

TITLE OF MAJOR PAPER: THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT AND THE RISE OF INDUSTRIAL FOOD
PRODUCTION IN AMERICA: A SYMBIOTIC RELATIONSHIP?

STUDENT'S NAME: NATASHA ARSENIJEVICH

SUPERVISOR'S NAME: ROD MACRAE

DATE OF SUBMISSION: JULY 30 2014

*A MAJOR PAPER SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER IN ENVIRONMENTAL
STUDIES, YORK UNIVERSITY, TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA*

STUDENT'S SIGNATURE:

MAJOR PAPER SUPERVISOR'S SIGNATURE:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	3-4
FOREWORD.....	5
INTRODUCTION.....	6-8
PART 1: THE AMERICAN WOMEN’S MOVEMENT.....	9-55
1.1 HISTORY OF THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT.....	9-10
1.1.1 THE FIRST PHASE.....	10-15
1.1.2 THE SECOND PHASE.....	15
1.1.3 THE THIRD PHASE.....	16-19
1.2 CONTEXTUAL FACTORS OF THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT.....	19
1.2.1 INDUSTRIALIZATION.....	20-21
1.2.2 URBANIZATION.....	22-23
1.2.3 SEPARATE SPHERES.....	23-28
1.3 FEMINIST THEORIES THROUGHOUT THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT.....	28
1.3.1 LIBERAL FEMINISM.....	28-38
1.3.1.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF LIBERAL FEMINISM.....	35-38
1.3.2 RADICAL FEMINISM.....	39-46
1.3.2.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF RADICAL FEMINISM.....	43-45
1.3.3 CULTURAL FEMINISM.....	45-49
1.3.3.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF CULTURAL FEMINISM.....	48-49
1.3.4 SOCIALIST FEMINISM.....	50-53
1.3.4.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOCIALIST FEMINISM.....	52-53
1.4 PART 1 SUMMATION.....	53-55
PART 2: INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION.....	55-66
2.1 HISTORY OF INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROCESSED FOOD.....	55-61
2.2 THE DESKILLED CONSUMER AND DEPENDENCE ON PROCESSED FOOD.....	62-65
2.3 PART 2 SUMMATION.....	65-66
PART 3: INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION PROMOTES THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT.....	66-78
3.1 ADVERTISING PROCESSED FOODS TO WOMEN.....	66-77
3.2 PART 3 SUMMATION.....	77-78
PART 4: THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT PROMOTES INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION.....	79-88
4.1 FEMINIST THEORIES.....	79
4.1.1 LIBERAL FEMINISM.....	79-81
4.1.2 RADICAL FEMINISM.....	81-82
4.1.3 CULTURAL FEMINISM.....	82-83
4.1.4 SOCIALIST FEMINISM.....	83-84
4.2 EVIDENCE OF WOMEN UTILIZING PROCESSED FOOD.....	84-86
4.3 PART 4 SUMMATION.....	87-88
CONCLUSION.....	88-91
WORKS CITED.....	92-96

ABSTRACT

This paper hypothesizes a symbiotic relationship between the women's movement and the rise of industrial food production in America. I will explore the possibility that the women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production were tied to one another, influencing each other's rise. Stated differently, I will analyze the historical relationship between women and food during the 19th and 20th centuries, and how this relationship has had an impact on the development and identity creation of each.

This hypothesis will be explored in four parts. Part 1 will discuss the American women's movement and will provide a brief chronological history, explain the three most significant contextual factors that catalysed the movement, and describe the feminist theories that helped to shape and define the movement. Part 2 will discuss the rise of industrial food production and will describe its history, explain how and why it was adopted on a national scale, and outline the social, economic, and physical consequences of the reliance on industrial cuisine. Part 3 will discuss how the aspirations, objectives, and theories that defined the women's movement encouraged the use of industrial cuisine, and subsequently industrial food production. Lastly, Part 4 will explain how industrial food production promoted the rise of women's independence, and therein the women's movement, through its marketing strategies and the creation of a consumer-based food culture.

It will be demonstrated that although there are different streams of feminism, all streams supported lessening women's presence within the private sphere. The most time consuming responsibility within the household was cooking and meal preparation; thus, women sought to minimize their time and efforts devoted to it. One way to achieve this was to utilize

processed food stuffs. It will be shown that the purchasing of processed food increased with the rise of the female labor force. Had women remained in the private sphere, absent from the workforce, there would have been little or no need for convenience foods. The American women's movement gave the food industry a chance to provide a new kind of service, which gave way to mass-consumption and mass-production, leading to demands that industrial food production could readily fulfill.

The development and success of industrial food production was based upon the growing need for greater convenience and efficiency in food production and provision within the private sphere. Thus, this industry was rooted in the idea of providing a value-added product: time. The idea of saving time was the most alluring to women, particularly working women. Therefore, the industry became dependent upon women. Industrially produced food products gave women an opportunity for more time and energy to follow their aspirations for equality and liberation. Had food provision remained in the production realm as opposed to evolving primarily into consumption, women would have had to dedicate a substantial amount of time to food production and provision, which would have made it nearly impossible for them to enter the public sphere.

FOREWORD

My Major Paper offers one perspective on how industrial food production became a dominant practice in the United States of America. More specifically, it suggests that one particular social and political initiative – the women’s movement – was used as a vehicle to greatly enhance the adoption of industrial food production; while simultaneously the rise of industrial food production positively influenced the successes of the women’s movement. The nature of this paper is inquisitive and based on a hypothesis that was derived from theoretical analysis and historical research. Given the focus of the paper, my research topic is directly linked to my Plan of Study, in which my Area of Concentration is “An Ecofeminist Critique of Industrial Food Production.” This Area of Concentration focuses upon the social, political, and economic impacts that have led to the rise of industrial food production through the analytic perspective of ecofeminism. It also relates to my three Components, which are Industrial Food Production, Ecofeminism, and Theories of Economics and Religion. Of the three Components, it relates most to Industrial Food Production. The research associated with my Major Paper, along with its content, will touch upon each of the five Learning Objectives. More specifically, it helps me fulfill the following learning objectives in greater depth: Learning Objectives 1.1 and 1.2 of Component 1, which aim to understand the economic, social, and political frameworks that guide the food system. This paper, as a culminating activity, has contributed greatly to my Area of Concentration, “An Ecofeminist Critique of Industrial Food Production,” and the associated Components and Learning Objectives.

INTRODUCTION

Few revolutionary moments have been able to completely transform the social, economic, environmental, and political landscape of America. One such moment was the women's movement. It was an incredibly significant force, responsible for essentially christening one half of the American population by reintroducing women into society. This affirmation dramatically reshaped the labour force, altered the political arena, and challenged social conventions surrounding gender identity. It was responsible for transforming legislation, challenging traditional societal norms, and introducing feminism as a philosophy and form of activism.

Another equally significant moment in American history was the adoption of industrial food production. Industrial food production reshaped the American landscape, literally and figuratively. The commercialization of this dominant method of food production and manufacturing made it increasingly difficult for the average individual to maintain self-provision. Food production, on a micro level, was essentially replaced by mass-consumption.

Historically, the women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production have been studied and analysed as autonomous, distinct and unrelated events. This paper hypothesizes a symbiotic relationship between the two, within the United States of America. I will explore the possibility of the women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production having parasitic ties to one another, influencing each other's rise. Stated differently, I will analyze the historical relationship between women and food during the 19th and 20th centuries, and how this relationship has had an impact on the development and identity creation of each.

This hypothesis will be explored in four parts. Part 1 will discuss the American women's movement and will provide a brief chronological history, explain the three most significant contextual factors that catalysed the movement, and feminist theories that helped to shape and define the movement. Part 2 will discuss the rise of industrial food production and its history, as well as explain how and why it was adopted on a national scale, and outline the social, economic, and physical consequences of industrial cuisine. Part 3 will discuss how the aspirations, objectives, and theories that defined the women's movement indirectly encouraged the use of industrial cuisine, and subsequently industrial food production. Lastly, Part 4 will explain how industrial food production promoted the rise of women's independence, and therein the women's movement, through its marketing strategies and the creation of a consumer-based food culture.

Thus far, the connection between the women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production in America has been relatively unexplored. This is an important topic and worthy of discussion as it uncovers the motivating factors that unite these two seemingly unrelated movements and identifies why and how certain social, economic, and political trends became hegemonic. Uncovering these underlying motivations allows for a more complete understanding of how to transform or challenge the negative impacts of industrial food production and demystify the stigmas and assumptions associated with feminism and women's independence in relation to food. The adverse consequences associated with industrial food production, and the fallacies and expectations that have defined the relationship between food and women, are abundant.

Beginning with industrial food production, the evolution of the current agricultural system, along with the adoption of alternative actor dynamics, has led to a paradigm shift in regards to food and society's relationship to food. As a result of this physical and philosophical shift in America's dominant method of agricultural production and food system dynamics, several problems have come to the forefront: environmental degradation, food insecurity, health concerns, environmental justice, the instrumentalization of animals and disregard for animal welfare, and the creation of the "deskilled consumer."

In reference to the American women's movement, there are common misconceptions and negative assumptions associated with feminism and food provision. Historically, food production and provision were socially assigned tasks for women. This task became a cultural symbol in America as it was used to help create and define gender roles and establish gender identifiers. Given that dynamic, there have been several social, economic, and political outcomes related to the traditional relationship between women and food. One is the expectation for fulltime working women to be the sole authority on food provision, an expectation that is based upon gender roles. This expectation reaffirms the connection between women and food and discourages food provision from being associated with masculinity. Another outcome is the belief that the connection between women and food production and provision is an archaic relationship that is both exploitative and a hindrance to women's independence.

Understanding the relationship between the American women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production in America is important and merits recognition and exploration.

PART 1: THE AMERICAN WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

1.1 HISTORY OF THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Women of the United States have struggled to transform their status within political, social, and economic spheres for more than a century. This extensive and tireless battle has often been defined by three phases of action: the first arose in 1848 and stretched to the 1870s; the second phase, the Progressive era, ran from 1890 to 1920; and the latest, often referred to as the contemporary phase, began in the latter years of the 1960s (Papachristou xi; Matthews viii).

It is believed that each of these phases was catalysed in a time of social reform. Specifically, in the first phase prior to the American Civil War, social change was spurred on by abolitionism. During the Progressive antebellum era, protestors cried out against the social and economic consequences of industrialization; and beginning in the 1950s, activists brought attention to the limited civil rights and economic prospects available to minority groups. Within each of these periods, women joined in protest for egalitarianism and came to realize their own subordinate position, therein expanding their advocacy to demand equality for all women (Papachristou xii).

The three phases of the women's movement were motivated by the prospect of specific economic, political, and social transformations. During the struggle for abolitionism in the first phase, women demanded to be legal persons through establishing particular rights: the right to own their own property and control their own earnings, the right to share control of their children with their husbands, the right to be the legal guardians of their children in instances of their husbands' death, and the right to vote. In addition, women demanded the right to an

education so that they may become economically independent (Papachristou xii; Matthews vii). In the second phase, women focused fundamentally on the right to vote as they believed that suffrage would initiate all measures of reform for women (Papachristou xii; Matthews vii). Lastly, in the contemporary phase, the movement extended its efforts into all existing avenues that still denied women of equality. In particular, since 1966, the main focus was to end discrimination against women in areas of education and employment through equal rights amendments in state and federal constitutions. They also called for the sexual liberation of women and their right to control their own body, including their reproductive activity (Papachristou xii).

1.1.1 THE FIRST PHASE

As briefly mentioned, the women's movement was formed out of concern for the egalitarianism of others. Beginning in the 1820s and 1830s, in areas such as New England, New York, and Pennsylvania, churches across the nation were involved with humanitarian and Christian-sanctioned issues such as capital punishment, temperance, education, and peace (Papachristou 3). Women who were involved in church affairs, which included the majority of women, became a part of these reform movements. There were two significant impacts of this involvement. Firstly, in being a part of this reform activity, women were developing self-confidence and independence in their ability to unify and collectively act, bringing "both a sense of personal worth and pride in their sex" (Berg 193). Secondly, this activity led to a conscious awakening of women as a separate social and gender-based category (Ryan 11). This newly discovered confidence and self-realization laid the foundation for a movement. Although

women took part in various amounts of activism within the church, it was through abolitionism that white women began to realize their own inferiority, relative to men, and began an organized effort to alter their subservient position within American society.

By the time the American Anti-Slavery Society, the first national antislavery association, was founded in Philadelphia in 1833, women were already involved in abolitionism. Four women were present at this founding (Papachristou 3). These four women reunited after the meeting in Philadelphia and organized their own Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society. Word of this spread from town to town and soon after there were several female antislavery societies that existed in New York, Indiana, Illinois, and Ohio, all of which were modeled after the Philadelphia Female Anti-Slavery Society (Papachristou 4; Matthews 28).

A few years following the founding of the first women's and national antislavery societies, abolitionists began to pressure Congress for political action against antislavery through a petition campaign. In May of 1837, there was a three-day convention for female antislavery groups in New York City, titled the Anti-Slavery Convention of American Women, which attracted over 200 women from ten states in an effort to coordinate with the petition campaign. The convention gained momentum and met twice again in 1838 and 1839 in Philadelphia area. Notable women of this time include Maria Weston Chapman, Lydia Maria Child, Charlotte Forten, Lucretia Mott, Lucy Stone, Sojourner Truth, Harriet Tubman, and Sarah and Angelina Grimke (Papachristou 6-9; Matthews 31; Hartman-Strom 45).

For years, women and men worked side-by-side in abolition societies, bringing women a sense of empowerment by this union and giving them a notable position within the reform movement. It wasn't until London held the World Anti-Slavery Convention in 1840 that women

realized that their improved political and social status was an illusion. During this convention, women were not recognized as delegates and were denied a seat. Two of these women in attendance, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, had been outraged by their dismissal, which spurred on discussion of a women's rights convention. Eight years later, Mott and Stanton met again to plan the first women's rights convention (Papachristou 18; Ryan 15; Matthews 37; Hartman-Strom 55).

On July 19, 1848, they held the first Woman's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York (Papachristou 18; Furer 289; Matthews 3; Ryan 11; Hartman-Strom 53) and the purpose of this meeting was to discuss "the social, civil, and religious condition and rights of women" (Papachristou 23). With over 100 women in attendance, they approved of a Declaration of Sentiments that had been prepared earlier by the women who organized the event. The Declaration essentially paraphrased the Declaration of Independence and insisted that "all men and women are created equal" (Papachristou 24). They also discussed a set of resolutions related to educational opportunities, oppressive laws, social double standards, and voting (Papachristou 25; Hartman-Strom 54).

After the Seneca Falls convention, there was still much to discuss and second meeting was held two weeks later in Rochester, New York (Ryan 11; Papachiristou 26). Since this meeting was held in a larger city, it received much publicity and word of the convention spread across states and led to the formation of several small groups that fought for women's rights throughout the 1850s. Eventually these groups linked together by state and national associations and led to the first National Women's Rights Convention in 1850, in Worcester, Massachusetts (Papachristou 30).

At these Women Right's Convention meetings, there were three goals that garnered more attention than any of the others. One was the amendment of state personal property laws, which denied women the proprietorship and control of their earnings and property. The second was changing child custody laws to give mothers shared custody and guardianship over their children. The third goal was the right to vote (Papachristou 37).

With the onset of the Civil War, the organized women's movement came to a halt. During this time, women played a fundamental role for both the Union and Confederacy groups. They helped to set up and run hospitals and collect medical equipment, managed businesses, farms, and plantations, aided their communities through cooking, sewing, providing nursing services, and raised funds (Papachristou 47). Despite these efforts, it was the anti-slavery efforts that got the first gain.

In 1865, Congress approved and ratified the Thirteenth Amendment, prohibiting slavery in the United States (Papachristou 30; Hartman-Strom 75; Matthews 119). Following the Thirteenth Amendment was discussion of the Fourteenth Amendment, which would grant citizenship to freed slaves (Papachristou 49; Hartman-Strom 76).

In light of these changes, one year after the war, in 1866, the National Woman's Rights Convention once again held a meeting. Suffrage was their main concern. With that in mind, the convention voted to merge with other state and national associations seeking the vote for freedmen, forming the American Equal Rights Association. As a now unified front, they had hoped to change the wording of the Fourteenth Amendment to include women's suffrage (Papachristou 51; Hartman-Strom 76; Matthews 126).

