

The Dividing Power of the Wage: Housework as Social Subversion

.....
Christina Rousseau recently completed her Ph.D. in Humanities at York University. She is currently a sessional instructor in both Canadian Studies and Gender and Women's Studies at Trent University, and is also an independent researcher and writer. Her main teaching, research, and writing interests focus on issues related to social reproduction; gender, the body, and sexuality; gender and work; and social movement organizing.
.....

Abstract

In this article, I revisit the Wages for Housework (WfH) perspective and movement in order to recover Marxist-feminist analyses of social reproduction. Social reproduction remains an important site of contestation, especially as women continue to bear the brunt of an increasingly neo-liberalized economy. WfH's nuanced view of wages and housework, I argue, should be reconsidered as a point of departure in responding to new forms of oppression in a re-organized economy.
.....

Résumé

Dans cet article, je revisite la perspective et le mouvement « salaire au travail ménager » afin de retrouver les analyses marxistes féministes de la reproduction sociale. La reproduction sociale demeure un champ important de contestation, d'autant que les femmes continuent à faire les frais d'une économie de plus en plus néolibérale. La vision nuancée du mouvement « salaire au travail ménager » au sujet des salaires et des tâches ménagères, devrait à mon avis être reconsidérée comme point de départ pour répondre aux nouvelles formes d'oppression dans une économie réorganisée.

Feminist scholars have increasingly been taking up the issue of care, a form of invisible emotional labour that permeates multiple aspects of women's lives (Boris and Parreñas 2010; Folbre 2001; Hochschild 2003a; Kofman and Raghuram 2015). In addition to the exacerbated exploitation of women on a global scale, care is also an important issue when sexist expectations dictate that women ought to be responsible for the emotional well-being of men, whether they are bosses, co-workers, intimate partners, or just some random man on the street telling you to smile. Women also continue to bear the burden of emotional labour and the care of the family in order to mitigate some of the pressures of the restructured neoliberal economy. One of the earliest groups to address the issue of care as a form of emotional labour was Wages for Housework (WfH), an international Marxist-feminist grassroots movement that began in Italy in 1972 and then spread to other countries including Canada, the United States, England, and Switzerland. Through written pamphlets and public presentations, WfH activists argued that women's oppression was rooted in the unequal power hierarchy produced by unpaid work performed in the household where the forces of patriarchy and capitalism intersected in critical ways. Rather than further entrench women in domestic labour, they maintained that wages would give them the power to refuse this work (Mian 1975). In broadly defining what constituted unpaid household work, they also engaged in various related struggles. These included the fight for access to abortion and contraceptives and the critique of forced sterilization and other restrictive reproductive policies aimed at marginalized women as well as the struggles for the right to sexual self-determination as they pertained to lesbians, welfare rights, and access to childcare and healthcare (Comitato per il Salario al Lavoro Domestico di Padova 1975; Ramirez 1977, 1978, 1979; Rousseau 2015).

Emotional labour, or care, is one of the most insidious forms of housework uncovered by WfH

feminists in the 1970s. In this paper, I revisit the WfH movement and consider the context in which it emerged, focusing on the movements in Italy and Canada. Drawing on the writings produced by WfH thinkers and activists as well as interviews I conducted with seven women involved in the movement in Italy (Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Silvia Federici, and Antonella Picchio) and Canada (Dorothy Kidd, Nicole Lacelle, Louise Toupin, and Francie Wyland), I explore WfH theoretical and political perspectives on questions related to wages and domestic work and how these were linked to broader struggles in the gendered sphere of reproduction. I also examine how the socialist-feminist analyses produced by WfH movement continue to have relevance in formulating responses to contemporary forms of oppression in a re-organized economy, particularly when we consider the work of care and emotional labour.

Theoretical Context: Domestic Labour Debate

In the 1970s, North American socialists, Marxists, and feminists (with some overlap in orientations) engaged in what is known as the domestic labour debate, which focused on the relationship between housework and women's subordination. Two main perspectives informed the debate. Some theorists concentrated on how housework was situated capitalist social relations and considered whether or not domestic labour is productive in a Marxist sense. This economic investigation of housework was primarily concerned with uncovering capital's creation of and reliance on housework and transposing analyses traditionally focused on the factory to the household (Briskin 1980; Harrison 1973; Seccombe 1980). Other theorists were more interested in the role of women vis-à-vis housework and how feminist political practice might address gendered relations in the household (Barrett 1980; Chodorow 1978; Delpy 1984). Though various important texts emerged on both sides of the debate in the 1970s and early 1980s (Blumenfeld and Mann 1980; Coulson, Magaš, and Wainwright 1975; Gardiner 1975; Holmstrom 1981; Molyneux 1979; Seccombe 1974; Vogel 1981), I will focus on three texts produced in the early years of the debate that were crucial in laying the foundation for the subsequent discussions: Margaret Benston's "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation" (1969), Peggy Morton's "A Woman's Work is Never Done" (1971), and

Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James' *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community* (1972).

In Canada, Margaret Benston was one of the key feminist scholars to initiate the domestic labour debate with the publication of her 1969 article, "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation." Because this piece had such a significant impact (Holmstrom 2003), I would suggest that it marked the beginning of the domestic labour debate even though the earlier work of writers like Mary Inman (1941) and Juliet Mitchell (1966) provided important socialist feminist analyses of women's oppression.¹ Copies of Benston's article were circulated among feminist and consciousness raising groups in Canada prior to its publication and her work soon formed the basis of a debate among Marxist and socialist feminists about women's oppression under capitalism, which focused on the role of unwaged labour in the household as its root (Benston 1969; Fox 1980, 2009; Luxton 1980, 2001; Seccombe 1974).

In her piece, Benston (1969) critiqued society's resistance to recognizing child-rearing and other forms of domestic labour as work, showing how paid forms of this work (i.e. daycare, cleaning services, etc.) made this classification easier. For Benston, the work women did was different from that of men; housework did not count as work because it was not attached to a wage: "To pay women for their work, even at minimum wage scales, would imply a massive redistribution of wealth" (23). She further argued that women were permitted to enter the workforce as secondary wage earners as long as they were not negligent in their primary responsibility: childcare. Even as women were granted more equal access to employment, they had not been granted the liberation many sought due to the persistence of housework (21) and the extra burden placed on them as both waged and unwaged workers. In Benston's view, women constituted a separate class because housework was "pre-capitalist" and their relation to the means of production was different than that of male waged workers (13-14). The assertion that women constituted a separate class clearly overlooked the intersections of race and gender in familial and social relations, the class differences that exist among women, and the ways in which the working class is stratified according to wages. While heteronormative social pressures may compel many women to marry, sex (or gender) does not represent a condition similar to class.

