

SUNY series in Gender and Society

Cornelia Butler Flora, Editor

Constructing Spanish Womanhood

Female Identity in Modern Spain

Edited by

*Victoria Lorée Enders
and Pamela Beth Radcliff*

State University of New York Press

Contents

List of Illustrations	ix
Foreword by <i>Karen Offen</i>	xi
Editors' Preface	xiii
General Introduction: Contesting Identities/Contesting Categories <i>Victoria Lorée Enders and Pamela Beth Radcliff</i>	1
Part I: Sociocultural Models: Prescribing Female Identity in Spain	
Introduction	19
1. Un/Contested Identities: Motherhood, Sex Reform and the Modernization of Gender Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Spain <i>Mary Nash</i>	25
2. Shaping True Catholic Womanhood: Francoist Educational Discourse on Women <i>Aurora Morcillo Gómez</i>	51
3. "Cortes and Marina": Gender and the Reconquest of America Under the Franco Regime <i>María A. Escudero</i>	71
4. Masculinity Versus Femininity: The <i>Sanfermines</i> : 1939–1978 <i>Clotilde Puertolas</i>	95
Part II: Work Identities	
Introduction	125
5. Life and Work in the Tobacco Factories: Female Industrial Workers in the Early Twentieth Century <i>Rosa María Capel Martínez</i>	131
6. Representations of Women Workers: Tobacco Strikers in the 1890s <i>D.J. O'Connor</i>	151
7. Women on the Land: Household and Work in the Southern Countryside, 1875–1939 <i>Timothy Rees</i>	173

8. Enlacing Women's Stories: Composing Womanhood
in a Coastal Galician Village 195
Heidi Kelley

Part III: Political Identities

Introduction	227
9. Liberty, Honor, Order: Gender and Political Discourse in Nineteenth-Century Spain	233
<i>Sarah L. White</i>	
10. Spanish Women in the Resistance to Napoleon, 1808–1814	259
<i>John Lawrence Tone</i>	
11. Redressing the Balance: Gendered Acts of Justice around the Mining Community of Río Tinto in 1913	283
<i>Temma Kaplan</i>	
12. Women's Politics: Consumer Riots in Twentieth-Century Spain	301
<i>Pamela Beth Radcliff</i>	
13. "Into the Clear Air of the Plaza": Spanish Women Achieve the Vote in 1931	325
<i>Judith Keene</i>	
14. Women and Men at the Ballot Box: Voting in Spain's Two Democracies	349
<i>Gerard Alexander</i>	
15. Problematic Portraits: The Ambiguous Historical Role of the <i>Sección Femenina</i> of the Falange	375
<i>Victoria Lorée Enders</i>	
General Conclusion	399
Bibliography	407
Contributors	429
Index	433

Illustrations

3.1. "Así nació América: Malinalli, historia de una india mejicana" (This is the way America was born: Malinalli, the story of a Mexican Indian woman).	80
3.2. "Glorias Imperiales" (Imperial Glories).	86
4.1. "Pamplona, San Fermin de 1949."	102
4.2. "Pamplona, San Fermin de 1953."	103
4.3. "San Fermin de 1960, Pamplona."	104
4.4. "Sanfermines 1969, Pamplona."	105
4.5. "Sanfermin, Pamplona, 1977."	106
6.1. "The Conflict in Seville. Una comisión de monumentos de Sevilla, inspirada en propósitos conciliadores, resuelve visitar á las autoridades para gestionar la terminación del conflicto" (A commission of Monuments of Seville, inspired by conciliatory proposals, resolves to visit the authorities in order to arrange the end of the conflict).	162
10.1. "Día dos de mayo."	262
10.2. "Agustina de Aragón." After the first siege, Agustina sat for the artist Juan Galvez, who produced this intimate portrait of the heroine of Zaragoza.	264
10.3. "Agustina de Aragón." This anonymous oil painting done soon after the siege showed Agustina striking a suitably heroic pose and wearing the uniform and decoration she earned for her bravery.	265
10.4. "Que valor" (What courage). Goya's apotheosis of Agustina in this etching from his "Disasters of the war" elevated "La Artillera" to a national icon.	266
10.5. "Y son fieras" (And they are beasts). One of Goya's favorite subjects was the resistance of women to the French occupation. In etchings like this one women fought to protect their homes, their children, and their sexual integrity.	268
10.6. "No quieren" (They don't want to).	269
12.1. "El sexo debil" (The Weaker Sex).	306
12.2. "Tením fám" (We Are Hungry).	307

7. Julián Pitt-Rivers, "Honor and Social Status," in Jean G. Peristiany, ed., *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1974), p. 69.

8. See, for example, J.G. Peristiany, Introduction to *Honor and Shame: The Values of Mediterranean Society* (1974), p. 10.

1

Un/Contested Identities: Motherhood, Sex Reform and the Modernization of Gender Identity in Early Twentieth-Century Spain

Mary Nash

Gender is one of the defining features of contemporary society and a key category in the cultural construction of human difference. In early twentieth century Europe and North America, gender discourse as an explanatory principle of a stratified sociopolitical order had developed cultural values with wide resonance in social norms and popular collective imagery. The cultural representation of human difference in terms of gender categories crystallized the other—male/female—through the establishment of absolute distinctions based on asserted natural, biological differences. Although many outmoded analytical frameworks have attempted to claim Spain's integral difference from the rest of Europe in its historical development,¹ this chapter argues, in line with current historiography in other fields such as politics, culture or economics, that in modern Spanish society gender issues also followed the parameters of development current in many Western countries. Thus, in contrast to the conventional explanatory framework of Catholicism or political conservatism, this chapter highlights the modernization of gender discourse in Spain in the early twentieth century.

In order to explore the modernization of gender discourse in Spain, this study focuses on cultural ideology with a specific emphasis on modern medical sources in the construction of gender discourse. Political conservatism, the weight of the Roman Catholic Church as a pervasive political institution, and economic underdevelopment have often been argued as the key explanatory factors to the situation of women in contemporary Spain.² It is one of the main contentions of this study that biological essentialism rather than religion became a core feature in the construction of gender difference and the modernization of the notion of femininity in early twentieth-century Spain, and, thus, a key feature in the development of women's shared cultural identity and their

collective definition of identity politics and a woman's agenda.³ In order to account for the paths Spanish women took either in the public arena, in a mode of feminism, or in their private life projects relating to motherhood or sexuality, the development of gender discourse and the significance of gender identity in shaping women's agency in society must be addressed.⁴

In line with Wieviorka's analytical framework on the development of the notion of race, this study contends that the "biologization of social thought"⁵ through gendered discourse was a core feature in the formulation of cultural norms on sexual difference in contemporary Spain. Biosocial thought converted gender identity and the cultural representation of women into a cultural myth that justified gender hierarchies, discriminatory values, and gendered social roles. In nineteenth- and early twentieth-century Western society, the discourse on race proposed to transmute ethnic differences to stratified social categories of inferior/superior.⁶ In a similar way, gender discourse of sexual difference transposed human sexual difference to a cultural and ideological plane that legitimated a hierarchical order based on the subordination of women and social asymmetry between the sexes.⁷ The cultural representation of gender in Western society presented human distinction in terms of an irrevocable natural, sexual difference that established a hierarchical ordering based on this asserted natural difference.⁸ Thus, biological essentialism functioned as a cultural device that asserted the hierarchization of human difference and justified gendered social roles.⁹ This chapter suggests that such a conceptualization of sexual difference is also decisive in accounting for the historical development of women in Spanish society in the early twentieth century and is also a critical factor in assessing the difficulties they had in contesting cultural norms and established gender identities. Gender discourse and the foundations of its legitimation in contemporary society are thus explored as a lens to understand contestation and conformity in Spanish women's lives.

