conférence Internationale des Femmes Socialistes* (First International Conference of Women Socialists) (Stuttgart, 1907) decided, despite the opposition of Madeleine Pelletier, that "women socialists must not ally themselves with the feminists of the bourgeoisie."

20. M. Rebérioux, Preface to C. Sowerwine, *Les Femmes et le Socialisme.*

21. Maria Pognon, *Congrès de la Condition.*

22. Louise Saummoneau, *La Petite République,* November 14, 1900.

23. Suzon, *Féminisme et socialisme.*

24. *La Fronde,* January 2, 1900.

25. Maria Pognon, *Congrès.*

26. Louise Saummoneau, *La Petite République.*

27. *L'Equité, organe éducatif du prolétariat féminin,* edited by Marianne Rauze, 1913–1919. *La Bataille syndicaliste,* Elizabeth Zemianska, "True feminism . . . is trade-unionism," August 1, 1913. *La Voix du Peuple,* journal of the C.G.T., 1914.

28. Cited in *L'Equité.*

29. Hélène Brion, *La Voix féministe* (Epone, 1917), Syros, 1978.

30. Venice Pellat Finet, *La Voix du Peuple.*

31. Hélène Brion, *La Voix Féministe.*

32. Suzon, *Féminisme et socialisme.*

33. Elisabeth Zemianska, "True feminism."

34. We can list fifty-four strikes by men for the expulsion of women between 1890 and 1908 (Madeleine Guilbert, *Les femmes et l'organisation syndicale avant 1914,* CNRS, 1964).

35. F. Engels, *The Origin of the Family.*

36. Aline Valette, who was first permanent secretary of the Worker Party, wrote the "Work Column" in *La Fronde* until her death in 1899; she was succeeded by Marie Bonnevial.

37. That is what Paul Lafargue contrasted with the idealized petit-bourgeois housewife in *La Question de la femme* (Paris, 1905).

38. *La Petite République,* "Les Grèves," June 2, 1900.

39. Unions of women typographers, typists, cashier-bookkeepers, makers of artificial flowers and feathers, midwives.

40. The C.G.T., founded in 1895, was a confederation of socialist trade unions. Today, a confederation of the same name often affiliates itself with the French Communist Party.

41. Marie Guillot, *La Vie ouvrière.*

42. M. Guilbert, *Les femmes.*

43. In 1913 Emma Couriau was refused admission to the Lyonnaise section of the Syndicat du Livre (the union concerned with all the technical aspects of newspaper and book production), which, in addition, expelled her husband for having permitted her to exercise the trade. Spurred on by the Southeast Feminist Federation (Fédération féministe du Sud-est), this case caused a great outcry in socialist and unionist circles and was the beginning of a notable shift in opinion.

44. Suzon, *Féminisme et socialisme.*