Regrettably, the wording was not changed, and when the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified in 1868, and freedmen were granted citizenship, the discussion moved to how the Fifteenth Amendment could aid in women's equality. The Fifteenth Amendment would prohibit the federal and state governments from denying a citizen the right to vote based on "race, color, and previous condition of servitude" (Hartman-Strom 77; Matthews 136). Some women saw this as another opportunity in attaining suffrage. Once the Fifteenth Amendment was proposed, the American Equal Rights Association split into two factions (Papachristou 56; Hartman-Strom 76). One group supported the revision of the amendment to include sex; while the other group supported just the inclusion of race for fear that the mention of sex would compromise the citizenship of freedmen (Papachristou 56; Hartman-Strom 77). In 1870, the desire of the latter group prevailed when the Fifteenth Amendment, which proposed universal suffrage to black males, was ratified (Hartman-Strom 77).

In 1869, the fractured group formed two new associations. One was the National Woman Suffrage Association and the other, American Woman Suffrage Association. The National Woman Suffrage Association was organized by Susan Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton and was the more radical of the two, aggressively supporting women's rights above all and it promoted a more revolutionary stance on feminism (Papachristou 66; Hartman-Strom 78; Matthews 142). The American Woman Suffrage Association was the more moderate of the two and was based on a reformist agenda (Tong 23). Nearly ten years later, after working separately, the members of the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association came together in July of 1876 to demonstrate for women's rights at the country's Centennial celebration (Papachristou 83). As the years went on, the attitudes

and goals that once separated these groups diminished. The American Woman Suffrage Association and the National Woman Suffrage Association united in 1890 to form the National American Woman Suffrage Association (Papachristou 86, Tong 23; Matthews 180). This union focused solely on women's suffrage, and marks the beginning of the second phase of the movement.

1.1.2 THE SECOND PHASE

The second phase of the women's movement is defined by its objective for women's suffrage. Between the years of 1890 and 1920, groups such as the National American Woman Suffrage Association campaigned and organized for the vote (Papachristou 98; Matthews 180). Beginning in 1848, there were over 500 campaigns launched to achieve women's suffrage. This included 56 state referendum campaigns, 277 separate efforts to persuade state party conventions to add women's suffrage to their planks, 19 congressional battles, and the ratification campaign in 1919 and 1920 (Ryan 9). Finally, on August 26th 1920, after 72 years of struggle, the Nineteenth Amendment was ratified and gave women the right to vote (Papachristou 188; Furer 205; Ryan 31; Matthews 180).

1.1.3 THE THIRD PHASE

For approximately forty years following the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment, feminists were fairly dormant, aside from a few national organizations (Papachristou 189). In 1920, the Women's Joint Congressional Committee was formed and its two most prominent goals were to amend the constitution to prohibit the child labor practice and to facilitate programs that would aid in maternity and child care (Papachristou 190). Another major

initiative of that time was the development of the American Birth Control League which fought for the improvement of birth control (Papachristou 191). Lastly, the National Women's Party was active during this time and fought for equal rights laws and anti-discrimination on a state and federal level (Papachristou 204). This relative quiet was broken by a group of feminists that recognized that the revolutionary stance led by Stanton and Anthony during their battle for suffrage was paramount to the full liberation of women; women needed to be given equal economic opportunities and sexual freedoms, alongside political equality (Tong 23). This marked the contemporary phase, which began in the 1960s, and can be defined by anti-discrimination campaigns in regards to education, sex, and employment for women.

From the 1940s to the 1960s, there was a dominant cultural and social perception of gender roles, and the notion of an ideal, traditional American family (Ryan 36). It is said that the rebirth of feminism stems from the family-centered years of the 1950s. Although the number of women in the workforce continued to increase, the era re-established women's place in the home and societal expectations defined women as a wife and mother who had a duty to maintain the family. This meant that women working outside the home were meant to feel "material guilt, spousal shame" and responsible for "child deprivation" (Ryan 42).

At the beginning of the 1960's, many women felt that feminism was no longer relevant. The lack of an organized women's movement gave many women the illusion that they had achieved full equality. As long as women satisfied their roles as mothers and wives, they could hold any position within society. The contemporary women's movement was sparked by these unsaid conditions and women began to recognize that there was a double-standard that limited their abilities to participate in society. Women were expected to be "superwomen," who played

both a domestic and financial role (Dumont 15). In other words, “working-class wives remained responsible for performing most of the unpaid labor that went into the household economy” (Boydston 90). Brenner explains that the:

...new gender order promises to transcend the oppression of the male-breadwinner nuclear family and the gender division of labour in the private and public life....The reality of course is a bit different: the drudgery of a double day, the impoverishment of single parenthood, the emptiness of identities realized in expanded consumption are hardly liberation (23).

Women began to reject this restricting role and had a desire to progress in their careers. However, their employment opportunities were limiting and restrictive. This was confirmed by President Kennedy’s Commission on the Status of Women which investigated and confirmed that there was discrimination and injustice against women occurring (Papachristou 216). With the publication of this report in 1963, women began advocating for three specific reforms in an effort to better women’s employment status: the 1963 Equal Pay Act, Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, and the Executive Order 11246, all of which prohibited discrimination based on sex (Papachristou 218-219). In 1966, women came together to form the National Organization for Women (NOW) (Papachristou 220). Their goal was to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment and give women equal opportunity and protection in paid employment.

The rebirth of the movement was again met with opposing views. One side of the movement sought reform, while the other wanted revolution. Most of the new organizations were structured traditionally with elected representatives, national conventions, and particular goals. Their focus was on legal and political change with an objective of equality. It was a movement that was reminiscent of the first phase (Papachristou 226, Tong 24). Groups such as the aforementioned NOW, the National Women’s Political Caucus (NWPC), and the Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL), emerged during this time. These groups had a liberal feminist

stance and aimed to improve the status of women by applying both legal and social pressure (Tong 24).

NOW was the first feminist group in the United States to challenge sex discrimination. It was one of the largest and most successful whose members included radical and conservative feminists, but was fundamentally following a liberal agenda (Tong 25). As a reformist position, their liberalism sought to improve equality within a set of previously defined institutions and structures, but did not try to alter these institutions (Burchler 109). It is believed that this position is a direct reflection of the suffrage movement of the prior era (Buechler 107).

Early on, it was clear that there was a contradictory focus in the movement between egalitarianism versus individual self-development. In 1968, Beverly Jones and Judith Brown wrote a pamphlet and papers on women's liberation, beginning the Female Liberation Movement (Papachristou 229). From there, many independent women's groups grew, ones that supported a more radical position. These radical groups believed that the larger, traditional groups such as NOW, promoted hierarchy and inequality amongst women. Instead, these radical groups purposely sought to have multiple smaller groups that were unstructured and leaderless (Papachristou 236). Among them, the most notable are the Redstockings, the New York Radical Feminists, and the Feminists (Papachristou 234-235). Thus, the movement was separated into a liberal reformist camp and a radical revolutionary camp.

Although there were two centres in this movement, women's righters and women's liberationists, they were able to collaborate and join forces to improve the status of women by fighting against job discrimination, for equal educational opportunities, to protect women from economic exploitation, and to challenge the unpaid labor of housewives (Papachristou 243).

Together, these centres lobbied and pressured the state and federal governments for new anti-discrimination laws. As a result, the Equal Pay Act and the title VII of the Civil Rights Act passed; while for the first time the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) was approved by both the Senate and the House of Representatives in the spring of 1973, where it was passed to the state legislatures for ratification (Papachristou 224). Unfortunately, the ratification of the ERA is still pending. As the women's movement grew, there were many different fractions, each fighting for specific goals and each representing a different ideology. Although there is great diversity, and various organizations, the movement continues to grow in the twentieth century.

1.2 CONTEXTUAL FACTORS OF THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

The American women's movement began at the time that it did because of specific social and economic factors, which acted as a catalyst and set the stage for a social revolution. These factors are the industrial revolution, the rise of urbanization, and the cultural focus on gender division and identification.

1.2.1 INDUSTRIALIZATION

As discussed, the predominant theory holds that the women's movement was initiated by piggybacking on issues of national reform – such as abolitionism and temperance. Although there is truth in this theory, there are other external factors that influenced the origin and timing of this movement. One significant contextual factors that came into play by the 1820s was industrialization (Dumont 1986; Buechler 1990).

The Industrial Revolution forever changed the social, political, and economic landscape of America. With this evolution came a changing dynamic for the family, employment, and habitation. For women, these forces began to increasingly lessen their productive and reproductive role, as well as altering family life. Steven Buechler explains:

Throughout the colonial era and into the nineteenth century, the family functioned as a major unit of economic production. Although this was a thoroughly patriarchal system, women nonetheless played socially recognized, directly productive roles in the various tasks associated with household production and familial survival. The process of industrialization gradually undermined the productive role of the family unit by fostering larger, nonfamilial units of production oriented to production for a capitalist market. As productive work was increasingly redefined as activity conducted in exchange for a wage outside the household, many women lost directly productive economic roles (12).

As Buechler stated, prior to industrialization, the production, distribution, and consumption of daily material goods, such as clothes and food, were integrated as a singular process and necessary function within individual households. Industrialization fractured that unifying process by reducing production from the home and creating a society defined by two, opposing sectors; one being the workplace, a place that is economic in nature and focused on production, and the other being the home, noneconomic in nature and focused on reproduction (Boydston xv). As a result, a “sizable chunk of the labor formerly undertaken by wives presumably vanished from the household: increasingly, bread came from bakers, yarn from textile mills, and eggs, cheese, and butter from specialized producers” (Boydston xvi).

The intensification of commercial markets and industrialization in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries had marked the end of productive labor of the family, and saw this torch being passed to the factory. It is argued by historians that this loss of labor led to the demise of the self-sufficient household, and in effect, the decline in women’s status. Their

claim to economic and social status was compromised by the productive and distributive power of industrialization (Boydston 2; Buechler 13). Firstly, this change removed women from a directly productive role, one that was seen as socially recognized and respected. Secondly, this domestic role brought with it a set of assumptions and expectations and revised a woman's social status, along with her expected behaviour. With the departure of men to the newly industrialized workplace, women were expected to be passive and complacent while being economically destitute and having the sole role of maintaining the home and raising children. The removal of women's productivity resulted in many women feeling that this role was a "major grievance" and created a sense of "deprivation" (Buechler 14). A "newly fashioned domestic role" defined as the "woman's sphere" began to emerge (Buechler 16; Dumont 7). This woman's sphere became increasingly prevalent with the rise of urbanization.

Therefore, industrialization was responsible for altering and essentially diminishing the previous notions of a woman's role and responsibilities in the household, acting as a catalyst for redefining women and motivating women to redefine themselves.

1.2.2 URBANIZATION

By 1900, 40% of the American population lived in an urban environment (Connor and Scheik 29). Urbanization exacerbated the impacts of industrialization as women were being physically removed from a lifestyle that offered them greater independence and responsibility. It had drastically altered the pragmatic and conceptual notions of life, transforming a once rural lifestyle, and its accompanying culture, to an urban one. This new urban setting was confining, characterized by reproduction within the home and consumption within the market, which led

women, particularly white middle-class women, to become increasingly economically dependent on men, fostering the demand for a more fulfilling and independent position (Buechler 16; Dumont 7).

As a result, women, particularly within an urban setting, began to feel restless, unfulfilled, and stifled. One result was the growing demand for higher education for women. With this rising aspiration, Emma Willard and Catharine Beecher pioneered the way by opening a “female academy” in 1821 in Troy, New York, which was geared towards young upper-and middle-class women. They no longer wished to be dependent on men and refused to acknowledge the common thought that women were mentally inferior to men (Matthews 16). By the 1850s, there were several female academies across the country, more than thirty of which were considered female colleges and were active in granting degrees (Matthews 18).

The opportunity for higher education, combined with the loss of a productive role fueled many women to take action against problems associated with urbanization. These problems included alcoholism, abolitionism, prostitution, the working conditions of women and children, health epidemics, pollution, and infant mortality (Dumont 7). The restlessness and diminished social status and purpose that were the result of industrialisation and an urban lifestyle, combined with the countless issues associated with urbanization, led women to organize themselves and participate in issues of national reform beginning in the 1820s and 1830s. As discussed in the first phase of the women’s movement, this collective organization and newfound confidence began in the protective and accepted umbrella of the Church, but soon gave women the courage to recognize their own insubordination, which motivated the

women's movement. Thus, urbanization was a significant factor in the rise of the women's movement as it fueled their need to become independent, productive, and respected as equals.

1.2.3 SEPARATE SPHERES

One concept that has helped to solidify and maintain the opposing identities of men and women, and helped to motivate the women's movement, was that of "separate spheres."

Popular culture of the nineteenth century believed that men and women each played a specific social role, with each meant to govern that sphere. Men were viewed as "physically and mentally strong and courageous, and were thus meant for the rough and challenging world of war, work, and politics, as well as the professions and all the 'higher' and more demanding realms of intellect and art. Women, physically and mentally weaker but morally purer, and with loving hearts and naturally self-sacrificing natures, were made for the home: for marriage, motherhood, domestic joys and charities" (Matthews 5). In other words, the men's sphere was the public world and the women's sphere was the private.

This division was sanctified in the Church, supported in politics, reflected in the law, and demonstrated by the working demographic (Hartman-Strom 34). Furthermore, it was reiterated through the media. In fact, between 1830 and 1840, the quantity of magazine and newspaper articles discussing and describing a women's "proper sphere" increased fourfold – a clear representation of how this concept had been adopted and reinforced (Matthews 7). This concept was also reiterated in the fields of social science and history. In her 1843 non-fiction, "Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society," Ann Graves wrote "[H]ome is [women's] appropriate sphere of

action; and...whenever she neglects these duties, or goes out of this sphere...she is deserting the station which God and nature have assigned to her" (156).

This concept was further legitimized with the disparity in male and female wages during the nineteenth century. Because it was a man's duty to take care of his family, it was believed that he deserved a larger wage that reflected his responsibilities. The rise of industrialization took men from the farm and into the workforce, and helped to create the model American family of a man who "works and provides for his homemaking wife and children" (Ryan 121). In contrast, a working woman who had economic independence was viewed as misfortunate, and was only temporary until she could find a husband to take care of her and have children to raise (Matthews 6).

With the loss of an economic role and diminishing reproductive role due to industrialization, women's lives were changing and narrowly defined by domesticity. This role "prescribed new and specific obligations for women vis-à-vis the family, the maintenance of households, the care and rearing of children, and the providing of emotional support for men" (Buechler 13). With men now physically removed from the home and into the workforce, women were left to tend to the home, giving her authority over domestic life and breathing truth into the idea of a woman's realm. It was and is common for men and women to believe that "catering to a man is built into a cultural definition of 'woman' that includes caring activity and the work of feeding" (DeVault 197).

Men embraced this division by resisting responsibility for domestic work and rejecting women's entry in the workforce. In part, this was to prevent women from accessing their jobs for economic and political reasons, as well as to sustain the created gender identities defined

by these spheres (Brenner 21). This is also reflected in the writings of British scholar John Stewart Mill who wrote on American social issues and became an honorary foreign member of American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1856 concluded that “the reason women continue in a state of subjection – apart from the continuance of traditional roles – is that it is in men’s interest to keep them there. The root of public exclusion of women lies in the male desire ‘to maintain [women’s] subordination in domestic life...’” (Mill and Mill 105).

The impact and resonance of “separate spheres” can be derived from its “usefulness and flexibility” (Matthews 7). It had created a power divide amongst the sexes that avoided competition and conflict, while simultaneously defining and confirming gender identity (Matthews 7). Women too began to internalize the segregation by recognizing the similarities between paid work and housework and viewed domestic responsibilities as their “business” (Boydston 114). The separation of the private and public life, of home and work, had become over the course of the antebellum period one of the most cherished truisms of American culture (Boydston x).

As a dominant ideology in the nineteenth century, the idea of men and women inhabiting separate spheres had a great impact on defining women’s lives and motivating the women’s movement. Between the Civil War and the Great Depression, more and more women perceived housework, and its devaluation within a capitalist industrial society, as the root of sex inequality (Boydston xi). Even though women began to recognize the oppression of this dynamic, other social factors forced them to remain in this limited role.