Verbal, visual, fictional, or historical discourse all form cultural representations of women.¹⁰ Religion, science, medicine, politics, art, language, literature, media, or history are among the many cultural constructs used to develop collective imagery of women. The discourses that give meaning to cultural representations of women and gender identity take many forms and are grounded in social and cultural sources. Their exploration can help reveal the complex workings of gender and women's agency in society. The cultural representation of women is highly functional in the creation of gender roles and models. Gender identities are, to a large extent, consolidated and disseminated through images of women. These models of femininity become decisive manifestations of informal social control and help channel women into historically constructed gendered relationships.¹¹ It is quite clear that images and representations do not mirror the complex world of women. Gender discourse does not necessarily reflect reality. In fact, its normative framework may blur

contestation or dissonance in the historical experience of women or obscure their renegotiation of gender contracts and relationships. Furthermore, the prevalence of archetypes of gender identity may, in fact, eclipse the existence of identities that are not shared but rather act in competition, thus reinforcing the monolithic dominance of a set of models of femininity.¹² Nonetheless, gender discourse can give us a clue to the system of ideas against which women had to measure their behavior and to the meanings of their challenges or compliance.

Domesticity and the Cultural Representation of Women

The ideology of domesticity provided the foundation of traditional gender discourse in late nineteenth-century Spain. As in Europe and North America, this model of good mothering and housewifery—the product of male thought—generated the notion that women's ambitions had to be exclusively limited to home and family.¹³ Motherhood figured as the maximum horizon for women's self fulfillment and social role. Women's cultural identity was shaped through marriage and motherhood to the exclusion of any other social or professional undertakings. It is true that as late as 1910 the Catalan feminist Carme Karr still had to forcefully denounce life as a nun in a convent as an inadmissible option for women.¹⁴ However, by the turn of the century conventional life no longer constituted a valid model of femininity. By then, the biological function of reproduction had already become the key component in structuring women's cultural identity.

The notion that women were inferior to men tended to prevail in the collective mentality of this period. Patterns of this gender discourse are quite clear in this representative text by Federal Republican Pompeyo Gener, published in one of the major newspapers, *La Vanguardia* in 1889, which also openly viewed women through the lens of biological essentialism:

In herself, a woman, unlike a man, is not a complete being; she is only the instrument of reproduction, destined to perpetuate the species; while man is charged with making it progress, he is the generator of intelligence, at the same time creator . . . of the social world.¹⁵

Writing later, in 1916, he also claimed psychological differences that specifically characterized Mediterranean women: "women, and especially Greco-Latin women, are highly sensitive, and act more on impressions and suggestions than on real reflection."¹⁶ This line of thought claimed that female psychology was at odds with rationality by linking women directly with nature, in accordance with the traditional dualism of Western thought that associated rationality with men and nature with women. In Gener's text,

women's natural biological distinction became transposed to a differentiating cultural category that effectively assigned women a specific gender role with an inferior social status. Through the naturalization of sexual difference and its transference to a sociocultural category, biosocial thought decreed that the biological destiny of reproduction and differential psychological traits determined women's commitment in society.

In the late nineteenth century the *Angel del Hogar*, the "Angel of the House," a familiar trope in Western culture, became the dominant cultural representation of Spanish women. Defined in 1877 as "an angel of love, consolation to our afflictions, defender of our merits, patient sufferer of our faults, faithful guardian of our secrets, and jealous depository of our honor,"¹⁷ she was also evoked as mother, spouse, or daughter: "as a mother she is the life and sweetness of the family, as a wife the vale of tears of her husband, as a daughter, an angel who keeps watch and prays for the lovingness and peace of the home."¹⁸ Values and beliefs about femininity continued to evoke the model of domesticity initially formulated in the still popular sixteenth-century tract by Fray Luis de León, *La Perfecta Casada*, the "Perfect Married Lady," which assigned women the sacred mission of efficient management of the home.¹⁹ In 1861 the eminent doctor and hygiene reformer, Pedro Felipe Monlau, underlined that household chores and home management were unquestionable female attributes:

The government of a home naturally corresponds to women, to the housewife, the mother of the family and in many cases and due to various circumstances, to the eldest daughter. Without a mother, daughter, housewife or housekeeper, a family cannot prosper, be it poor, of medium resources or opulent. Thus it has been said that women are those who make or ruin a home.²⁰

The importance of women's role in the family economy was commonly acknowledged in the nineteenth century when mothers and housewives were attributed an important social status and a role of significant consequence in the family.²¹ At the turn of the century, however, the modernization of the discourse of domesticity generated a less approving view of the housewife, whose status declined over the decades.

Traditional gender discourse on domesticity implied that domestic responsibilities were women's exclusive duty. In this way, the cultural identity of women was not formulated through paid work but through the assumption of services inherent to the figure of a wife and mother. By establishing a cultural identity as mothers and wives the discourse of domesticity legitimated a negative attitude towards women's right to employment in the labor market, even among the working classes.²² Another significant long term consequence

was the redefinition of housework as nonwork and services, thus leading to its invisibility, lack of monetary value and ultimately, its low social status. In addition, it was also decisive in upholding an interclass definition of femininity that denied women's identities as workers while legitimating women's discrimination in the labor market. Although paid work was central to many women's lives and also to their sense of identity, as is illuminated in the second section of this volume, women had to contest dominant gender models of femininity to integrate a work identity into their sense of self.²³ The recognition of women's work identity and their claims to the recognition of their right to waged work and professional training were priority demands in the agenda of early twentieth-century Spanish feminism.²⁴

The public and private divide implied by this discrimination became a significant feature of gender discourse in modern Spain. The connections and changing boundaries of public and private are a crucial aspect of gender discourse and provide clues to the changing dynamics of gender relations. The public/private interaction also has a crucial impact on key issues such as citizenship, feminism, and female identity politics.²⁵ The ideology of domesticity established separate spheres assigning men a role in the public arena of production, politics and culture while confining women to the private domain of home and family. Despite the historical reality of women's ongoing presence in the public arena,²⁶ the gendered distribution of space in the model of domesticity implied that women were only to occupy the domestic realm. *Flora o la educación de una niña*, a popular educational tract for girls initially published in 1888 by the educator Pilar de Sanjuán, reaffirmed in its 1918 edition the canon of women's confinement to the home:

Women, especially, are destined by Providence to live secluded in the modest home, perfuming it with the essence of their ignored virtue, making it beautiful with their simple grace; so that those who have received from Heaven manly values, privileged talent and other gifts, have been the most wretched of their sex.²⁷

The notion of the "natural" was constantly evoked to justify the separation of public and private spaces. By attributing certain "natural" traits to women, it determined their aptitude for motherhood in the home while contending that men's natural biological and psychological capacities geared them towards activities in the public arena. Almost a decade later, in 1922, dominant cultural views concerning women still espoused the notion of separate spheres as a natural divide between public and private.

The value of man is active, that of a woman is passive. . . . Man is reflexive, analytical; woman, imaginative. The first is characterized princi-

pally by reason, consciousness, the second by sentiment, affection. The first is exceptionally apt for public life, for a life of relationships, for social commerce; the second is, by essence, *the angel of the hearth*.²⁸

Furthermore, what is at stake in these messages of domesticity is the notion that any woman who did not conform to her natural or divine destiny of a secluded life in the home in unselfish service to her family provoked misfortune by her transgression of the norms of gender behavior. The naturalization of social thought meant that any challenge to gender roles implied defying nature.²⁹ The force of the discourse of domesticity as a mechanism of social control resided precisely in its link with nature. Any woman who contravened the norms of nature by adopting transgressive gender conduct was implicitly threatened with disaster. The pressure of this symbolic violence can thus explain the practice of consent by women and the sustenance of traditional norms of gender conduct.³⁰ Transgression in this symbolical vision opened up fearful threats of chaos, disorder, and unhappiness. As one author expressed in the early 1920s, any transgression by women threatened not only men but also the established social order:

And, woe to Humanity! and woe to women! if one day the angel [of the Hearth] lets her fine wings be burnt by the destructive fire of pride and abandons the secluded and loving shelter in which she always lived, to launch herself madly in the wild whirlpool of public life in which man has to wage the most violent and terrible battles.³¹

