

de correctifs, mener aux derniers mais aucune logique intrinsèque n'y conduit. Une réflexion théorique plus poussée sur les types de dissidence, la nature de chacun et les liens qu'ils entretiennent entre eux permettrait de faire les distinctions qui s'imposent et sortirait le volume de sa dimension trop descriptive.

Les auteurs ne prétendent pas à un travail de recherche neuf mais à une synthèse large, en langue française. Ils atteignent bien l'objectif en fournissant une œuvre soignée bien documentée et utile. On aurait cependant pu s'attendre à voir dans l'une des 781 notes quelque référence aux volumes de Rudolf L. TÖKÉS, *Dissent in the USSR: Politics, Ideology and People*, (Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press, 1975), Joshua RUBENSTEIN, *Soviet Dissidents: Their Struggle for Human Rights*, (Boston, Beacon Press, 1980) ou Marshall S. SHATZ, *Soviet Dissent in Historical Perspective* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1980). On constate encore une fois que la distance linguistique et psychologique entre la France et le monde anglo-saxon n'est pas facile à franchir.

Christine PIETTE
Université Laval

* * *

DOLORES HAYDEN—*The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Houses, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1981. Pp. xi, 367.

On the strength of its diagnosis of "The Problem That Has No Name", Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* became a best seller in North America in 1963, particularly among suburban housewives. The women's liberation movement of the late sixties and seventies now recognized as the second great wave of feminism, emerged in part out of the discontents that Friedan had given voice to. Certainly one of the major grievances that the new feminists brought against the existing social order concerned the apparent inevitability of women's relegation to housework and housewifely roles. Another concerned the short shrift which academic history, and with it history as taught in the schools, had given women's past. To know ourselves, the women's liberationists argued, we have to know who our foremothers were, and furthermore, in order to effect social change, we have to understand the oppressive structures which society imposed on women in the past and the strategies, if any, which women developed to try to circumvent or surmount those constraints. Rarely have I read a work in the new women's history as clearly dedicated to those two objectives as Dolores Hayden's *The Grand Domestic Revolution*. Not only does she reclaim a nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American feminist tradition from the deep obscurity to which it had been consigned, the tradition she has uncovered was devoted to revolutionizing housework.

Hayden has named the contributors to this tradition "material feminists because they dared to define a 'grand domestic revolution' in women's material conditions" (p. 3). She does not intend this term to be dichotomous in the way that the typologies of other historians have set equal rights feminism, for instance, in opposition to social feminism or public feminism to domestic feminism. Those dichotomies have worked to obscure not only the coexistence in many individual feminists of more than one tendency, but also the extent to which late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American feminism was concerned with the effect on women of the separation of domestic work, spatially and economically, from

the public sphere and the larger economy. This latter represents one of the major revisionist implications of Hayden's study. By taking this more open approach, Hayden can regard feminists holding widely divergent political views as still contributing to the material feminist tradition.

The aim of the material feminists was above all to put an end to the primitive nature of private housework and its oppressiveness to women. Insofar as this goal is taken as the definition of material feminism, Hayden has marshalled an impressive array of evidence to establish its lively existence in the period covered by her book, roughly 1820s to 1920s, with the main focus on the period between the end of the Civil War and the onset of the Great Depression. Not content with that definition, however, Hayden expands it to include a second commitment, the goal of "ending the confinement of women to domestic work" (p. 49). But that second definition would appear to be, by Hayden's own evidence, ahistorical. While Hayden can claim for her tradition material feminists who identified "the economic exploitation of women's domestic labor by men as the most basic cause of women's inequality" (p. 3), and others who in addition "identified economic independence for women as the real basis for lasting equality between men and women" (p. 203), as did Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Hayden herself admits that "among all the vehement nineteenth century feminists only a handful ever suggested that men do housework, or that boys and girls be trained equally in domestic skills" (p. 298). In fact, as Hayden shows, it was through gaining payment or some other economic recognition for "industrialized" cooking, cleaning and laundry that many of her feminist reformers sought to end men's economic exploitation of women's domestic labour and to achieve economic independence for women.

Degenderizing housework, then, was not taken into consideration by most material feminists. Collectivizing and industrializing domestic toil, however, was central to their aims. Indeed the main contradiction which the subjects of Hayden's book sought to resolve was that between the increasing rationalization of factory production through division of labour, specialization and mechanization and the continuing waste and inefficiency of housework done in the private home. As a feminist writing for the *Ladies Home Journal* in 1919 succinctly concluded: "The private kitchen must go the way of the spinning wheel, of which it is the contemporary." (p. 226).

