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Gender and Class in the 20th Century

Sexe et Classe au XXe Siècle.

Denise De Weerdt, editor

International Colloquium, organized by Amsab in collaboration with the Department of Contemporary History at the University of Ghent, the Gender Studies at the University of Ghent and the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam

With industrialisation women's remunerated work became the object of intense attention and debates. Female employment was regarded as problematic but the 'problem' was not always localised in the same sector of the economy. Still, society's perception of women's work as a social problem or, in the interwar years, as a problem of economic justice, remained a recurrent scheme of interpretation of social reality as expressed in gender relations. It was as if the gender order functioned as a signifier of a general sense of moral disorder in times of crisis, while certain sectors of women's employment served as sites of contest and negotiations about the order of society.

In the last decades of the 19th century a large discourse arose from many quarters on the 'social problem' of women's work in factories: medical doctors warned about the inherent dangers for women's health and consequently for national wealth, official investigations tried to expose the grim hygienic realities of factory life, social scientists portrayed the dismal results of women's industrial work on working-class families. The problem was discursively constructed. According to one spokesman for the workers' interests in the cantonal constituent assembly of Zurich, in 1868, women were no longer able to accomplish 'their high vocation within the family'. Thus he called for a necessary regulation of women's work.

Such a move did not enjoy much popular support until the 1870s when the Swiss Parliament passed the first national factory legislation. The bill was hotly debated and contested by different sides of the political spectrum. Employers, especially the powerful textile industrialists, vehemently opposed state intervention, which they considered an intrusion into the factory's internal order, their private sphere, and into the sacred principle of the freedom of trade and business. Federalists also opposed the law as well as many workers who feared a limitation of their freedom of contract. But, in the initial stages of drafting the legislation, only the industrialists contested the protective measures aimed at women. On the other hand, the Workers' Federation (Arbeiterbund) welcomed them and even wished for an extension of what they saw as the first step towards 'the complete elimination of women's factory work'. Women, they argued, ought to be 'given back' to their homes and their children. Such a position was shared...
which are able to protect their lives and health. More specifically the message addressed to the industrialists, argued that cantonal experiences had proved their fears unfounded. The measures taken in favour of the protection of a healthy evolution and a better education of children, of the protection of family life, of the care of the workforce did not weaken industry and its productivity, but finally strengthened it. Thus, in conclusion, it was a matter of accomplishing a duty towards the children and the mothers who worked in factories. In such a case it was not tolerable to speculate whether this duty could be fulfilled at a later date or at a lower cost, it had to be fulfilled without delay.

In the course of the debates, advocates of factory legislation raised another important point, namely the respective duties of men and women as regards the political body, thus uncovering a further aspect of the question of protective legislation, or more globally social policy. The state intervention into the paternalist private sphere of the employer finally aimed at resetting the relation of the individual worker to citizenship. The conditions of his or her employment had to be reshaped in order to fit in with certain obligations of the citizen. These were of course highly gendered. In the early Swiss democracy, with generalised male suffrage from 1848 on, men were expected to participate in the leadership of public affairs. The reduction of the working day for all factory workers was meant incidentally to give men more time precisely for this male duty, while women would be freed to perform their household and maternal duties. The majority report of the preparatory commission of the Upper Chamber presented in November 1876 expressed this finality in a rather straightforward way. It said: "The male working population is called upon by our democratic constitution to participate in lawmaking and in the political development of the state. Therefore, our republic has a vital interest in giving workers the necessary time, so that they can perform the rights and duties of citizenship." While it was expected that young men and boys would use the spare time for their further education, for women, the reduction of working hours would mean more time to prepare the meals. The report relied on the experience with the general working day in the canton of Glarus, concluding that "one sees with satisfaction, that the coming and going in a great hurry for meals has stopped and that the preparation of the food has become more orderly since it can be undertaken with much more leisure."

