

UC Irvine

UC Irvine Previously Published Works

Title

Evelyn Nakano Glenn's 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' (1985)

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0dn0h3rg>

Journal

Feminist Theory, 26(3)

ISSN

1464-7001

Author

Kang, Laura Hyun Yi

Publication Date

2025-08-01

DOI

10.1177/14647001251326478

Peer reviewed



Evelyn Nakano Glenn's 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' (1985)

Feminist Theory

1–13

© The Author(s) 2025

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/14647001251326478

journals.sagepub.com/home/fty**Laura Hyun Yi Kang** 

University of California Irvine, USA

Abstract

This article considers the important insights and arguments of Evelyn Nakano Glenn's 1985 journal article 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor: The Intersection of Race, Class and Gender Oppression.' It presents a model for considering the article in three ways: (1) historically—as the product of collective feminist knowledge production in the 1980s, (2) intertextually—in relation to Glenn's publications before and after 1985, and 3) biographically—against Glenn's 'life story' published in 1997.

Keywords

'internal colonialism', intersection and intersectionality, Marxist-feminist theory, 'racial ethnic women', women's work, reproductive labour

A work from a different generation of feminist theory that I especially admire is Evelyn Nakano Glenn's (1985) article 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor: The Intersection of Race, Gender and Class Oppression.' Glenn is the scholar whose work I include most often and most regularly across several of my classes in Gender & Sexuality Studies. I appreciate her abiding commitment to elucidate the historical and contemporary experiences of working women alongside a clear explication of diverse theories and concepts. I have taught her different writings about racialised and gendered labour, citizenship, family, and care work in a large introductory lecture course (100–300 students) on 'Gender & Power,' an upper-division seminar on 'Money, Sex and Power,' which is organized around women's paid and unpaid work of social reproduction, and a graduate seminar on 'Feminist Knowledge and Social Change.' But it is 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' which I have taught consistently in my 'Feminist Theory' seminar for over 20 years.

Corresponding author:

Laura Hyun Yi Kang, Gender & Sexuality Studies, University of California Irvine, 3000 Humanities Gateway, Irvine CA 92697-2655, USA.

Email: laura.kang@uci.edu

'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' is impressively broad in comparative scope and is multilayered. In addition to conveying detailed information about work, family, and community formation for three groups of women—African American, Mexican American, and Chinese American—Glenn also traces changes in each group's experience over time; what she calls a 'historical perspective.' The readings for each week in the 'Feminist Theory' course proceed chronologically according to the dates of publication. That means that I usually teach Glenn's 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' in the same week as two other feminist theory classics which were also published in the mid-1980s: Donna Haraway's (1985) 'A Manifesto for Cyborgs: Science, Technology, and Socialist Feminism in the 1980s' and Patricia Hill Collins's (1986) 'Learning from the Outsider Within: The Sociological Significance of Black Feminist Thought.' Students make generative connections across the three articles, such as considering Glenn's well-structured outlining of 'racial ethnic women' against Haraway's rousing figuration of cyborgs and 'women in the integrated circuit' as both contending with the insights and limits of Marxist-feminist theory. They learn to relate the '(c)ountless numbers of Black women [who] have ridden buses to their white 'families,' where they not only cooked, cleaned, and executed other domestic duties, but where they also nurtured their 'other' children' from Collins's (1986: S14) opening paragraph to the longer historical context and broader comparative frame of Glenn's essay, which documents how many 'racial ethnic women' have long performed crucial yet exploited reproductive labour for white families even as they have had to struggle to care for and maintain their own families.