Peggy Morton's "A Woman's Work is Never Done" first appeared in 1970 and an expanded version was then published in 1971. Much of Morton's (1971) analysis was similar to Benston's; however, she emphasized the need to develop a foundation upon which to build a strategy for liberation: "Our revolutionary potential lies in the fact that most women are both oppressed as women and exploited as workers, and our strategy must reflect this duality" (224). While Benston (1969) argued that women would see material changes in their lives once housework was socialized and they were able to enter the workforce (21), Morton (1971) maintained that such an approach to liberation would fail because it did not take into account the changing nature of the family as an economic institution or the shifting demands of the labour market (214). For example, Morton discussed how women were pushed out of industry jobs as the need for job training increased. Since women were seen as requiring time off for child-birth and child rearing, investing time and money on their training was not seen as cost effective. As labour demands shifted, however, women's presence in the workplace increased, indicating that they were central to capitalist production (even as a reserve army of labour) especially given that they often filled low-waged positions (221-223). As a liberation strategy, Morton advocated organizing around issues that would give women economic independence like access to abortion and birth control. Addressing such needs was not seen as an end in itself, but as a means through which to develop revolutionary consciousness: "We can give expression to the needs that women have and at the same time raise the level of these struggles through militant actions around some of these issues" (227). This call to build struggles out of specific demands was similar to the strategy adopted by the WfH movement.

Mariarosa Dalla Costa and Selma James' (1972) *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community* was also influential in the domestic labour debate, laying the theoretical foundation for the development of a Marxist-feminist praxis aimed at attacking the oppressive nature of housework. Informed by the discussions at the meeting of the International Feminist Collective in Padua in 1972, Dalla Costa wrote an essay called "Women and the Subversion of the Community." This piece was published along with Selma James' "A Woman's Place" as *The Power of Women and the Sub-*

version of the Community in 1972 and was foundational to the WfH perspective. In this work, Dalla Costa and James examined unwaged housework in the United States, Britain, and Italy in order to demonstrate how capitalism was predicated on the oppression of women. Women, they argued, were not only oppressed by the sexual division of labour in the household, but also by their position in the working class. In providing a Marxist-feminist investigation of the changing nature of the working class, the authors identified wagelessness as the major dividing line between workers. Building on Benston's (1969) and Morton's (1971) analysis, they identified unpaid housework as the root of women's oppression. As a strategy for liberation, Dalla Costa and James focused on the demand for the housework wage as critical in the struggle against the exploitative nature of capitalism because it produced the capacity to refuse this work and to subvert social relations.

For Dalla Costa and James, the family unit was essential for capitalist production and all women could be classified as housewives whether or not they also worked for a wage outside the home. Dalla Costa's latter assertion was based on a nuanced definition of housework, recognizing that it was not only a type of work, but also constituted a "quality of life and quality of relationships which it generates, that determine a woman's place wherever she is and to whichever class she belongs" (Dalla Costa and James 1972, 21). In other words, it was capitalist social relations that gendered housework as feminine. According to Dalla Costa and James, the working-class housewife represented the position of all women. It was precisely the lack of wages that obfuscated the productive nature of housework. For Dalla Costa, women's exploitation as household workers did not end when they left the home and worked for wages:

The question is, therefore, to develop forms of struggle which do not leave the housewife peacefully at home...we must discover forms of struggle which immediately break the whole structure of domestic work, rejecting it absolutely, rejecting our role as housewives and the home as the ghetto of our existence, since the problem is not only to stop doing this work, but to smash the entire role of housewife. (Dalla Costa and James 1972, 36)

The struggle for wages, therefore, was presented as ne-

cessary for abolition of housework and the liberation of women.

An analysis of the emotional complexity of the family unit and domestic labour was largely absent in the more economic writings produced during the domestic labour debate (Briskin 1980; Harrison 1973). Benston (1969), however, did identify the emotional elements of housework, asserting that relationships formed with friends or co-workers were not valued in the same way as the mother-father-child relationship within the nuclear family was. For her, the emotional ties of the nuclear family tended to create a stable workforce, in that male workers as “family wage” earners were less likely to withhold their labour power. That said, the so-called nuclear family ideal is a Western, Eurocentric, middle-class construction that was normalized by the church and state. Its emergence was intimately connected to imperial and colonial expansion and the rise of capitalism. As such, the nuclear family model has been shaped not only by capitalism and patriarchy, but also by racism. While some early second wave feminists identified women’s liberation from the confines of the nuclear family as a central goal of the movement (Millet 1970; Greer 1970), this vision did not take into account role of the family unit in the lives of marginalized women. Morton (1971), for example, cautioned against calling for an outright abolition of the family because of the contradictory role it played in women’s lives. While it constituted a site of women’s oppression, the family was also a unit where the basic needs for love, support, and companionship were met.

Wages for Housework

Organization and Political Framework

The WfH movement drew from two main tenets of feminism. First, it was influenced by the socialist feminist perspective that maintained that women’s emancipation was connected to the broader working-class movement. Second, it revisited the works of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in an effort to analyze the reproductive and productive oppression of women inside and outside the home. Approaching women’s oppression from a historical materialist perspective, Marxist-feminism examined material forces and class relations, arguing that women’s oppression was connected directly to class position and the operations of patriarchy specific to capitalism. In other words, patriarchy was not the-

orized as a freestanding system. In their re-reading of Marx and Engels, WfH thinkers also borrowed from anti-colonial scholars and movements in order to deepen their analysis of unwaged labour and to challenge distinctions between productive and reproductive forms of labour.² The household, they argued, was the basis of the factory system rather than its alternative (Miles 1974).