The normative character of Swiss protective law was not aimed solely at women and at the strengthening of their household and maternal duties. They also had to secure men's ability to fulfill their duties as citizens. There was no incompatibility either between the symbolic confirmation of men's role as family provider and their protection by labour legislation. Regina Wecker has demonstrated about Glarus, where men amended the first cantonal bill of 1864 in order to include provisions for their own protection, that in the early years of discussions male workers were not completely hostile towards the legal intervention in their labour conditions. In fact, I would argue, that this attitude of male workers did not disappear, even though the accent was put on women's protection first. Over and over workers' parties and trade unions demanded legal protection in the form of general labour legislation, intensifying their campaign after the turn of the century when many social groups requested a revision of the Factory Act. This did not preclude that the formulation and the finality of the protective measures remained quite dissimilar for men and women. As a rule, workers' representatives firmly refused to endorse laws that covered only certain categories of male workers, in this adhering to the fundamental tactical principle of trade unions that no unnecessary divisions should be introduced into the male workforce. The justification for male protection remained very different from that for women. In the language of gender, women needed protection because of their physical and political weakness, while men wanted it because they were free citizens of the country whom nobody was entitled to exploit. It was from the standpoint of rights that a better protection was 'expected' from the Swiss trade union congress in 1911, 'a protection against overwork and exploitation as well as against the violation of the rights the worker possesses as a man, a citizen and a free and equal contract partner of the employer. All these qualities were the prerogative of male adult workers only. Women and young workers were not supposed to need them. From this representation of social reality based on a specific discourse on gender (in which young workers were associated to the status of women until they became adult), it followed that a hierarchy of priorities dominated political practice. Although in the discussions of the new labour law for small trade and artisans (Ge werbegesetze) during the years preceding the First World War, socialist and christian trade unions deemed necessary the extension of protection to all workers, they insisted on the protection of women and young workers first, 'the weakest', as the main speaker on the question at the Swiss trade union congress of 1913 put it. "It is our duty of solidarity", he explained, "to help first those by means of legal dispositions who cannot help themselves."

Except for the gradual reduction of the working day in two steps, in 1905 and in 1919 the Swiss factory law of 1877 was not modified substantially before the adoption of a general labour legislation in 1964. Nevertheless, the overall revisions of the law in 1914 and 1919 extended female protection once more by introducing the new disposition that, starting in 1925, all married women could take off Saturday afternoon. The idea was to allow them to do their household chores and shopping before Sunday. But in spite of the different treatment of women by the law, there was never such a strong call legally to ban married women from factory work, as this was apparently the case in Germany toward the end of the 19th century. The rather early adoption of the Factory Act, at a time when only some workers' associations asked for the right to a 'norma family life with a wife at home, along with a strong and early industrialisation probably explain this difference. Practically all political forces considere married women's work in the factory as important for the family income as for the economy. The catholics, who would have preferred to do without women work outside the home, lacked the strength to impose their view. Nevertheless the notion that a married woman should stay at home made its way: at least from the turn of the century, social reformers and catholic unions were
progressively joined by social-democrats who deplored the fact that lower-class women did not earn enough to allow their wives to abandon factory work. The perception that the employment of married women in factories was still an unavoidable necessity, also served as an argument to reduce the eight weeks of (unpaid) maternity leave to six at the time of the revision of the factory law in 1914. By not proposing paid maternity leave, Switzerland remained faithful to its overall liberal politics of strictly limited state interference. But its protective measures for workers and especially women workers were far more comprehensive than the German labour legislation of 1878, at about the same time. Furthermore, with the daily limitation of working hours for men and women alike, the Swiss factory bill also included some general protection for all workers comparatively early. Only in 1892 did France adopt a law banning night work for women coupled with the introduction of the eleven hours working day.