One of the points I repeatedly stress to the students in 'Feminist Theory' is to approach each text by seeing the author striving to make critical sense of a persistent injustice or inequalities and using the critical concepts, forms of evidence, and published scholarship which were both available and compelling at their moment of thinking and writing. I tell them from the outset that it's easy to criticise many of the texts from that period of feminist theory for being insufficiently inclusive and intersectional. But it's also not fair to apply 'intersectionality' retroactively to texts that were conceptualised and written *before* the coinage and gradual adoption of that term. Then too, I try to have students grasp that, although 'intersectionality' is often attributed to a single author, Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991), whose 1991 essay 'Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color' is assigned at the end of the quarter, the imperative to consider multiple and overlapping structures of domination was proposed by many different feminist thinkers who named it differently and added or emphasized different forces of oppression: Frances Beales's (1970) 'double jeopardy', Mirta Vidal's (1971: 6) 'triple form of oppression', the Combahee River Collective's (1977) 'racial-sexual oppression' and 'interlocking systems of oppression', and Deborah King's (1988) 'multiple jeopardy'. In order to impress upon them that the words they read were agonistically composed but also courageously and hopefully put out into the world by each author, I ask students to try to imaginatively inhabit that space of non-knowing, curiosity, and striving rather than to stand outside and critique the text for what it does *not* address.

In preparing to write this article, I discovered an amazing essay that Evelyn Nakano Glenn composed in 1994, titled 'Looking Back in Anger? Re-remembering My

Sociological Career,' which was included in a 1997 collection of 'life histories' of feminist sociologists. I urge people to read the essay as a very forthright, compelling, and dignified model of academic memoir, which insightfully contextualizes Glenn's prolific body of work in the context of her geographical and intellectual travels as well as institutional travails in academia. Reading about some of her institutional mistreatment and alienation made me respect even more how Glenn's generation of feminist scholars managed to produce such ground-breaking theorisation and scholarship under much more hostile and less resourced conditions. The essay would be generative reading for a unit on feminist knowledge production, the problems of disciplinarity/interdisciplinarity, and the racist and sexist hiring, tenure, and promotion process in a robust course on critical university studies. Glenn opens with a section provocatively titled 'Graduate School and Its Irrelevance' and ends with an 'Epilogue: A Response to a Query as to Whether I Am Still Angry.' It helped me to make better critical sense of 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' and how it could be situated in two ways: (1) as a product of a long, sustained practice of collective feminist thinking and writing that Glenn was engaged in before and after its publication; and (2) as an important pivot in her own research trajectory from her earlier publications on women's clerical work which were co-authored with Roslyn L. Feldberg (Glenn and Feldberg, 1977, 1979) and Japanese American women engaged in paid domestic labour (Glenn, 1980, 1986) to her later monographs, which provide a broadened critical examination of historical shifts in the intertwined contours of citizenship, family, work, and care (Glenn, 2004, 2010).

Throughout her many publications, Glenn assiduously names and credits the many other scholars that she has studied, researched, written, and taught with over the course of her career. Such determined naming and collective attribution were important practices of feminist theory. For 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor,' she acknowledges, 'This paper grew out of studying with members of the Inter-University Group Researching the Intersection of Race and Gender: Bonnie Thornton Dill, Cheryl Gilkes, Elizabeth Higginbotham, and Ruth Zambrana' (Glenn, 1985: 86).¹ Glenn then thanks the Women and Work Study Group, which was comprised of Carole Turbin, Natalie Sokoloff, Susan Lehrer, Amy Kesselman, Amy Srebnick, Myra Feree, Nadine Felton, Roz Feldberg, Peggy Crull, Carol Brown, and Chris Bose. Both feminist collectives deserve a more extended study than I can provide here. I will try to touch upon them briefly by way of Glenn's own account of their formation and activities. The Women and Work Study Group began meeting in March 1979 and published an edited collection of their writings, *Hidden Aspects of Women's Work* (Bose et al., 1987).² In her 1997 essay, Glenn characterizes this group as growing out of a larger interdisciplinary network that was '(m)ade up for the most part of Marxist feminist anthropologists, historians, and sociologists' (Glenn, 1997: 81).

The Inter-University Group on Gender and Race was a separate research and writing collective that formed in the early 1980s. As Glenn (1997: 87) recalls its formation:

We were dissatisfied with 'white feminist analysis,' which ignored how race/ethnicity interacted with gender in shaping the lives of women of color. We felt that comparative analysis across groups would get at this interaction. Reading with this group fostered in me a better

understanding of connections between the histories of African American, Latina, and Asian American women ...