The invasion of the public arena was perceived as a threat to the established gender order and incompatible with the ideology of respectable femininity. By taking on a male role in the public arena, women inevitably became "the most wretched of their sex."³²

Through its symbolic violence and forceful normative tone, male-dominated gender discourse was effective in dissuading women from openly claiming a place in politics. The ideology of domesticity reinforced the notion of the lack of political subjectivity of Spanish women and the identification of the political sphere as male. This notion was further reinforced by the political culture of Spanish politics up to the 1930s. It is important to underscore that until the development of political reform under the democratic Second Republic, the social legitimization of individual political rights was not central to the Spanish liberal and democratic tradition. Predominant political culture did not associate progress with political rights. In this context, it is not surprising to find that Spanish feminists did not focus on political rights either. I have argued elsewhere that predominant political and gender culture led most Spanish women to legitimate their claims for women's rights on the grounds of

gender difference rather than in the paradigm of equality.³³ In common with other Mediterranean countries such as France or Italy, the Spanish women's movement developed a strand of social feminism oriented to civil society.³⁴ Thus, the agenda of Spanish and Catalan feminists in the early twentieth century did not focus on political rights and suffrage but on sociocultural demands that entailed the defense of their social and civil rights, access to quality education and professional training, integration into the labor market and a voice on social issues. The combination of the political culture of Restoration Spain and the prevalent gender discourse of domesticity formed a significant sociocultural apprenticeship that shaped women's political subjectivity and favored the development of a social rather than political definition of Spanish feminism.³⁵

Despite the negation of political agency to women, Spanish feminists were politicized and mobilized in collective action to achieve a feminist agenda that challenged the core of traditional gender discourse by claiming the public arena for women.³⁶ Political identities were also crucial in the formation of female identities through women's mobilization and experience of identity politics in nationalist, labor, and educational movements.³⁷ Although political enfranchisement was not a significant feature in the definition of Spanish feminism in this period, women were actively engaged in diverse forms of political action, as is illustrated in the third section of this book.

The Modernization of Gender Discourse

The growing modernization of Spanish society in the early twentieth century entailed significant modifications in economic, social, and demographic structures. This brought about changes in social structures and the transformation of cultural modes and values which, in turn, generated modifications in the ideological discourse on women. The traditional cultural representation of women as the *Angel del Hogar* was challenged by a new gender discourse based on the *Nueva Mujer Moderna*, the "New Modern Woman"—an "ideal" woman already in vogue in many European countries and in North America.³⁸ In the 1910s and 1920s, this new gender model was developed more systematically in highly industrialized Catalonia.³⁹ However, the notion of the modern woman was prevalent in many publications of the time and defended enthusiastically by women such as the feminist and socialist, Carmen de Burgos, in her book *La mujer moderna y sus derechos* (*The Modern Woman and Her Rights*).⁴⁰

Although not as widely accepted as the traditional *Angel del Hogar*, this new cultural representation became incorporated into social values and collective imagery about gender norms. This redefinition of women in terms of modernity was an effective symbolic device for adapting women to new social, political, economic, and demographic contexts. The shift from the old

traditional model of femininity to the innovative *Nueva Mujer Moderna* allowed women to adjust to the process of modernity. It accommodated more restrictive gender roles toward the new needs of the labor market and society. This readjustment was, in fact, a very functional mechanism which allowed women access to specific areas of public activity such as education, culture, social welfare, and new sectors of the labor market. It thus responded to the new socioeconomic needs of society and, in this way, became part of hegemonical discourse on women.

Nonetheless, changes in the models of femininity and gender roles also responded to contestation by women. In this sense, the gender model of the "New Modern Woman" was liberating for many Spanish women. It was intentionally used by them in their struggle for emancipation to legitimate their claims to public spaces, to new experiences and to freedom. The importance of the notion of modernity in the subjective construction of a new gender identity by women can be seen in *La Victoria*, the first novel published by anarchist leader Federica Montseny in 1925. In the subtitle she presented her book as a narrative of "the problems of a moral order that are presented to women with modern ideas." Montseny claimed that her novel was subversive because it addressed the problem of the freedom and dignity of women and thus confronted all "the millenarian prejudices of masculinity. . . ."⁴¹

The model of the "New Modern Woman" challenged women's restriction to the home and contested discriminatory practices toward women. This modernized version of domesticity facilitated the adaptation of gender roles to the new social and labor demands of society. Nonetheless, it also enhanced women's personal and professional options and their subjective experience as women. Women used this new gender model as active social agents in their claim for the recognition of a work identity for women. Despite its modernizing effect, however, it must be stressed that it also maintained the core of traditional gender identity by redefining women as essentially mothers and childbearers, albeit in a new way.

Motherhood, Medical Discourse and the Construction of Modern Gender Identity

In the nineteenth century the discourse on domesticity was based on Roman Catholic ideals of women and also on scientific theories of the day. This article argues that one of the characteristics of the modern redefinition of gender discourse was the transfer from a religious legitimation to a medical and scientific foundation as had occurred in previous decades in other European countries.⁴² By the early twentieth century Spanish society had initiated an ongoing process of modernization which implied, amongst other fea-

tures, an increasing secularization of cultural values. In this context some professional groups, and especially physicians, played a significant role in the formulation of lay cultural parameters founded on a scientific authority that gradually replaced traditional, cultural values and their cosmivision of religious legitimation. As doctors began to supplant clergymen as male authorities on cultural norms, gender issues also became a crucial topic in their emergence as a social group charged with the guardianship of the nation's morals. It can also be argued that the appropriation of gender discourse by doctors was an effective device in their strategy to gain political recognition of the sociocultural status of the medical profession in Spanish society.⁴³ In any case, during the 1920s and 1930s medical discourse was the most influential source in the formulation of cultural values that redefined women's identity through motherhood.⁴⁴

Doctors intervened significantly in the dissemination of a modernized gender discourse based on a reconceptualization of motherhood as women's social duty.⁴⁵ In the 1920s prestigious medical forums such as the *Sociedad Ginecológica Española*, the *Academia Nacional de Medicina*, and medical publications such as *El Siglo Médico*, systematically presented a medical discourse that attempted to influence gender patterns and cultural values. As in Europe, the politics of motherhood was a key construct in the modernization of social welfare and health services in Spain.⁴⁶

The outstanding authority on medical gender discourse was the prestigious endocrinologist, Dr. Gregorio Maraón, whose theory on the differentiation and complementarity between the sexes became the standard paradigm for gender discourse in Spain in the following decades.⁴⁷ A physician of renowned eminence and international scientific prestige, Maraón's theory represented a readjustment of the explanatory basis of traditional Spanish gender models in consonance with the trends towards egalitarian, liberal, and democratic values. The scientific authority that underpinned Maraón's discourse gave it a modern basis. Furthermore, his theory of sexual difference was significant in the modernizing of gender discourse because it was based on the premise that women were not inferior to men. His proposition openly admitted an equal social status between the sexes, thus challenging one of the implicit assumptions of the traditional ideology of domesticity. Despite his admission of the principle of equality, Maraón qualified it with the incontrovertible recognition of biological difference. Thus the individual subject was sexed and consequently predetermined as a person. For women, then, motherhood was still the defining feature of femininity. In addition, his definition of gender identity signified the assignment of distinct and complementary social commitments for women.

In his famous tract *Maternidad y feminismo: Tres ensayos sobre la vida sexual*, published in 1927, Maraón made it quite clear, in a curious mixture of

scientific and religious language, that motherhood was still the inevitable destiny for women.

Here there is marked, in the deepest life of the organism, a difference which teaches us, with the cold demonstrative exactitude of physical chemistry, which divergent paths have been traced for each sex by Destiny. Man's economy has been built for wear, that is, for struggle in the exterior environment. Woman is made for saving energy, for concentrating it in herself, not for dispersing it around her; as in her womb the child who prolongs his life has to be formed, and from her breast the food for the first period of the life of the new being has to gush forth.