When, in the 1890s, most western countries realised the need to introduce some form of labour legislation, the Swiss factory legislation became the model. Switzerland, thus, was very active in implementing international norms, partly because it feared its own economic disadvantage if other countries did not follow. In March 1889, the Swiss government issued a circular to the governments of the industrialised countries of Europe for an international congress. It proposed to take protective measures mainly for the under-aged and the female labour force. The German emperor preceded the Swiss initiative by inviting himself to a conference in Berlin, in March 1890, but the meeting lacked any concrete results. Following the first international conference for workers’ protection of 1897 in Zurich, initiated by the Swiss Workers’ Federation (Arbeiterbund), the International Association for Labour Legislation (Internationale Vereinigung für gesetzlichen Arbeiterschutz) was founded in 1900 in Paris. It decided the creation of an international labour office, set up in Basle the following year. It was a private organisation but several states subsidized the enterprise. Regulating women’s night work was defined as the priority. With the outcome of the international conference of 1906, in Bern, the objective was achieved. The international organisation adopted two conventions, one concerning the prohibition of white phosphor in the matchmaking industries, the other the prohibition of women’s industrial night work, that is from ten o’clock in the evening till five in the morning. After the First World War, the newly created International Labour Organisation (ILO) integrated this measure into its own corpus of regulations during its first conference, in 1919 in Washington, with the adoption of Convention number four. Switzerland, as a member of the ILO, which had approved the convention, implemented it by promulgating in 1922 a law banning women and young people from night work in artisan and small businesses (Gewerbe) that where not included in the federal Factory Act, but were already protected to a certain extent by cantonal laws. In 1934, the ILO amended the international convention, so that women with supervising functions be allowed to work at night.

Why did women accept (with some exceptions that only confirmed the rule) protective legislation of women’s labour, and later the family wage, although both put them at a disadvantage on the labour market and reaffirmed their obligations within household and family, thereby reinforcing their unequal status? To the extended discussion of this question, I will return later. In the meantime, I want to highlight the strong argument that was put forward in the 1930s, originating from the point of view of public health, that the family wage had become emblematic of social progress.

The perception that the employment of married women in factories was still an unavoidable nuisance was also adapted to the particular position of working-class women and to a context in which prevailed the consensus that married women’s industrial work was (an unavoidable) nuisance. As stated unequivocally by Hélène Burniaux, speaker on the question of protective legislation at the international women workers’ trade union conference in 1927 the ‘bourgeois’ women’s associations demands of total equality went against the interests of ‘working women’. For working-class women, it was not an either or choice between class and gender. Their solidarity lay with their class because they accepted what they would call an arrangement between genders, centred around family values, with a division of gender roles. They also acted in solidarity with their husbands or more generally the men of their class who were demanding the family wage. At the same time they pursued their own gender strategy, which was not the same as that of the middel- and upper-class women (although there were also some shared interests and positions). By accepting a ‘certain just and reasonable degree of discrimination’ (as stated in 1935 by the International Women Workers’ Trade Union Committee, affiliated with the International Trade Union Federation), working-class women attempted to preserve a delicate balance between male working-class identity based on gender differences, that is essentially hierarchic, and a female identity which accepted these differences, but attempted to reduce their hierarchical feature in order to secure their right to remunerated work.

Though Swiss protective legislation for women was not significantly developed further in the 20th century, except to include more professional categories of female workers, it had become emblematic of social progress. This also holds true for international norms. Making women work with certain machines or at certain tasks was labeled uncivilized. Such a perception was grounded on a specific representation of gender relations and of masculinity and femininity. The gender specific legal protection did not only respond to a particular reality, but it also contributed to the construction of this reality. The protective measures at work helped to form and fix conceptions of femininity and masculinity by defining which working conditions were acceptable for women and which for men, and therefore which behaviour and roles were fitting for each sex. While heaving large loads or working on dangerous machines ran contrary to the definition of women as feeble beings, therefore challenging the masculine identity, pregnancy and parturition were considered in accord with women’s nature. In the Swiss case, the majority of the members of parliament considered the bearing of children a natural act free of State interference. The intervention of the legislator could therefore be limited to a strict minimum in order to avoid health risks for pregnant women and young mothers. Confronted with the dilemma that, contrary to restrictive measures such as the banning of Sunday
and night work, a redistributive social policy on maternity would imply costs, the members of parliament regularly opted to postpone the question, notwithstanding that they had declared it important while drafting the factory act of 1877 and then again at its revision in the years preceding the war. Even after the Swiss delegates had voted the Washington Convention on maternity protection in 1919, government and parliament could not decide upon its implementation it²⁹. 