Several members published early iterations of academic journal articles as Working Papers put out by the Inter-University Group. Memphis State University, where Bonnie Thornton Dill was then teaching, is sometimes listed as the publisher of these working papers.³ In 1982, Glenn published an earlier version of 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' as Working Paper No. 4 under a different title: 'Racial Ethnic Women and Work: Towards an Analysis of Race and Gender Stratification.'⁴ Members of the group often cited each other's work.

'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor' opens by positing feminist failure and feminist possibility:

The failure of the feminist movement to address the concerns of black, Hispanic and Asian-American women is currently engendering widespread discussion in white women's organizations. Paralleling this discussion is a growing interest among racial ethnic women in articulating aspects of their experiences that have been ignored in feminist analyses of women's oppression. (Glenn, 1985: 86)

But who or what are 'racial ethnic women' with *their* distinctive yet conjoined interests and experiences? The 1980s was a particularly energetic period of feminist theorising, which Denise Riley (1987: 38) has aptly described as 'the systematic fighting-out' of the indeterminacy and instability of the category of 'women.' In my 'Feminist Theory' class, I direct students to pay attention to the linguistic experimentation and grammatical marking and unmarking of a diverse range of categorical delineations in the 1970s and 1980s. Words were wilfully capitalised while other terms were demoted in small case. Composite identities were subject to hyphenation or separation by a slash: Third World/third world/third-world women, women of Color, Black/black/Afro-American women, Chicana/Hispanic/Mexican American/Raza women, Latina/latinas, and Asian-American/Asian American women. New categories such as 'racial ethnic women' were promoted. As Glenn (1985: 105) explains in the first endnote to the 1985 article:

The term racial ethnic designates groups that are simultaneously racial and ethnic minorities. It is used here to refer collectively to blacks, latinos and Asian-Americans, groups that share a legacy of labor exploitation and special forms of oppression described in the body of this paper. It is offered as an alternative to more commonly used designations, viz. minority groups, people of color and Third World minorities, each of which is problematic at some level.

Glenn does not explicate why or how these categories were problematic.

Here, I turn to a 1983 article in which Bonnie Thornton Dill (1983: 150), a fellow member of the Inter-University Group, provided this illuminating explanation of the different implications of the other categories:

The term 'racial ethnic women' is meant as an alternative to either 'minority,' which is disparaging; 'Third World,' which has an international connotation; or 'women of color,' which lacks any sense of cultural identity. In contrast to 'ethnic,' which usually refers to groups that are culturally distinct but members of the dominant white society, 'racial ethnic' refers to groups that are both culturally and racially distinct, and in the United States have historically shared certain common conditions as oppressed and colonized peoples.

Dill's charge against 'women of color' is especially interesting considering how that category ended up becoming so dominant and commonplace. Both Glenn's and Dill's articles are helpful in remembering that there was a concerted effort to contest and offer alternatives to certain identity categories before they are selectively institutionalised and become taken for granted.⁵

It was important to emphasise *cultural* distinctions among 'women of color' because assault on the culture of the colonised was seen as a key dimension in the model of 'internal colonialism' articulated by Robert Blauner in his influential 1972 book *Racial Oppression in America*. Blauner (1972: 67) argued that:

The colonial situation differs from the class situation of capitalism precisely in the importance of culture as an instrument of domination ... Culture and social organization are important as vessels of a people's autonomy and integrity; when cultures are whole and vigorous, conquest, penetration, and certain modes of control are more readily resisted.