Beginning in 1972, WfH emerged as a response to the politics of the New Left. During my interviews, both Italian and Canadian WfH theorists and activists indicated that they were critical of the tendency of many men in the New Left to dismiss women’s specific struggles around unpaid work in the household, to conflate women’s and factory workers’ oppression, and to subordinate feminist struggles to a homogenous working-class struggle. Silvia Federici (2012a) discussed the different forms of resistance that feminists in Italy had to confront:

I was part of a process where women in Padua put out a journal, which was, in part, a response to some of these attacks that different groups, different parts of *autonomia*, were making on the feminist movement... The anomaly of the situation in Italy was that they had to deal not only with the right, but also with the Left in a much more serious way because it was very prominent in the social scene.

In 1972, feminists from several countries (Canada, the United States, England, and Italy) met in Padua to discuss feminist activism oriented around the issue of housework. This resulted in the formation of the International Feminist Collective demanding wages for housework and the development of a feminist manifesto that focused on the family and unwaged labour as the root of women’s oppression. The WfH movement adopted a radical and autonomous organizational practice, which meant that its women-only feminist activism was separate from the New Left, the state, and from men (Federici 2012b; Picchio 2012; Toupin 2014).

Federici was instrumental in developing one of WfH’s originating manifestos—*Wages Against Housework* (1975). Born and raised in Italy and then based in New York where she formed a WfH chapter, Federici was connected to autonomist-Marxism. In *Wages Against Housework*, Federici (1975) noted that “Wages

for housework...is a revolutionary demand not because by itself it destroys capital, but because it forces capital to restructure social relations in terms more favorable to us and consequently more favorable to the unity of the class" (19). In other words, the goal behind the demand for wages was not to reify housework as women's responsibility; instead, the aim was to abolish housework in order for capitalist patriarchal domination to be eradicated. Hence, unlike those feminist scholars and activists who focused primarily on women's exclusion from the paid labour force and legal structures (Friedan 1963; MacKinnon 1989; Wendell 1987), Federici (2012b) continued to insist that the home and domestic labour should remain central to the analysis of women's exploitation and revolutionary change.

In contrast to some liberal feminists who argued that working-class and increasingly middle-class women's entry into the paid labour force constituted a form of emancipation (Friedan 1963) and allowed them to become "economic actors in their own right" (Eisenstein 2009, 39), feminists involved in WfH campaigns promoted a broader revolutionary model of liberation that addressed the social and economic structures that fostered systematic gender inequalities. They drew on the notion of the social factory, which was connected to Italian autonomist-Marxism or *operaismo* (workerism). They argued that capital's hegemony was so dominant that every social relationship was incorporated within this system, making it increasingly difficult to draw distinctions between what was social and what was work. *Operaismo* moved from a sole focus on the factory and waged production to a consideration of the social factory and unwaged work in the home as sites of struggle (Tronti 2006, 2009). Building on this work, WfH maintained that housework and relationships in the home, which had long been considered separate from the work of the factory, must be acknowledged as part of and as the basis of the factory system and as *work*. From a socialist-feminist perspective, the liberation of women required the defeat of capitalism and a "Marxist-inspired alternative" whether it be socialist or communist (Eisenstein 2009, 57).

For some feminists in the 1960s and 1970s, identifying the home and the family as the origin of women's oppression meant the rejection of the family structure. This entailed not only controlling the number of children one bore as a measure to mitigate against

"overwork," but also often entailed refusing marriage and procreation altogether (Dunbar 1970; Frye 1983; Solanas 1967). As such, reproduction became a major terrain of struggle. The rejection of unpaid reproduction would provide women with the opportunity to define themselves outside of their role in the family with options for work outside the home and the chance to build capacity for struggle.

Wages and Housework

For those active in the WfH movement, home and housework were considered key sites of political struggle. The potential for social subversion was imagined beyond the narrow vision articulated by the New Left that saw struggles limited to the workplace; the community and the family were sites where women could fight for change in their lives. WfH's demand for wages and their political perspective sought to demystify the hierarchical structures used to divide the working class. Feminists operating from the WfH perspective emphasized that the demand for a wage was for *housework*, not for *housewives*; the strategic demand for the wage related to the power it held and was not designed to restrict women to the role of housewife. The power associated with the wage meant the creation of greater opportunities to struggle and to subvert social and economic power relations (Cox and Federici 1975; Dalla Costa and James 1972; Federici 1975).

The link between wages and work was contentious in terms of what counted as "real" work and what *mattered* in a class-based analysis. According to Dalla Costa (1988), "...the family was identified as the other factory...within which the woman was exploited and not just oppressed as the prevalent literature claimed, caged in a form of labour—housework—with an unlimited working day, no wage, no vacation, no pension, and no social assistance" (25). The concept of the social factory offered a way to view reproduction in the home in a similar manner to the production that took place in the factory. Unlike workers who were paid for their labour, a housewife was limited in the way she could negotiate the terms of her work in the home because there was no wage exchanged for her labour power. In *Counter-Planning from the Kitchen*, Nicole Cox and Silvia Federici (1975) highlighted the importance of the wage as an instrument in fighting against oppression:

Our power as women begins with the social struggle for the wage, not to be let into the wage relation (for, though we are unwaged, we were never out of it) but to be let out, for every sector of the working class to be let out. Here we have to clarify the nature of our wage struggles. When the left maintains that wage demands are ‘economist’, ‘union demands’, they seem to ignore that the wage, as well as the lack of it, is the direct measure of our exploitation and therefore the direct expression of the power relation between capital and the working class and within the working class. They also seem to ignore the fact that the wage struggle takes many forms and it is not confined to wage raises. Reduction of work-time, more and better social services, as well as money—all these are wage gains which immediately determine how much of our labour is taken away from us and therefore how much power we have over our lives. (11)

As Cox and Federici suggested, whether or not they received pay for their work, all workers operated in relation to the wage. This key 1975 WfH document articulated the importance of the wage as it was connected to structures of power and highlighted the different ways in which WfH envisioned fighting for wages in a concrete sense and in the form of social wages. Social wages were meant to provide a certain basic standard of living for individuals on the basis of citizenship, rather than employment, and included welfare, family benefits, healthcare, childcare, and so on. According to Federici (2012b), “Welfare mothers...denounced the absurdity of the government policy that recognizes childcare as work only when it involves the children of others, thus paying the foster parent more than the welfare mother” (43). The position of welfare mothers amplified and clarified the position of all housewives.