The prospect of the implementation of a maternity insurance became more and more unlikely in the 1920s and 30s when body politics turned its attention away from the regulation to other social measures. This was the time when local state-funded welfare activity knew an unprecedented boom: an increasing number of employers and several towns and cantons, particularly in Western Switzerland, – where the influence of France was noticeable – introduced family allowances, and private industry began to create pension funds. National insurance lagged behind, yet health and accident insurance were set up in 1911. A federal law (Bundesgesetz) on unemployment came into effect in 1925, and discussions about old age insurance were running high. All these schemes and interventions were profoundly gender specific, insofar as they were based on the notion of the male breadwinner and the dependent housewife. These measures were embedded in a flow of discourses on the protection of the family, especially large ones, and on the threat of depopulation. In 1923, the French-speaking canton of Vaud boasted a league for the protection of the family (Ligue vaudoise pour la protection de la famille), and in 1929 the Catholic Josef Escher introduced the first parliamentary postulate (less constraining than a motion) in favour of financial assistance for large families³⁰. In the 1930s the debates spilled over from social reform societies and catholic-conservative political circles to the sphere of public opinion. The topic of ‘family protection’ dominated the general assemblies of various associations. Even the trade unions, as well as the Alliance of women’s societies (Bund Schweizerischer Frauenvereine, the largest progressive women’s association) devoted meetings, workshops and debates to the question. The issue filled the columns of journals and newspapers³¹.

The preoccupation with women’s reproductive functions stood at the centre of the debates on the organisation of the family. Heretofore associated with factory work, the problem of the birth-rate and the health of the young generation was now located in the family itself. Several factors account for this change of focus. On one hand, the proportion of married women in the female workforce had sunken drastically: from 30.6% in 1920 it went down statistically to 25.8% in 1941³². Overall the proportion of employed women in the female population between 15 and 64 dropped steadily from 46.9% in 1910 to 35.5% in 1941 when it began to rise again. A decrease in absolute numbers only started in 1920, when the female workforce still counted 635,444 persons, to reach the low point of 570,215 in 1941³³. On the other hand, the question of the delimitation of male and female occupations and tasks in industry, which seemed jeopardised by mechanisation, had been firmly redrawn on the practical, as well as on the symbolic level – not the least by the protective legislation. The lower-classes had adopted the notion of the wife’s responsibility for the well-being of the family, even if during the inter-war years the non-employed housewife and mother was still not a generalised reality. This recasting of the family order had been reinforced by the 1907 civil code that legally defined the sexual division of labour in the family. Finally, in the interwar period, women’s factory work was no longer considered a major social problems. The sites of contest over social policy as body politics – where women stood at the centre – were now oriented directly towards the family. The labour market remained an object of political and discursive attention only concerning men’s roles as husbands, fathers and main breadwinners and the claim of a family wage. Why, then, did the site of work come again into the heart of conflicts over the gender order in the thirties?

The debate on married women’s employment in the civil service in the 1930s

On the 25th September 1931, the Swiss member of parliament, Max Johann Z’graggen, put forward a question to the government: "Is the Federal Council (Bundesrat) not of the opinion that considering the hard times caused by the crisis [...] the double income (Doppelverdienst) of well-to-do people should be eliminated as far as possible? In particular, measures against those ‘double-earners’ seem justified, where the husband earns enough to guarantee a sufficient and appropriate standard of living without the female income"³⁴. What he had in mind was that the government should pressure the cantons into taking all kinds of restrictive measures. Until the regression of unemployment in 1937, and then again during the war, over a dozen parliamentary interventions at communal, cantonal and federal level were presented regarding that question³⁵. Most of those who intervened were members of the Peasant, Artisans and Self-employed Party and the Catholic-Conservatives, and, on the local level, some belonged to the fascist National Front. But the left, the Social-Democratic Party and many trade unions, did not lag behind. In May 1932, the metal workers’ paper wrote: "[...] it is an obvious injustice when husband and wife of one and only family receive an income of over 10,000 francs, while a father, head of a family has no possibility to find a job"³⁶.