In referencing Blauner in her article, Glenn (1985: 91) emphasises the 'profound effects on the culture and family systems of racial ethnics.' The conjoining of culture and family opened up several theoretical and categorical possibilities. First, 'family' was denaturalised as a stable unit of biological generational reproduction, cohabitation, and kinship. The following paragraph begins with Glenn (1985: 91) foregrounding the 'assaults on family ties of blacks under slavery.' From there, Glenn (1985: 91) is able to move to a discussion of 'the assaults on the culture and family lives of Chicanos and Chinese-Americans.' Under conditions of cultural domination, labour exploitation, and racial oppression, 'family' was a historical formation and collective achievement. Second, following Blauner's argument, maintains that culture and family systems could also function as both tools and products of resistance' and points to then recent scholarship on how 'slaves resisted assaults on family integrity and managed to maintain conjugal and kin ties to a greater extent than previously believed.' Glenn (1985: 104) returns to this note of resistance towards the end of the essay, where she differentiates the experiences of 'racial ethnic women' from the then dominant feminist theorization of the family as the primary site and mechanism of women's oppression:

By transmitting folkways and language, socializing children into an alternative value system, and providing a base for self-identity and esteem, the family helps to maintain racial ethnic culture. Women do a great deal of the work of keeping the family together and teaching children survival skills.

The *ethnic* in 'racial ethnic women' does the double work of signalling both 'cultural assault' and cultural preservation and transmission as forms of resistance to racist oppression.

This alignment of the three 'racial ethnic' groups through this family-centred conceptualisation of *culture* was more methodologically challenging than these confident declarations suggest. We can see this by turning to an article Glenn published two years earlier in 1983, titled 'Split Household, Small Producer and Dual Wage Earner: An Analysis of Chinese American Family Strategies.' The essay begins by noting that 'Most research on family patterns of black and other poor minorities points to the decisive impact of larger institutional structures. Particular attention has been paid to structures that lock certain classes of people into marginal employment and/or chronic under-employment' (Glenn, 1983: 35). In contrast, Glenn (1983: 35) pointed out that studies of the Chinese American family 'focus on purely cultural determinants, tracing the characteristics of family life to Chinese values and traditions.' Glenn distinguishes the two different explanatory frameworks as 'the institutional approach' and 'the cultural approach.' The two different approaches produce different knowledges and conclusions such as the 'highly favorable' representation of the Chinese American family as 'stable and problem-free—low in rate of divorce, delinquency and welfare dependency' (Glenn, 1983: 35).

The article is also notable as an early theoretical elaboration of the incipient category that Glenn hyphenated as 'Asian-American women.' Even as Glenn refers to 'Asian-American women' as a distinct, knowable, and thus comparable group of 'racial ethnic women,' she had to contend with two important epistemological limits. First, an examination of the bibliography attests to the small body of existing scholarship, with only two recent publications indicating the category: the 1982 collection *Asian and Pacific American Experiences: Women's Perspectives* (Tsuchiya, 1982) and Elaine Kim's (1983) book of life stories and photographs, *With Silk Wings: Asian American Women at Work*. In her 1997 retrospective account, Glenn discusses a second, different kind of epistemological blockage around 'Asian-American women.' In tracing the origins of the 'comparative historical research on African American, Latina, and Asian American women's work' that she began in the mid-1980s, she recalls:

My initial interest in comparative study grew out of my writing and teaching about Asian Americans in the late 1970s. I became dissatisfied with the cultural frameworks that seemed to pervade the literature: Japanese and Chinese American family, economic practices, and community formation were explained as extensions or adaptations of Chinese/Japanese values and cultural forms, such as Confucianism and familialism. (Glenn, 1997: 90)

She labelled this a 'cultural bias' and attributed it to a dominant perception of Asian Americans as 'perpetual foreigners,' who were deemed not only as culturally alien but permanently so due to the grip of their 'eternal and unchanging' culture. This stickiness and stuck-ness of *culture* impeded any comparative, relational analysis with other, coeval groups:

Interpreting social patterns of Japanese and Chinese Americans in cultural terms emphasized their 'uniqueness', denied their commonalities with other people of color, and obscured the impacts of racist legal, political, and economic structures on their lives in the United States. (Glenn, 1997: 90)

In 'Split Households,' Glenn (1983: 35) points out how the emphasis on Chinese *culture* could be marshaled to counter and delegitimize the structural analyses of the racist political and economic subordination of other groups:

The apparent fortitude of the Chinese has been cited as evidence supporting the view of black and Hispanic families as disorganized. Along with other 'model' minorities, notably the Japanese and Cubans, the Chinese seem to have offered proof that some groups possess cultural resources that enable them to resist the demoralizing effects of poverty and discrimination.