After World War II, when men returned from the war, “experts argued that the labor market could not absorb the war veterans while keeping the female labour force active” and

there was a desire for to regain a traditional social climate (Collectif 395-397). Thus, even though women had proven themselves as employable and valuable in the job market, they were forced to return to the private sphere.

During this time in the mid-twentieth century, women were abandoning higher education and focused once again on the household. The average number of children per family began to rise, many moved to the suburbs, and the nuclear family was born. In 1945, the old slogan, "A woman's place is in the home" came back into circulation and in less than one year, four million women lost their jobs (Castro 7). This is further supported by contemporary studies that suggest "when wives and mothers assert their rights to pursue individual projects, they often discover the limits of choice and the force of cultural expectation. When women resist – by demanding help with housework or a respite from serving others – they challenge a powerful consensual understanding of womanly character by suggesting that women's care for others is effort rather than love" (DeVault 197).

Women's role as a mother, wife, and homemaker may not be recognized as economically and politically valuable, however, it was seemingly a vital foundation upon which society rests. The failure to recognize a woman's labor is known as "backgrounding." Plumwood explains that backgrounding occurs when there is a power dynamic between the "master" and the "other;" men and patriarchal society being the master and women being the other. The master "attempts both to make use of the other, organizing, relying on and benefiting from the other's services" while denying the dependency this creates by minimizing the contribution of the other through hierarchies and unrecognition (Plumwood 48). Micheline Dumont-Johnson mirrors this notion, claiming that:

no one dares to admit...that the present organization of work depends on the free, underpaid, nonunionized, part-time, volunteer, moonlight, household, and ghetto work of women, without which everything would collapse...yet, their work effort does not seem to be regarded as fully legitimate. As for work in the home, it is not even a focus of resistance: men continue to think collectively that this is a naturally female occupation (22).

Therefore, even though the unpaid and invisible labor of the private sphere is undervalued and unrecognized, it is the backbone of a functioning domestic life.

Although the idea of “separate spheres” began in the 1800’s it has sustained through to the twentieth century and continues to dominate cultural practices. However, the promotion of a specific kind of femininity, and a role that was identified with the private sphere, helped women to develop a sense of identity that allowed them to build a foundation for the first phase of the women’s movement (Buechler 14). This united front was based on a shared sense of oppression and frustration for their devalued social status, economic dependency, and non-existent political standing. Similarly, the ideologies about women in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which promoted political subservience, economic dependency, and social duty within the home, were the basis of feminist scholarship of the 1960s, which helped to renew the women’s movement after its 40 years of relative stillness from the 1920s to the 1960s (Boydston 1). Thus, the conception of a “woman’s sphere” led to the ‘justified’ subordination of women by restricting their presence in the public sphere, denying them viable employment opportunities, and associating their worth and identity with the home. At the same time, this concept helped to catalyse the rise of the women’s movement by creating a shared dissatisfaction and desire to improve the status and identity of women.

1.3 FEMINIST THEORIES THROUGHOUT THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT

Feminist political theory is often divided into three theoretical categories: liberal feminism, radical feminism – which includes cultural feminism – and socialist feminism (Kensinger 178). In order to explore the theoretical and pragmatic social, economic, and political impacts of the women's movement, and its influence towards food procurement, production, consumption, and distribution, I will briefly describe and explain the ideologies and objectives of liberal feminism, radical feminism, cultural feminism, and socialist feminism. This exploration will help to uncover the motivations and the intended actions and behaviours associated with each stream of feminism, allowing for a better understanding of its influence towards the women's movement and how it may have impacted the success of industrial food production.

1.3.1 LIBERAL FEMINISM

During all three phases of the women's movement, there was a question of whether women were fundamentally different from men on a biological level, or if women were raised to be different from men. In other words, was the identity of a woman based on nature or nurture?

The most prominent position, often defined as the political philosophy of classical liberalism and the liberal (equal rights) stream of feminism, assumes that men and women are fundamentally the same. This position claims that women have the same mental capabilities as men and therefore deserve an equal political, social, and economic status. The women's rights sector of the women's movement, defined by the first and second phase, is characterized by liberal feminism. This group of feminists predominately focus on the analyses of equality, a

defining feature of mid-19th century feminism. It argues that that any perceived sex differences are based on social constructions that are maintained through religion, laws, social norms, and myths for the purposes of maintaining a power structure; the power structure being patriarchal and oppressive to women (Ryan 118). In other words, liberal feminists do not believe that there is a fundamental root identity to define women or men; gender identity is simply based upon life experiences – nurture (Ryan 118). Based on this ideology, it is believed that any inequalities between men and women could be overcome by dismantling any political, social, and economic disadvantages through the use of legislation and democracy (Banks 162).

Liberal feminist theory believes that a certain group or groups of people have been excluded from a system that is “basically functional” (Gaard 32). Thus, the goal of liberal feminism is to reintegrate those excluded groups within the pre-existing, unchanged system, by extending their rights based on their likeness to the existing, already-accepted groups within the system (Gaard 32). More specifically, a liberal feminist is anyone who believes that a “capitalistic democracy with a bill of individual rights can and will produce legislation sufficient for redressing any pattern of unjust treatment falling to women as a group for reasons of gender” (Almeder 299). Thus, this position is challenging the social order but only to amend who, not what, is allowed to participate. It is believed that all of the political and social tools are there to provide social justice. In other words, it aims to liberate women through their uncritical assimilation into society via traditional tools of political pressure, but it does not try to change or question the societal paradigm itself (Dumont 30).

Alison Jaggar explains that "The main thrust of the liberal feminist's argument is that an individual woman should be able to determine her social role with as great freedom as does

man" (6-7). Liberal feminists view freedom and self-development as the underlying motivation of the women's movement. The pursuit of freedom and self-development is applied through agency – the ability to have free choice through the use of rationality. Based on this, every human being is considered a free agent who has the capacity to choose and reason, which makes them equal. This means that there is no justification to restrict a class of individuals from their right to exercise their freedom and development. Therefore, there is no moral explanation or rationale to limit an individual's right to self-development based on sex (Gould 3-18). Thus, individuals are able to set their own goals as long as their pursuits do not infringe upon the rights of others. Therefore, liberals believe that individuals will reach their maximum self-fulfillment when they are given the opportunity to engage in their chosen behavior or activities without obstacles, so long as it does not impact anyone else's rights (Wendell 71).

With that in mind, liberal feminists believe that women are valuable in themselves, as individual human beings, and not just as caregivers for their family (Wendell 76). According to Valerie Bryson, liberal feminism believes that women have the equal capacity to reason and are therefore entitled to the same rights as men (159).

Traditional liberal political theory and liberal feminism recognizes a division between the public and private spheres, which is also synonymous with valuing rationality over emotions – or the mind over the body (Wendell 79). The public sphere is superior to the private sphere in that it actively exercises reason. Since women have customarily been tied to the private sphere, they have been denied entry into the public sphere and thus, been denied the opportunity to fully explore and discover their abilities as rational creatures (Kensinger 184). Based on this perspective, it is believed that one way women achieve liberation is entry into the public sphere

and provision of civil rights (Bryson 159). Jaggar summarizes liberal feminism as viewing “liberation for women as the freedom to determine our own social role and to compete with men on terms that are as equal as possible” (9). The importance of having an equal playing field with men is also emphasised by Bryson (1992) and Tong (1983).

Liberal feminism can be divided into two groups – traditional liberal feminism, also known as classic liberal feminism, and contemporary liberal feminism, also known as welfare liberal feminism (Jaggar 30). While traditional liberal feminists are concerned with exercising and maintaining individual rights, contemporary liberal feminists are concerned with the welfare of individuals based on the impact of modern economic dynamics, such as globalization. Jaggar explains that:

With the development of a modern economy, it has become obvious that all individuals are affected inevitably by others in far-reaching ways and, in particular, that those who possess great wealth have enormous control over the lives of those who lack it. Recognizing that it can no longer guarantee non-intervention in people's lives, liberals now expect the state itself to mitigate the worst effects of a market economy (34).

Given that, the one element that created the division between traditional and contemporary liberal feminism was the rise of the modern economy and its impact on individuals.

The most prominent liberal feminist organizations are the National Abortion Rights Action League (NARAL) and the National Organization for Women (NOW) (Jaggar 1983, Tong 1989, Bryson 1992). Betty Friedan's *The Feminist Mystique* is thought to be highly influential to liberal feminism (Jaggar 1983, Tong 1989, Bryson 1992). In reference to Friedan's work, Bryson claims that it is “The clearest and most famous expression of American liberal feminism” (160).

The early theorists and philosophers of the first and second phases of the women's movement predominately reflected and helped to develop liberal feminism and classical liberal

politics. Among the most notable figures of the time were Mary Wollstonecraft, John Stuart Mill, Harriet Taylor, and Sarah Grimke. The opinions of these men and women were significant as they shaped and guided the ideology propelling the American women's movement. During the first phase of the movement, both women and men were very much influenced by the French Revolution and the Enlightenment. On a more domestic level, the American Revolution also promoted an ideology that theoretically supported equality among the sexes (Ryan 12). These prominent figures reflect liberal political thought, which is represented by their emphasis on rationality, natural rights, and individualism.

As a liberal feminist in the late eighteenth century in England, Wollstonecraft embraced the Enlightenment view. This meant that she viewed a person as being divided between reason and the senses. With that in mind, she and others viewed life with the same dichotomy: "the world's important business is conducted in the public arena where reason obtains, while frivolous, unimportant pleasures are confined to the private sphere where women live. Women's sole purpose is therefore to cultivate the non-rational, sensuous side of life in order to please men" (Donovan 24). According to Wollstonecraft, this role assigned to women "lacks dignity" (Donovan 24). Wollstonecraft's liberal feminist position rested on the belief that reason is the same in all people and thus, critical thinking and an education are the key to liberating women. She advocated for the entrance of women into the public sphere and viewed the private, domestic sphere as confining and crippling (Donovan 25). Although Wollstonecraft resided in England, her writings and philosophy had a great impact on intellectuals in America (Donovan 24).

Like Wollstonecraft, Sarah Grimke aligned herself with the Enlightenment assumption that men and women were naturally equal, each having the same intellectual and moral capabilities. She believed that in order to claim her identity as a person, a woman must assure that “all she does and says must be done and said irrespective of sex” (Donovan 32). Thus, it is detrimental to view a woman as a female first and a person second: “Nothing...has tended more to destroy the true dignity of woman, than the fact that she is approached by man in the character of a female” (Donovan 32). She too criticized the concept of women belonging in the private sphere (Donovan 31).

John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor believed that in order to achieve sexual equality, women must be given the same political rights, economic prospects, and educational opportunities as men (Tong 16). Mill and Taylor’s stance on women’s liberation depended on demonstrating that women can do anything men can do (Tong 18). Thus, Mill and Taylor believed that women’s suffrage was essential to gaining equality. They believed that the ability to vote would allow for the alteration of existing social and political systems (Tong 21).

The viewpoints of these aforementioned influential writers echo the suffrage movement and of the NOW activists in the contemporary phase, and are defining figures of the women’s movement in the United States (Tong 11; Buechler 108, 127). Moreover, these writers deemed that this form of feminism sought to mimic men and the attributes and qualities that traditionally define men. It attempted to “fit women uncritically into a masculine pattern of life,” a pattern that was presented as gender-neutral (Plumwood 27). Women were trying to prove their equality by demonstrating that they were as human as men, which solidified and maintained conventionally male characteristics such as rationality, economic independence,

intelligence, and urbanization (Plumwood 29). This led intellectuals to criticize liberal feminist stance.

Firestone claims that the women's rights movement, along with general liberal feminists, "view themselves as defective men" in that men's issues are viewed as "human" and "universal," while women's issues are viewed as "special" (27). Like Firestone, Jean Bethke Epshtain also criticizes liberal feminism. She identified what she considered to be liberal feminism's three greatest flaws: (1) its claim that women can become like men if they set their minds to it; (2) its claim that most women want to become like men; and (3) its claim all women should want to become like men, to aspire to masculine values (Tong 40). Furthermore, in reference to Wollstonecraft's position, Jane Roland Martin said "In making her case for the rights of women...[Wollstonecraft] presents us with an idea of female education that gives pride of place to traits traditionally associated with males as the expense of others traditionally associated with females." It did not occur to Wollstonecraft to question the value of these traditional male traits. On the contrary, she simply assumed traditional male traits were "good," and women – not men – were the ones who were rationally and morally deficient (Tong 15). This can also be applied to the stance of Mill, Taylor, and Grimke.

This liberal feminist position was also prevalent in the contemporary phase of the women's movement. Betty Friedan, like Wollstonecraft, Taylor, and Mill before her, persuaded women to conquer the public realm; however, she did not encourage men into the private domain to share the responsibilities (Tong 28). The message of her notable book, *The Feminine Mystique* (1963), was that "women's liberation hinged on women becoming like men. To be a

full human being is, in short, to think and act like a man” (Tong 31). Simply put by Linda Alcoff, “liberal feminists [advise women] to wear business suits and enter the male world” (414).

As demonstrated, the liberal feminist position is centered on highlighting women’s likeness to men. Put differently, women’s equality is validated by establishing the similarities between the sexes. This attitude is attributed to centuries of legislators and philosophers who have defined a person and a citizen as being synonymous with men (Dumont 10).

1.3.1.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF LIBERAL FEMINISM

Liberal feminism’s political goals include: “to the promotion of women's greater recognition and self-value as individuals, to equality of opportunity, to the promotion of equal education for girls and boys, to ending sex prejudice and defacto discrimination, to equality of legal rights, and to the use of education as a major tool of social reform” (Wendell 66). Liberal feminists advocate for significant economic reform and redistribution of wealth, since one of their political goals is equality of opportunity (Wendell 66). Furthermore, liberal feminists share the traditional liberal beliefs in the influence and power of education as a means for social transformation, a tradition that began with Mary Wollstonecraft (Wendell 66). While liberal feminists have historically promoted equal rights, contemporary liberal feminism has demanded an end to sex discrimination, turning to existing legal structures and the state for assistance (Wendell 66). Common themes in liberal feminist discussion include rationality, rights, self-development, self-fulfillment, justice, equality, and natural rights (Buechler 96; Kensinger 184).

One of the most prominent and historic goals of liberal feminism is to create equal employment opportunity for women. Work was central to feminist ideology because work symbolized independence. As Matthews explains:

The meaning of independence for feminists was not much different from what it was in traditional republican ideology as adapted to the conditions of a modern capitalist economy. The model republican citizen was the 'independent' man, the man whose integrity of character rested on the solid material base of being able to support himself decently. In appropriating this ideal for women, feminists were attacking head-on the central point of the separate spheres ideology: that woman was naturally dependent on man (95).

Thus, work was an opportunity for women to demonstrate their independence and their capabilities. It was thought that being able to have a paid profession would catapult women into social, political, and economic equality.

To achieve equal opportunity in employment, liberal feminists believed that this would require two social reforms: ensuring that girls and women are given the same education as men, and ending sex discrimination. To eliminate discrimination, it is believed that there needs to also be an elimination of stereotyping and social roles based on sex, as well as designating value to activities that are traditionally undervalued – activities that are usually associated with women (Wendell 85). In turn, to work towards these reforms would require acknowledging and adjusting the unequal division of domestic work. Many women are restricted from reaching their employment ambitions because they have a "double-day" (Wendell 85).

The double-day is a phenomenon that arose during the postwar era and describes the expectation for women to participate in paid employment as well as maintaining their responsibility for domestic chores. During WWII, many women began acquiring paid employment within the form of industrial labor, but immediately following the war, they were encouraged to once again focus their energies on domestic duties and maintaining a family

(O'Hara 101). Eventually, the postwar population boom and the expansion of employment sectors led more and more women to enter the labor force on a more permanent part-time and full-time basis. However, women were and are still expected to maintain the household while functioning in the working world (Echols xiii; O'Hara 101). Many argued that it is not possible to evade the double-day in a capitalist economy; thus, women are forced to make a choice between enduring a double-day of work, having a traditional domestic role, or pursuing a career (Wendell 87).

