WerkstattGeschichte 41, Klartext Verlag, Essen 2006, S. 27-44

■ Heidi Tinsman

Feminist Labor History and Marxist Legacies in Latin American Studies

Ironically, women have become central to Latin American labor history at the very moment that labor history is in danger of becoming passé. At a time when history as a discipline and women's studies as an interdisciplinary project are moving away from materialist paradigms and a focus on the working class, Latin American history has just produced some of its very first book-length histories of *women as workers*. There are some important exceptions,[1] of course, but the topical equivalents of the US and European literatures on women in the industrial revolution or plantation slavery, which were gaining steam in the 1980s, have, in the Latin Americanist case, appeared only in the last decade, if not the last five years.[2] The newness of this kind of research is remarkable given that Latin American labor history has an innovative tradition dating back some forty years, Latin American

1 Early histories of women and labor include Silvia Arron, The Women of Mexico City, 1790–1857, Stanford 1985; Gabriel Salazar, Laboradores, peones, y proletarios: Formación y crisis de la sociedad popular chilena del siglo XIX, Santiago 1986; Cecilia Alvarez Salinas, La Mujer proletaria: Una Historia para contar, Santiago 1987; Lourdes Arizpe, La mujer en el desarrollo de México y de América Latina, Mexico City 1989; Elizabeth Jelin (ed.), Women and Social Change in Latin America, London 1990; Sandra Lauderdale Graham, House and Street: The Domestic World of Servants and Masters in 19th Century Rio de Janiero, New York 1988; Xímena Valdéz, La Posición de la mujer en la hacienda, Santiago 1988; Donna Guy, Sex and Danger in Buenos Aires: Prostitution, Family, and Nation in Argentina, Lincoln 1991.

2 Early works in women's labor history in the United States and Europe are numerous. Important examples include Temma Kaplan, Anarchists of Andalucia 1868–1903, Princeton 1977; Nancy F. Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood: The »Woman's Sphere in New England, New Haven, 1977; Judith Walkowitz, Prostitution and Victorian Society: Women, Class, and the State, Cambridge 1980; Mary P. Ryan, Cradle of the Middle Class: The Family in Oneida County, 1790–1865, Cambridge 1981; Alice Kessler Harris, Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States, New York 1982; Sally Alexander, Women's Work in 19th Century London: a Study of the Years 1820–1850, London 1983; Judith Newton/Mary Ryan/Judith Walkowitz (eds.), Sex and Class in Women's History, London 1983; Jacqueline Jones, Labor of Love, Labor of Sorrow: Black Women, Work, and the Family From Slavery to the Present, New York 1985; Lousie Tilly/Joan Scott, Women, Work, and the Family, New York 1987; Christine Stansell, City of Women: Sex and Class in New York, 1789–1860, Urbana 1987; Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South, Chapel Hill 1988.
Recent works in Latin American women's labor history include Joel Wolfe, Working Women, Working Men: Saõ Paulo and the Rise Brazil's Industrial Working Class, 1900–1955, Durham 1993; Heather Fowler-Salamini/Mary Kay Vaughan (eds.), Creating Spaces, Shaping Transitions: Women of the Mexican Countryside, 1850–1990, Tuscon 1994; Barbara Weinstein, Social Peace in Brazil: Industrialists and the Remaking of the Working-Class in Brazil, 1920–1964, Chapel Hill, 1996; John D. French and Daniel James (eds.), The Gendered World of Latin American Women Workers: From the Household and the Factory to the Union and the Ballot Box, Durham 1997; Thomas Miller Klubock, Contested Communities: Class, Gender and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904–1951, Durham 1998; Anne Farnsworth-Alvear, Dulcinea in the Factory: Myths, Morals, Men and Women in Colombia's Industrial Experiment, 1905–1960, Durham 2000; Daniel James, Doña María's Story: Life History, Memory, and Political Identity, Durham 2000; Elizabeth Quay Hutchison, Labors Appropriate to Their Sex: Gender, Work, and Politics in

women's history is at least 25 years-old, and some of the very first discussions about »women and work« came from Latin American Studies during the 1970s' anthropological debates about »women and development.«[3] But it is fair to say that these literatures long remained separate. Latin American labor history left women out; Latin American women's histories were not conceived of as »labor histories« (though most dealt with issues of women's work); and where scholarship addressed women and work (the important literature on *maquiladoras* and export-processing zones, for example), it had an almost exclusively contemporary focus.[4]

Yet different timing also entails different possibilities. If Latin Americanist histories of gender and labor »lagged behind« those of US and European historiographies, it is instructive to think about why this was the case, what else Latin American labor historians were doing with their time, and how the recent feminist scholarship on Latin American labor history makes very specific contributions to discussions of gender and class. The new literature on Latin America does not merely replicate earlier US and European works, it asks new questions that reflect new directions in feminist theory, including debates over globalization and post-modernism. So too, it draws on many longstanding intellectual currents within Latin American Studies, in particular, Marxist approaches to thinking about class, imperialism, and the state. If Latin Americanist considerations of gender and labor have come relatively late to the table, they may well now also be in a position to help keep gender and sexuality central to the surviving traditions of labor history and to help save class as a meaningful category for feminist analysis.