That essay thus set out to describe 'the existence of qualitatively different family forms among Chinese Americans in different historical periods,' and she identifies three 'distinct family types' from three different historical periods, which are 'demarcated by shifts in institutional constraints' (Glenn, 1983: 37). Towards the end of the essay, Glenn (1983: 44) summarises the historical evidence as follows:

If cultural patterns were the sole or primary determinants, we would expect to find greater continuity in family patterns over time; instead, we find discontinuities associated with shifts in institutional conditions. These discontinuities, thus, underline the importance of larger political economic structures in which the family is embedded.

Thus, what is categorised as 'cultural' cannot be separated from the economic, social, political, legal, and material registers.

In her 1997 memoir, Glenn discloses that she began the research on Chinese American families in response to a dean's request for her to present a public lecture on the topic. More importantly, Glenn (1997: 91) was prodded towards cross-racial comparative work by a Chinese American student's remark about feeling a greater affinity with her Black classmates because of a common valuing of their families: 'I began applying the institutional framework used for analyzing black families to Chinese Americans.' This move of using an institutional approach that had been used to study another racial ethnic group also addressed the problem of 'cultural bias.' Her clear explanation of this analytical gambit is worthy of full recitation and remains instructive for cross-racial and transnational feminist studies:

Working out an institutional analysis turned on three kinds of evidence: first, that Chinese Americans displayed different family formations in different historical periods marked by shifts in immigration law and other political/legal constraints; second, that Chinese immigrants in other societies, such as the Philippines, displayed dissimilar patterns of family

formation; and third, that other groups with very different cultures displayed patterns similar to those of Chinese Americans under similar circumstances. (Glenn, 1997: 91)

In 'Racial Ethnic Women's Labor,' Glenn more fully takes up the third 'kind of evidence' by comparing the histories of Chinese American women to African American and Mexican American women. Here, it is important to keep in mind that the full title of the essay points to the *labour* of 'racial ethnic women.' Glenn's essay usefully explicates the two theoretical models that were then influential for understanding how power and inequality over groups are centrally manifest in the coercive exploitation and unpaid extraction of their labour: *patriarchy* and *internal colonialism*. According to Marxist-feminist analyses of patriarchy, 'the main mechanism by which control is achieved and maintained by men is the *sexual division of labor*, which places men in positions of authority over women and permits them to reap disproportionate benefits' (Glenn, 1985: 87; emphasis in original). Glenn (1985: 87) charges that this singular focus on the sex/gender division 'ignores differences among women based on race' and furthermore treats racial inequality as 'a parallel system of stratification,' which produces this significant analytical blind spot: 'an analogy is often made between 'women' and 'minorities,' an analogy that involves comparison of the subordinate status of white women and minority men. Minority women are left in limbo.' Glenn then explicates the internal colonialism model as 'a system of power relations by which subordinate minorities are kept politically and economically weak so they can be more easily exploited as workers.' She continues:

The main mechanism by which economic dependency is maintained is a *colonial labour system*, characterized by a segmented labour market, discriminatory barriers and separate wage scales. This system ensures that people of color are relegated to the worst jobs, i.e., insecure, low-paying, dangerous, dirty and dead end. (Glenn, 1985: 87; emphasis in original)

Glenn (1985: 87) points out that existing studies have largely focused on male workers and problematically 'assume that the detrimental impacts of the labor system on men is synonymous with the impacts on the group as a whole, men and women alike.'

One of the most insightful details of the essay is Glenn's clear explication of what she calls 'racial ethnic labour.' Pointing to how 'racial ethnic groups [...] were brought to this country for the express purpose of providing cheap and malleable labor,' Glenn (1985: 89–90) later explains:

Their cheapness was ensured by institutional barriers that undercut their ability to compete in the labor market. The labor market itself was stratified into separate tiers for whites and racial ethnics ... A dual wage system was also characteristic of the colonial labor system; wages for racial ethnics were always lower than for white in comparable jobs.