Therefore, for us, it is unquestionable that a woman must first of all be a mother, forgetting everything else if it were necessary; and that, by the inexcusable obligation of her sex; just as man must apply his energy to creative work through the same inexcusable law of his manly sexuality. Let us hear once again the voice of God, insistent and eternal: "You, woman will give birth; You, man, will work."⁴⁸

Explicit in Marañón's proposal was the espousal of motherhood and the perpetuation of the species through reproduction as woman's "supreme mission" in life. Thus, sexual difference was established in the biological terrain and hence transposed to the social realm. This biological definition of sexual difference also enunciated a gendered social division based on an irreducible divine destiny: women must give birth while men must work. Marañón's discourse articulated gender identities that linked masculinity to "manly" sexuality and femininity to motherhood and childbearing. It converged with traditional nineteenth-century discourses on domesticity in that it legitimated a strict division of the spheres, the sexual division of labor and the construction of female identity through motherhood. However, it also maintained biosocial thought as the theoretical foundation for a modern, scientific, gender discourse.

By establishing the precedence of motherhood as women's unavoidable destiny, Marañón subordinated any other life options to this priority. According to this set of ideas, any activity by women had to be subordinated to their defining role as mothers. Thus waged work and other activities outside the home could be compatible only as long as they did not interfere with women's primary obligation of motherhood. Full-time dedication to children was a woman's duty and in line with the legacy of traditional domesticity, her cultural identity was still constructed through motherhood.⁴⁹ Thus, despite the attempt to modernize the discourse of domesticity, gender identity for women was still not defined through work. Marañón only admitted women's paid employment in exceptional circumstances; when they were single or widowed,

unattended by male support. In other words, they could work when life circumstances did not allow them to be identified as mothers. "Manly sexuality" was the pole of Marañón's definition of masculinity, but he also based male gender identity on the traditional model of the breadwinner. Despite the crucial impact of women in the formal and irregular labor markets,⁵⁰ he still upheld the traditional view that ignored work as a feature in the construction of female gender identity.

The scientific arguments developed by Marañón and other doctors to assert women's gender identity as mothers gave them a decisive voice of authority in the legitimation of modern cultural patterns concerning women and their role in society.⁵¹ Medical science confirming motherhood as the core of female identity appeared to be indisputable. Moreover, it gave a scientific, professional tone to ideological and cultural values, thus disguising cultural norms as objective, scientific facts. The modernization of gender discourse, embedded in the ideology of domesticity and placed in a scientific medical framework, was a very effective device of social control. Challenging the modern redefinition of gender roles meant contesting the scientific basis for modernity while also engaging with traditional religious canons. It also implied formulating a gendered reading of cultural norms within an alternative conceptual framework for modernity, a steep challenge indeed for Spanish women, who were long denied equal access to the universe of culture and education. They still lacked a voice in the medical profession because their late official access to higher education (1910) impeded the development of a peer group of women doctors.⁵² In the era of modernity, women did not have an established genealogy of doctors or scientists and thus lacked legitimate "scientific" or medical authority to challenge the gender norms espoused by doctors.

The definition of the social role of women through maternalism redefined motherhood as a common good, thus transcending women's individual rights as persons. Many doctors espoused the view that women's maternal duties went beyond biological motherhood to embrace "social motherhood." Maternalism allowed women who were not mothers to develop their social mission of motherhood as a service to the community. Thus social motherhood was defined through the dedication of maternal resources and services to society. As has been argued for other Western countries, it can also be contended for Spain that maternalist politics and gender discourse established the basis for a differential gender citizenship.⁵³ According to this differential, men had the right to exercise political citizenship based on direct involvement in the public world of politics. In contrast, a social citizenship founded on human reproduction but also on social motherhood was the grounds for women's political integration. This powerful political framework legitimated women's access to some spaces within the public arena, while guaranteeing that others

were out of bounds.⁵⁴ It goes beyond the scope of this paper to explore the development of social feminism in Spain; suffice it to recall that the mobilization of women within the canons of gender discourse accepted the proclaimed view of social motherhood and, thus, the idea of a gendered social citizenship for women. This undoubtedly legitimated their claims to be active in the public arena, but at the same time, redefined the gendered boundaries of the public.

The inauguration of the democratic regime in 1931 forced a redefinition of citizenship according to the paradigm of equality and political rights.⁵⁵ Then, as is discussed in later chapters, the suffragist lawyer Clara Campoamor clearly espoused the defense of women's suffrage on the grounds of equality, freedom and individual rights. However, as I have stressed elsewhere, a traditional reading of sexual difference still prevailed in the conceptualization of citizenship during the suffrage debate in 1931 when male politicians across a political divide of left and right still claimed a differential gender citizenship.⁵⁶

Sex Reform, Conscious Maternity, and Birth Control

The practice of birth control represents a significant key to shifts in cultural and religious values on intimate matters such as sexuality and motherhood. Attitudes to sexuality and birth control also provide insights into the gender dimensions of changing mentality and cultural values. Shifts in the politics of motherhood and reproduction can also illuminate women's agency and attitudes towards collective gender identity. In Spain changes in cultural values regarding sexual conduct and procreation represented a significant break with traditional Roman Catholic views that associated sexuality with conception and rejected birth control as sinful. And yet, despite the rejection of the language of sin, it is important to note that the medical discourse around sex reform and birth control never questioned women's primary maternal function, and thus was focused around the (mostly male) management of that function rather than the liberation of female sexuality.

Most doctors espoused motherhood as an inescapable biological mandate for women. As late as 1934 in the *Academia Nacional de Medicina*, the official seat of medical authority, Dr. Vital Aza restated this point of view:

It is the duty of any healthy woman to accept the integral capacity of her intimate biological nature (with no desertions other than those imposed by accidental, unhealthy or passing circumstances), and with the only pauses which derive from the period when she is fulfilling her duties of nursing. This [dedication] must be required as a command, whose strength stems from a biological mandate.⁵⁷

Women were not allowed (by male physicians) to renounce their biological destiny of reproduction on a voluntary basis. As the guardians of the nation's morals, doctors sought to be both moral and medical arbiters on reproductive rights and practice. They largely attempted to define birth control as a medical, hygienic question and claimed that its regulation should be in the hands of the medical profession.

With very few exceptions, Spanish women had no public voice on birth control and sexual conduct. Although intimately linked to women's life experience and personal subjectivity, women's groups rarely openly discussed birth control, abortion, and voluntary motherhood or identified these issues as part of a feminist agenda. The strong gender divide of Spanish society led, in fact, to a situation where women's reproductive rights were not necessarily addressed in public by women, much less defended by them, not even among women activists in radical anticlerical groups such as anarchists.

Some discussion of these issues occurred among progressives, such as anarchist sex reformers and some members of the reformist eugenics movement, who developed a new code of sexual ethics.⁵⁸ It is significant, nonetheless, that even as late as the 1930s birth control was still sufficiently controversial that many progressive eugenicists were reticent to defend it.⁵⁹ It is true that *conscious maternity*, that is the voluntary regulation of motherhood, was defended by some members of these minority groups. However, when addressed within the reformist eugenics movement, it was couched in the modern, scientific language of eugenics, sex reform, and social medicine, and not of women's emancipation. Among the minority who espoused birth control, eugenic justifications such as the protection of the health of mothers and children were the basic arguments that rendered its practice socially acceptable.⁶⁰ Eugenic arguments legitimizing the practice of birth control were less problematical, as they framed the question in relation to high profile public concerns such as the diffusion of hereditary diseases (especially the "social plagues" of tuberculosis and venereal diseases) and race degeneration. The reduction of infant and maternal mortality rates was also used by eugenicists in their justification of birth control. Conscious maternity was thus not necessarily associated with women's sexual freedom but rather with medical motives that prevailed quite clearly over economic, cultural, or gender arguments.⁶¹ Women's voices and specific concerns were not publicly presented by women's groups in this discussion of the politics of reproduction and motherhood.