In order to mitigate this, liberal feminists suggested that men take equal responsibility for childcare and domestic duties and encourage women to refuse doing more than her share. Since women's identities had traditionally been associated with their capacity to care for the family, men had been encouraged to evade domestic duties and childcare (Wendell 76). As Wendell explains, "Such a change appears selfish and uncaring only if we assume that men are incapable of responding by taking greater responsibility for their own and their children's nurturance and emotional life, i.e. for doing their share" (77). With this in mind, some liberal feminists argued that women should abandon their domestic responsibilities in an attempt to focus their energies on paid employment as men do (Freedman 51). Liberal feminists such as Friedan believed that with the absence of wives and mothers from the home due to paid employment, husbands and children would necessarily become more self-sufficient and learn to cook and clean on their own (Tong 28). Some liberal feminists dismiss housework, childcare, and other traditional activities associated with women, and only desire to compete with men in the public sphere (Wendell 80). Thus, proponents of liberal feminism aim to either diminish their domestic house duties or seek to eliminate the responsibility of it entirely.

To summarize, this position required women to participate within an exclusive and narrowly defined culture and humanity that was based upon masculinity and its associated characteristics. Liberal feminism demands that women have equal access to this exclusive culture and the public sphere, but it does not challenge the definition of this culture and the implications it has on sex and gender identity (Plumwood 27).

Although undeniably dominant in the first and second phase of the women's movement, liberal feminism has also been accepted as the most prevalent representative of the contemporary movement. Echols states that after 1975, "liberal feminism became the recognized voice of the women's movement" (243). It is believed that because liberal feminism is based on reform, as opposed to revolution, it has been accepted in the mainstream as a less threatening and more realistic feminist position (Echols 243). As Buechler explains, liberal feminism is the most ubiquitous stream of feminism for two reasons, "an equal rights, liberal feminist approach partakes of the dominant political philosophy of capitalist societies and thereby resonates with some mainstream cultural worldviews," and secondly, "an equal rights, liberal feminist approach appeals most strongly to women who are middle-class, college-educated, and professionally oriented" (126). These two factors assure that the liberal feminist approach becomes the most prevailing and accessible position during the mobilization of the women's movement because it resonates with the dominant culture and because it is the type of feminism that best represents the interests of the movement participants (Buechler 119). Furthermore, the success of liberal feminism is due to its compatibility with the dominant cultural values of "individualism and equal opportunity" (Buechler 119).

1.3.2 RADICAL FEMINISM

Just as slavery was a catalyst for the first and second phases of the women's movement in the nineteenth century, issues of racism and civil rights in the 1960s spurred on the contemporary phase of the women's movement (Firestone 36). Radical feminism developed in the 1960s, amidst the rise of new social movements (Gaard 36). More specifically, the movement began in 1968 and ended five years later in 1973 (Echols vii). The four most prominent radical feminists groups were The Feminists, New York Radical Feminists, Cell 16, and Redstockings, who were most active in New York City, Washington D.C., Boston and the West Coast (Echols 139; Willis 92).

During the first year of the radical movement, two theoretical positions of radical feminism emerged – one referred to as the “politicos” and the other as the “feminists” (Echols 51). The politicos believed that women's oppression derived from capitalism and patriarchy and that women's liberation groups should be interconnected and merged within a larger socialist revolution. In other words, women's liberation is an important tool of the left, but is not the foremost motivation or goal behind the movement of the New Left (Echols 52). As Willis explains, the politicos “saw capitalism as the source of women's oppression: the ruling class indoctrinated us with oppressive sex roles to promote consumerism and/or keep women a cheap reserve labor force and/or divide the workers; conventional masculine and feminine attitudes were matters of bourgeois conditioning from which we must all liberate ourselves” (Willis 93). In opposition were the feminists, who argued against the subordination of women's liberation in the left and focused on the impacts of male supremacy (Echols 52). The feminists argued that “male supremacy was in itself a systemic form of domination—a set of material,

institutionalized relations. Men had power and privilege and like any other ruling class would defend their interests” (Willis 93). The “politicos” took shape as socialist feminism while radical feminism emerged from the “feminists” and was a response to the growing “antifeminism of the left and the reluctant feminism of the politicos” (Echols 101).

Radical feminists had a commitment to an autonomous and independent women’s movement – one that was separate from the left. They felt that the liberal feminism, along with its main association NOW, had a restricting and formal version of equality, but it did not tackle the fundamental problem, which was women’s subordination within the public and private spheres (Echols 139). While the goal of liberal feminism was to incorporate women within the public sphere of mainstream society, radical feminism rejected mainstream society in itself (Echols 15).

The term ‘radical’ was selected to signify the intentions of this branch of feminist ideology. The original meaning of radical is “root,” and “going to the origin;” along that vein, radical feminism aimed to get to the root of women’s oppression, which they believed was men. By this definition, radical feminists believed that society, as it was structured, was patriarchal. They believed that gender was the product of social construction, which meant that a social transformation was needed to eliminate the unequal power dynamic between men and women (Ryan 55). Radical feminists also accused capitalism, alongside male supremacy, as the foundation for sex prejudice (Ryan 55; Taylor and Rupp 37).

Radical feminists believed that women’s subordination began within the family – viewing the family through a political dimension. It was argued that this structure groomed children of both sexes to succumb to the dominant culture and to maintain the values inherent

in the family system, which was to preserve heterosexual monogamous marriage and procreation (Willis 99). As women began entering the public sphere and maintaining paid professions, men did not take responsibility for their share of the domestic duties— the result being a double-day for employed women. According to a national survey, the five most time-consuming and major household tasks are considered to be: meal preparation or cooking; housecleaning; shopping for groceries and household goods; washing dishes or cleaning up after meals; and laundry, including washing, ironing, and mending clothes (Coltrane 1210). It is these tasks in particular that lead to the double-day, meal preparation or cooking being the most time consuming of the five. It is this dynamic that radical feminists wished to challenge and transform.

The idea that women's oppression was the primary source of all oppression was appealing for three reasons. Firstly, it countered the left's assumption that class oppression was the primary source of oppression, which meant that women's liberation would no longer be a subset of social transformation, it would be the main focus. Secondly, it minimized any advantages associated with race and class status since gender was the primary focus, and thus, it assimilated white, middleclass women in the movement without garnering them any privileges or positions of authority. Lastly, it was a feminist theory that could be embraced as a general social theory, which meant that it could be accepted on the macro level and be used to discuss other forms of oppression within society (Willis 96).

One way that radical feminists would analyze the root problems of society was through consciousness-raising groups. Consciousness-raising groups were made up of small groups of women who would discuss their experiences through a political lens. The most common

themes of discussion included being mother, wife, and female, as well as their relationships with men, work, and their children (Nachescu 29). Radical feminists valued women's experiences as a fundamental aspect of feminist politics (Nachescu 29). There was an assumption behind consciousness-raising, and that was "that most women were like ourselves – not different" (Echols 1989 10). Through consciousness-raising groups, radical feminists tested the conventional notions of politics by integrating the private sphere into the public domain, creating the slogan "the personal is political" (Nachescu 30).

Aside from believing that personal experiences were a foundation of feminist theory, radical feminism was based on two principles. The first principle was the belief that women's oppression was the direct result of men exercising their power over women through economic, social, and sexual contexts. Based on this perspective, it was believed that institutions and systems such as the family and capitalism were tools operated by men to oppress women (Willis 97). The second principle is the belief that women's behavior and actions are and always were "a rational, self-interested response to their immediate material conditions" (Willis 97). If and when it seemed that women were consenting to oppression, it was merely because they were choosing to comply in an effort to avoid punishment and violence (Willis 97). Thus, women are capable of refusing and fighting against oppression; they just chose not to in the past because of their limited social standing and lack of protection.

1.3.2.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF RADICAL FEMINISM

The primary goal of radical feminism was to eliminate the sex-class system and render gender as irrelevant (Echols 6). They believed that gender, not race or class, was the primary

source of oppression and that all other forms of domination were derived from male supremacy (Echols 139; Willis 96). With that in mind, radical feminism organized the movement by encouraging women to unify based on gender versus focusing on any class and race parameters that once divided them (Echols 10).

One of the first major campaigns for radical feminists was the legalization of abortion. Abortion embodied radical feminism in that it demanded genuine equality as well as self-determination and free choice (Echols vii; Willis 92). The goal was to give women the right to control their own bodies and fertility as opposed to being given the right in limited circumstances, such as rape, health threats, or fetal deformity (Echols viii). Radical feminists were also responsible for being the first feminists to demand “total equality” in the private sphere in terms of sharing the housework and child care (Willis 92). In addition, radical feminists coined the terms “sexism” and “sexual politics” (Echols ix). By comparing sexism with racism and imperialism, the women’s liberation movement was provided with historic and crucial sources of arguments and strategies. The analogy between sex and race, which was created by radical feminists, was the "founding rhetoric" for second wave feminism (Nachescu 46).

Like liberal feminists, radical feminists demanded a transformation in the responsibility of domestic duties. As mentioned, radical feminists believed that the traditional family structure indoctrinated gender roles that then manifested into sexism and impacted women’s liberation and their equality within the public and private spheres. Under male supremacy, women were designated and expected to perform specific “female” tasks in an effort to maintain control and boundaries for both genders. Thus, those who supported radical feminism

wished to break the pattern of gender roles, starting with the roles that were birthed within the family unit. This meant challenging activities that are traditionally thought of as female, within the home, such as cooking, cleaning, and shopping.

The belief that gender roles have influenced the dynamics of household duties is not just a belief; rather, it is a proven fact. Studies have shown that the segregation of household duties had more to do with gender role ideology than with resources or time constraints (Calasanti and Bailey 1991; Shelton and John 1996). In their study on the division of household labour, Beth Anne Shelton and Daphne John claim that “gender remains a more important determinant of housework time than any other factor” (317). Furthermore, in their comparative study between the United States and Sweden, on the division of household labor, Toni Calasanti and Carol Bailey found that both countries were influenced by gender role ideology more than any other influence (46). With this in mind, radical feminists believed that creating a gender-neutral environment within the home, as related to household work, would help to eliminate the hidden politics and power imbalances that resided within menial everyday tasks and would in effect help to combat sexism. In a home with children, this approach would teach them sex equality by demonstrating the shared, yet non-specific, responsibilities between males and females; and in a home without children, dividing household labor would ensure fairness and eliminate the presence of male supremacy and expectations based on sex.

In order to transform these gender roles, one strategy would be for women to minimize their participation in performing household duties, while simultaneously encouraging men to participate. In reference to their stance on women’s role within the private sphere, the difference between liberal feminism and radical feminism is the inclusion of men. Liberal

feminists aim to propel women into the public sphere but do not encourage men into the private sphere. This creates a great burden for women as they are expected to continue their involvement, and the quality of that involvement, within the home while maintaining full-time employment. Radical feminism was critical of this and instead aimed to incorporate men and women into both spheres equally – the idea being that no sex would be restricted or defined (Willis 92). Therefore, they did not believe that it was, or should be, the woman's sole responsibility to maintain daily household tasks.

Although radical feminism was a powerful influence, it disintegrated within five years. Its decline can be attributed to internal struggles. Through consciousness-raising groups, it was clear that women's commonality was a myth; white women had different perspectives than black women, working women had different concerns than homemakers, heterosexual women had different experiences from homosexual women (Echols 11). These differences dismantled their newfound sisterhood and caused internal turmoil within the movement. By 1973, the values of radical feminism were evolving into cultural feminism and liberal feminism (Echols 199).

1.3.3 CULTURAL FEMINISM

Cultural feminism derived from radical feminism, and began after 1975 (Gaard 37). Cultural feminism was a countercultural movement that intended to reverse the devaluation of women; it "sought to celebrate femaleness" by promoting a culture based on female values (Echols 6; Willis 91; Alcoff 406). This movement rejected the New Left, which they believed was inherently male, and called for a feminist revolution through a gynocratic culture (Gaard 37). They aimed to accomplish this by promoting essentialism through biological determinism,

separatism through institutional independence and male exclusionism, and building an alternative female culture through the promotion of female values and female bonds (Taylor and Rupp 33).

The thought process was that since many of the social, political, and economic problems can be traced to the valuation of men and male supremacy, as established in radical feminism, then the solution would be to promote female principles (Echols 37). Furthermore, cultural feminists view a male supremacist culture as problematic because women are being defined by men. This is concerning since men have a different perspective and alternate set of interests from women, which leads to a devalued and misleading characterization of women and femininity (Alcoff 406). In order to redefine women, cultural feminism subscribed to a universal “caricature” of men and women, which more often than not supported traditional characteristics and stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (Echols 37). However, it is important to note that cultural feminists did not accept the stereotypes of women that were created from patriarchal influence; they denied the passive and submissive female nature for a femininity that they defined as “nurturant,” “peaceful,” and “egalitarian” (Echols 38; Alcoff 408). According to Ellen Willis, female nature is “loving, nurturing, in tune with nature, intuitive and spiritual rather than genital in our eroticism,” while men are “violent, predatory, alienated from nature, committed to a sterile rationalism and obsessed with genital sex” (Willis 112). Thus, cultural feminism called for a redefinition of worldviews toward women through a change in overarching cultural influences including an alteration in the artistic, linguistic, sexual, and symbolic interpretations of women (Ryan 55).

In order to promote the superiority of femininity and female nature, cultural feminists had to reinforce the concept of sex differences, which they did through biological explanations. This essentialist position recognizes men and women as two distinct groups, often based upon biology and a woman's unique reproductive role. They believe that the differences between men and women are concrete and represent two separate identities, which they support through scientific and cultural means (Ryan 118; Alcoff 408). Unlike liberal feminism, this ideology did not believe that alteration of the legal and political system would bring equality. Instead, these feminists determined that change can only come through social and cultural alteration (Banks 162). Although it derived from radical feminism, this essentialist argument was diametrically conflicting with radical feminism's assertion that biology should not justify a sex hierarchy (Echols 37). As Anne Koedt explains "Thus the biological male is the oppressor not by virtue of his male biology, but by virtue of his rationalizing his supremacy on the basis of that biological difference" (Koedt 249). Cultural feminism, on the other hand, clung to biology to explain and sustain differences between the sexes, even attributing patriarchy "either to the rapaciousness or barrenness of male biology" (Echols 37). Thus, they view men as the enemy based on their maleness versus attacking the power that a patriarchal system has given them. Whereas radical feminists saw female biology as a potential liability for women's liberation, cultural feminists were using female biology as a resource for cultural transformation (Echols 37; Alcoff 407).

1.3.3.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF CULTURAL FEMINISM

Cultural feminism suggested that individual liberation could come into fruition without transforming patriarchal culture – the solution being to separate cultural feminist values from patriarchal culture and patriarchal values. This was meant to be an ideological and physical separation. Separatism was seen as a means of “both drawing sustenance and maintaining feminist identity” (Taylor and Rupp 44). This physical separation was exercised by some women through their complete withdrawal from male dominance in the form of self-sufficient rural communities. This was an extreme strategy and not the most common form of separatism, but some cultural feminists would create their own female-only communities. A less extreme version of separatism was illustrated by the movement’s exclusion of men. It was often the case that men and boys were not allowed or welcomed within cultural feminist organizations, institutions, or groups (Taylor and Rupp 43). Separatism was also a strategy within the movement itself. This can also be seen in the organization of the National Women’s Studies Association (NWSA) where there were separate caucuses for women of colour, or lesbian women, or working-class women etc., in order to validate the differences among women while maintaining a universal female identity (Taylor and Rupp 44).

The promotion of these female values through a proposed woman’s revolution was an attempt to ideologically separate cultural feminism from patriarchal culture. Through female bonding and female-centred relationships, cultural feminism aimed to strengthen sisterhood and promote an alternative female culture. The relationships between women were considered to be political acts, not just personal ones. It was often the case that lesbianism was associated with cultural feminism. This is reflective of the slogan, “Feminism is the theory and lesbianism is

the practice” (Taylor and Rupp 45). For some, lesbianism was not always defined by sexual attraction; rather it was used to describe the powerful and committed identification with women and womanhood – “political lesbianism” (Taylor and Rupp 45). Womanhood and femaleness was defined by particular values, which cultural feminists claimed were “egalitarianism, collectivism, an ethic of care, respect for knowledge derived from experience, pacifism, and cooperation” (Taylor and Rupp 42). This is in stark contrast to men, who, cultural feminists claim, emphasize “hierarchy, oppressive individualism, an ethic of individual rights, abstraction, violence, and competition” (Taylor and Rupp 42). The promotion of sanctioned female values was meant create a counterculture that would compete with, and hopefully replace, the patriarchal, male supremacist culture.