The Swiss debates were analogous to those in other countries³⁷. It focussed particularly on the civil service since, in times of depression, civil servants were considered a privileged group in society. The metal workers’ paper mentioned above went on: "He [the worker, B.S.] sees civil servants with an income that amounts twice what he gets annually, and wives who receive high salaries from a private or public job, who have no children and are able to possess a car – but he is hungry"³⁸. The article went on to denounce civil servants who accepted work during their free time or even during their holidays. The same theme can be found in nearly all declarations and articles: every second income, which of course lead to a more comfortable standard of living, was attacked as unjustified and unjust. When it came to practical measures, however, all that was advocated...
were legal dispositions which would limit paid work for married women. Over and over again, articles and letters to the editor complained about the luxury in which certain couples were living thanks to the second income... of the wife. Volkrecht, the Zurich social-democratic daily newspaper, criticised the female bank clerk who kept her job after marriage and who could use her 'pocket money' (that is her salary, B. S.) for fur coats, for car rides and holidays abroad. But, of course, she would not have children. This brings up another topic which recurred with tiresome regularity; the 'egoism', the 'stinginess' or the 'materialism' of the 'Doppelverdienster'. Although the last term was specifically used by fascist parties like the National Front, the accusation of voluntary childlessness to allow a woman to take on waged work and to have an easier life, was in no way particular to any political group. The extreme-right newspaper, Die Front, put it neatly: 'No children, but a car instead'.

The terms in which the problem was put seem to indicate that the conflict was about social justice or, as Alice Kessler-Harris has suggested, about workplace justice. According to that interpretation, work in a time of economic crisis and unemployment had the status of a public resource, which had to be fairly distributed. This implied that the breadwinner, male or female, ought to be entitled to a job first, since he or she had to care for dependent family members. In a popular moral code, it appeared untenable that some had no income and others had two, furthering, as Kessler-Harris remarks, the consumption of luxury goods. Margaret Hobbs, though finding convincing the argument of workplace justice, goes further in arguing that work should not be considered as a neutral site, but as profoundly gendered. Assumptions about male and female identity form the basis for the established hierarchy of working rights. For masculinity and virility, work was central. The manner in which the problem was discussed publicly in the case of Switzerland indicates that the question of 'Doppelverdienst' served, indeed, as a code for expressing a deep anxiety and dissatisfaction about the gender order as well as the social order. Put differently, the question of married women's work in the civil service inspired a discourse that merged quite different problematics. The double income became a symbol for social and sexual disorders. Around the issue of women's right to work stood the questions of legitimate 'rights' to work, the family hierarchy, the sexual division of labour, the segregation of the labour market, and the gender-specific distribution of social power and status. A letter written by a young and unemployed business employee illustrates in a particularly expressive way the role of gender for the social order and citizenship:

"Is it not absurd", he asked, "when in the Swiss economic activity thousands and thousands of female domestics have to come from other countries, while our girls find employment with the federal, the cantonal or local administration. Is it not as absurd, that young business employee and office clerks who are compelled to do military service cannot find a job, while sisters, cousins, etc. occupy well-paid jobs in the public service? How will this unequal treatment be justified, when a young business employee has to present all kinds of diplomas, but pretty girls without any trade or professional training, find employment in public administrations, right away from high-school?"

This letter illustrates why the jobs in civil service were particularly sought after. For one thing, the author expressed a very common argument in the debate, i.e. that these jobs were defined as rather qualified, requiring special training and were therefore relatively well paid. They were considered emblematic of jobs designated for a breadwinner. But as public administration made no discrimination in salaries between men and women, in theory at least, there was a general impression that the upper echelons of the work hierarchy, with high salaries and social status were no longer male prerogatives. The author also dwells on an aspect rarely expressed in such a direct way in the debate, but which was nevertheless revealing about the gender-based conflicts on citizenship rights. In his opinion, the secure jobs in public administration ought to be attributed according to civic merits. In a certain way these jobs were meant as compensation to the male citizen for the duties fulfilled for his country as a soldier. In opening such jobs to women, then still deprived of political rights, this logic of attribution was broken.