Reshaping female sexuality rather than liberating it was the goal of most Spanish eugenicists. In fact, only a tiny group of radical birth controllers and eugenicists sanctioned an unrestricted use of birth control. The gynecologist Dr. Francisco Haro justified birth control on the grounds of eugenics, economics, and health.⁶² He was also exceptional in his open espousal of birth control

as a free, unconditioned decision of the individual, and in his defense of women's choice in this matter.⁶³ Another singular figure was the adolescent feminist writer, Hildegart Rodríguez, a well known sex reformer and eugenicist who was the Secretary of the Spanish League for Scientifically Based Sex Reform.⁶⁴ She openly espoused women's freedom to practice conscious maternity. However, the adoption of birth control based on free will, individual choice, or women's freedom was not commonly admitted to be ethical or socially acceptable by most eugenicists.

Anarchist sex reformers, on the contrary, generally tended to espouse birth control. In fact, it was seen as the key to a new sexual ethics that established a powerful indictment of traditional moral and religious sexual values. They also proclaimed the legitimacy of an active sexual life unconditioned by procreation or religious puritanism.⁶⁵ Since the turn of the century, their publications had played a decisive role in the dissemination of sexual education.⁶⁶ Congruent with their anarchist outlook, these sex reformers advocated self-help in sexual education. Through numerous publications and translations, they provided information on hygienic, sexual, and reproductive issues as a means to achieve the development of the full potential of the integral person, an old anarchist ideal.

Despite its pathbreaking defense of a new sexual code, anarchist sex reform continued to be gendered, as sexuality tended mainly to be defined in terms of male sexuality. Even such an outstanding sexologist as Dr. Félix Martí Ibáñez had an essentialist view of an abounding male sexual drive.⁶⁷ Although he recognized women's right to sexual pleasure, he considered that female sexual eroticism was of less interest and that a woman's sexual drive disappeared at the age of 40 to 45.⁶⁸ Moreover, following a tradition established in the early anarchist sex reform movement led by Luis Bulffi at the turn of the century,⁶⁹ women's sexuality still tended to be linked to motherhood. Although no longer defined as ethereal unsexed angels, anarchists did not reformulate women's identity through the notion of sexuality. Motherhood continued to define female identity while sexuality continued to be a key component in male identity. Female emancipation was thus seen in terms of women's freedom from unwanted pregnancies, through conscious maternity.⁷⁰

A similar logic informed the anarchist attitude towards abortion, which was exemplified during the Civil War by Félix Martí Ibáñez, then Director General of Health and Social Assistance of the Generalitat of Catalonia.⁷¹ His initiative, significantly known as the "Eugenics Reform," endorsed traditional anarchist sex reform, including abortion. It responded to a eugenic and hygienic class rationale and was primarily a pragmatic measure designed to regulate the practice of abortion in Catalonia.⁷² The eradication of clandestine abortions and infanticide and the reduction of illnesses and mortality due to abortive practices were among its proclaimed goals. It also targeted a reduc-

tion in overall abortion figures in Catalonia through the establishment of a parallel family planning service that would enable working-class mothers to avoid having recourse to abortion. This abortion reform was quite exceptional in the context of Europe at the time, where few countries had introduced such measures.⁷³ It was very advanced, in that it maintained quite an unrestricted policy of admittance to its service based on therapeutical, eugenic, neomalthusian, and personal grounds. It also respected women's reproductive rights, as a woman's choice was considered decisive in the resolution to have a voluntary abortion. However, despite such innovative legislation and respect for women's will, the regulation of abortion was a notable failure. Only one birth control clinic was established, and the records of the major hospitals in the Catalan health services show that abortion services were practically negligible.⁷⁴

Despite the development of abortion reform, then, women still remained aloof from reproductive politics. Moreover, with the exception of the Female Secretariat of the *Partido Obrero de Unificación Marxista*, the minority dissident marxist party, none of the women's antifascist organizations (anarchist, communist, socialist and unitary antifascist) defended legal abortion publicly.⁷⁵ What is even more significant is that the anarchist women's organization, *Mujeres Libres*, did not address the issues of abortion or birth control. They did not support the initiatives of their fellow anarchist, Martí Ibáñez. Despite its revolutionary rhetoric, the "Eugenic Reform" of abortion was still experienced by women as an exclusively male, medical initiative. Birth control and the legalization of abortion were still not included on the agenda of the women's organizations and these issues were not seen as agents of women's liberation, not even in the context of war and revolution.

Un/Contested Identities: Women's Voices and Motherhood

Mainstream and radical feminists did not challenge the male, public monopoly of birth control and sex reform, nor did they openly incorporate the politics of reproduction into their agenda. I contend that this choice was shaped by predominant gender discourse and gender identity; i.e., gender codes made it extremely difficult for Spanish women to have a voice on these issues. In the context of a conservative society, the Roman Catholic Church was still pervasive in shaping cultural values although these were not necessarily adhered to in practice. Thus, demographic data clearly shows the widespread decline in birthrates by the early twentieth century.⁷⁶ Furthermore, modern scientific medical views had also firmly established motherhood as women's natural mandate. Thus for women to address the problem of voluntary motherhood or sexual conduct represented an inadmissible transgression of gender conventions and an implicit contestation to both modern and traditional cultural norms. The stigma attached to any discussion of reproductive issues was thus

enormous, even for men. In 1934, Félix Martí Ibáñez admitted that only non-conformists and rebels were interested in promoting an alternative sexual culture and developing sexual eugenics.⁷⁷

Modern female identity was shaped around motherhood. The definition of women's identity through motherhood was not contested in the early twentieth century, as it was still an essentially unquestioned cultural value. It can be argued that the theoretical glass ceiling of the Spanish women's movement was the inability to challenge motherhood as the nucleus of female identity. In this context, it would have been very difficult for most women to articulate a public discourse on reproductive rights that could have dissociated them from the definition of their primary role and subjectivity as mothers. Dissenting voices among women were thus very exceptional. Few contested motherhood as the key to female identity or defended sex reform or birth control as ways to achieve their emancipation. The tiny number of women who openly challenged established views were not representative of Spanish women as a whole nor even of the feminist movement. Their voices of transgression contested gender norms of female decorum by expressing public views on such taboo issues. Although unrepresentative of the collective views of Spanish women of the time, they are an expression of dissonance and nonconformity to established norms of conduct and gendered cultural values. The strength of their subversive convictions in such a hostile context provides an insight to a different reality of dissent not often openly expressed by Spanish women.

Hildegart Rodríguez, whose life biography makes her a uniquely extraordinary figure, was the most outspoken defender of feminist sex reform.⁷⁸ In the early thirties she openly addressed the taboo topics of sexuality and birth control.⁷⁹ She contested conventional gender identity by espousing a new sexual ethics that embraced sexual equality for women as well as men: "Both sexes, whose equality feminists claim, with respect to the law, with respect to public opinion, must also be equal with respect to sexual conduct, with no other limitations than those which their conscience imposes."⁸⁰ She denounced the traditional position of the Church that held sexuality to be sinful and blamed both the double sexual standard and conventional cultural values about sex for the deprivation and "sexual hunger" of Spanish women.⁸¹ In her view, the prevalent norms of the Roman Catholic Church had led women to identify sexual activity exclusively with procreation and thus to reject most sexual activity as sinful. Purity, chastity, and lack of sexuality were the key elements to the cultural identity of femininity based on motherhood. Traditional female identity, grounded in the cultural representation of the angel of the hearth, had generated the view of women as ethereal, angelical, asexual beings. In contrast, the gender identity of masculinity was constructed on the basis of sexual virility and male honor, understood as the control of women's sexuality. Hildegart's questioning of gender sexual norms led her to contest the predomi-

nant gender discourse on women. She defended the "sexual revolution" as a key force of modern civilization and of women's emancipation. She thus contested motherhood as the core gender identity for women and, indeed, provided a new reading of female identity through women's sexual identity.