This essay does two things. First I briefly explore some of the reasons for and consequences of an apparent paradigm lag between US/Europeanist and Latin Americanist scholarship on gender and labor. I argue that the different research agendas of regional fields were fundamentally shaped by the different Cold War contexts facing Latin America and the North Atlantic, and that these differences produced specific strengths and weaknesses.

Urban Chile, 1900–1930, Durham 2001; Katherine Bliss, Compromised Positions: Prostitution, Public Health, and Gender Politics in Revolutionary Mexico City, University Park 1991.

3 For an excellent discussion of the development of Latin American gender history as a field see, Sueann Caulfield, The History of Gender in the Historiography of Latin America, in: Hispanic American Historical Review, 81 (2001) 3-4, p.451–492; and, Thomas Miller Klubock, Writing the History of Women and Gender in Twentieth Century Chile, in: Hispanic American Historical Review, 81 (2001) 3-4, p. 493–518.

4 Scholarship on women and export-processing zones in Latin America includes, June Nash/Helen Safa (eds.), Sex and Class in Latin America, New York 1976; June Nash/María Patricia Fernández-Kelley (eds.), Women, Men, and the International Division of Labor, Albany 1983; María Patricia Fernández-Kelly, For We Are Sold, I And My People, Albany 1985; Eleanor Leacock/Helen Safa (eds.), Women's Work: Development and the Division of Labor by Gender, South Hadley 1986; Lourdes Arizpe/Josefina Aranda, Women Workers in the Strawberry Agribusiness in Mexico, in: Eleanor Leacock and Helen Safa (eds.), Women's Work: Development and the Division of Labor by Gender, South Hadley 1986, p. 174–198; Lourdes Benería/Shelly Feldman (eds.), Unequal Burden: Economic Crises, Persistent Poverty, and Women's Work, Boulder 1987; Lourdes Benería/Martha Roldán, The Crossroads of Class and Gender: Industrial Homework, Subcontracting and Household Dynamics in Mexico City, Chicago 1987; Xímena Valdes, Mujer, trabajo, y medio ambiente: Los Nudos de la modernización agraria, Santiago 1992; Silvia Venegas, Una Gota al dia ... un chorro al año: El Impacto social de la expansión fruítcola, Santiago 1992; Susan Tiano, Patriarchy on the Line: Labor, Gender, and Ideology in the MexicanMaquila Industry, Philadelphia 1994.

Second, I discuss at length some of thematic areas where I see new feminist scholarship on Latin American labor making contributions to discussions of class. In a critique of several recent studies, I highlight four areas where such contributions have been especially strong: studies of the state, studies of transnationalism, studies of sexuality, and studies of race. I argue that Latin Americanist scholarship offers some particularly innovative blendings of structuralist and post-structuralist paradigms, cultural history and social history, which are borne of a certain resistance to abandoning materialist analysis and Marxist paradigms in particular. In a twist on the standard and much deserved feminist criticism of Marxism for subordinating gender to class, I propose that, within Latin American history today, the survival of Marx has in many ways helped make women workers and the gendered nature of labor visible.

The Politics of Timing

The notion that Latin American feminist labor history has »followed behind« that on the US and Europe makes many a Latin Americanist bristle, but it also generates grudging agreement. That the timing of women workers' appearance in regional historiographies is different seems undeniable. Yet this is not a matter of thwarted trickle-down or a weaker Latin Americanist commitment to feminism. Rather, it springs from the different Cold War contexts facing Latin America and the US and Western Europe as regions, and the correspondingly different academic agendas that area studies paradigms generated about each region. The emergence of intellectual paradigms is always closely related to the social movements and political conflicts of particular moments and places. While many regions of the world faced similar and interconnected problems in the second half of the 20th century, the global divisions between »east« and »west,« »developed« and »developing« worlds placed Latin America in a firmly exterior, contentious, and aspiring place vis-à-vis the North Atlantic. Although the political landscapes of the US and various parts of Europe were themselves profoundly different, Latin America always figured as the more constant »other,« a place whose nations were »not yet« fully industrialized western democracies.