WfH activists in Canada focused much of their energies on the struggle for welfare provisions, family allowance increases, and divorce law reform so that wives would receive alimony payments that recognized their household labour (Toronto Wages for Housework Committee 1976). WfH’s early work on family allowance provides one example of the link that was made to the question of social wages. Family allowance was issued monthly to all families with children, regardless of income, and was paid directly to the mother. It was often the only income women who worked exclusively in the home received in their own name. The payments also suggested that, at some level, the state recognized

the value of raising children. As Francie Wyland (2012) indicated in her interview, when cuts to family allowance were contemplated in 1970s, women in Toronto mobilized in what was known as the “Hands Off The Family Allowance” campaign:

We went to work early fighting against cuts to the baby bonus. We took petitions door to door in Regent Park. Through that, women came into the movement from those situations. Then later I helped start the Lesbian Mother’s Defense Fund, which were all women with kids. Most of them had left their husbands, but not all of them.

During the campaign, women went door to door, to schools, and to community groups, asking people to sign a petition demanding that the federal government under the leadership of Pierre Elliot Trudeau not claw back the family allowances program as part of larger cutbacks to social services. The flyer attached to the petition read in part as follows:

The \$220,000,000 Baby Bonus increase we were all expecting has fallen victim to the government’s ‘anti-inflation program.’ Why have they seen fit to make one of their biggest cutbacks from the pittance they give mothers? As always, we mothers are the ones who are expected to do without, to put ourselves last, and sacrifice ‘for the good of others.’ (Toronto Wages for Housework Committee 1976)

In addition to the family allowance struggle, the WfH committee in Toronto fought alongside women who attempted to maintain welfare benefits and to facilitate greater access. For a group of women in Winnipeg, the struggle for welfare rights was directly connected to women’s position in the home and the lack of recognition of their unwaged work: “We are certainly not against a woman obtaining a job outside the home...But we are against the assumption that a woman’s work in the home is not worth any financial remuneration, and that going into the workforce is the only mechanism toward financial independence...” (Kidd and Wages Due Lesbians Toronto 1977). In 1979, this group of Winnipeg women also demanded that the government keep its hands off the child tax credit, which the local housing authority was threatening to seize from mothers in rent arrears. Other government authorities were debating whether this money should

also be deducted from welfare amounts. The group's protest was taken up in Ottawa in less than a week and they won the first round when it was ruled that mothers could keep the tax credit (Kidd 1979). Within a month, they had also won commitments from both the City of Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba to exclude child tax credits in calculating social assistance benefits. Other provinces soon followed suit with the same provisions (Johnson 1987). Welfare was presented as a social wage, suggesting that housework had, in some ways, been acknowledged by the state. This expanded view of the wage in the form of family allowance and welfare at least symbolically acknowledged the labour value in raising children (although, of course, social assistance was and is never enough to allow families to live with dignity). The wage, as both a literal cash demand and as an ideological demand, was used to highlight the unwaged work that women performed in the household.

The call to recognize reproductive work was a perspective that WfH feminists articulated and it was meant to extend to the entire working class. As Antonella Picchio (2012) stated in her interview:

It's true that you have to bring this issue to the class, but then you have to challenge the class on the basis of the different quality of this work. So, in fact, instead of saying that we work as waged workers and want to be paid (the pay was the slogan, but the perspective was deeper than the money, though it included the money). At the end, we were, in a sense, trying to connect to the expectations of the waged work and had to, what I would say now, use the quantity of care and the quantity of housework and all that just to challenge the way the class views their whole life—not just their work—and the tensions between their home life and their work.

To say that this struggle was limited to a single demand—that of a wage in the form of cash—discredits and misrepresents what WfH attempted to achieve. If conceptualized as such, it is easy to dismiss the demand as unrealistic, unachievable, or divisive to working-class struggles. These campaigns, however, which were also connected to ones that focused on sexuality and bodily autonomy as discussed below, tackled multiple obstacles that women faced and reflected a nuanced view of housework and wages.

Sexuality and Bodily Autonomy

The fight for reproductive justice has been one of the most significant areas in women's struggles against gender and class based oppression. Such victories as gaining access to contraceptives and abortion as well as the delinking of women's sexuality from its reproductive role have provided women with the opportunity to advance in other areas in the fight against oppression. In Italy, WfH activists prioritized struggles related to sexuality and access to abortion, contraceptives, and healthcare in the 1970s because these issues were, in their view, connected to the central role of procreation in social reproduction and women's oppression and exploitation: "abortion was and is the extreme means of the rejection of motherhood that is, first and foremost, an intensification of the exploitation of women ... to try to lower the pace and reduce the amount of that housework which, because it is not paid, comes to be demanded without limits, and also to make the male wage sufficient" (Movimento per il Salario al Lavoro Domestico 1976, 29; my translation).

In Italy in the 1970s, abortion was generally not discussed openly because it was illegal under the fascist Rocco Code. Though most of these laws had been abolished once Italy became a Republic in 1948, abortion continued to be criminalized until 1981 and women who underwent the procedure faced a maximum penalty of four years in prison (Calloni 2001). An important case that became a rallying point for Italian WfH feminists was that of Gigliola Pierobon. At the age of 17, Pierobon had a clandestine abortion and, as a consequence, was put on trial in Padua in 1973. WfH feminists used the case to advocate for all women who were persecuted, shamed, and forced underground because they feared prosecution for having an abortion. In the end, the tribunal in Padua granted Pierobon judicial forgiveness on the basis that she had been a minor at the time of her abortion, but categorically refused to hear defense testimony that would have made this case stand as a burning example of the condition of women in Italy (Lotta Femminista 1973). The persecution of women who had abortions continued—forty women were arrested in Florence in 1975. Mass-rallies were organized in response and the number of women who participated in them continued to increase; for example, 50,000 women attended a rally in Rome on April 3, 1976 (Bracke 2014, 86).

Italian feminists, including WfH activists who mobilized around the question of access to abortion, contributed to intensified public discussions on the issue. In Italy, the rate of abortions rose significantly during the post-war period, with some claiming that upwards of thirty percent of all conceptions resulted in abortion even though both contraception and abortion were illegal at the time (Birnbaum 1986, 38). There was also a decline in birthrates in the post-war period, which further suggested women's efforts to reduce pregnancies and births (Dalla Costa and Fortunati 1976). This trend was also symptomatic of anxieties over impending war during the Cold War period (Federici 2012b) and a lack of desire on the part of women to support the destructive forces of capital (Dalla Costa and Fortunati 1976). Abortion and the issue of unwanted pregnancy, therefore, were no longer internalized as the personal problems of individual women and instead were considered from the perspective of patriarchal oppression and capitalist exploitation.