The movement succeeded at internal unification, a task that radical feminism failed to do, through the emphasis of women’s essential and biological commonalities (Gaard 37). They argued that race and class disparity are a result of male values, and that a woman’s revolution would reintroduce the repression of female principles and eliminate these forms of oppression since feminine values do not support oppression and discrimination (Echols 39).

Although cultural feminism was successful at maintaining alliance within the movement, it was readily criticized and dismissed for its essentialist and biological notions, as well as its restrictive and narrow ideology that was combative against men and overgeneralizing in nature. For these reasons, it was viewed as a more extreme version of feminism and generated many stigmas and assumptions against feminism in general (Gaard 37; Taylor and Rupp 44; Echols 37).

1.3.4 SOCIALIST FEMINISM

Socialist feminism developed from radical feminism and was known as the abovementioned “politicos” in the “politicos-feminist” split in the early development of radical feminism in 1967 (Kennedy 499). Socialist feminism differs from liberal feminism and radical feminism in that it calls for a complete transformation of social, political, and economic structures, but does not believe that women’s liberation could be achieved separately from other forms of oppression such as racism and classism (Gardiner 560). Although socialist feminists did not believe that the New Left was adequately addressing issues of feminism, they did not want to completely lose their ties to the left like radical feminism; socialist feminism was strongly committed to participatory democracy, as well as institutional transformation (Kennedy 519; Ryan 55). The two most distinct groups of socialist feminism arose in 1969; one is the Chicago Women’s Liberation Union and Bread and Roses of Boston (Kennedy 500).

Socialist feminism can be described as an amalgamation of Marxism and feminism that explored the impact and role of race, class, and gender in women’s oppression (Kennedy 503; Ehrenreich). Displeased with the “economic reductionism” of Marxism and “sexual determinism” of radical feminism, socialist feminists believed that women’s social position must be analyzed within the intersection of capitalism and patriarchy theories (Burriss 51). Socialist feminists criticized Marxism for marginalizing women both theoretically and politically, while arguing that radical feminists universalized women’s oppression as opposed to recognizing the variances that come with different classes and races (Burriss 52). While, like Marxist feminists, they believe that capitalist forces have made women an economic underclass, they do not believe that replacing capitalism with socialism will be enough to enact

women's liberation. In addition, like radical feminists, they believe that there needs to be an equal distribution of responsibility between men and women within the private sphere i.e. childcare and domestic duties must be evenly distributed, but does not believe that gender was the primary source of oppression (Almeder 300). Thus, it was concluded that sex inequality could not solely be the product of class exploitation, nor could it solely be the result of biological influence (Burris 52). It was decided that both capitalism and patriarchy were crucial elements in understanding the subordination of women within society. Val Burris describes how it is the combination of capitalism and patriarchy that best explains women's oppression:

Socialist feminists have therefore retained the feminist concept of patriarchy to denote the specificity of women's oppression, while Marxist economic categories are invoked to account for the historical variability in the forms of such oppression. Capitalism and patriarchy are thus posited as two 'relatively autonomous' structures, neither of which can be subsumed under the other, but which interact to determine the concrete position of women in society (52).

According to recent writings in socialist feminism, the meaning of patriarchy varies between three definitions: "(1) patriarchy as a generalized structure of hierarchical sexual relations; (2) patriarchy as male control of women's labor power; and (3) patriarchy as male control of women's reproductive capacity" (Burris 53). While this explains the nuanced theoretical and ideological definitions of patriarchy, Heidi Hartmann explains the material methods used to apply patriarchy:

The material base of patriarchy is men's control over women's labor power. That control is maintained by denying women access to necessary economically productive resources and by restricting women's sexuality. Men exercise their control in receiving personal service work from women, in not having to do housework or rear children, in having access to women's bodies for sex, and in feeling powerful and being powerful (14).

As described by Hartmann's explanation, men exert their control over women within the private sphere by "not having to do housework or rear children." Thus, socialist feminism

was interested in examining and critiquing middle-class family dynamics (Gardiner 563). Because socialist feminists did not support patriarchy, they did not support the unequal distribution of responsibility between men and women and did not support any actions or behaviour that would cause a power imbalance. Given that, since the late 1960s and into the 1970s, socialist feminists were interested in theorizing domestic work (Vogel 151).

Similar to radical feminism, socialist feminism aimed to integrate men within the private sphere as opposed to only adding to a woman's responsibility by thrusting her into the public sphere and creating the burden of a double-day. Thus, like liberal and radical feminism, socialist feminism supported the equal division of household labour between men and women as this equality would have symbolized the negation of patriarchy.

1.3.4.1 GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF SOCIALIST FEMINISM

Socialist feminists believed that there was a presence of male supremacy within American culture and that the need to challenge this was crucial in achieving social justice. Like radical feminists, socialist feminists valued personal experiences in understanding sexism, but also analyzed these experiences in the larger social context (Kennedy 506). However, unlike radical and cultural feminism, socialist feminism did not believe that male supremacy was the primary contradiction (Kennedy 500). Thus, socialist feminists call for a complete social revolution that does not have a point source or a primary contradiction; rather, it wishes to condemn all forms of oppression since they believe that one form of oppression is a catalyst for all forms of oppression. They believed that capitalism and patriarchy were responsible for creating the oppression of not only women, but oppression of minority groups and of the poor

as well. Thus, socialist feminism was responsible for establishing the interconnectedness between race, sex, and class (Kennedy 513).

1.4 PART 1 SUMMATION

The American women's movement officially began on July 19 1848 at the first Women's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, New York. Beginning with their campaign for the right to vote, women were demanding political, economic, and social equality; a demand that is still ongoing and necessarily so, as evidenced in the failed ratification of the ERA in 1982. Whether it was based on biological, cultural, or historical justifications, women have been viewed as the subordinate sex and remained so with the help of imaginary and actualized obligations and restrictions. One of these said obligations and restrictions is being the primary nurturer and authority of the household, as demonstrated by the expectations outlined in the concept of separate spheres and a woman's realm. Studies of contemporary families show that "women continue to put family before their paid jobs, and take primary responsibility for housework" (Devault 14). Using these expectations as an obstacle, women were given a set of responsibilities, particularly rearing children and maintaining the general cleanliness and upkeep of the home, which inhibited them from expanding their potential in the public sphere. One of the more significant duties was food production and provision; women were expected to be the sole provider of meals to their children and their husbands. Amongst the backlash against the women's movement, one of the strongest concerns was the fear that women would not be able to meet their responsibilities in the household if they were given equality.

As the movement grew, ideas and opinions about a woman's identity and worth, including their responsibilities, began to develop in the theoretical and activist form of feminism. The main streams of feminism in the first three phases of the movement were liberal, radical, cultural, and socialist. As evidenced by the goals and attitudes of the first and second phases of the women's movement, liberal feminism became the dominant form of feminism. The third phase saw the development and rise of radical, cultural and socialist feminism, but overall, the women's movement is said to be best characterized by liberal feminism.

Liberal feminist theory encouraged women to propel themselves into the public sphere. They were encouraged to embrace traditionally masculine traits and imitate the values and identifiers that are customarily defined as male. This meant minimizing that which is traditionally associated with femininity and female activities, while participating in and valuing masculine qualities, which translates to women minimizing their role in the woman's realm. Although liberal feminists encouraged the idea of women entering the public sphere, there was little discussion on a woman's new diminishing role in the private sphere. Furthermore, there was no discussion on the role of men and their responsibilities in the private sphere now that women's roles were more inclusive. As a result, liberal feminists expected women to balance their responsibilities in both realms, making it very difficult to succeed or excel in either. Women who supported liberal feminism diminished the quality of their performance in the private sphere, as well as the time spent, by utilizing technological efficiencies in household maintenance as opposed to eliminating some of those responsibilities or requesting assistance from the men in their lives. Liberal feminism, and its perspective on a woman's role in the

private sphere, is important to acknowledge as liberal feminism has been deemed the primary and consistent voice of the women's movement. Thus, it can be claimed that the views of liberal feminism best represents the women's movement (Echols 243).

Based on the history of the movement, its primary goals, and its leadership by liberal feminists, it is fair to suggest that the American women's movement was predominantly guided by the desire for women to be viewed as equal. The standard by which women were measuring themselves, and their successes, were based upon men and how a patriarchal society defined success. Given this, it is conceivable that most women would have been motivated to prove themselves in the public arena, while demonstrating their ability to maintain their role in the private sphere. In order to preserve their traditional roles, they would have necessarily sought external services, which would have been based upon convenience and ease. These external services would have been utilized in an effort to appease the private expectations placed on women, while giving them greater time and freedom to pursue their public ambitions. This gave industries an opportunity to dominate and assert their necessity. One such industry is the food industry and industrial food production.

PART 2: INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION

2.1 HISTORY OF INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION AND PROCESSED FOOD

A key characteristic of modern industrial society is the reduction of a good to commodity status as opposed to an intrinsic element of an intricate set of connections. In other words, most of our world is viewed through the lens of materialism, where resources and matters of life sustenance are reduced to "things" instead of a "web of relationships"

(Kirschenmann 109). Modern philosophers suspect that this mindset can be traced to the scientific revolution of the 17th century. It was during this time that men such as Rene Descartes wanted matters of science to reach levels of universalism, which reduced reality to “measurable things” and “ignored dynamic relationships” (Kirschenmann 109). This viewpoint has, not surprisingly, had an influence on the way society views food, along with the actors and relationships that facilitate its production and consumption. As a consequence, food has become produced, processed, consumed, distributed, and marketed like any other product; the result being industrial food production and processing.

Industrial food processing can be defined as “a branch of manufacturing that transforms raw animal, vegetable, or marine materials into intermediate foodstuffs or edible products through the application of labor, machinery, energy, and scientific knowledge” (Connor and Scheik 3). In laymen’s terms, many view processed food as that which has been mass-manufactured and has been prepackaged, premade, frozen, dehydrated, blanched, canned or preserved (Truswell and Brand 1186-1187). The purpose of food processing is to transform raw materials from “relatively bulky, perishable commodities into products that are more palatable, nutritionally dense, stable and portable” (Connors and Scheik 9). This method of production and processing was made possible by the development and innovation of four areas: preserving, mechanisation, retailing, and transport (Goody 338). Another very significant factor in the development of industrial food production and processing is urbanization, the same urbanization in America that was discussed in section 1.2.2 of Part 1 (Connor and Scheik 29).

Industrial food production is characterized by highly mechanized and intensified farming techniques with the purpose of yielding large quantities of animal and plant products. This method is based upon segregating animal and plant species so that they may be mass-produced with the greatest efficiency. The most dominant methods include annual monocultures and factory farming.

In the late nineteenth century, processed food had begun to emerge as a more common good on the market, and it had transformed the daily consumption practices of millions of U.S. households. The majority of people were initially suspicious of the quality and value of these products as most grew or made the bulk of their food at home (Koehn 350). What they could not produce themselves, they bought on a local or regional basis, and this consisted mostly of flour, coffee, rum, and spices. Although these products too had undergone some form of primary or secondary processing, they were already accepted as specialty items and recognized as products that could not easily be produced at home. Reservations developed for products that were traditionally produced from home – such as preserved pickles and sauces. In some cases, prepared foods were also exchanged; for example, many merchants carried horseradish and other locally produced foods that they had accrued as customer payments. It was also typical for consumers to buy certain staple processed items such as sugar, butter, crackers, and cocoa in bulk (Koehn 353).

Suspicious of food quality stemmed from ignorance about a given item's composition or origins beyond what the storekeeper told them. This lack of knowledge heightened the growing concerns around food quality and safety, which progressed in mid nineteenth-century cities. Issues and concerns over food safety were not new. Various local laws had mandated

inspection of meat and flour exports since the colonial period, while other laws had regulated bread prices and ingredients, banning additives such as chalk and ground beans (Koehn 356). But as both urban areas, and their food suppliers expanded, controls had weakened. Public anxiety about contaminated food, including milk, meat, eggs, and butter had increased and journalists, activists, and legislators began calling for stricter monitoring of the nation's food supply in the late 1840s (Koehn 356). These demands intensified as the scale and scope of food manufacturing increased in the late nineteenth century as skepticism and fear of processed and premade foods made it difficult for food industries to promote their innovative products. Although methods such as canning and packaging were not new, their mass production was.

Two of the most dominant processes that helped to develop and defined industrial food are canning and freezing (Goody 340). Canning is defined as “the process of heating hermetically sealed foods to a temperature that kills harmful microbes. The container may be made of metal, glass, or any other material that is air-tight and heatable” (Connor and Schiek 15). Canning, and the preservation of foods in jars, can be traced to prehistoric times, as it was practiced by the ancient Romans (Connor and Schiek 15). Modern canning dates back to early nineteenth-century France. In 1809, Nicolas Appert, a man skilled in the culinary arts, had developed a technique for preserving foods (Connor and Schiek 15). This initiative was in response to a government request to provide roving French armies with wholesome foods (Koehn 389; Goody 340). Appert's method was quite simple: meats, eggs, fruits, and vegetables were packed in air-tight bottles, and then placed in boiling water for variable lengths of time. This process kept foods edible for longer periods of time than other preservation techniques. In 1810, Appert published his methods in the books “The Book for All Households” and the “Art of

Preserving Animal and Vegetable Substances for Many Years” (Koehn 389). By the 1820s, several American entrepreneurs were adopting Appert’s techniques and using them to process and preserve food that they sold on a regional basis.

Initially, all canning was done in glass jars, but in 1812, Bryan Donkin of the U.K. introduced canning with steel cans (Connor and Schiek 16). The 1860s saw the introduction of calcium chloride to boiling water, which cut sterilization times for meats, fish, vegetables, and fruits from as much as five hours to twenty-five minutes, increasing factory outputs from 2,500 cans of food a day to over 20,000 cans (Koehn 389; Connor and Schiek 16). After 1868, can-making became increasingly mechanized, resulting in expanded production and efficiency, and the invention of the pressure cooker in 1874 further reduced cooking times for food processors. It wasn’t until 1875 that canning processes and technology were advanced for efficient, large-scale food processing (Koehn 389; Connor and Schiek 16). Canning technology continued to improve rapidly during the last two decades of the nineteenth century (Koehn 390). In 1900, Carnation, one of the larger food processors, introduced “the hole-in-cap can,” which was filled through a matchstick opening in one end (Koehn 389). The sanitary can was invented three years later and quickly replaced others. These new containers were the first air-tight cans that did not need to be soldered during the sealing process (Koehn 390). During the early twentieth century, canned foods were established as an economic and socially viable success.

Now armed with new technological advances in food preservation and backed with the support of scientific nutrition – which emerged in the 1890s – the food processing industry began developing very quickly. Between 1859 and 1899, total productivity expanded by 1500 % (Koehn 350). After about 1880, a relatively small number of rapidly growing companies

generated much of this increase; particularly, National Biscuit, Swift, Armour, Heinz, Quaker Oats, Campbell Soup, Borden, Pillsbury Flour, Libby, and others. Prior to 1870, the value of unprocessed foods was greater than processed foods, but by 1900, processed food comprised almost a third of all finished commodities produced in the United States and the value of processed foods was twice that of unprocessed (Connor and Scheik 29). By 1920, virtually all households purchased some form of processed food, whether it had undergone primary, secondary, or tertiary processing (Koehn 350).

Frozen foods were not introduced into the market until the 1920s (Connor and Schiek 17). Clarence Birdseye, a Massachusetts businessman, helped to create “quick frozen” food in the early 1920s (Levenstein 106). In partnership with DuPont chemical company, Birdseye produced a moisture-proof wrapping that allowed foods to be frozen at a quicker rate. Since the exterior wrapping was made of waxed cardboard, it prevented disintegration into the food once thawed. Birdseye was able to entice General Foods to purchase his innovation in 1929. Unfortunately for General Foods, frozen meals would not become an economically pragmatic or socially accepted foodstuff until after World War II (Levenstein 106). Prior to the end of World War II, frozen foods were sold at high prices in low volumes in fragmented markets. Their consumers were those of affluence who could afford personal freezers, which were not common until the mid-1950s. Between the 1930s and 1950s there were many innovations in freezing technologies that improved the quality of frozen foods; this included ice glazing to reduce freezer burn, the use of packaging materials designed for frozen foods, and the use of liquid nitrogen (Connors and Scheik 17).