Cold war difference is especially striking when considering the connection between women's movements and feminist scholarship. Women's movements within the US, Western Europe, and Latin America were in very different structural positions to impact national academies. In the US and Western Europe, the beginning of formal women's studies programs in the early 1980s marked a high point of the second-wave feminism that emerged from the New Left. Its goals were largely articulated in terms of broader struggles for civil rights, which, however radical, always assumed an *already-existing* liberal-democratic framework wherein the university was a primary site of political action. In contrast, in many parts of Latin America, where feminism was also re-emerging with force in the 1970s and 1980s, feminist struggles coalesced around pro-democracy movements and anti-imperialist revolutionary struggles. Women's movements and debates about gender equality were crucial to fights against Pinochet as well as for Sandinista socialism. Yet despite the force of such movements, feminist agendas were far more often pointedly excluded from the university because of military dictatorship (Southern Cone), civil war (Central America), or acute government hostility (Mexico) – political contexts that directly resulted from US Cold War policy in the region. Important feminist scholarship on Latin America was generated underground in the many non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that served as »shadow universities,« but such work tended to focus on public policy and contemporary

social movements.[5] It was only *after* transitions to democracy – still very much in process today – that Latin American feminist paradigms began to make significant gains within the formal academy. So, in many ways, the »different timings« of feminist labor history on the US, Europe, and Latin America flowed from the ways that the Cold War created authoritarian climates in Latin America which placed women's movements more exclusively in the streets (or on the barricades), while at the same time the Cold War generated conditions in the US and Western Europe which allowed for widening the democratic franchise via feminist struggles in the university (as well as in the streets).

For scholars of Latin America training and working in US and British universities, the existence of formal women's studies programs had a crucial impact, and we see a consequent flourishing of English-language histories of Latin American women and gender relations beginning in the late 1980s and early 1990s. But it is fair to say that this literature was never in the same volume as that done on US or European histories, and it remained a distinct genre from labor history. Tellingly, many US-trained Latin Americanists who considered themselves feminists did not first undertake histories of women or gender. In recent years, feminist historians of Latin America have highlighted the different intellectual agendas and unequal resources of feminists working *in* Latin America versus those working *in* the US and Europe. Yet however significant such differences have been, the Latin American scholarship coming from »the North« developed in close tandem with the Cold War politics inside Latin America, which worked against privileging women or gender as objects of study.

A second factor in the different timings of feminist labor studies is the far longer-lived influence of Marxist paradigms within Latin American history. If right-wing political regimes bear responsibility for excluding Latin American feminists from the academy, leftist political projects (including Marxist scholarship) bear a different responsibility for subordinating the gender-based claims of Latin American women's movements to other priorities. Certainly Marxism was also central to the evolution of US and European social history, and there it posed similar problems for gender history. But Marxism remained dominant for longer in Latin American Studies for reasons that, again, sprang from Latin America's specific Cold War reality, including the importance of leftist political parties to Latin American pro-democracy movements, the existence of actual socialist revolutions in Cuba and Nicaragua, and various stripes of Marxist insurgency throughout the region. In the US and Europe, academic Marxism and leftist politics were generally on the defensive

5 In Argentina, Brazil, and Chile, many studies of women and class emerge from pro-democracy institutes running projects on domestic violence, human rights, and anti-poverty initiatives. But the discipline of history, and its close association with narratives of national identity, was especially guarded by the political right; and in numerous places, military governments re-staffed history departments with their own personnel.
An example of feminist scholarship produced by independent non-governmental organizations includes the burgeoning Chilean literature on women in the grape-export sector and its implications for democracy. See Xímena Valdés, Una Experiencia de organización autónoma de mujeres del campo, in: Cuadernos de la mujer del campo, 2 (1983) 1, p. 22–44; Xímena Valdés, Sinopsis de una realidad oculta: La Trabajadoras del campo, Santiago 1987; María Elena Cruz/Cecilia Leiva, La Fruticultura en Chile despúes de 1973: Una Area privilegiada de expansión del capitalismo, Santiago 1987.
For an excellent discussion of women in pro-democracy movements see, Temma Kaplan, Taking Back the Streets: Women, Youth and Direct Democracy, Berkeley 2004, and Lisa Baldez, Why Women Protest, Cambridge 2002.