Glenn later explains these 'institutional barriers' as 'legal and administrative restrictions' on citizenship, political rights, and economic protections. Even as the category of 'racial ethnic' opened up ways of thinking about Asian Americans as a racialised group, subject to exclusionary legislation and disenfranchisement based upon ideologies of racial

difference, Glenn (1985: 90) also clearly acknowledges that Chinese Americans—and here she also added Japanese Americans—are an ‘intermediate’ case of unfree entry, which distinguishes them from the more violent transplantation and enslavement of African Americans and the territorial annexation and displacement of Mexican Americans.

A concluding section titled ‘Implications for Feminist Analysis’ takes on three concepts in Marxist-feminist theory, which ‘require reformulation if it is to generate analyses that are inclusive of racial ethnic women’ (1985: 101): 1) the separation of public and private spheres; 2) the primacy of gender conflict as a feature of the family; and 3) the gender-based assignment of reproductive labour. Citing the scholarship on working-class women’s labour and income-generating activities that showed that many women do both paid work in the public sphere and unpaid housework and care work at home, Glenn (1985: 102) points out that ‘racial ethnic women were never out of public production.’ She points to how Black women long worked for pay in agriculture and domestic service and how ‘Chinese-American women frequently engaged in unpaid labor in family enterprises, where there was little separation between public and private life’ (Glenn, 1985: 102). But this work was not treated as productive work.

Rather than dismiss the two theoretical frameworks for their exclusions and blind spots, Glenn proceeds to explain how they might be insightful and facilitate further feminist theorisation. She outlines ‘some important commonalities’ between the two frameworks, which might provide ‘some common ground for developing a more integrated framework’ (Glenn, 1985: 87–88):

Each focuses on explaining the persistence of inequality and sees gender/race stratification as dynamically related to the organization of the economy. Thus, each implies an historical perspective, one that traces changes in the relations between dominant and subordinate groups in relation to the development of capitalism. Each emphasizes institutional arrangements that ensure control by the dominant group over the labour of the subordinate group.

Towards the end of the essay, Glenn considers ‘the very useful notion of reproductive labor,’ which she attributes to a 1980 book by Natalie Sokoloff, one of the members of the Women and Work Study Group:

Marxist-feminists identified two distinct forms of labor, production and reproduction. Reproduction refers to activities that recreate the labour force: the physical and emotional maintenance of current workers and the nurturing and socializing of future workers ... Although both men and women engage in production, women are still the ones who carry out most of the reproduction. In large part this is because much reproductive work remains at the household level, which is women’s domain.

But here, Glenn (1985: 104) imposes a clear racial demarcation:

In considering the situation of racial and ethnic women, it is useful to recognize the existence of a racial as well as a sexual division of reproductive labor. Historically, racial ethnic women have been assigned distinct responsibilities for reproductive labor.

Glenn (1985: 104) goes on to describe how ‘racial ethnic women’ have long performed domestic work for white households:

Even where white immigrant domestics were employed, the dirtiest and most arduous tasks, laundering and heavy cleaning—were often assigned to black servants. There was a three-way division of labor in the home ...

Redeploying her method of tracking the persistence of racial inequalities across historical changes in the social and economic organization of capitalist production, Glenn goes on to point out that even after reproductive activities were ‘increasingly taken out of the household and turned into paid services which yielded profits,’ there continued to be a ‘racial stratification’ within ‘female-typed public reproduction work’: ‘Racial ethnic women perform the more menial, less desirable tasks.’ Glenn (1985: 104) adds finally, ‘The better pay white women receive also allows them to purchase services and goods that ease their reproductive labor at home.’ Glenn (1991, 1992, 2010) would go on to publish two essays and a monograph that more fully historicised and theorised this racial division of reproductive labour. In the final paragraph, Glenn (1985: 105) advises against an additive model of conceptualising ‘racial ethnic women,’ which would mark them off as different and separate from white women:

It may be tempting to conclude that racial ethnic women differ from white women simply by the addition of a second axis of oppression, namely race. It would be a mistake though, not to recognize the dialectical relation between white and racial ethnic women. Race, gender and class interact in such a way that the histories of white and racial ethnic women are intertwined.