After the war, the frozen food industry began to reconsider its marketing strategies and its relationship with consumers (Hamilton 34). An industry that had struggled to sell its products since the early 1930s became, by the 1950s, the fastest-growing sector in the food business. The explosive growth of the home-freezer industry in the late 1940s is particularly indicative of the sudden enthusiasm for frozen foods. Sales of home freezers and refrigerator-freezer combinations rose sharply, breaking sales records from the late 1940s into the early 1950s (Hamilton 34). The growth of the U.S frozen foods industry was 25 % a year between 1940 and 1945; and in the decade following the war, the growth was 15 % a year (Connor and Schiek 17). This success allowed for a low-priced, “high-quality” product that all Americans would rely on as a staple to their diet. Although there was a focus on low-price, during the 1950s companies continued to promote their association with upper-class consumers and expanded their advertising campaigns by adding the allure of lower prices to the already established advantage of convenience (Hamilton 34). In 1940, 90 % of the frozen food that was sold was fruits and vegetables, but by the 1950s, the purchasing of frozen entrees and meals surpassed fruits and vegetables (Connor and Schiek 17). Thus, as the frozen food market began to expand, so too did the public’s dependence on these processed foods.

Although methods of canning and food preservation began in the time of the ancient Romans, it did not have a strong social or economic presence until the nineteenth century. During colonial America, between the fifteenth and eighteenth centuries, 90 % of the population was living on farms and almost all households “cured their own meats, made their own butter and cheese, baked their own bread, brewed their own beer, and picked fruits and vegetables from their own gardens” (Connor and Schiek 23). It was not until the twentieth

century that food processing, particularly in the forms of canning and freezing, became a staple purchase and diet in the United States. Today, that ratio of processed to unprocessed foods is more than 9:1 (Connor and Scheik 29).

2.2 THE DESKILLED CONSUMER AND DEPENDENCE ON PROCESSED FOOD

A consequence of this industrialization is the deskilled consumer. As explained by Jaffe and Gertler, the deskilled consumer refers to individuals that have “become progressively less ‘skilled’ in absolute and relative terms, as they become increasingly distanced (in time and space and experience) from the sites and processes of production” (143). In other words, as a result of the current agricultural production method and food system dynamics, many individuals are disconnected from their food and are illiterate in both food production and consumption. This illiteracy has manifested through the purposeful manipulation of society through hegemonic social, political, and economic ideologies that have led to the calculated deprivation of certain analytical frameworks and knowledge sets that individuals require in order to make fully informed decisions that best reflect their interests in relation to food (Jaffe and Gertler 143).

According to Harry Braverman, the formation of the deskilled consumer lies within the capitalist mode of production (Burawoy 248). As a key feature of production, producers sell their labor power to the capitalist (as opposed to selling themselves or labor services). As such, the translation of labor power to labor becomes a managerial problem of control that results in alienation as the labor process is separated from the laborer (manual labor versus mental labor), or in the words of Braverman, the separation of “conception” and “execution” (Burawoy

248). The labor process itself is defined by the principles of scientific management, particularly Taylorism, where knowledge and skilfulness are extracted from the producer, replaced by a reductive, monotonous duty via assembly-line practices (Burawoy 248). In effect, management (the conceivers) encourages the deskilling and deconstruction of the labor process by fragmenting it into distinct segments so that workers (executors) are only exposed to one specific element within the entirety of the production process (Burawoy 248). Hence, knowledge of production, whether it be of food or other aspects of reality, is reduced to the one element that the worker is exposed to, utilizing humans in inhuman ways as their intelligence, and their abilities to conceptualize and analyze, are restricted (Braverman 139). As technology began to control methods of production, labor was often transformed from processes based on skill to processes based on science. This transformation aided in restricting the ability for the worker to exercise their craft and reduced their skill set to general and homogenous labor power, giving more control to those of managerial status (Braverman 120-121). As society is based upon the acquisition and trade of labor power, dividing the production process is essential in reducing the overall cost of production. Thus, the separation of conception and execution in the scope of work ensures managerial control and cheapens the worker (Braverman 80, 118). This ideology of production led to greater competition among capitalists and tools of mechanization to increase productivity became standard; efficiency became the driving force of production (Burawoy 285). This has especially accelerated in scale over the last century, defining the capitalist system of production today (Braverman 126).

The standardization in this mode of production began to govern all aspects of life as the needs of the individual and the family were now placed in the sphere of the market. In other

words, capitalism has transformed society into a “gigantic marketplace” (Braverman 271). As such, the totality of capitalism has conquered processes that were formally carried out on the family farm or the home and has converted these natural processes into an untapped source of labor power for the market (Braverman 275, 299). As Jaffe and Gertler explain, the “profitable employment of wage labor is based, in part, on the ability to turn workers, and their families and neighbors, into new kinds of consumers – those who invest a minimum of time and effort in their food. This leaves more time for wage work, but also more time for other (more profitable) kinds of consumption” (145). The propelling of capitalism into family and community life has extracted new kinds of industries and forms of labor power, further commanding the separation of conception and execution from one sector to the next; thus, the creation of a mechanized food system and the formation of the deskilled consumer.

Based on the encouragement of advertising, consumers have identified and defined themselves through the consumption of particular items. In relation to food, deskilling is often presented as a positive condition since ready-made meals or convenience foods are sources of convenience and efficiency, leaving more time for other, more important, activities. As consumers are ill-equipped in the scientific and practical knowledge of food production, and vulnerable to external sources of misinformation or persuasion, advertising becomes incredibly effective. In fact, the food industry is the nation’s largest advertiser. Advertising in food processing alone grew from 1,637,000,000 billion dollars in 1963 to 16,755,000,000 billion dollars in 1992, 80 %of which was advertised through television. Of the processed food advertisements, “prepared and convenience foods” have the largest share (Connor and Scheik 359-362). This is also reflected in the average consumer’s expenditure patterns; beginning in

the early 1950s, there was a rapid growth in foodservices and foodstuffs being eaten away from the home, and a 10-fold increase in the purchase of food between 1963 and 1992 (Connor and Scheik 125).

As it became normal for members of a household, including women, to be employed in one or more jobs, jobs that are often defined by shift work, commuting, overtime, standing by on-call, or long-distance travel, people were faced with time-constraints, exhaustion, or unpredictability. Therefore, eating was usually done alone, on-the-go, and for many at inconsistent and odd hours. These eating habits reinforce the dependency on food outlets such as restaurants, ready-made meals, and processed food (Jaffe and Gertler 145-146). This leads to the deskilling of women's abilities in the kitchen.

"Deskilling" is a phenomenon that has manifested from natural and external factors. As America underwent an industrial revolution, society evolved from a rural lifestyle to an urban one. As a product, subsistence living and work transformed into a life of surplus and capitalist-based motivations. Thus, naturally, patterns of food production altered. As food production left the home and became a separate industry, the general public transformed primarily into consumers as opposed to producers. This left Americans dependent on the industry and consequently vulnerable to its motives and agendas; their primary purpose being to control food production and consumption.

2.3 PART 2 SUMMATION

Industrial food production and processing first became a prominent industry in America during the nineteenth century. Beginning with innovations in canning and freezing techniques,

the industry expanded to create a wide range of processed foodstuffs and ultimately redefined the way people produced and consumed food – it redefined food itself. As the industry grew, methods of food production and manufacturing necessarily had to develop in order to support mass-production. Those methods were defined by intensified, efficient, highly mechanized, and homogenous techniques, inspired by Taylorism’s principles of scientific management. These methods produced high yields and were based upon economic motivations. As a result, aspects related to ecological or animal welfare were not recognized, nor were they not viewed as significant or of primary concern.

As technology advanced and as the food industry began focusing on marketing strategies, industrially produced and processed food became increasingly adopted during the twentieth century. As more and more people began utilizing processed food, they grew increasingly dependent on upon these foodstuffs and were becoming deskilled in the knowledge and performance of food production. The process of deskilling led to a greater dependence on industrial cuisine and the growing dependence on industrial cuisine led to a greater level of deskilling.

PART 3: INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION PROMOTES THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT

3.1 ADVERTISING PROCESSED FOODS TO WOMEN

The process of deskilling and mass advertising can be best demonstrated during the “golden age” of food processing, between the years 1940 and 1965 (Levenstein 101). During this time, the industry rooted itself in the consumer public’s consciousness through marketing to women. The processed food industry had specifically targeted women as their primary

consumer through several marketing strategies, which reaffirmed gender roles and altered the relationship between women and food production and consumption (Levenstein 105).

In 1900, it was determined that a typical American woman spent roughly 44 hours a week preparing meals and cleaning up after them. At this time, food was cooked using coal and wood stoves, which meant that wood had to be cut and coal had to be shoveled. Only a few houses had indoor plumbing, so water for cooking had to be pumped and carried in from outside and in most cases, food was prepared from scratch (Jaffe and Gertler 149). Those living in the cities could buy bread from bakeries, but in rural areas it was still baked at home. Trips to the market were frequent, as most food was purchased fresh and kept in ice boxes. Many women at that time, both in rural and city areas, gardened and canned (Jaffe and Gertler 154). Cooking meals, caring for infants, and nursing the sick took precedence over other duties such as laundry and cleaning. In this context, few women welcomed the tasks of canning or making homemade condiments or preserves.

During this same time, over 20% of all American women, and over 5% of married women, worked outside the home, but they still continued to maintain their roles in the household. As women began entering the work force and technological advances helped to relieve some of the maintenance and upkeep around the household, the stage was set for increased consumption and media watching. This also came at a time when cities were expanding, which meant fewer households had access to their own food supplies, such as livestock or gardens. For this reason, it was believed that many might turn to mass-produced foods, such as canned soups, packaged meat, and condiments (Jaffe and Gertler 149).

Endorsing the relationship between women and processed food began with the rise of mass consumerism. In the 1920s and 1930s, there was an investment in “patriarchal industrialists” who would instruct families in “proper living” and inform the public of appropriate consumption habits (Jaffe and Gertler 149). The birth of a consumerist mass population needed new sources of information to direct and inform them, which was a role that many parts of the media are more than happy to fill (Jaffe and Gertler 149).

The social relations of food being organized along the lines of sex is nothing new. From the mid-1920s advertisers were enthralled by the discovery that women made the critical decisions for 90% of the household’s disposable income (Levenstein 30). With this knowledge, food industry leaders tailored their products and advertising for the “American housewife.” With a focus on consumerism, women’s labour within the private sphere was expanded to include shopping. With the family’s growing dependence on the market for both raw and processed foods, a woman’s efficiency as a shopper had direct implications on their ability to thrive economically (Boydston 124).

The housewife’s traditional bedrock of useful household information, her mother’s and grandmother’s recipes and advice, seemed outdated and irrelevant. By the 1930s, then, mass media had replaced family wisdom as the major source of culinary advice for women (Levenstein 120). This was enforced by food and appliance producers after World War II when they switched from patriotic wartime themes to worshipping the virtues of the middle-class American home and family – the new core of the mass market. With this understanding, *Time Magazine* acknowledged “that the emphasis in the food business has moved more and more from manufacturing to marketing” (Levenstein 115). Top food executives were very aware that

the crux of the middle-class American home and family was the wife and mother, who they referred to as “our boss- Mrs. Consumer” (Levenstein 105).

Companies such as Heinz were cognizant of these social and technological changes and targeted their marketing efforts on convenience and saving women time and energy (Koehn 363). Heinz also suspected that women would be willing to pay a dependable source to take over some of their cooking duties. In 1932, Howard Heinz wrote that one of the greatest benefits of the food industry "has been what it has done for women. It has released them from the drudgery of the kitchen, increased their leisure, and made it possible for them either to engage in business or to enjoy the social life of the community without seriously interfering with their duties and responsibilities as home makers" (Koehn 364).

Food processors, like the Heinz Company, recognized that these women represented an excellent market for convenience foods; they did not always have the time to prepare well-balanced family meals and could afford to have the industry lend a hand. As early as 1932, the disparity in the amount of time spent on preparing food in the city versus the farm home had been reduced to nearly zero. On average, farm women did spend slightly more time in the kitchen, but mainly because they had to bake their own bread. Well-off farm women seemed even more taken with the convenience of processed foods than city ones, eagerly abandoning much of traditional home food production (Levenstein 28). The closing gap between these women is a representation of their diminishing desire for food production and provision, and welcomed the usefulness of consumption.

With this agenda in mind, media outlets, large food conglomerates, and highly esteemed members of the political, economic, and social spheres solidified the images of

women as wives and mothers. The mother, the preparer of the food, was central to this enterprise. "Home cooking" was placed on the uppermost of the domestic pedestals. The kitchen was "women's sacred domain," said a typical cookbook, the "forbidden realm [to males] of the culinary arts" (Levenstein 31). After the war, the middle-class housewife once more saw her culinary role as an important and satisfying one, with the exception of a small group of feminist activists.

Marjorie Husted, Betty Crocker's creator, told advertising executives that women must be made to feel that "a homemaking heart gives her more appeal than cosmetics, that good things baked in the kitchen will keep romance far longer than bright lipstick" (Levenstein 102). Similar messages were reinforced by *Vogue Magazine*, which went so far as to say that women who did not cook well were "nervous, unstable types" (Levenstein 102).

Although the industry had an emphasis on convenience and a promise to emancipate the American homemaker from her kitchen, industry leaders generally expected frozen and processed foods to make it more convenient for women to maintain their "traditional" family roles (Hamilton 53). This expectation continued once women left the home and entered the workforce. Cooking abilities were still valued and this indicated that women continued to take their gender identity and responsibilities seriously. Skill in the kitchen continued to be regarded as a measure of a woman's worth, even as prepared foods made home cooking less necessary and new technologies and appliances made it less labor intensive. Thus, whether a housewife or a working mother, a woman was still responsible for food provisioning (Jaffer and Gertler, 147; Boydston 85). Food processing executives made it clear that their products were "a

blessed relief for mother and other women in the household," effectively confirming and solidifying the relationship between women and processed foods (Koehn 373).

When asked the question, "Who uses Frozen Foods?" the answer in the Frozen Food Fact book's 1952 was the "average homemaker," graphically depicted as a smartly dressed white woman with fine features, holding a packaged frozen convenience item to help her prepare her "family meals." Frozen-food promoters generally refused to think of their consumers as working women, preferring to view them as housewives (Hamilton 53). However, their consumers were not all homemakers. Soon after 1945, women in the workforce began to steadily climb. In 1950, women made up 29% of the workforce; in 1960 they made up 33%; and in 1970 women comprised 40% of the workforce (Papachristou 214).

The industry's focus on women was transparent. Based on the social expectations and cultural gender roles of America during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which called for woman to have an exclusive relationship with food production, the housewife as the center of marketing campaigns was a natural ploy.

Between the 1930s and 1960s, processed foods were becoming exceedingly popular, both economically and socially. Endorsers of the industry raved about how advantageous its products were for women. There are countless examples of the media boasting about their services. Their messages are important because they led to a new food normalcy and altered the relationship between women and food. The following compilation of advertisements and sentiments about processed foods has been chosen to demonstrate this new food relationship and its social meaning to women.

"You'll Eat Better with Less Work," *House Beautiful* had guaranteed to its readers in January of 1946. The magazine predicted that within two years, women would be spending 50 to 75 %less time on feeding their families (Levenstein 106). In the 1950's, frozen-food promoters asserted that "every mother will be an expert, effortless cook because of her delicious delicacies frozen fresh. Then indeed will womankind acclaim the Second Half Century-America's Frozen Food Era!" The convenience of frozen foods would emancipate not just those women able to afford the luxury of maids-whether "built-in" or wage-earning-but the entirety of "womankind" (Hamilton 48). In 1953, *Life* magazine shared this sentiment, arguing that every woman could now afford a "maid" of her own, since "servants . . . come built into the frozen, canned, dehydrated and pre-cooked foods which lend busy women a thousand extra hands in preparing daily meals" (Hamilton 48). According to one editorialist, what the average housewife really wanted when she bought a package of frozen foods was not freedom to enter the workforce but, rather, freedom to laze about the house and give them time for "church or club work, or that hobby you have always wanted to find the time for" (Hamilton 53). In 1957, *Food Engineering* argued that there was a rising percentage of working women of variable status – married widowed or divorced – who "favors convenience....working wives and mothers are great buyers of convenience foods" (Levenstein 105). When asked in 1957 why people wanted things so "highly packaged," the president of Campbell Soup replied: "To save trouble. The average housewife isn't interested in making a slave of herself. When you do it day after day [cooking] tends to get a little tiresome, and the young housewife is really less interested in her reputation as a home cook today....She doesn't regard slaving in the kitchen as an essential of a good wife and mother" (Levenstein 108-109). At the 1962 Grocery Manufacturers Association

convention, the group's president credited convenience foods with cutting the average housewife's daily kitchen time from five and a half to one and a half hours a day, within a ten-year span. An executive of the American Can Company told the assembly that "the packaging revolution" had helped give the American family not more time for women to work but "more time for cultural and community activities (Levenstein 105-106). Even as late as 1969, when it had become common for married women to work, the chairman of the board of the Corn Products Company saw the "social revolution" that convenience foods had brought in regard to full-time housewives: "We – that is, the food industry – have given her the gift of time," he said (Levenstein 106). These marketing campaigns also focused their energies on women through TV shows, radio shows, movies, and magazines; cookbooks; and formal and informal education.