Although Hayden labels as feminist only those who sought to resolve the contradiction in the interests of women's greater autonomy and release from household toil, she has cast the net of her study wide enough to catch almost anyone or any group who addressed themselves to the problem; and her far-ranging and painstaking research has turned up an amazing collection of individuals and movements, idealists and pragmatists, philanthropists and entrepreneurs who did.

Hayden locates the fountainhead of material feminism in communitarian socialism. She points to the fact that Robert Owen and Charles Fourier, who inspired the founding of a number of experimental villages in the United States starting in the 1820s and 1840s respectively, both included in their vision of a more egalitarian society a critique of the oppressiveness of the private home and plans to socialize housework and child care. It is the feminism of Owenite and Fourierist communitarian socialism which is stressed here. In this Hayden, like other contemporary socialist feminists, turns from the relative barrenness of Marxist concepts for a theory of women's oppression to a rediscovery of those earlier socialists whom Engels dismissed as Utopian, but who were committed to freedom for women. (See, for example, Barbara Taylor, *Eve and the New Jeru-*

salem: *Socialism and Feminism in the 19th Century* [London: Virago Press, 1983].)

Most of the other contributors to a "grand domestic revolution" are not as generally well known. In fact, the staggering impact of Hayden's study comes from her documentation of the extent to which the socialization of housework was discussed, designed for, and implemented in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century America. How well known is it, for instance, that Melusina Fay Peirce, wife of philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce, organized a rebellion against privatized housework within the Harvard establishment of the late 1860s? While her experiment in "cooperative housekeeping" foundered on the opposition of husbands, leading Peirce to castigate "'HUSBAND-POWER which is apt to shut down like an invisible bell-glass over every woman as soon as she is married'" (p. 82), her book *Cooperative Housekeeping* exercised influence over many who came after her including Charlotte Perkins Gilman. Indeed Hayden's study puts Gilman into a historical context. No longer the lone radical feminist advocate of socialized housekeeping, Gilman is presented here as a great synthesizer and popularizer, her most original contribution having been to argue "that the development of socialized domestic work and new domestic environments should be seen as promoting the evolution of socialism, rather than following it" (p. 184).

Hayden identifies in Peirce's proposals a flaw which would bedevil other collectivized housekeeping ventures started by middle- or upper-class women: a failure to see beyond their own class or race to other women whose need for a solution to the problem of housework was as great as their own. In fact these women appear to have been all too willing to seek their own liberation at the expense of the continued enslavement of women of a lower social order. In Peirce's "factory of housework", a class of female employees would have performed the industrialized household labour which the wives of Harvard dons were to manage and for which their husbands were to pay. Similarly, in Gilman's dream of the Feminist Apartment Hotel, brought close to realization in New York City in 1914 by her disciple Henrietta Rodman, mothers with outside careers were to be relieved of housework and twenty-four-hour motherhood by entrepreneurs who collectivized the cooking, cleaning, clothes-washing and child care with the labour of professionalized women workers. As Hayden comments, "No one asked how the 'professional' domestic workers could also be mothers" (p. 201). No one, that is, except opponents. Ironically one of the fiercest critics of the project, Laura Fay-Smith, was the younger sister of Melusina Fay Peirce. While avoidance of "the 'responsibilities' of motherhood" was her main accusation, Fay Smith also leveled a more indefensible charge: "The feminist... wants to climb high over the harsh labors of the house, on the shoulders of the women whose hard necessity compels them to be paid servants" (p. 201).

Hayden may be a politically committed historian, but her perspective is not that of the narrow-minded ideologue who condemns and dismisses what in the past does not agree with her present politics. Rather, for political as well as scholarly reasons, she wants to see the whole picture as clearly as possible. Thus, while she identifies difficulties, she devotes most of her attention to the positive side of the endeavours: the daring and imagination involved in the schemes to revolutionize housework. Moreover, while as a socialist feminist she might have limited her focus to socialistic projects, in fact she has extended her purview to include any attempt at socialized domestic labour. So cooked-food delivery services, which tended to be developed in big cities and on an entrepreneurial basis, form part of her story as well as community dining clubs, organized principally in small, midwestern towns as consumers co-operatives with hired servants.