The anarchist feminist Lucia Sánchez Saornil was another exceptional dissenting female voice in the 1930s in her questioning of mainstream gender discourse.⁸² Cofounder of the anarchist organization *Mujeres Libres* in 1936, she was silent on the issues of birth control and sex reform.⁸³ Nonetheless, she was unique in her open challenge to Gregorio Marañón's gender discourse based on motherhood as the nucleus of female identity. In a series of articles published in *Solidaridad Obrera* in the early 1930s, she argued that gender identity could not be based on biological essentialism. In her view, the definition of women as mothers represented the subjection of women to the biological process of reproduction:

By the theory of differentiation a woman is no more than a tyrannical womb which exercises obscure influences to the utmost folds of her brain; all the psychical life of a woman is subordinated to a biological process, and that biological process is no other than pregnancy. . . . "To be born, to give birth and to die." Here are all the horizons women have.⁸⁴

She vindicated the human potential of a woman free of the biological conditioning of motherhood. The individual rights of a woman as a person were, thus, paramount. Sánchez Saornil claimed that motherhood could never annul a woman as an individual. Women's self-fulfillment, freedom, and development were to be achieved as individuals, not as mothers.

This subversive viewpoint was exceptional among Spanish women, including feminists and working-class leaders who tended to acknowledge their cultural identity as mothers, as was the case with anarchist leader Federica Montseny.⁸⁵ Conformity to traditional gender identity points to the force of the legacy of gender discourse and its biosocial foundation. Although motherhood was reframed around a more political reading of social motherhood, which was linked with the notion of differential citizenship in the process of modernization of Spanish society, it still revolved around a traditional, biological notion of motherhood. In this, to my understanding, lies the strength of modern Spanish gender discourse. Uncontested in its core definition of motherhood, gender identity shaped most women's experiences, choices, and social itinerary, including the construction of historical Spanish feminism and the definition of its goals.⁸⁶

However, Spanish women did contest a significant feature of gender identity: the public and private divide. Although most feminists did not define

feminism in terms of suffragism and women's individual political rights, they did claim civil and social rights in work and education and their own active role in these areas.⁸⁷ Women as diverse as Carme Karr, Catalan feminist and director of the journal *Feminal*, Margarita Nelken, socialist activist, or María Espinosa, feminist leader of the *Asociación Nacional de Mujeres Españolas*, demanded recognition of women's work, an improved social status and the right to be active in many sociocultural fields in the public arena.⁸⁸ In this way they questioned the boundaries that limited female activity to the private sphere. They did not accept the separation of the spheres and women's exclusive confinement to the home. In their lives and activities, they staked out new spaces for women within the public arena. Many Spanish women attempted to redefine the standard norms of gender relations. They contested gender codes of conduct although they did not challenge their gender identity as mothers. Motherhood as the core definition of gender discourse and female identity remained uncontested, even celebrated. However, women intentionally developed effective identity politics around the experience of motherhood to achieve female emancipation and to contest discriminatory practices. The contested/uncontested nature of the category and bonds of motherhood provided a collective identity for Spanish women that generated complex and multifaceted experiences of contestation, self-empowerment, compliance, and social control.

Notes

1. For a more recent example see: Guy Hermet, *L'Espagne au XXe siècle* (Paris: P.U.F., 1992) and a critique of this interpretation in Mary Nash, "L'Espagne au XXe siècle: Critique," *History of European Ideas* 21, no. 4 (July 1995).

2. Rosa María Capel Martínez, *El sufragio femenino en la Segunda República española* (Madrid: Horas y Horas Editorial, 1992); Concha Fagoaga, *La voz y el voto de las mujeres, 1877-1931* (Barcelona: Icaria, 1985); Pilar Folguera, ed., *El feminismo en España: Dos siglos de historia* (Madrid: Fundación Pablo Iglesias, 1988); Mary Nash, "Two Decades of Women's History in Spain: A Re-appraisal" in Karen Offen, Ruth Roach Pearson, and Jane Rendall, eds., *Writing Women's History: International Perspectives* (London: Macmillan, 1991); Geraldine Scanlon, *La polémica feminista en la España contemporánea, (1868-1974)* (Madrid: Akal, 1986).

3. Mary Nash, "Experiencia y aprendizaje: La formación de los feminismos en España," *Historia Social* 20 (1995) and "Political Culture, Catalan Nationalism and the Women's Movement in Early Twentieth-Century Spain," *Women's Studies International Forum* 19, nos. 1-2 (Jan.-Apr. 1996).

4. Ibid.

5. Michel Wieviorka, *El espacio del racismo* (Barcelona: Paidós, 1992). See also C. Guillaumin, *Sexe, race et pratique du pouvoir: L'idée de nature* (Paris: Côté Femmes Editions, 1992).

6. Mark B. Adams, *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990); F. Anthias and N. Yuval-Davis, *Racialized Boundaries: Race, Nation, Gender and Class and the Anti-racist Struggle* (London: Routledge, 1992); Verena Stolcke, *Racismo y sexualidad en la Cuba colonial* (Madrid: Alianza, 1992); Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism and History* (London: Verso, 1992); and Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

7. C. Gallagher and Thomas Laqueur, eds., *The Making of the Modern Body: Sexuality and Society in the Nineteenth Century*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1987); Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1990); Mary Poovey, *Uneven Developments: The Ideological Work of Gender in Mid-Victorian England* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1988).

8. Pat Caplan, ed., *The Cultural Construction of Sexuality* (London: Routledge, 1991); Emily Martin, *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987); Susan Rubin Suleiman, ed., *The Female Body in Western Culture* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1986).

9. Sandra Lipsitz Bem, *The Lenses of Gender: Transforming the Debate on Sexual Inequality* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1993).

10. Teresa de Lauretis, *Alicia ya no: Feminismo, semiótica, cine* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1992); Clifford Geertz, *La interpretación de las culturas* (México: Gedisa, 1987); Joan W. Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis," *American Historical Review* 91 (1986).

11. For examples in wartime see: Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Women and War* (Brighton: The Harvester Press, 1987); Margaret R. Higonnet, Jane Jenson, Sonya Michel, and Margaret G. Weitz, *Behind the Lines: Gender and the Two World Wars* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1987); Mary Nash, *Defying Male Civilization: Women in the Spanish Civil War* (Denver, CO: Arden Press, 1995).

12. For a discussion of the implications of cultural identities in an international perspective, see Valentine M. Moghadam, ed., *Identity Politics and Women: Cultural Reassertions and Feminisms in International Perspective* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1994); and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, *Real and Imagined Women: Gender, Culture and Postcolonialism* (London: Routledge, 1993).

13. Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot, *Historia de las mujeres en Occidente* (Madrid: Taurus, 1993) vol. 4; Paula Baker, "The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Society, 1780-1920," *American Historical Review* 89 (June 1984); G.

Matthews, *"Just a Housewife": The Rise and Fall of Domesticity in America* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987).

14. Carme Karr, *Cultura femenina: Estudi y orientacions. (Conferències donades en l'Ateneu Barcelonès els dies 6, 13 y 20 d'abril de 1910)* (Barcelona: Tip. L'Avenç, 1910), p. 29.

15. Pompeyo Gener, "De la mujer y sus derechos en las sociedades modernas," *La Vanguardia*, February 26, 1889.

16. Pompeyo Gener, *La dona mediterrània: Llegendes històriques*. (Barcelona: Societat Catalana d'Edicions, 1916), p. 12.

17. Julián López Catalán, *Breves reflexiones sobre la educación doméstica: Discurso leído el día 1 de mayo de 1877 en la sesión pública que celebró la Sociedad Barcelonesa de Amigos de la Instrucción* (Barcelona: Librería de Juan y Antonio Bastinos, Editores, 1877), pp. 10–11.

18. Buenaventura Ribas y Quintana, "Prólogo: María de Centelles," in *Llamamiento a la Juventud de Señoras Cristianas dedicado a la Asociación de Madres Católicas* (Barcelona: Imp. Pablo Riera, 1869), pp. 5–6.

19. This model was initially proposed in 1583 by Fray Luis de León in *La perfecta casada*. See the 1932 edition published in Barcelona by Montaner y Simón.