Seen from this angle it did not matter that the number of women effectively occupying such jobs, and who in addition were married, bore no relation with the scope of the debate. Women in such occupations were highly visible, not only because of the symbolic dimension of their presence in a domain defined as masculine, but also literally, since they were quite often in direct contact with the public. As revealed by inquiries initiated by parliamentary interventions and also by public pressure, even a extremely generous estimate of the numbers involved came to near 2000 cases, where a husband or a wife employed by the federal state lived with a spouse who also had a paid job. With over 63,000 public employees this would have amounted to a bit more than 3 percent. Most cases came from the administration of transports and from the postal services. Working for the railroad service, 750 female gate-keepers and 60 small station masters were counted. The large majority was married - reflecting in this the recruitment policy of the employer. As the government explained to parliament, these jobs were 'not suited for men', the pay was too low to feed a family, and this kind of the work required a permanent attendance 24 hours a day - which explained why these jobs were given to married women, since they were not supposed to be geographically mobile.

From another point of view, moreover, the proposed measures against the 'Doppelverdienster' seemed totally out of proportion with 'the problem'. Most political interventions, as well as public statements in articles and letters to the press, asked for legal restrictions on the employment of married women. Many cantons already had legal dispositions to force female civil servants in schools and in public administration to quit their jobs upon marriage. For instance, in 1922, the urban canton of Basel-Stadt had introduced such a rule for teachers; in 1926, it extended it to all female civil servants. Many other cantonal and local
governments took similar measures or implemented a celibacy clause in the twenties and thirties. On the national level, the legal measure became generalised with the law on the status of federal functionaries in 1927. In view of the government’s proposed policy, it was only due to the protests of women’s organisations that women remained eligible as civil servants. Thanks also to the Alliance of women’s societies, the rule allowing break or modification of contracts for reason of marriage remained only a threat, and not an obligation, as in the preceding ordinances of several federal services.

For all these reasons, the federal government repeatedly refused to comply with the restrictive demands presented by members of parliament. Still, the government officially disapproved of ‘double positions’ held by couples. It instructed the administration to eliminate as far as possible existing cases, and not to create new ones when a job had to be filled again. This policy seemed to have had some effect, since in its 1940 report on current affairs the government could announce that, according to a recent internal survey, practically no cases of ‘double income’ remained in the federal administration.

Conclusion

In contrast to the conflicts over women’s factory work in the last quarter of the 19th century, the debate over the ‘double income’ resulted in rather modest legislative consequences. Only few local and cantonal administrations introduced an official and absolute ‘marriage bar’, while the federal administration merely retained the flexible rule of 1927 concerning civil servants. It nevertheless hardened its practice. It was in fact on the level of social norms that the effects of this discursive phenomenon were more important. To delegitimize the wage work of married women, a legal ban was not necessary. Given the force of social pressure and the ‘precarisation’ of married women’s work posed by the already existing legal prescriptions, those who insisted on staying in the labour market had to present strong reasons indeed: that she was single, widowed or divorced or that her husband was unable to work, or that he did not earn enough to support his family. Such conditions created a social climate where highly qualified women, especially those married to well-paid men, stood under particular pressure to justify themselves – a configuration that did not escape the attention of women’s organisations like the Alliance of women’s societies.

Thus, besides the fact that different social stratas were involved, - working-class women in the case of the debates around women’s factory work, (lower) middle-class women in the case of the debates around clerical work, – the questions at stake were similar, and it seems that the effects were comparable, too. In each case the conflicts touched upon the question of a gender-based workplace hierarchy and a segregation of the labour market along gender lines. At the same time, the negotiations on these questions were not without direct implications on the division of roles and tasks in the domestic sphere. The restriction of women’s employment to certain activities defined as female, and to certain moments in the day and the week, respective to a certain civic status pointed to women’s place in the family, and reinforced men’s role as breadwinners.