Hayden's research uncovered twenty of the former experiments and thirteen of the latter lasting from six months to thirty-three years between 1884 and 1925. The reader also learns of co-operatively owned apartment hotels developed in New York in the 1880s which allowed well-to-do individuals and families with servants to benefit from central heating and central refrigeration. "Speculative 'cooperative'" apartment houses, such as one developed on Manhattan in the 1920s, with a restaurant, a staff of maids, a laundry, beauty shop, barber shop, nursery, and supervised playground, did provide professional domestic service as a privilege for those wives whose husbands could afford to pay (pp. 260-61).

But the socialist impulse did not die. The free-love feminist Marie Stevens Howland was greatly impressed with the Fourierist co-operative industrial community, called the *Familistère* or Social Palace, begun in Guise, France in 1859, particularly with its provision of collectivized developmental child care. Its example informed her novel *The Familistère*, which recreated the Social Palace in a New England setting, as well as her input into the plans of Albert Kimsey Owen to create a model co-operative city in Topolobampo, Mexico, in the 1880s and 1890s. Those decades witnessed the publication of a spate of futurist, socialist novels which envisioned an urban world of both industrial and domestic reform, where domestic space was recognized, household drudgery abolished, and house-keeping made co-operative. The most remarkable of these, Henry Olerich's *A Cityless and Countryless World: An Outline of Practical Cooperative Individualism*, featured Mars as a feminist planet on which gender distinctions had been abolished. There were male as well as female "specialists" doing the "'public, domestic work' of cooking and cleaning". And all adult Martians shared child care (p. 145). In contrast, the co-operative housing projects, built by trade-union groups in New York after 1917 to protect workers from "rent-gouging landlords" (p. 254), still expected women to cook the food and mind the children. Perhaps the most ambitious scheme to combine socialist and feminist concerns was Alice Constance Austin's design for an entire city of kitchenless houses and socialized domestic work. On May Day 1916 California farmers and urban workers gathered in Llano del Rio to examine Austin's architectural model for an alternative to Los Angeles, but they lacked the capital to construct it.

Others, out of philanthropic rather than socialist impulse, had undertaken to aid the tenement dwellers of crowded industrial cities like Chicago whose apartments were kitchenless, but not from choice. Familiar to the general reader are the settlement houses run by highly educated women who sought on their own or by lobbying municipalities to fill the breach with public kitchens, baths, and laundries, and public nurseries, kindergartens and playgrounds. Less publicity has gone to the forms of co-operative housekeeping which the settlement house residents, frequently single professional women, developed to meet their own needs. It is above all in that area that Hayden finds Jane Addams' famous Hull House such an interesting experiment. In general Hayden stresses the significance of co-operative "boarding clubs" organized by single female workers for, "Whether they were factory workers, clerical workers, or even professionals", she points out, "none of them earned enough to enjoy the independence and security enjoyed by single men of their own social class, unless they formed clubs to 'cooperate' toward that end" (p. 170).

Hayden also highlights the work of civic-minded home economists in the first generation of that new female profession, women like Ellen Swallow Richards, the Instructor in Sanitary Chemistry at MIT who designed public kitchens like scientific laboratories. World War I gave a boost to public kitchens when the Women's Committee of the Council of National Defense supported their creation

for married women war workers. Later however, home economists would frown on "untrained" women's attempts at co-operative housekeeping and recognize as the only legitimate area for socialized domestic labour "the large-scale institutional kitchens, bakeries, and laundries" that evolved under their professional supervision in "colleges, hospitals, asylums, prisons, and hotels" (p. 177).

The last major subject of Hayden's study is Ethel Puffer Howes, a woman who until age thirty-six single-mindedly pursued an academic career as a philosopher. Then she married and had two children. Sensitized to the difficulties of being at once professor, mother and housewife, in 1923 she "launched a popular campaign for women's cooperative home service clubs" (p. 269) in the pages of *Woman's Home Companion*. A few years later, having raised funds and secured the sponsorship of Smith College, she opened the Institute for the Coordination of Women's Interests to research what domestic reform would be necessary to allow women to balance marriage (and motherhood) and career. Howes herself taught a first-year course in sociology designed to introduce young women to the "career or marriage" dilemma as a necessary part of their "mental hygiene". Opposed to the choice, she proposed that women manage the combination by cultivating subdued ambition and part-time work. While Howes' approach can be seen as a realistic programme for coping, one is puzzled by Hayden's pronouncement that Howes and her Institute colleagues "cannot be faulted . . . on their integration of feminist theory and practice, history and strategy" (p. 277). Certainly female faculty at Smith would not have agreed, concerned as they were that Howes' pragmatism would lead to lower academic standards and levels of achievement for women. Furthermore it is the weakness of her theoretical position which made her susceptible to co-optation by the very forces that would defeat material feminism.