20. Pedro Felipe Monlau, *Nociones de higiene doméstica y gobierno de la casa para uso de las escuelas de primera enseñanza de niñas y colegios de señoritas* (Madrid: Librería de la Viuda de Hernando, 1890), pp. 108–109.

21. Pilar Ballarín, "La construcción de un modelo educativo de 'utilidad doméstica,'" in Duby and Perrot, *Historia de las mujeres en Occidente*, vol. 4.

22. Mary Nash, "Identidad de género, discurso de la domesticidad y la definición del trabajo de las mujeres en la España del siglo XIX," in Duby and Perrot, *Historia de las mujeres en Occidente*, vol. 4 (Madrid: Taurus, 1993).

23. See also Cristina Borderías, *Entre líneas: Trabajo e identidad femenina en la España contemporánea, La Compañía Telefónica, 1924–1980* (Barcelona: Icaria, 1993); Pilar Pérez-Fuentes Hernández, *Vivir y morir en las minas: Estrategias familiares y relaciones de género en la primera industrialización vizcaína, 1877–1913* (Bilbao, Spain: Servicio Editorial, Universidad del País Vasco, 1993).

24. Mary Nash, "Experiencia y aprendizaje."

25. Baker, "The Domestication of Politics"; G. Bonacchi and A. Groppi, *Il Dilemma della cittadinanza: Diritti e doveri delle Donne* (Rome: Laterza, 1993); Gisela Bock and S. James, eds., *Beyond Equality and Difference: Citizenship, Feminist Politics, Female Subjectivity* (London: Routledge, 1992); P. Levine, *Feminist Lives in Victorian England: Private Roles and Public Commitment* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990).

26. Fagoaga, *La voz y el voto de las mujeres*; M.J. Lacalzada de Mateo, *Mentalidad y proyección social de Concepción Arenal* (Ferrol: Cámara Oficial de Comercio, Industria e Navegación, 1994); María Gloria Núñez Pérez, *Trabajadoras en la Segunda República: Un estudio sobre la actividad económica extradoméstica (1931–1936)* (Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y de Seguridad Social, 1989).

27. Pilar Pascual de Sanjuán, *Flora o la educación de una niña* (Barcelona: Hijos de Paluzié Editores, 1918), p. 357.

28. E. Escartín y Lartiga, *El triunfo de la anarquía: Los problemas del siglo XX* (1922). Reproduced in Mary Nash, *Mujer, familia y trabajo, 1875–1936* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1983), p. 64.

29. Mary Nash, "Identidades, representación cultural y discurso de género en la España contemporánea," in Pedro Chalmeta, Fernando Checa Cremades, et al., *Cultura y culturas en la historia* (Salamanca, Spain: Universidad de Salamanca, 1995).

30. Danièle Bussy Genevois, "Le corps du délit," *Violence ordinaire, violence imaginaire en Espagne*. Les Cahiers de Paris VIII (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 1995); Roger Chartier, "De la historia social de la cultura a la historia cultural de lo social," *Historia Social* 17 (Fall, 1993).

31. Escartín y Lartiga, *El triunfo de la anarquía*, p. 65.

32. Pascual de Sanjuán, *Flora o la educación de una niña*, p. 357.

33. Nash, "Experiencia y aprendizaje."

34. A. Buttafuoco, "Tra cittadinanza politica e cittadinanza sociale: Progetti ed esperienze del movimento politico delle donne nell'Italia liberale," in Bonacchi and Groppi, *Il dilemma della cittadinanza*; Nancy Cott, "What's in a Name: The Limits of 'Social Feminism,' or Expanding the Vocabulary of Women's History," *Journal of American History* 76, no. 3 (1989); Steven C. Hause, *Women's Suffrage and Social Politics in the French Third Republic* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1984); Karen Offen, "Defining Feminism: A Comparative Historical Approach," *Signs* 14 (1988).

35. Nash, "Experiencia y aprendizaje" and "Political Culture, Catalan Nationalism and The Women's Movement in Early Twentieth-Century Spain."

36. Ibid.

37. Rosa M. Badillo Baena, *Feminismo y educación en Málaga: El pensamiento de Suceso Luengo de la Figuera (1892–1920)* (Málaga, Spain: Universidad de Málaga, 1992); Esther Cortada Andreu, *Escuela mixta y coeducación durante la Segunda República* (Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Sociales, 1988); Mary Nash, *Defying Male Civilization*, chap. 1.; Mary Nash, ed., *Més enllà del silenci: Historia de les dones a Catalunya* (Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya, 1988); Mercedes Ugalde Solano, *Mujeres y nacionalismo vasco: Génesis y desarrollo de Emakume Abertzale*

Batza (1906–1936) (Bilbao, Spain: Universidad del País Vasco, 1993) and “Dinámica de género y nacionalismo,” *Ayer* 17 (1995).

38. Nancy Cott, “Mujer moderna, estilo norteamericano: Los años veinte,” in Duby and Perrot, *Historia de las mujeres* vol. 5; Atina Grossman, “Girkultur or Thoroughly Rationalized Female: A New Woman in Weimar Germany?” in J. Friedlander, Blanche Wiesen Cook and Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, eds., *Women in Culture and Politics: A Century of Change* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986).

39. Elisenda Macià, “L’Institut de Cultura: Un model de promoció cultural pera la dona catalana,” *L’Avenç* 112 (1988); Mary Nash, “La dona moderna del segle XX: La ‘nova dona’ a Catalunya,” *L’Avenç* 112 (1988).

40. Carmen de Burgos, *La mujer moderna y sus derechos*. (Valencia, Spain: Ed. Sempere, 1927). See Paloma Castañeda, *Carmen de Burgos: “Colombine”* (Madrid: Horas y Horas, 1994).

41. Federica Montseny, “*La Victoria*”: *Novela en la que se narran los problemas de orden moral que se le presentan a una mujer de ideas modernas*, 3d. ed. (Barcelona: La Revista Blanca, 1930), p. 6. See also Carmen Alcalde, *Federica Montseny: Palabra en rojo y negro* (Barcelona: Argos Vergara, 1983); Mary Nash, “Federica Montseny: Dirigente anarquista, feminista y ministra,” *Arenal: Revista de historia de las mujeres* 1, no. 2 (Jul.–Dec. 1994); Susanna Tavera García, “Federica Montseny y el feminismo: Unos escritos de juventud,” *Arenal: Revista de historia de las mujeres* 1, no. 2 (Jul.–Dec. 1994).

42. Mary Jacobus, Evelyn Fox Keller, and Sally Shuttleworth, eds., *Body/Politics: Women and the Discourses of Science* (New York and London: Routledge, 1990); Ludmilla Jordanova, *Sexual Visions: Images of Gender in Science and Medicine between the Eighteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1989); Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex*; Emily Martin, *The Woman in the Body: A Cultural Analysis of Reproduction* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987).

43. Mary Nash, “Maternidad, maternología y reforma eugénica en España,” in Duby and Perrot, *Historia de las mujeres*, vol. 5.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid.

46. Gisela Bock and Pat Thane, eds., *Maternity and Gender Policies: Women and the Rise of the European Welfare States, 1880s–1950s* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991); Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, eds., *Mothers of a New World: Maternalist Politics and the Origins of Welfare States* (London: Routledge, 1993).

47. Gregorio Marañón, *Tres ensayos sobre la vida sexual: Sexo, trabajo y deporte, maternidad y feminismo, educación sexual y diferenciación sexual* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 1927) and *Amor, conveniencias y eugenesia* (Madrid: Historia Nueva, 1929).

48. Marañón, *Tres ensayos*, pp. 82–84.

49. Marañón, *Amor, conveniencias y eugenesia*, p. 27.

50. Núñez Pérez, *Trabajadoras en la Segunda República*; Pilar Pérez-Fuentes Hernández, *Vivir y morir en las minas*.

51. Teresa Ortiz, “El discurso médico sobre las mujeres en la España del primer tercio del siglo XX,” in M.T. López Beltrán, ed., *Las mujeres en Andalucía: Actas del segundo encuentro interdisciplinario de estudios de la mujer en Andalucía* (Málaga, Spain: Diputación Provincial, 1993).