As women’s factory work at the end of the 19th century, in the 1930s women’s work in the tertiary sector, more precisely in the civil service, served as a site of discursive conflict and re-negotiation of the gender order. Gender, in these years of economic and cultural crisis, stood at the centre of a confluence of a number of concerns: the division of labour in the work sphere and in the family, the vertical segregation and the gendered hierarchy of jobs, the role of the breadwinner in times of unemployment and supposed female emancipation and not least anxiety over masculine and feminine identity. All these worries touched upon both gender relations and the social order. When many people expressed publicly their concerns over economic justice, these rested upon a conception of the gender system based on the male breadwinner. Society regulated access to a workplace according to certain criteria, in which gender and civil status figured prominently. But the discussions took place in an entirely different context from the one of the special protection for working women. The debates about the ‘Doppelverdienertum’ were part of the discursive and political mobilisation over the conservative recasting of the gender order in the thirties. Indeed, contrary to the debate over factory work, women’s interests in the thirties had no place inside the discursive frame of the ‘double income’. As stated earlier in this article, many activists of the nineteenth-century women’s movement, as well as most female leaders of the workers’ movement understood the protective legislation as favouring the conciliation of paid work and motherhood. The interpretation was of course not the prevalent one. In comparison, the debate over the employment of women civil servants in the thirties left for those concerned only the space for a defensive position against the contestation of the legitimarc of women’s work in jobs considered secure and relatively well-paid. Bread winners’ jobs in the representations of the time. Not a good starting position for negotiations!

NOTES

1) Protokolle des Verfassungsrates des eidgenössischen Standes Zürich 1868-1899. Sitzung vom Donnerstag, dem 5. November 1868, (s. l., s. a.), p. 8. - My gratitude goes to Andree Lévesque for her careful reading of my English and her sensible and inspiring remarks on this text.

2) Several cantons had legislated already before, though only two had made laws that concerned not only children but adults as well. Until 1874 the legislative competence for the regulation of working conditions in factories lied with the cantons and not with the federal state. For a historical overview of this early period see Heinz Düllnben, Kantone, Bund und Fabrikgesetzgebung. Die parlamentarisch Debatte und die publizistische Diskussion zu den kantonalen Fabrikgesetzen 1853 bis 1873 und zum ersten eidgenössischen Fabrikgesetz vom 23. März 1877 (Zurich, Jura, 1961). Earlier works are due mostly to social reformers and trade unionists: Julius Landmann, Die Arbeiterenschutz-Gesetze.
12) 'Bericht der Mehrheit der ständlichen Kommission zur Vorbereitung des Fabrikgesetzes vom 30.
11) 'Bot schrift des Bundesrates an die hohe Bundesversammlung, betr. den Gesetzesentwurf über die
10) ...
7) Michel Foucault, 'Eingabe des Schweizerischen Arbeiterbundes an die hohe schweizerische Bundesversammlung in
6) Erich Gruner, 'The most comprehensive study on workers' position is Erich Gruner.
5) The division between skilled and unskilled workers was never contested, at least as far as salaries were concerned.
4) ... It is only lately that this approach has been taken up by gender history. See
3) ... Informative, though rather deterministic and teleological...
2) ...
1) ...

24) Schweizerisches Bundesblatt, 5 (1920), p. 437. For the wording of the 'Convention internationale sur l'interdiction du travail de nuit des femmes employées dans l'industrie; signée à Berne, le 26 septembre 1906' and 'Convention internationale sur l'interdiction de l'emploi du phosphore blanc (jaune) dans l'industrie des allumettes; signée à Berne, le 26 septembre 1906' see Gr. Fr. de Mürten, Nouveau recueil général de traités et autres actes relatifs aux rapports de droit international, série III, tome II (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 601-871 and 872-877.


27) Comité syndical international des travailleuses affiliées à la Fédération syndicale internationale, 'Memoandum soumis à la session de septembre 1935 de l'assemblée de la SDN', Archives of the Swiss Trade Union Congress, Berne, G 153 / 6.

28) It is significant that in the process of application of the law, the authorities granted numerous exceptions for men's work, but practically none for women's work. Cf. Das Bundesgesetz betreffend die Arbeit in den Fabriken vom 23. März 1877. Kommentiert durch seine Ausführung in den Jahren 1878-1899. Hg. vom schweizerischen Industriepartement (Bern, Schmid and Franche, 1900).


31) The Alliance of women's societies was in favour of family allowances since 1926, although in a different optic than most other social actors. The organisation hoped for an independent female income and thereby also a symbolic recognition of the maternal function by the state. The dominant semantic and the practices which were finally implemented looked quite different. See Studer, 'Familienzulagen', pp. 164-170.
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