Almost three decades after the decriminalization of abortion in Italy (in 1981) and in Canada (in 1988), discussions about women's reproductive health have continued especially as these rights are under attack at various levels. As the site of reproduction, the female body has been a site of exploitation and oppression. In *Caliban and the Witch*, Federici (2003) contends that the female body can also be a site of resistance. Through an examination of the history of witch-hunts as a reaction against the power women had gained through control of their own sexuality and reproductive rights, she maintains that capitalist patriarchal society has relied on the control over women's bodies—from restricting and vilifying contraceptive methods, to persecuting midwives as witches, to denying and outlawing abortion.

When talking about abortion, contraception, and reproductive justice, it is important not gloss over the fact that reproductive health policies disproportionately impact women of colour (INCITE! 2006; Mullings 1996). Women from marginalized communities—including Indigenous women, incarcerated women, women with disabilities, Third World women, lesbians, etc.—have been forced to undergo procedures that limit their reproductive capacities or have had their children taken away. As Wyland (1976) argued, these forms of population control directly serve the interests of capitalism:

Capital *depends* on being able to tell us who we should sleep with and when, which of us should have children and who will be sterilized, how many children we should have, and under what conditions they will be brought up. Some of us are denied birth control and abortions, while others of us have childlessness imposed on us by forced sterilization and abortion, child custody laws and poverty. But whatever our situation, we are fighting for the power to control our own sexuality and our reproductive capacities. (7)

WfH feminists recognized that they could not demand access to abortion and contraceptives while simultaneously ignoring how marginalized women's bodies continued to be controlled. The WfH network, operating at an international level, reframed the struggle for access to abortion and contraceptives as a demand for the broadly defined right to "choose": "*The problem is not abortion. The problem is having the possibility of becoming mothers every time we want to become mothers. Only the times that we want but all the times we want*" (Toro and Colletivo di Lotta Femminista 1972, 86; my translation). In other words, the right to choose was connected to the right to bodily autonomy; this included being able to choose when and if to have children, how many, having access to services to care for children, and being able to afford to clothe and feed the children women did want. Ultimately, this right to choose would give women control over their own bodies and the power to fight against the state's attempt to control their sexuality.

Contrast to Liberal Feminism

This revisiting of the WfH movement comes at a time when we are beginning to see the effects of thirty years of neoliberalism on feminist struggles. It is important to consider the social and political reasons why liberal feminism has achieved relative hegemony while the influence of Marxist and socialist feminisms have diminished significantly. Given that various streams of feminism were active in the 1970s and beyond, it is important not to homogenize either socialist or liberal tendencies. That said, Joan Sangster and Meg Luxton (2013) have presented a comprehensive account of this waning of socialist feminism and the rise of liberal feminism. They identify the decline of socialist states and economies paired with the rise of neoliberalism (with neoliberalism as a partial response to the rise of so-

cialism and New Left movements in many parts of the world) as partially responsible. Mainstream liberal feminism's push for jobs outside the home was supported by deindustrialization and the rise of the service industry as well as the growing need for female labour to be diverted to the kinds of jobs once done for free in the home.

In the 1960s, the demand for female labour began to draw middle-class women into the workforce, a trend that Betty Friedan (1963) associated with their emancipation. According to Hester Eisenstein (2009), "The entry of both working-class and middle-class married women into the paid workforce was accompanied by a 'bourgeois revolution' for women. Liberated from the feudal aspects of the marriage contract, they emerged as economic actors in their own right" (39). In other words, shifts in the labour market were mutually beneficial for capital and for certain groups of women who gained greater access to financial independence.

Beginning in the late 1960s, the National Organization of Women (NOW) became one of the most prominent mainstream liberal feminist organizations in North America. Consistent with the mandate of other liberal feminists of the 1960s and 1970s, NOW advocated for individual women's entry into male-dominated employment and other spaces (NOW 1966), arguing that equal economic opportunities in a capitalist free market system (as well as sexual freedom) were necessary conditions for women's liberation. Although liberal feminists sought to disrupt the ideology of the traditional nuclear family and the family wage model, this work did little to address broader social and economic inequalities. Working-class and racialized women have long been working outside the home for a wage, yet their material conditions have not been altered much in the last thirty to forty years.

In North America in particular, the mainstream feminist movement has, since the 1970s, been critiqued (and this criticism is not limited to a particular "wave") for its tendency to ignore the intersections of gender, race, and class in shaping women's lives (Davis 1983; hooks 1984; and Lorde 1984). In contrast to mainstream feminist tendencies, WfH's materialist analysis allows for the inclusion of race, ethnicity, and class when examining women's oppression and exploitation. Further, in distinguishing Marxist and socialist feminist tenden-

cies from more mainstream feminist movements, it is important to reconsider core concepts like exploitation and oppression (Luxton and Bezanson 2006). Socialist and Marxist feminisms differentiated between exploitation and oppression. Exploitation referred to the expropriation of surplus value from workers by the dominant class; all workers are exploited under capitalism. Oppression is rooted in social relations and hegemonic power (Briskin 1980). In this vein, WfH's theoretical analysis considered women's specific oppression, both as a consequence of their working class status and as a result of their relationship to patriarchy. It is necessary, then, to examine the specific exploitation of women as workers and how they are positioned in social relations in order to develop a nuanced account of the specificity of women's oppression and to devise strategies to refuse these distinctions.

Conclusion

Feminists have long been arguing that "the personal is political" (Hanisch 2009). According to Selma James (2012), the WfH perspective inverted this adage:

When feminism asserted that 'the personal is political' it usually conveyed that women's personal grievances were also political. I wanted to use this occasion to show that the political was profoundly personal, shaping our lives, and that applying Marx's analysis of capitalism to the relations between women and men illuminates them. (143)

When looking back to the domestic labour debate of the 1970s, there continue to be important feminist questions that remain unanswered: What is the relationship between ownership over one's own body and women's right to make decisions about marriage or having children? Is there a connection between the sexual division of labour and women's reproductive health or domestic violence? Further, what would happen if unpaid and unrecognized housework were collectivized (possibly even by the state)? What if jobs were no longer gendered (i.e. stigmatized and downgraded) as "women's work"? If housework were acknowledged as "real work" through the implementation of a wage, would it revolutionize how society perceives domestic labour both inside and outside the home? While the struggle for higher wages and women's access to male-dominated trades are useful as intermediary steps, these strategies do little

to address the situation of working-class women or the international division of labour. Women's liberation is only possible when existing social, political, and economic systems of power and domination are systematically attacked at their roots.