The 1950s-1960s era TV shows, movies, magazines, and popular radio shows all reaffirmed the traditional family values of the "real" America and reflected the notion that food preparation was central to women's roles in binding family ties. This was observed through TV shows such as "Father Knows Best" and movies like "My Son John" (Levenstein 103).

There were also several women's magazines that discussed the economical and nutritional benefits of processed foods. Most notable were: *Women's Home Companion*, *Ladies Home Journal*, *The Delineator*, *Good Housekeeping*, and *The American Home* (Levenstein 34, 104). *Good Housekeeping* would advise women that "delicious spaghetti with tomato sauce and cheese now comes in cans," which meant there is no need to spend time and energy on making it from scratch (Levenstein 30). *Women's Home Companion* assured food processors that its features were "brilliantly edited to focus the attention of more than three million women on advertising pages" (Levenstein 32). By the 1930s most daily newspapers had "women's pages"

providing an endless stream of recipes and kitchen hints. Food companies were more than happy to help out with recipes using their foods, many were run without even editing out their brand names (Levenstein 33).

The A&P grocery chain was one of the first to use the radio to distribute advice on how to use processed foods in menu planning (Levenstein 33). However, the most successful of the radio purveyors of food advice was “The Betty Crocker Show,” which was created in 1926 by Marjorie Husted (Levenstein 33). This show featured recipes, which included ingredients from processed foods, and held celebrity interviews with stars who were particularly dedicated to their home lives (Levenstein 33). Women’s media was highly influential. Most were dedicated to their magazines and emulated the era’s celebrities. Radio shows such as Betty Crocker’s were incredibly valued and well-respected.

Some of the most recognized cookbooks of the era that supported processed foods were *Good Housekeeping Cook Book* and *Better Homes and Gardens Cookbook*. The newer cookbooks were enthusiastic about processed foods. Canning was “the magic key which opens food treasure chests from all lands,” raved one (Levenstein 37). Another stated, “Thanks to this progressive industry, every single one of us may enjoy foods which even the richest Croesus would have considered luxuries beyond attainment not too many years ago” (Levenstein 37). For those who longed for creativity and innovation in the kitchen, a standard recommendation was to combine foods from different cans. In Mary Ellsworth’s reputable cookbook, she boasted about the many possibilities of canned soup and explained that the recipes for “making two good soups into one better one” include adding a can of ABC minced clams to one of the Hormel vegetable soup to make clam chowder (Levenstein 37). Industry giants also published

their own cookbooks, including the *General Foods Kitchens Frozen Foods Cookbook*, which was "intended especially for beginners" and included a series of questions and answers that demonstrated the superiority of frozen foods for the modern cook (Hamilton 49). Cookbooks were incredibly popular during this era, and women were emphatic compliers to this authority on cuisine.

In terms of education, many women were targeted by the food industry through formal classes and informal programs. Women often learned the basics of cooking in home economics classes. There, teachers were charmed by the benefits of the industrial revolution in the kitchen and taught that simplified processes and efficiency were the keys to culinary success and that canned and processed foods were invaluable tools (Levenstein 32). Another form of education was through the Consumer Education Program that was funded by The National Association of Frozen Food Packers and provided a test kitchen where home economists cooked and created menus for new recipes using frozen foods, which they then released to women's magazines for publication. Similar to that, capitalizing home economists persuaded newspapers to sponsor "home institutes" and cooking schools, which drew audiences of up to twelve thousand to watch processors' products being promoted in cooking demonstrations (Levenstein 222). Knowledge and skills in food preparation were being dominated by programs such as these.

What the industry was conveying through these messages is that they have a value-added product and something almost as valuable to sell as sustenance to the busy postwar housewives: time. Longer shelf-lives, more processing, precooking, and packaging all had one great justification: to liberate "Mrs. Consumer" from the kitchen (Levenstein 108). Packaged, canned, and bottled foods replaced those once butchered, baked, and pickled at home.

Prepared foods introduced convenient substitutes for dishes previously cooked from scratch, altering women's established cooking responsibilities.

As Laura Shapiro wrote so aptly “The advertising industry, the manufacturers of household goods, the food companies, the women’s magazines, and the schools all shared in the task of creating a woman who could discriminate among canned soups, but who wouldn’t ask too many questions about the ingredients: neither angel nor scientist, but homemaker” (221–222). The goal was to teach women, especially those who had learned to cook in the days before electric refrigerator-freezers, how to use frozen and processed foods to quickly create healthful, tasty meals (Hamilton 45).

While many of the advancements in food technology were welcomed by women who were overwhelmed and overworked by the mental and physical labors of maintaining a household and entering the job market, processed foods made their way into women’s homes by feeding off of their insecurities and their “subordinate” position inside and outside the home (Jaffe and Gertler 150). Makers of processed foods followed nutritionists and home economists in discouraging women’s cooking knowledge, as passed down to them from generations, as being traditional or even threatening to health, appealing to their maternal feelings for the well-being of their families and assuring the benefits of processed foods (Jaffe and Gerlter 149). Women associated their knowledge with science and modernity, quickly dismissing traditional skill sets that were given to them by their mothers and grandmothers and becoming dependent on industrially-produced food.

Less and less women cooked from scratch, and were encouraged through various media outlets to purchase premade foodstuffs. Food and food production was seen as a chore and

something that could be replaced through readymade meals and processed food ingredients. Time spent in the kitchen was meant to be based on efficiency as opposed to quality. Cooking and baking was now viewed as nuisance versus a pleasurable and time-worthy activity. Overall, food and food production went from being worth a woman's time, efforts, priority, pride, and happiness to become a woman's chore, inconvenience, enslavement, and problem. Women were conditioned to devalue food and view it no longer as sustenance, but an object to consume.

Turning food into a necessary evil, as it was deemed a time stealing nuisance as opposed to a domestic activity that one can take pleasure in, gave women an alternative; it gave them an opportunity for more time, more convenience, and more freedom. It offered women a chance to shed some of their responsibilities within the private sphere and allowed them to pursue other endeavors. However, it is important to keep in mind that women were still expected to provide meals, whether it took 10 minutes or 10 hours.

3.2 PART 3 SUMMATION

Given the history of industrial food production, it can be said that its development and success was based upon the growing need for greater convenience and efficiency in food production and provision within the private sphere. Therefore, it is fair to state that this industry was rooted in the idea of providing a value-added product: time. The idea of saving time was the most alluring to women.

As demonstrated, the food industry targeted women, and in doing so, it simultaneously reaffirmed gender roles by solidifying the association between women and their responsibility

for food production and provision, while giving them an opportunity to escape this very role in offering them convenience, time, and efficiency. Thus the industry became dependent upon women. They were also dependent upon women viewing food as a commodity. Employed women were the most susceptible to processed food as they were struggling with the burden of a double-day and needed the most assistance with time management. This fact was understood by food processors as they “recognized that these women represented an excellent market for convenience foods; they did not have the time to prepare ‘balanced’ family meals but could afford to have the industry do some of it” (Levenstein 105). Based upon this understanding, the food industry realized that the women’s movement was an emerging social phenomenon that could be exploited.

Industrial food production removed one of women’s largest burdens – food production and provision – gave women an opportunity for more time and energy to follow their aspirations for equality and liberation. Had food provision remained in the production realm as opposed to evolving primarily into consumption, women would not have been able to provide food for their families while fighting for equality in society. Had there been no pre-made, processed foodstuffs, women would have had to dedicate a substantial amount of time to food production and provision, which would have made it nearly impossible for them to enter the public sphere and obtain or sustain paid full-time or part-time employment. The absence of industrially produced food would have meant the absence of an opportunity, an opportunity that allowed women to utilize external sources to aid in sustaining their prescribed social responsibilities in their realm, while allowing for the time and energy to facilitate a women’s movement.

PART 4: THE WOMEN'S MOVEMENT PROMOTES INDUSTRIAL FOOD PRODUCTION

4.1 FEMINIST THEORIES

As discussed extensively in Part 1, the women's movement was characterized by four significant feminist ideologies: liberal feminism, radical feminism, cultural feminism, and socialist feminism. Each of these feminist theories suggest why women have become subordinate to men, and each of these women's groups challenged this oppressive power dynamic in different ways. Although each provides a different perspective, all wish to challenge dominant cultural trends and interrogate a woman's place in the public and private spheres. More specifically, these streams of feminism address gender roles and how these roles are applied as methods for social identity construction and used to confine women on a social, economic, and political level. In particular, each feminist theory directly and indirectly discusses the relationship between women and food production and provision. It will be shown that each stream of feminism has, in one way or another, supported the use of industrial cuisine, and thus, industrial food production.

4.1.1 LIBERAL FEMINISM

Liberal feminists encouraged women to propel themselves into the public sphere, and to diminish their presence in the private sphere (Tong 28). They were encouraged to embrace traditionally masculine traits and imitate the values and identifiers of men (Tong 18). This meant valuing independence, rationality, intelligence, economic stability, achieving and maintaining a successful career, and obtaining higher education. With that in mind, the proponents of liberal feminism began dismissing and devaluing traditional female

characteristics and activities that prevented them from fully participating in the public sphere (Wendell 85). This meant that liberal feminists no longer placed value on household duties. They no longer took pride in maintaining the home and participating in domestic activities (Freedman 51; Wendell 80). What was once viewed as honorable work, they now saw as a chore and demeaning. This was especially true with food provision (Levenstein 108).

The social understandings on the responsibility of food and its production have historically been structured around sex. Traditionally – and even in most societies today – women are assigned the task of mentally and physically accounting for food production (Allen and Sachs 23). Thus, after a day of work at paid employment, most women are still expected to make dinner (Echols xiii). This task was viewed as a chore and an inconvenience; just one more thing on their to-do list.

Food production was not considered to be reflective of rationality or masculinity; it was viewed as another obstacle that prevented women from competing on a level playing field with men and only reinforced the conventional gender roles that they have been trying to defy (Wendell 80). Food no longer defined a woman's identity, she no longer felt judged or valued by her cooking. As women began devaluing their association with food, they began devaluing food itself. To women, food provision was a symbol of regression; it chained them to the traditional expectations that defined femininity and a woman's role. Therefore, working women and women who supported liberal feminism did not feel the need to produce quality meals, especially under time and budget constraints. Their identity as women was evolving and they did not feel the need to maintain the parameters of their old identity, which was heavily defined by food. Once industrial food production began, women took advantage of its

products. In an effort to maintain their position in the public sphere, and to limit their role within the private sphere, women turned to ready-made convenience meals to be relieved of the burden of a double-day. In utilizing these products, women were able to diminish the amount of time and energy they placed within the private sphere, yet still met their expectations of providing food for the family. Purchasing ready-made meals and processed food ingredients also symbolized their growing detachment and disdain for this historically assigned role. In using these products, women indirectly made the decision to view food and food production as a low priority; thus, giving it increasingly less thought and effort.

4.1.2 RADICAL FEMINISM

Like liberal feminists, radical feminists sought to change the expectations and assumptions surrounding domestic duties (Willis 92). As mentioned, radical feminists believed that the family unit birthed sexism and impacted women's liberation and their equality within the public and private spheres through the use of gender roles. Thus, those who supported radical feminism wished to break the pattern of gender roles. This meant challenging activities that are traditionally thought of as female, within the home, such as cooking, cleaning, and shopping (Willis 99).

With that in mind, radical feminists wished for men and women to share the responsibilities within the private sphere. It is conceivable that industrially produced food products was one answer to bringing about equality. These products are designed to provide a quick and easy meal; their very nature is built upon convenience. They help women provide food for their families through fast, effortless meals, without compromising too much of their

time and energy devoted to the public sphere. At the same time, processed foods and ready-made-meals are one way for men to take the initiative on food provision as it would allow them to perform their share of responsibilities within the home without requiring them to learn a significant new skill set, such as cooking homemade meals from whole foods. This would increase their presence within the private sphere and help to break the cycle of gender roles within the family unit.

4.1.3 CULTURAL FEMINISM

Unlike liberal and radical feminism, cultural feminism took a more ideological approach to women's liberation. They did not promote a clear and direct set of actions to take into the material world; they did not encourage women to enter the public sphere as was promoted by liberal feminism, nor did they suggest that there be a fair distribution of labour in the private sphere as proposed by radical feminism. Instead, cultural feminists celebrated "femaleness" and vowed to prevent the restrictive conditions that originally promoted male supremacy, which included "forced parenting" and a "lack of physical autonomy" (Alcoff 414).

Based on this, it can be inferred that cultural feminism would not have supported roles that limited women or roles that were traditionally assigned to women by men. This conclusion is based on cultural feminism's rejection of what it means to be a "woman" and possess "femininity" as these concepts have been defined by a male-dominated culture, which is believed to be problematic since men have different viewpoints and motives than women – leading to male supremacy (Alcoff 406). Thus, it is conceivable that cultural feminism would have denied or redefined their duties within the home in order to construct a new set of

expectations under an accepted definition of femaleness and femininity. This denial or redefinition would have likely included their responsibilities towards food provision, as food provision and women have historically and traditionally been aligned. Therefore, it is likely that supporters of cultural feminism would have wished to redefine or reinterpret their role with food production and food provision.

4.1.4 SOCIALIST FEMINISM

Like liberal, radical, and cultural feminists, followers of socialist feminism did not support patriarchy or any oppressive dynamic that would have been used to control or limit women (Burris 52). Within the private sphere, this control would have been exerted through the use of gender roles, which includes the historical association between women and their responsibility for food provision (Hartmann 14).

Similar to radical feminism, socialist feminists would have promoted a shared obligation of food production and food provision between men and women (Tong 28). Since convenience foods would have been a non-threatening way for men to contribute and participate in food provision, it is plausible that men turned to these foodstuffs as a crutch and comfortable alternative to homemade food production. Because the socially constructed identity of men, and traditionally defined male characteristics, did not include the responsibility for food in the private sphere, they did not have the skill set, knowledge, or desire to create meals from scratch or meals from whole foods. The use and dependence on processed foods and ready-made-meals were a feasible way for men to take some responsibility. Although socialist feminists did not speak specifically on a woman's role toward food production and provision,

they did speak about the necessity for equality within the domestic sphere. Based upon this, it is inferred that socialist feminism would have encouraged women to utilize processed foods and ready-made-meals in an effort to maintain their status in the public sphere and to provide a quick and easy meal for their families, in an effort to battle the time constraints of a double-day.

As described earlier, many women viewed their responsibility for food provision as archaic and regressive. As a result, many women did not care to put more time and effort into food provision than necessary. Providing meals for the family became a chore and a constant reminder that their sex was limiting their full potential and their social status. Furthermore, the assigned role of food provision would have been viewed as a form of oppression through patriarchy in that it was a role that men used to define and confine women. It is likely that many women who supported socialist feminism resented this duty and began devaluing their relationship with food. In minimizing their efforts towards it, and choosing pre-made meals and processed ingredients, women were subtly rebelling against this old-aged tradition and rebelling against patriarchy. In effect, there was an increasing reliance and demand for efficiency and technologies that would have aided women in balancing their duties in the public and private spheres; processed foods would have been one of their tools of choice.