These forces, in Hayden's analysis, are clearly connected to American capitalism's turn in the 1920s towards mass consumerism as the basis for mass production and a stable economy. The post-World War I "Red Scare" and the resulting fears of worker militancy also figured prominently in turning popular opinion against material feminism. The single family suburban house on its own lot, accepted as a goal by many trade unionists as much as it was promoted by employers, served not only to deflate worker radicalism but also to increase demand for private cars and consumption of domestic commodities. The labour-saving technology originally developed for laundry, dish washing, cleaning, and refrigeration on a large scale, was now miniaturized for use in the private home. Advertising became big business. If the white male skilled worker was to be the "home owner", his wife was billed as "Mrs. Consumer", the "home manager". In what Hayden describes as "the final corruption of home economics, representing not women's interests but businesses' interests in manipulating women, their homes, and their families", the home economist Christine Frederick misrepresented "scientific management" as applicable to private housework and helped advertisers develop techniques to exploit "what she called women's suggestibility, passivity, and their 'inferiority complexes'" (p. 285). As suburban tract housing multiplied, material feminism was consigned to oblivion.

I have not yet sufficiently stressed how visual this book is. Those who sought to advance "the grand domestic revolution" conceptualized it not only in words, but also in designs and, when possible, structures. Appropriately Hayden's book is illustrated with numerous reproductions of architectural diagrams and sketches, of photographs of experimental kitchens and kitchen equipment as well as of the designers and reformers themselves. Hayden approaches social history with the skills of an historian of architecture.

At a fundamental level, however, the book is a political statement, intended as a contribution to feminist theory as well as historical analysis. Hayden tends to see material feminism not only as a rich and varied tradition, but as a cumulative body of theory and practice on "the struggle to unite socialism and feminism" (p. 201). This tendency peaks in the final chapter. Here Hayden summarizes two major lessons which she believes can be learned from the historical experience of material feminists. The first is that one class of "women can never gain their own liberation from stereotypes of gender at the expense of other women of lower economic class or another race whom they exploit by paying them low wages to do sex-stereotyped work." (p. 299) The second is that, not only individual men, but also capitalism as it has developed, has a vested interest in keeping women trapped in subordinate domesticity.

Hayden believes there are also lessons to be learned from the theoretical development of material feminism. At this point the ahistorical nature of her second definition of material feminism comes into focus, for she now identifies as the *new* insight of the *contemporary* feminists their critique of the sexual division of labour which dumps housework and child care on women. Nonetheless, in Hayden's opinion, present-day feminists could still learn a thing or two from their forebears. From material feminism's "spatial critique of the home as an isolated domestic workplace" (p. 295), for instance, they could learn the need to redesign space to facilitate the socialization of housework. Secondly, according to Hayden, current feminism loses many potential supporters because it appears to offer no alternative to the family home it attacks; material feminists, in contrast, "created a positive, concrete ideal of feminist homes linked to Frances Willard's ideal of making a homelike world as a way of improving and expanding woman's sphere" (p. 302). But here Hayden leaves the reader with a conundrum. Granted that many women opposed the ERA out of a commitment to household labour as valuable nurturing work, if the theoretical advance made by contemporary feminists was to attack the woman's sphere/ man's world division, then how can they, without re-endorsing that division, accept woman's sphere "as an essential, historical, material base" (p. 303) from which to mobilize women? But such is Hayden's political advice.

Ruth Roach PIERSON

*Ontario Institute for Studies in Education/
Memorial University of Newfoundland*

* * *

MARIAN FOWLER—*The Embroidered Tent. Five Gentlewomen in Canada: Elizabeth Simcoe, Catharine Parr Traill, Susanna Moodie, Anna Jameson, Lady Dufferin.* Toronto: House of Anansi Press Limited, 1982. Pp. 239.

SUSAN JACKEL, ed.—*A Flannel Shirt and Liberty. British Emigrant Gentlewomen in the Canadian West, 1880-1914.* Vancouver and London: University of British Columbia Press, 1982. Pp. xxvii, 262.

Because of our landscape and climate, all Canadians, men as well as women, feel every day the interface of embroidery and tent of old world refinement and frontier roughness, lyricism and rhetoric, intuition's tangle and reason's right-angle.

FOWLER, p. 12

Fowler's apt metaphor "The Embroidered Tent" captures the tension between the traditional values of the mother country and the new skills required