Most WfH activism had halted by 1980. This decline was due to a number of factors, including the general decline of socialist movements in the West, the powerful rise of neoliberalism, the threat of state persecution of activists in Italy, and internal political differences that splintered the WfH network in Canada.³ However, the issues feminists active in the WfH movement engaged with have not disappeared. As economies are increasingly de-industrialized, the job market has become more flexible, the workforce more precarious, and the workplace more unstable. There are also ideological moves to restore women's traditional roles in the household and to assign them primary responsibility for social reproduction. The "...the female ability to shift roles and hybridize professional and personal life" (Fantone 2007, 13) does not sound that different from the idea that, under the male breadwinner ideal, women were the ones responsible for making ends meet on a tight budget (Creese 1999).

Thirty-five years after the decline of WfH, "domestic work has not disappeared, and its devaluation, monetarily and otherwise, continues to be a problem for most of us, whether it is unpaid or done for a wage" (Federici 2012b, 9). While there have been technological improvements that have restructured productive work, there has not been the same kind of advancement in the domestic sphere (106-107). Since the 1980s, housework might have been reorganized, which gives the appearance of a reduced work schedule. However, as Arlie Hochschild (2003b) argues in *The Second Shift*, the double day or second shift has not disappeared in the lives of women who work outside the home. Even though the majority of women in the Western world are employed outside the home, entry into the workforce does not appear to be the key to women's liberation. In many cases in fact, women's participation in the paid workforce has been facilitated by the employment of low-wage live-in caregivers or other precarious care workers (Pratt 2004; Bakan and Stasiulis 2005; Lenard and Straehle 2012). In order to develop a full account of the current implications of women's and especially racialized women's ongoing responsibility for social reproduction, it is

necessary to examine what kind of work is performed, where it is performed, and under what conditions (Ferguson 2008). Given these realities, feminists should also take seriously the political demand for a social wage in the form a guaranteed income—as a mechanism to acknowledge the value of both unpaid and paid domestic labour.

Endnotes

¹ Mary Inman's 1941 book *In Woman's Defense* presented a challenge to the U.S. Communist Party for its inability to offer a meaningful analysis of women's oppression, which she saw as based in their position in the domestic sphere. While Inman viewed both housework and production as beneficial to capital, housework was different because it was not recognized as work. Juliet Mitchell's 1966 essay "Women: The Longest Revolution" (later published as a book entitled *Women's Estate* in 1971) examined classical Marxist writings on the "woman question," which she critiqued as being overly economic. She explored women's social situation in relation to capitalist social relations and the emergence of private property, illustrating the ways in which ideological constructions of women's roles came to be viewed as natural facts.

² The influence of anti-colonial scholarship is most clearly seen in relation to Selma James, who had her early politicization with the Johnson-Forest Tendency in the U.S. In this group, the work of C.L.R. James, Raya Dunayevskaya, and Grace Lee Boggs focused on marginalized sections of the working class, specifically women, youth, and people of colour. James (who eventually married C.L.R. James) lived in Trinidad from 1958-62, and was actively involved in the West Indian independence movement. See James 2012.

³ While the WfH network in Canada had dissolved by 1980, the Lesbian Mothers' Defense Fund remained active in Toronto until 1987. This fund was established in 1978 to support lesbian mothers navigating custody battles in the homophobic court system. See Rousseau 2015.

References

Bakan, Abigail, and Daiva Stasiulis. 2005. *Negotiating Citizenship: Migrant Women in Canada and the Global System*. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.

Barrett, Michele, 1980. *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis*. London, UK: Verso.

Benston, Margaret. 1969. "The Political Economy of Women's Liberation." *Monthly Review* 21 (4): 13-27.

- Birnbaum, Lucia Chiavola. 1986. *Liberazione Della Donna: Feminism in Italy*. First Edition. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
- Blumenfeld, Emily, and Susan Mann. 1980. "Domestic Labour and Reproduction of Labour Power: Towards an Analysis of Women, the Family, and Class." In *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*, edited by Bonnie Fox, 267-298. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- Boris, Eileen, and Salazar Parreñas. 2010. *Intimate Labors: Cultures, Technologies, and the Politics of Care*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Bracke, Maud Anne. 2014. *Women and the Reinvention of the Political: Feminism in Italy, 1968-1983*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Brenner, Johanna. 2000. "Rethinking Women's Oppression." In *Women and the Politics of Class*, by Johanna Brenner, 11-57. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Brenner, Johanna, and Nancy Holmstrom. 2000. "Socialist-Feminism versus Communitarian Conservatism." In *Women and the Politics of Class*, by Johanna Brenner, 165-185. New York, NY: Monthly Review Press.
- Brenner, Johanna, and Barbara Laslett. 1989. "Gender and Social Reproduction: Historical Perspectives." *Annual Review of Sociology* 15: 381-404.
- Briskin, Linda. 1980. "Domestic Labour: A Methodological Discussion." In *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*, edited by Bonnie Fox, 135-172. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- Calloni, Marina. 2001. "Debates and Controversies on Abortion in Italy." In *Abortion Politics, Women's Movements, and the Democratic State: A Comparative Study of State Feminism*, edited by Dorothy McBride Stetson, 181-204. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Chodorow, Nancy, 1978. *The Reproduction of Mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clement, Dominique. 2009. "Generations and the Transformation of Social Movements in Postwar Canada." *Histoire sociale/Social History* 42 (84): 361-387.
- Comitato per il Salario al Lavoro Domestico di Padova. 1974. "Relazione Provvisoria Del Convengno Di Montreal." Donazione Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Cassa 1 (Parte 3), Fascicolo 2. Biblioteca Civica del Comune di Padova.
- _____. 1975. "Aborto Libero E Gratuito," 13-2. Donazione Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Cassa 3, Fascicolo 4: Comitato Triveneto Salario. Biblioteca Civica del Comune di Padova.
- Coulson, Margaret, Branka Magaš, and Hilary Wainwright. 1975. "'The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism': A Critique." *New Left Review* 1 (89): 59-71.
- Cox, Nicole, and Silvia Federici. 1975. *Counter-Planning from the Kitchen: Wages for Housework, A Perspective on Capital and the Left*. New York, NY: New York Wages for Housework Committee and Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press.
- Creese, Gillian Laura. 1999. *Contracting Masculinity: Gender, Class and Race in a White-Collar Union, 1944-1994*. Toronto, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa. 1988. "Domestic Labour and the Feminist Movement in Italy Since the 1970s." *International Sociology* 3 (1): 22-34.
- _____. 2012. Interview by Christina Rousseau. June 1. Transcript.
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Leopoldina Fortunati. 1976. *Brutto Ciao: Direzioni Di Marcia Delle Donne Negli Ultimi 30 Anni*. Torino, IT: Edizioni delle Donne
- Dalla Costa, Mariarosa, and Selma James. 1972. *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community*. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press Ltd.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1983. *Women, Race & Class*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Delphy, Christine. 1984. *Close to Home: A Materialist Analysis of Women's Oppression*, Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts.