To conclude, I want to restate how much I continue to be awed and humbled by the courage and insight of the feminist theories produced at a historical moment that was much more inhospitable to women and especially women of color. In ‘Looking Back in Anger?’ there are many moving details about her birth, early childhood, family life, and educational trajectory, which allowed me to consider her scholarship within the arc of her lived experiences. Born in 1940, Evelyn Nakano Glenn was incarcerated with her Nisei parents during the Second World War:

My earliest memories are from the concentration camp in Gila, Arizona ... At first my father and mother were always around, and other extended kin were housed in nearby barracks. The communal bathrooms and mess hall led to an enforced closeness with the larger community. In 1944 after my father was allowed to leave the camp to work in the Midwest, my mother became ill with tuberculosis and was hospitalized for a year. After that I lived with my mother’s parents, who were in Heart Mountain, Wyoming, concentration camp. They were also raising my eldest cousin, Betty, so I suddenly had a sibling, an older sister, for the first time. (Glenn, 1997: 85)

Glenn describes how, due to her mother's illness, they were able to join her father in Chicago in October 1945—"four months after the war ended." There they took up residence in another crowded, multi-family dwelling:

We lived in two rooms of a three-story tenement building that had been carved up into small apartments. My father's parents, my aunt and her husband, an uncle, his wife and kids, and assorted single aunts also lived in the building. (Glenn, 1997: 85)

Most of these relatives gradually returned to California. Evelyn and her parents and younger brother were the last to move back to Oakland, where they all lived and worked in a small motel purchased with family savings. Thus, Evelyn Nakano Glenn herself experienced the split households, small family enterprises, and extended family living arrangements that she researched and theorised, and did so in ways that were forcibly ordained and enforced by the state.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

ORCID iD

Laura Hyun Yi Kang  <https://orcid.org/0009-0005-8345-2364>

Notes

1. There have been slightly varied names for the group across different citations, including the Inter-University Research Group on Gender and Race and the Inter University Group on Gender and Race.
2. In addition to the three editors and Glenn, the other members included: Carol Brown, Peggy Crull, Nadine Felton, Myra Marx Feree, Amy Gilman, Amy Kesselman, and Susan Lehrer. In the 'Preface,' Bose, Feldberg, and Sokoloff also credited Mary Blewitt, Heidi Hartmann, Alice Kessler-Harris, and Dorothy Remy as early members who had left the group.
3. For an illuminating account of Dill's career, see Weiss (2022). The Inter-University Group is not named as such, but a section subtitled 'Defining 'Intersectionality'' refers to Thornton Dill organizing 'a small working group of women professors of sociology from around the country in the emerging field of race, class and gender studies.' Ruth Zambrana, identified as a member of this group, is quoted: 'Bonnie led us in her kind, graceful way. She had a real belief in the potential for our scholarship to change policies and institutions and benefit the people and communities that were most disadvantaged.' There is also a marvellous black-and-white group portrait that includes Evelyn Nakano Glenn. Thornton Dill is also credited as co-founding the Center for Research on Women at Memphis State with Elizabeth Higginbotham and Lynn Weber in 1982.

4. In 1982, Bonnie Thornton Dill published 'Survival as a Form of Resistance: Minority Women and the Maintenance of Families' as Working Paper No. 7, which would later be revised and published as 'Our Mothers' Grief' (Dill, 1988). Also in 1982, Elizabeth Higginbotham (Higginbotham, 1982) published 'The Dimension of Racial Oppression: The Early Nineteenth Century' as Working Paper No. 10. I have not been able to identify the authors and titles of the other 'working papers' but it appears that 1982 was a particularly productive year for the group. In that same year, Cheryl Gilkes (Gilkes, 1982), another member, published her article 'Successful Rebellious Professionals' in *Psychology of Women Quarterly*.
5. Although 'racial ethnic women' features prominently in the title of Dill's 1988 article 'Our Mothers' Grief,' she deploys it interchangeably with 'women of color' and also hyphenates it throughout as 'racial-ethnic women' along with 'Afro-American women, Chinese-American and Mexican-American women' (Dill, 1988: 428).