4.2 EVIDENCE OF WOMEN UTILIZING PROCESSED FOOD

Beginning with the mass-manufacturing of canned goods, the production of food in America was forever altered and food was redefined as industrial cuisine. The demand for processed food was fueled by the fact that “farm families were becoming less self-sufficient”

(Connor and Scheik 33). Aside from the industrial revolution, and the transformation of a rural to an urban society, one of the factors that may have contributed to the diminishing self-sufficiency within the home is the rise of the women's movement and the integration of women within the workforce. As more and more women became employed, or opted to challenge traditional gender roles, the primary food provider had disappeared.

Studies show that "Employed wives typically manage household tasks by redefining the work and doing less than they would if they were home" (Devault 183). This can be evidenced in a national survey that demonstrated that employed women are doing less housework. It indicated that the time that women spent on housework declined from 24 hours per week in 1965 to 16 hours in 1985, which is a decline of one third. At the same time, men's contributions to routine housework increased from about 2 hours per week to about 4 hours per week. This resulted in doubling of men's housework between 1965 and 1985, from about 15% to 33% of the total (Coltrane 1211).

As extensively explained, women have been encouraged by all streams of feminism (liberal, radical, cultural, and socialist) to engage in the public sphere and detach themselves from activities that are traditionally viewed as 'female,' which includes food production and provision. Since the once designated head of household activities - the woman - is now limiting her presence, members of the household are either encouraged or forced to seek food elsewhere, or the woman chooses to utilize processed foods so that she may limit her energy and time towards this task. As women entered the workforce, dual-career households became the norm, and the demands on women have caused "shopping and food preparation patterns to change [...] Take-out, fast-food, and home-delivered foods have grown quickly" (Connors and

Scheik 276). A 1960 survey indicated that 25% of supermarket shoppers were working women, a number that continues to grow (Levenstein 105). It has been determined that “fewer traditional meals are eaten together at home, and more men and children are preparing food at home, though the principle burden still falls on the female heads of households... [studies show] less time is being spent preparing those meals that are eaten at home” and that “dual-career households are a major force underlying the trend toward eating away from home” (Connor and Scheik 276). O’Hara claims that “The greater emphasis on shopping, convenient foods, fashion, and buying rather than making/mending clothes and producing material use-values changed the nature of much household labor” (99). As explained, labor within the household transformed from production to consumption. This is also evidenced in *Gender at Work*, by Ann Game and Rosemary Pringle, who explain that there was a major shift from “housework as production to housework as consumption,” where shopping increased from 2 hours a week in 1935 to more than 10 hours a week in 1966 (120). Furthermore, evidence shows that the marketing strategies of the food industry was immensely successful as women at almost all income levels bought more processed foods than their grandmothers had, such as canned hams and packaged cookies, and fewer raw ingredients such as flour and baking soda (Koehn 351). Thus, as a result of the increasing female labor force, and the changing attitudes towards food and a woman’s role, industrially produced and processed foods have gone from a niche market to an essential and depended-upon aspect of the American diet.

4.3 PART 4 SUMMATION

Even though there are different streams of feminism and their stances on the subject of women's rights and liberation differed, the result was the same; all forms of feminism, with the exception of cultural feminism as its scope was too narrow to infer with certainty what their stance would have been on a woman's role within the private sphere, supported the idea of lessening women's presence within the private sphere. Part of that process included minimizing their time and efforts on performing domestic duties. The most time consuming responsibility within the household, as evidenced by a national survey, was cooking and meal preparation. Thus, it is likely that women sought to minimize their time and efforts in cooking and meal preparation. One way to achieve this would have been to utilize products that allowed for efficiency, convenience, and ease. These products would include processed foods such as ready-made meals, or the use of canned, preserved, or frozen ingredients, which are manufactured through an industrialized method. As demonstrated above, the purchasing of processed food increased with the rise of the female labor force. Had women remained in the private sphere, absent from the workforce, there would have been little or no need for convenience foods as women would have continued to have the time and energy for food production and provision. In fact, food production and provision would have continued to be one of women's greatest responsibilities as it historically had been. The women's movement gave the food industry a chance to provide a new kind of service to the domestic sphere – to provide ready-meals and pre-cooked foodstuffs as opposed to raw ingredients. This gave way to mass-consumption and mass-production, leading to high demands that can only be fulfilled through industrial food production.

Women were expected to enter the public arena to verify their equality, but on the condition that they were able to maintain their responsibilities in the private sphere, which gave particular industries the opportunity to dominate and assert their necessity. One such industry is the food industry and industrial food production.

CONCLUSION

This paper sought to hypothesize the possible connection between the women's movement and the adoption of industrial food production, within the United States of America. The purpose of this research was to demonstrate how the motivations and ambitions of the women's movement, and the goals and intentions of the industrial food industry, operated in parallel and contributed to the creation, successes, and identities of one another. Stated differently, the food industry utilized the aspirations of the women's movement as a vehicle to ensure its adoption and success, while the women's movement produced certain goals and desires that incidentally supported the use and dependence of industrialized and processed foodstuffs.

Part 1 demonstrated that the women's movement was predominantly motivated by the desire for women to hold equal social, economic, and political standing as their male counterpart. The movement was best characterized by the objectives and ideology of liberal feminism, which encouraged women to enter the public sphere and to adopt society's version of success, which was based upon patriarchal values. In effect, women in support of liberal feminism – which was most women since it was the most accepted form of feminism – measured their achievements based upon traditional male principles and practices, but failed

to explore the evolution of a woman's role in the private sphere now that her role has become more inclusive. Given that, the dominant and most prevalent identifiers of the women's movement (components of liberal feminism) failed to challenge the new duties and expectations for women within the private sphere. Thus, the centuries old notion of "separate spheres" lingered and remained embedded in American culture. As a consequence, even after women have entered the public sphere, traditional gender roles still influenced and solidified the expectation for women to continue to remain as the primary authority over the domestic realm.

As described in Part 2, industrial food production was responsible for redefining the relationship between food and society by creating a consumerist culture around food and diminished the physical act of food production, on a micro level. This method of industrial food production allowed for an unprecedented level of efficiency, mechanization, intensification, and homogenization of food. This led to the creation and mass-production of pre-assembled meals, pre-cooked foodstuffs, as well as frozen and canned ingredients, all of which was based upon providing convenience, efficiency, ease, and ultimately giving the gift of time to the consumer.

As established, the primary consumer and authority figure on food production and provision was women. Although it was already a cultural expectation for women to be responsible for food, Part 3 demonstrated how the industry reinforced this by primarily targeting women in their marketing and advertising campaigns. In effect, the industrial food industry reaffirmed gender roles by asserting that it was a woman's place to provide food, but gave them an opportunity to escape or minimize this role by using said products. Given that,

industrial food production allowed women to minimize their performance in the private sphere and expand their identity within the public sphere.

Based on the conveniences of these value-added foodstuffs, many women turned to industrial cuisine. This growing dependence on processed foodstuffs contributed to food “deskilling,” which created a culture of food consumption versus production, and consequently removed the necessity to have the skill set for primary food production and provision. As the industrial food industry began to expand, based upon the growing demands, women increasingly relied upon processed foodstuffs. With the growing absence of women from the private sphere, many men and children had followed suite by substituting this absence with industrial cuisine.

Simultaneously, as shown by the objectives of the American women’s movement and the influences of liberal, radical, cultural, and socialist feminism in Part 4, women were encouraged to extend their role into the public sphere and diminish their role in the private sphere. This expectation led to an overwhelming amount of responsibilities for women, especially working women. This overburdened state led most women to seek reprieve from the double-day, and they did so by turning to services and products that offered convenience and efficiency. This generated a new need for greater efficiency and convenience in the realm of food production and provision, a need that did not exist previously. Therein, the women’s movement created a market for the successful adoption of industrial cuisine, and consequently, industrial food production within America.

Based on the histories, objectives, and outcomes of the women’s movement and industrial food production within America, it is likely that their successes were interconnected

and that they shared a symbiotic relationship, each thriving from one another's motivations and vulnerabilities.

WORKS CITED

- Alcoff, Linda. "Cultural Feminism versus Poststructuralism: The Identity Crisis of Feminist Theory." *Signs* 13.3 (1988): 405-436.
- Allen, Patricia and Carolyn Sachs. "Chapter 3: Women and Food Chains: The Gendered Politics of Food" in Williams-Forsson, Psyche and Counihan, Carole *Taking Food Public: Redefining Food Pathways in a Changing World*. New York: Routledge (2012): 23-40.
- Almeder, Robert. "Liberal Feminism and Academic Feminism." *Public Affairs Quarterly* 8.4 (1994):299-315.
- Banks, Olive. *Becoming a Feminist: the Social Origins of 'First Wave' Feminism*. Georgia: University of Georgia Press, 1987.
- Berg, Barbara. *The Remembered Gate: Origins of American Feminism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Boydston, Jeanne. *Home and Work: Housework, Wages, and the Ideology of Labor in the Early Republic*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Braverman, Harry. *Labor and Monopoly Capital: The Degradation of Work in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1974.
- Brenner, Johanna. Chapter 1: "The Best of Times, the Worst of Times: Feminism in the United States." *Mapping the Women's Movement: Feminist Politics and Social Transformation in the North*. Ed. Monica Threlfall and Sheila Rowbotham. London: Verso, 1996. 17-72.
- Bryson, Valerie. *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction*. New York: Paragon House, 1992.
- Buechler, Steven M. *Women's Movements in the United States: Woman Suffrage, Equal Rights, and Beyond*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1990.
- Burawoy, Michael. "Toward a Marxist Theory of the Labor Process: Braverman and Beyond." *Politics & Society* 8.3-4 (1978): 247-312.
- Burris, Val. "The Dialectic of Women' Oppression: Notes on the relation between Capitalism and Patriarchy." *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*. 27(1982): 51-74.
- Calasanti, Toni M. and Carol A. Bailey. "Gender Inequality and the Division of Household Labor in the United States and Sweden: A Socialist-Feminist Approach." *Social Problems* 38 1 (1991): 34-53.

- Castro, Ginette. *American Feminism: A Contemporary History*. Trans. Elizabeth Loverde-Bagwell. Paris: Presses de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, 1984.
- Collectif, Clio. *L'histoire des femmes au Québec*. Montréal: Quinze, 1982.
- Coltrane, Scott. "Research on Household Labor: Modeling and Measuring the Social Embeddedness of Routine Family." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 62.4 (2000): 1208-1233.
- Connor, John and William Schiek. *Food Processing: An Industrial Powerhouse in Transition*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1997.
- Devault, Marjorie. "Conflict and Deference." *Food and Culture*. Ed. Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik. New York, London: Routledge, 1997. 180-200.
- Donovan, Josephine. *Feminist Theory: The Intellectual Traditions*. New York: Continuum, 2000.
- Dumont-Johnson, Micheline. *The Women's Movement: Then and Now*. Ottawa: CRIA/ICREF, 1986.
- Echols, Alice. "Cultural Feminism: Feminist Capitalism and the Anti-Pornography Movement." *Social Text* 7 (1983), pp. 34-53.
- Echols, Alice. *Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967-1975*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. "What is Socialist Feminism?" *WIN Magazine*. 3 June. 1976
- Firestone, Shulamith. *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution*. Great Britain: Jonathan Cape Limited, 1971.
- Freedman, Jane. *Feminism*. Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2001.
- Furer, Howard B. "The American City: A Catalyst for the Women's Rights Movement." *The Wisconsin Magazine of History* 52.4 (1969): 285-305.
- Gaard, Greta. *Ecological Politics: Ecofeminists and the Greens*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.
- Game, Ann and Rosemary Pringle. *Gender at Work*. London: Pluto Press, 1984.
- Gardiner, Judith Kegan. "What Happened to Socialist Feminist Women's Studies Programs? A Case History and Some Speculations." *Feminist Studies* 34.3 (2008): 558-583.

- Goody, Jack. "Industrial Food: Towards the Development of a World Cuisine." *Food and Culture*. Ed. Carole Counihan and Penny Van Esterik. New York, London: Routledge, 1997. 338-356.
- Gould, Carol C. "Private Rights and Public Virtues: Women, the Family and Democracy." *Beyond Domination*. Ed. Carol C. Gould. Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Allanheld, 1983.
- Graves, Ann. *Woman in America: Being an Examination into the Moral and Intellectual Condition of American Female Society*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1843.
- Hamilton, Shane. "The Economies and Conveniences of Modern-Day Living: Frozen Foods and Mass Marketing, 1945-1965." *The Business History Review* 77.1 (2003): 33-60.
- Harriss, Kathryn. "New Alliances: Socialist-Feminism in the Eighties." *Feminist Review* 31(1989): 34-54.
- Hartmann, Heidi. "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a more Progressive Union." *Capital and Class* 8 (1979): 1-33.
- Hartman-Strom, Sharon. *Women's Rights*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 2003.
- Hewitt, Nancy A. *No Permanent Waves: Recasting Histories of U.S. Feminism*. NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010.
- Jaffe, JoAnne and Michael Gertler. "Victual Vicissitudes: Consumer Deskillling and the (gendered) Transformation of Food Systems." *Agriculture and Human Values* 23 (2006): 143-162.
- Jaggar, Alison M. "Political Philosophies of Women's Liberation." *Feminism and Philosophy*. Ed. Mary Vettering-Braggin, Frederick A. Elliston, and Jane English. Totowa, NJ: Littlefield, Adams, 1977.
- Jaggar, Alison M. *Feminist Politics and Human Nature*. Totowa, N J: Rowman and Allanheld, 1983.
- Kensinger, Loretta. "(In)Quest of Liberal Feminism." *Hypatia* 12.4 (1997): 178-197.
- Kirschenmann, Frederick L. "Food as Relationship." *Journal of Hunger & Environmental Nutrition* 3.2-3 (2008): 106-121.
- Koedt, Anne. "Lesbianism and Feminism." *Radical Feminism*. Ed. Anne Koedt, Ellen Levine, and Anita Rapone. New York: The New York Times Book Co, 1973.

- Koehn, Nancy F. "Henry Heinz and Brand Creation in the Late Nineteenth Century: Making Markets for Processed Food." *The Business History Review* 73.3 (1999): 349-393.
- Lapovsky-Kennedy, Elizabeth. "Socialist Feminism: What Difference Did It Make to the History of Women's Studies?" *Feminist Studies* 34.3 (2008): 497-525.
- Levenstein, Harvey. *Paradox of Plenty: A Social History of Eating in Modern America*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Matthews, Jean. V. *Women's Struggle for Equality: The First Phase, 1828-1876*. Chicago: The American Ways Series, 1997.
- Mill, John Stuart and Harriet Taylor Mill. *Essays on Sex Equality*. Ed. Alice Rossi. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- Nachescu, Voichita. "Radical Feminism and the Nation: History and Space in the Political Imagination of Second-Wave Feminism." *Journal for the Study of Radicalism* 3.1(2009): 29-59.
- O'Hara, Phillip Anthony. "Household Labor, the Family, and Macroeconomic Instability in the United States: 1940s—1990s." *Review of Social Economy* 53.1 (1995): 89-120.
- Papachristou, Judith. *Women Together: A History in Documents of the Women's Movement in the United States* New York: Random House, 1976.
- Plumwood, Val. *Feminism and the Mastery of Nature*. New York; London: Routledge, 1993.
- Ryan, Barbara. *Feminism and the Women's Movement: Dynamics of Change in Social Movement, Ideology, and Activism*. New York; London: Routledge, 1992.
- Shapiro, Laura. *Perfection Salad: Women and Cooking at the turn of the Century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1986.
- Shelton, Beth Anne and Daphne John. "The Division of Household Labor." *Annual Review of Sociology* 22(1996): 299-322.
- Taylor, Verta and Leila J. Rupp. "Women's Culture and Lesbian Feminist Activism: A Reconsideration of Cultural Feminism." *Signs* 19.1 (1993): 32-61.
- Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction*. Colorado: Westview Press, 2009.
- Tong, Rosemarie. *Feminist Thought: A comprehensive Introduction*. Colorado: Westview Press, 1989.

Truswell, A. Stewart and Jennie C. Brand. "Processing Food." *British Medical Journal (Clinical Research Edition)* 291.6503 (1985): 1186-1190.

Vogel, Lise. "Domestic Labor Revisited." *Science & Society* 64.2 (2000): 151-170.

Wendell, Susan. "A (Qualified) Defense of Liberal Feminism." *Hypatia* 2.2 (1987):65-93.

Willis, Ellen. "Radical Feminism and Feminist Radicalism." *Social Text* 9/10 (1984): 91-118.