- Dunbar, Roxanne. 1970. "Female Liberation as the Basis for Revolution." In *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*, edited by Robin Morgan, 536-553. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Eisenstein, Hester. 2009. "Women, Work, and the Mainstreaming of Feminism." In *Feminism Seduced: How Global Elites Use Women's Labor and Ideas to Exploit the World*, by Hester Eisenstein, 39-71. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Fantone, Laura. 2007. "Precarious Changes: Gender and Generational Politics in Contemporary Italy." *Feminist Review* 87: 5-20.
- Federici, Silvia. 1975. *Wages Against Housework*. Bristol, UK: Falling Wall Press.
- _____. 2003. *Caliban and the Witch: Women, the Body and Primitive Accumulation*. New York, NY: Autonomedia.
- _____. 2012a. Interview by Christina Rousseau. April 13. Transcript.
- _____. 2012b. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Ferguson, Sue. 2008. "Canadian Contributions to Social Reproduction Feminism, Race and Embodied Labor." *Race, Gender & Class* 15 (1-2): 42-57.
- Folbre, Nancy. 2001. *The Invisible Heart: Economics and Family Values*. New York, NY: New Press.
- Fortunati, Leopoldina. 1995. *The Arcane of Reproduction: Housework, Prostitution, Labor and Capital*. Translated by Hilary Creek. New York, NY: Autonomedia.
- Fox, Bonnie, ed. 1980. *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- _____. 2009. *Family Patterns, Gender Relations*. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.
- Friedan, Betty. 1963. *The Feminine Mystique*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Frye, Marilyn. 1983. *The Politics of Reality: Essays in Feminist Theory*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Gardiner, Jean. 1975. "Women's Domestic Labour." *New Left Review* I (89): 47-58.
- Greer, Germaine. 1970. *The Female Eunuch*. New York, NY: Bantam Books.
- Hall, Ruth, and Beth Ingber. 1975. "Why We Expelled Toronto Wages for Housework Group I: Notes on the First Day of the Montreal Conference Feb. 1975." Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fonds. Series 1.4: WFH - Other Organizations, Box 624.14. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Hanisch, Carol. 2009. "The Personal Is Political: The Women's Liberation Classic with a New Explanatory Introduction." *Women of the World, Unite! Writings by Carol Hanisch*. <http://www.carolhanisch.org/CHwritings/PIP.html>.
- Harrison, John. 1973. "Political Economy of Housework." *Bulletin of the Conference of Socialist Economics* 3 (1).
- Hemmings, Clare. 2005. "Telling Feminist Stories." *Feminist Theory* 6 (2): 115-139.
- Hennessy, Rosemary, and Chrys Ingraham, eds. 1997. *Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Hochschild, Arlie Russell. 2003a. *The Managed Heart: Commercialization of Human Feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- _____. 2003b. *The Second Shift*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Holmstrom, Nancy. 1981. "'Women's Work,' the Family and Capitalism." *Science & Society* 45 (2): 186-211.

- _____. 2003. "The Socialist Feminist Project." *Monthly Review* 54 (10). <http://monthlyreview.org/2003/03/01/the-socialist-feminist-project/>.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. London, UK: Pluto Press.
- INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence. 2006. *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Inman, Mary. 1940. *In Woman's Defense*. Los Angeles, CA: Committee to Organize the Advancement of Women.
- James, Selma. 2012. *Sex, Race and Class: The Perspective of Winning. A Selection of Writings 1952-2011*. Oakland, CA: PM Press.
- Johnson, Andrew F. 1987. "Restructuring Family Allowances: 'Good Politics At No Cost'?" In *Canadian Social Welfare Policy: Federal and Provincial Dimensions*, edited by Jacqueline S. Ismael, 105-119. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Kidd, Dorothy. 1979. "Winnipeg Women for Welfare." *Wages for Housework Campaign Bulletin* 4 (1). *Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defence Fund Fonds*. Series 1.5: WFH - Outreach, Box 625.4. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- _____. 2013. Interview by Christina Rousseau. May 27. Transcript.
- Kidd, Dorothy, and Wages Due Lesbians Toronto. Letter to the editor of *Body Politic*. 1977. "Defensive Strutting," June. *Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defence Fund Fonds*. Series 2.1: WDL Organization and Mandate, Box 625.28. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Kofman, Eleonore, and Parvati Raghuram. 2015. *Gendered Migrations and Global Social Reproduction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lacelle, Nicole. 2012. Interview by Christina Rousseau. January 19. Transcript.
- Lenard, Patti Tamara, and Christine Straehle. 2012. *Legislated Inequality: Temporary Labour Migration in Canada*. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Lorde, Audre. 1984. *Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Lotta Femminista. 1973. "A Padova è processata per Gigliola Pierobon." *Donazione Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Cassa 1 (Parte 3), Fascicolo 3*. Biblioteca Civica del Comune di Padova.
- Luxton, Meg. 1980. *More Than a Labour of Love: Three Generations of Women's Work in the Home*. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- _____. 2001. "Feminism as a Class Act: Working-Class Feminism and the Women's Movement in Canada." *Labour/Le Travail* 48: 63-88.
- Luxton, Meg, and Kate Bezanson. 2006. *Social Reproduction: Feminist Political Economy Challenges Neo-Liberalism*. Montreal, QC and Kingston, ON: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- MacKinnon, Catherine. 1989. *Towards a Feminist Theory of the State*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mian, Clare. 1975. "Statement of Political Difference with the Montreal Power of Women Collective." *Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond*. Series 1.3: WFH - Correspondence, Box 624.27. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Miles, Angela. 1974. "Women's Work at Home and in the Paid Labour Force, or Wages and Housework." *Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond*. Series 1.5: WFH Outreach, Box 625.2. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.