References

- Beale F (1970) Double jeopardy: To be black and female. In: T Cade (ed.) *The Black Woman*. New York, NY: Signet, pp.90–110.
- Blauner R (1972) *Racial Oppression in America*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.
- Bose C, Feldberg R and Sokoloff N (eds) (1987) *Hidden Aspects of Women's Work*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Collins PH (1986) Learning from the outsider within: The sociological significance of Black feminist thought. *Social Problems* 33(6): s14–s32.
- Combahee River Collective (1977) *A Black Feminist Statement*.
- Crenshaw K (1991) Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–1299.
- Dill BT (1988) Our mothers' grief: Racial ethnic women and the maintenance of families. *Journal of Family History* 13(4): 415–431.
- Dill BT (1983) Race, class, and gender: Prospects for an all-inclusive sisterhood. *Feminist Studies* 9(1): 131–150.
- Gilkes C (1982) Successful rebellious professionals: The Black woman's professional identity and community commitment. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 6: 289–311.
- Glenn EN (1980) The dialectics of wage work: Japanese American women and domestic service, 1905–1940. *Feminist Studies* 6(3): 428–471.
- Glenn EN (1983) Split household, small producer and dual wage earner: An analysis of Chinese-American family strategies. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*: 35–46.
- Glenn EN (1985) Racial ethnic women's labor: The intersection of race, gender and class oppression. *Review of Radical Political Economics* 19(3): 86–108.
- Glenn EN (1986) *Issei, Nisei, War Bride: Three Generations of Japanese American Women in Domestic Work*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Glenn EN (1991) Cleaning up/kept down: A historical perspective on racial inequality in women's work. *Stanford Law Review* 43(6): 1333–1356.
- Glenn EN (1992) From servitude to service work: Historical continuities in the racial division of paid reproductive labor. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 18(1): 1–43.
- Glenn EN (1997) Looking back in anger? Re-remembering my sociological career. In: B Laslett and B Thorne (eds) *Feminist Sociology: Life Histories of a Movement*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, pp.73–102.
- Glenn EN (2004) *Unequal Freedom: How Race and Gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Glenn EN (2010) *Forced to Care: Coercion and Caregiving in America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Glenn EN and Feldberg RL (1977) Degraded and deskilled: The proletarianization of clerical work. *Social Problems* 25(1): 52–64.
- Glenn EN and Feldberg RL (1979) Clerical work: The female occupation. In: J Freeman (ed.) *Women: A Feminist Perspective*. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield Publishing, pp.313–375.
- Haraway D (1985) A manifesto for cyborgs: Science, technology, and socialist feminism in the 1980s. *Socialist Review* 80: 65–107.
- Higginbotham E (1982) *The Dimension of Racial Oppression: The Early Nineteenth Century*. Inter-university research group on gender and race. Working paper No.10.
- Kim E with Otani J (1983) *With Silk Wings: Asian American Women at Work*. San Francisco, CA: Asian Women United of California.
- King DK (1988) Multiple jeopardy, multiple consciousness: The context of a Black feminist ideology. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 14(1): 42–72.
- Riley D (1987) Does a sex have a history? ‘Women’ and ‘feminism’. *New Formations* 1: 35–45.
- Sokoloff N (1980) *Between Money and Love*. New York: Praeger.
- Tsuchiya N (ed.) (1982) *Asian and Pacific American Experiences: Women’s Perspectives*. Minneapolis, MN: Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center.
- Vidal M (1971) Women: New voice of la raza. In: *Chicanas Speak Out*. New York, NY: Pathfinder Press, pp. 3–11.
- Weiss J (2022) Bonnie Thornton Dill, long-time dean of UMD’s College of Arts and Humanities, to step down this spring, 12 April. Available at: <https://wgss.umd.edu/news/bonnie-thornton-dill-longtime-dean-umds-college-arts-and-humanities-step-down-spring> (accessed 12 April 2024).