52. M.C. Alvarez Ricart, *La mujer como profesional de la medicina en la España del siglo XIX* (Barcelona: Anthropos, 1988).

53. Bock and Thane, eds., *Maternity and Gender Policies*; Bonacchi and Groppi, eds., *Il Dilemma della cittadinanza*; E. Janes Yeo, “Social Motherhood and the Sexual Communion of Labour in British Social Science, 1850–1950,” *Women’s History Review* 1 (1992); Seth Koven and Sonya Michel, *Mothers of a New World*; Linda Gordon, ed., *Women, the State and Welfare* (Madison, WI: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1990).

54. The politics of motherhood was also quite clear during the Civil War and the Franco period: See Mary Nash, *Defying Male Civilization*, and “Pronatalism and Motherhood in Franco’s Spain” in Bock and Thane, eds., *Maternity and Gender Policies* pp. 160–177.

55. Mary Nash, “Género y ciudadanía,” in Santos Juliá, ed., “Política en la Segunda República,” *Ayer*, no. 20 (1995).

56. Ibid. On the suffrage debate see Capel Martínez, *El sufragio femenino en la Segunda República española*; Scanlon, *La polémica feminista en la España contemporánea*; María Gloria Núñez Pérez, *Madrid, 1931: Mujeres entre la permanencia y el cambio* (Madrid: Horas y Horas, 1993).

57. Vital Aza y Díaz, “Derechos y deberes biológicos de la mujer: Parte doctrinal del discurso leído en su recepción como miembro de número de la Academia Nacional de Medicina,” in *El Siglo Médico* 24 (February 1934).

58. R. Alvarez Peláez, “Introducción al estudio de la eugenesia española (1900–1936),” *Quiju* 2, no. 1 (1985); Mary Nash, “Social Eugenics and Nationalist Race Hygiene in Early Twentieth-Century Spain,” *History of European Ideas* 15, nos. 4–6 (1992), and “Riforma sessuale e ‘nuova morale’ nell’anarchismo spagnolo,” in Giuliana Di Febo and Claudio Natoli, eds., *Spagna anni Trenta: Società, cultura, istituzioni* (Milan, Italy: Franco Angeli, 1993); P. Pérez Sanz, C. Bru Ripoll, “La sexología en la España de los años 30,” *Revista de Sexología* 30 (1987).

59. Mary Nash, “El control de la natalidad y la difusión de los medios de contracepción: El debate en el movimiento eugénico español,” *Actas del I Congrés Hispano Luso Italià de Demografia Històrica* (Barcelona, 1987).

60. *Genética, eugenesia y pedagogía social: Libro de las Primeras Jornadas Eugénicas Españolas* (Madrid: Javier Morata, 1934).

61. For comparative international perspectives on eugenics and sex reform see Mark B. Adams, ed., *The Wellborn Science: Eugenics in Germany, France, Brazil and Russia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990). N. Leys Stepan, "Race, Gender and Nation in Argentina: The Influence of Italian Eugenics," *History of European Ideas* 15, nos. 4-6 (1992); Angus McLaren, *Birth Control in Nineteenth-Century England* (London: Croom Helm, 1978); R.A. Soloway, *Demography and Degeneration: Eugenics and the Declining Birthrate in Twentieth-Century Britain* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina, 1990); Jeffrey Weeks, *Sex, Politics and Society: The Regulation of Sexuality since 1800* (London: Longman, 1981); Paul Weindling, *Health, Race and German Politics between National Unification and Nazism, 1870-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

62. Years earlier Dr. Haro had participated in a controversial debate sanctioning the practice of abortion. See Mary Nash, "Ordenamiento jurídico y realidad social del aborto en España: Una aproximación histórica," in *Ordenamiento jurídico y realidad social de las mujeres* (Madrid: Universidad Autónoma Madrid, 1986).

63. Francisco Haro, "Concepción y anticoncepción," *Genética* 1: 339.

64. R. Alvarez Peláez and R. Huertas García-Alejo, *¿Criminales o locos? Dos peritajes psiquiátricos del Dr. Gonzalo R. Lafora* (Madrid: CSIC, 1987); Eduardo de Guzmán, *Aurora de Sangre: Vida y muerte de Hildegart* (Madrid: G. del Toro, 1972); Mary Nash, "A Disreputable Sex Reformer: Hildegart, the Red Virgin," in Aránzazu Usandizaga and Elizabeth Russell, *Wayward Girls and Wicked Women: In Memoriam of Angela Carter* (Barcelona: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 1995).

65. Mary Nash, "Riforma sessuale e 'nuova morale' nell'anarchismo spagnolo."

66. Mary Nash, "El neomaltusianismo anarquista y los conocimientos populares sobre el control de la natalidad," in Mary Nash, ed., *Presencia y protagonismo: Aspectos de la historia de la mujer*. (Barcelona: Serbal, 1984).

67. See prologue by Ignasi Vidal in Félix Martí Ibáñez, *Consultorio psíquico-sexual* (Barcelona: Tusquets, 1975).

68. Félix Martí Ibáñez, *Higiene sexual: Fisiología e higiene de las relaciones sexuales y del anticoncepcionismo* (Valencia, Spain: Biblioteca Estudios, 1934), pp. 17, 27.

69. Mary Nash, "El neomaltusianismo anarquista."

70. Luis Bulffi, *Huelga de vientres* (Buenos Aires: Editorial la Poligráfica, s.d.), p. 2.

71. See Mary Nash, "Marginality and Social Change: Legal Abortion in Catalonia during the Spanish Civil War," in William D. Phillips and Carla R. Phillips,

eds., *Marginated Groups in Spanish and Portuguese History: Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Society for Spanish and Portuguese Historical Studies* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1989).

72. Félix Martí Ibáñez, *Diez meses de labor en Sanidad y Asistencia Social* (Barcelona: Ed. Tierra y Libertad, 1937), pp. 69-79. Also Domènec Bellmunt, *La revolució i l'assistència social* (Barcelona: Imp. Clarasó, 1937).

73. Malcolm Potts, Peter Diggory, and John Peel, *Abortion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).

74. Mary Nash, "L'avortement legal a Catalunya: una experiència fracassada," *L'Avenç* 58 (March 1983).

75. Nash, *Defying Male Civilization*.

76. See the *Boletín de la Asociación de Demografía Histórica*.

77. Martí Ibáñez, *Higiene sexual*, p. 11.

78. Alvarez Peláez and Huertas García-Alejo, *¿Criminales o locos? de Guzmán, Aurora de Sangre*.

79. Hildegart Rodríguez, *La rebeldía sexual de la juventud* (1931; reprint Madrid: Anagrama, 1977), p. 195; and *El problema sexual tratado por una mujer española* (Madrid: Javier Morata, 1931).

80. Rodríguez, *La rebeldía sexual*, p. 57.

81. Rodríguez, *La rebeldía sexual*, p. 195.

82. Nash, Mary. "Dos intelectuales anarquistas frente al problema de la mujer: Federica Montseny y Lucía Sánchez Saornil," *Convivium*, nos. 44-45 (1975).

83. On *Mujeres Libres* see Martha A. Ackelsberg, *Free Women of Spain: Anarchism and the Struggle for the Emancipation of Women* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991); Mary Nash, *Mujeres Libres: España 1936-1939* (Barcelona: Tusquets, 1976), *Mujer y movimiento obrero en España, 1931-1939* (Barcelona: Fontamara, 1981), and *Defying Male Civilization*.

84. Lucía Sánchez Saornil, "La cuestión femenina en nuestros medios," *Solidaridad Obrera* 15 (October 1935).

85. Nash, "Dos intelectuales anarquistas frente al problema de la mujer."

86. Nash, "Experiencia y aprendizaje."

87. Ibid.

88. A.M. Aguado, et al., *Textos para la historia de las mujeres en España* (Madrid: Cátedra, 1994).