- Millett, Kate. 1970. *Sexual Politics*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Mitchell, Juliet. 1966. "Women: The Longest Revolution." *New Left Review* I (40): 11-37.
- _____. 1971. *Women's Estate*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Molyneux, Maxine. 1979. "Beyond the Domestic Labour Debate." *New Left Review* 1 (116): 3-27.
- Morton, Peggy. 1971. "A Woman's Work is Never Done." In *From Feminism to Liberation*, edited by Edith Hoshino Altbach, 211-227. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Publishing.
- Movimento per il Salario al Lavoro Domestico. 1976. *Le Operaie della casa* (November-February). Donazione Mariarosa Dalla Costa, Cassa 8 (Parte 4.1). Biblioteca Civica del Comune di Padova.
- Mullings, Leith. 1996. *On Our Own Terms: Race, Class, and Gender in the Lives of African-American Women*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Organization for Women (NOW). 1966. "Statement of Purpose." *The National Organization for Women*. <http://now.org/about/history/statement-of-purpose/>.
- Picchio, Antonella. 2012. Interview by Christina Rousseau. June 9. Transcript.
- Pratt, Geraldine. 2004. *Working Feminism*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Ramirez, Bruno. n.d. "Self-Reduction Struggles in Italy." Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond. Series 1.6: WFH Clippings, Box 625.21. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Ramirez, Judith. 1977. "Is Abortion the 'Right to Choose'?" *Wages for Housework Campaign Bulletin* 2 (1). Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond. Series 1.5: WFH - Outreach, Box 625.3. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- _____. 1978. "Housework: For Love or Money?" *Canadian Woman Studies* Winter 1 (2): 25.
- _____. 1979. "Immigrant Domestic: Modern-Day Slaves." *Wages for Housework Campaign Bulletin* 4 (2). Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond. Series 1.5: WFH - Outreach, Box 625.3. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Rousseau, Christina. 2015. "Wages Due Lesbians: Visibility and Feminist Organizing in 1970s Canada." *Gender, Work and Organization* 22 (4): 364-374.
- Sangster, Joan. 2010a. "Radical Ruptures: Feminism, Labor, and the Left in the Long Sixties in Canada." *American Review of Canadian Studies* 40 (1): 1-21.
- _____. 2010b. *Transforming Labour: Women and Work in Post-War Canada*. Studies in Gender and History. Toronto, ON: University of Toronto Press.
- _____. 2011. *Through Feminist Eyes*. Edmonton, AB: Athabasca University Press.
- Sangster, Joan, and Meg Luxton. 2013. "Feminism, Co-Optation and the Problems of Amnesia: A Response to Nancy Fraser." *Socialist Register* 49: 289-309.
- Secombe, Wally. 1974. "The Housewife and Her Labour Under Capitalism." *New Left Review* 1 (83): 3-24.
- _____. 1980. "Domestic Labour and the Working-Class Household." In *Hidden in the Household: Women's Domestic Labour Under Capitalism*, edited by Bonnie Fox, 25-99. Toronto, ON: Women's Press.
- Solanis, Valerie. 1970. "Excerpts from the SCUM (Society for Cutting Up Men) Manifesto." In *Sisterhood is Powerful: An Anthology of Writings from the Women's Liberation Movement*, edited by Robin Morgan, 577-582. New York, NY: Vintage Books.
- Threlfall, Mónica. 1996. *Mapping the Women's Move-*

- ment: *Feminist Politics and Social Transformation in the North*. London, UK: Verso.
- Toro, Rorò, and Colletivo di Lotta Femminista. 1972. "Chi Sei? Dove Vai? Che Fai?" Centro della donna (Parte 2); Archivia: Archivi, Biblioteche, Centri Documentazione delle Donne (Rome).
- Toronto Wages for Housework Committee. 1976. "Hands Off the Family Allowance: Petition and Statement." Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defence Fund Fonds. Series 1.6: WFH - Clippings, Box 625.9. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Toupin, Louise. 2012. Interview by Christina Rousseau. January 18/19. Transcript.
- _____. 2014. *Le salaire au travail ménager: Chronique d'une lutte féministe internationale (1972-1977)*. Montreal, QC: Les Éditions du remue-ménage.
- Tronti, Mario. 2006. *Operai e capitale*. Roma, IT: DeriveApprodi.
- _____. 2009. *Noi operaisti*. Roma, IT: DeriveApprodi.
- Vogel, Lise. 1981. "Marxism and Feminism: Unhappy Marriage, Trial Separation or Something Else?" In *Women and Revolution: A Discussion of the Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism*, edited by Lydia Sargent, 195–217. Montreal, QC: Black Rose Books.
- Wages Due Collective, Ellen Agger, Lorna Boschman, Judith Quinlan, Boo Watson, and Ellen Woodsworth. n.d. "Fucking Is Work." Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defense Fund Fond. Series 2.1: WDL Organization and Mandate, Box 625.27. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- Weigand, Kate. 2001. *Red Feminism: American Communism and the Making of Women's Liberation*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Wendell, Susan. 1987. "A (Qualified) Defense of Liberal Feminism." *Hypatia* 2 (2): 65-93.
- Wyland, Francie. 1976. *Motherhood, Lesbianism, Child Custody*. Toronto: Wages Due Lesbians. Wages for Housework: Wages Due Lesbians; Lesbians Mothers' Defence Fund Fonds. Series 2.1: WDL Organization and Mandate, Box 625.27. Archives and Special Collections, University of Ottawa Library, Ottawa, ON.
- _____. 2012. Interview by Christina Rousseau. March 11. Transcript.