

UCLA

UCLA Historical Journal

Title

Women, War and Revolution. Edited by CAROL R. BERKIN and CLARA M. LOVETT. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980. Pp. xiii + 310. Illustrations, annotated bibliography, index. \$9.75 (paper).

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7kt3j9vj>

Journal

UCLA Historical Journal, 3(0)

Author

Barzman, John

Publication Date

1982

Copyright Information

Copyright 1982 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

Lawrence Krader's discussion of Marx's relationship to Darwin, Carlyle, Morgan, Maine, and Kovalevsky is simply bad. To apply the categories of surplus value and exchange value to pre-capitalist societies betrays a fundamentally flawed understanding of historical materialism. The essay is also a good example of a desiccated, mechanical Marxism contaminated by a strong dose of Darwinism.

For regular readers of *New Left Review*, this anthology does not break new ground in either the selection of themes or their treatment. For Marxists, this should not come as a surprise. It is difficult to make breakthroughs in the realm of theory when they have yet to be made in the realm of practice. This will undoubtedly change if socialism becomes a real historical alternative in the advanced capitalist countries of the West.

John Morot
University of California, Los Angeles

Women, War and Revolution. Edited by CAROL R. BERKIN and CLARA M. LOVETT. New York: Holmes and Meier, 1980. Pp. xiii + 310. Illustrations, annotated bibliography, index. \$9.75 (paper).

Vast numbers of women have been mobilized in modern wars and revolutions. Their non-domestic, public activities as concerned citizens, agitators, teachers, industrial workers, and soldiers have been accepted and even encouraged by those in power. At the same time, particularly in revolutions, millions of women have embraced egalitarian principles and discovered the eminently finite and changeable character of human institutions, including those most directly restricting their rights. The changes in women's prescribed and actual roles, from exclusively domestic to more public and political ones, compose the basic theme of this anthology.

Carol R. Berkin and Clara M. Lovett have selected eleven articles from a May 1978 conference on "Women, War, and Revolution" to further the comparative dimension of current research on women's status during and after major social crises. Five deal with episodes from bourgeois democratic revolutions, three with world wars, and three with socialist revolutions. The articles embrace the United States, France, Italy, Germany, Russia, China, and Cuba.

The result is more a collection of disparate articles --some excellent--than an attempt to test the validity of a clear thesis in a variety of situations. Some contributions are synthetic and theoretically stimulating, others narrowly focused and narrative. The editors' three brief introductions attempt to define the issues raised by the relation between women, war, and revolution. But most contributors do not address these issues directly. As the editors freely admit, this unevenness reflects the state of research and theoretical elaboration on the subject. The book's value lies in the quality of several articles and the impetus it

may give to further comparative and theoretical study of this fascinating topic.

Most of the writers agree that major social crises such as wars and revolutions undermine traditional definitions of female roles. Differences arise when they consider the durability and benefits of these changes, particularly in relation to three specific questions: Were women's war-time and revolutionary mobilizations simply the result of male leaders' need for a mass of powerless followers? Did women who assumed non-domestic functions enjoy a lightening of their burden at home and a more egalitarian redefinition of their status in society? What organizational forms explain those cases in which women took advantage of social upheavals to consolidate advances?

On the first question, two case studies demonstrate that women themselves decided whether or not to mobilize. Drawing mainly from records of the Nazi secret police, Leila Rupp shows how German women passively resisted Nazi calls to join the industrial workforce: she found that upper-class women could not be motivated sufficiently; non-employed working-class women rejected the idea of work unless upper-class women shared the burden equally; and women factory workers complained of the long hours and regimentation in defense industries. Rupp suggests that "women's responses to mobilization policies played [a role] in the ultimate failure of German society to engage in total war" (p. 37).

Darline Levy and Harriet Applewhite argue that plebeian women's participation in the French Revolution was a conscious political act, taken through increasingly formal civic networks. In the famous October 1789 march on Versailles, as well as in the demonstrations against the Thermidorean abolition of price controls, women actually led the *sans-culotte* men into action around issues of prime concern to women.

To the second question authors answer that the mere mobilization of women to meet increased demands for labor did not necessarily improve women's relative position in society. Two case studies demonstrate the point. The first, a study of World War II Portland, Oregon, shipyards, shows that even when women took non-traditional jobs, a new division between "man's work" and "woman's work" was created. Even though most female welders and helpers had previously been employed in manual work outside the home, their employers treated them as housewives temporarily working in industry; at war's end, they were pushed out of the shipyards and back into lower-paid jobs. The second case study focuses on labor mobilization for Soviet economic development. Here also, women's massive involvement in the workforce did not necessarily signify a lightening of their domestic responsibilities. Women simply had to bear the "double burden" of job and home.

In discussing organizational forms most favorable to female advancement, several authors argue that only women's efforts on their own behalf made a difference. Beatrice Farnsworth claims that any gains which created a new and more equal role model for Soviet women resulted from the separate organization of women. She views the Women's Section, "Zhenotdel," as the driving force behind the changes in attitudes toward Soviet women during the 1920s and its

dismantling in 1930 as a shift toward a more manipulative assignment of women in the workforce. Judith Howard shows that many of the educational advances of Italian women after 1861 were created by women who had been political activists in the Risorgimento struggles and who had set up female associations. Lourdes Casal sees the two-million strong Cuban Federation of Women (FMC) as decisive in promoting a more assertive public role for Cuban women.

Another factor in determining the effects of social crisis on women's status is the relative success of democratic trends. Berkin and Lovett attribute failures of women's emancipation to elitist currents. For them, the more democratic the revolution and the more widespread the institutions of popular political participation, the more women's concerns and activities come to the fore. They agree with Levy and Applewhite's suggestion that "the extent of women's political participation and organizational activity should be used as a barometer for measuring the democratic character of the French Revolution" (p. 4).

Most authors included in the anthology attempt to grapple with these issues from the point of view of social classes and overall political power. By showing that women massively affected the outcome of major social conflicts, they demonstrate the relevance of women's studies to mainstream historical concerns. As this type of research emerges, historical studies that fail to examine the social and political role of women will appear more incomplete.

John Barzman
University of California, Los Angeles

The Origins of the South African War: Joseph Chamberlain and the Diplomacy of Imperialism, 1895-99. By ANDREW N. PORTER. New York: St. Martins Press, 1980. Pp. xiv + 321. Map, notes, select bibliography, index. \$25.00.

Set against the background of advancing democracy in late nineteenth century Britain, Andrew N. Porter's study of the origins of the Boer War is a fresh reappraisal of the role of Joseph Chamberlain that brings together domestic politics and imperial diplomacy. Based upon a wide selection of primary sources, chiefly the private and official papers of Chamberlain, Alfred Milner, and the Colonial Office, Porter explores the relationship between public opinion and policy making within the context of a changing political climate. While it has been a difficult problem for statesmen, the impact of democratic politics upon diplomacy takes on a special relevance when someone such as Chamberlain, a product of a new era in politics, assumes office with a keen understanding of the importance of public opinion in the policy making process.

From his post as colonial secretary, Chamberlain combined the needs of domestic politics with imperial diplomacy in the hopes of fusing social reform and imperialism to form a new national party. It is Porter's thesis that