by the 1980s. By contrast, in Latin America, the elections of Margaret Thatcher and Ronald Reagan signified not the eclipse of 1960s radicalism, but the hyper-polarization of Cold War dichotomies wherein Marxism remained potent for another two decades. Moreover, within the context of »Latin America as the ›third world,‹« Latin American Marxism, far more than US or British and continental Marxisms, tied class struggle to national liberation. Such nationalist urgency hugely shaped the labor histories on Latin America, both those produced within Latin America and those generated by scholars from the North. Labor history was most commonly a meta-narrative of anti-imperialist struggle, or its frustration.[6] And as was true of Marxist stories everywhere, such narratives assumed either that women's »labor« was a minor part of the story or that women's experiences were adequately covered within the rubric of »the working class.«

The long life of Marxism within Latin American labor history is closely related to a third factor important to the different timings of feminist scholarship: the different ways Latin American Studies responded to the challenges of post-structuralism and post-modernism. In the last decade and a half, US and European women's studies have engaged, and helped produce, a vibrant critique of the universal subject and modernist paradigms of citizenship, nation-building, developmentalism, and historical linearity. Feminists have emphasized the need to deconstruct how modernity's universals are constituted in the first place, and have underscored the hierarchies, exclusions, heterogeneity, and temporal flux of such categories. This has produced a decisive shift in the object of what many feminists in European and US-American Studies are studying: a shift from writing about »women and women's experience« to writing about »gender and sexuality as ›discourses‹ or ›modes of power;‹« a shift from social history to cultural history; from historical-materialism to cultural studies; from utilizing Marx and Levi-Strauss to utilizing Foucault and Derrida.

These shifts also have occurred within Latin American history, but their implementation has been far more selective and syncretic. While many forces are at play here, one important reason for the difference has been the much higher stakes in Latin America as a region of

6 Economic and labor histories utilizing Marxist fameworks are numerous. Important examples include, Stanley Stein, Vassouras, A Brazilian Coffee County, 1850–1900: The Role of Planter and Slave in a Changing Plantation Society, Cambridge 1957; John Womack, Zapata and the Mexican Revolution, New York 1968; Barbara Stallings, Class Conflict and Economic Development in Chile, Stanford 1978; Eric Van Young, Hacienda and Market in Eighteenth-Century Mexico: The Rural Economy of the Guadalajara Region, 1675–1820, Berkeley 1981; John Coatsworth, Growth Against Development: The Economic Impact of Railroads in Porfiran, Mexico, DeKalb 1981; Barbara Weinstein, The Amazon Rubber Boom, 1850–1920, Stanford 1983; Peter DeShazo, Urban Workers and labor Unions in Chile, 1902–1927, Madison 1983; Florencia Mallon, Defense of Community in Peru's Central Highlands: Peasant Struggle and Capitalist Transition, 1860–1940, Princeton 1983; Sidney Mintz, Sweetness and Power: The Place of Sugar in Modern History, New York 1985; Charles Bergquist (ed.), Labor in Latin America: Comparative Essays on Chile, Argentina, Venezuela, and Colombia, Stanford 1986; Peter Winn, Weavers of Revolution: The Yarur Workers and Chile's Road to Socialism, New York 1986; Steve J. Stern, Peru's Indian Peoples and the Challenge of the Spanish Conquest: Huamanga to 1640, Madison 1982;Carmen Diana Deere, Household and Class Relations: Peasants and Landlords in Northern Peru, Berkeley 1990; John D. French, The Brazilian Workers' ABC: Class Conflict and Alliances in Modern Sao Paulo, Chapel Hill 1992; Jeffrey Gould, To Lead as Equals: Rural Protest and Political Consciousness in Chinandega, Nicaragua, 1912–1979, Chapel Hill 1990; Jonathan Brown, Oil and Revolution in Mexico,Berkeley 1992; Steven C. Topik/Allen Wells (eds.), The Second Conquest of Latin America: Coffee, Henequen, and Oil During the Export Boom, 1850–930, Austin 1998.

giving up »the nation« and »the national subject« as objects of study and political struggle. Given the deeply compromised sovereignty of most Latin American countries throughout the 20th century, modernist conceptualizations of state- and class- formation, citizenship, and national liberation have retained an urgency in Latin America and Latin American Studies that they have lacked in the US and Western Europe. It is not that essentialist categories of »the working class,« »the nation,« or »the woman« are any less problematic for thinking about gender in Latin America, but what is politically at stake in jettisoning them is very different. In today's post-authoritarian, post-Cold War Latin America, feminists are finally in a position to make nationally-recognized claims about women's specific position within the polity, and assertions about »women's experience,« in the past or present, have been a crucial, very embattled, part of this project. Moreover, within the contemporary context of an aggressive neo-liberalism and US political dominance, many Latin Americans and scholars of Latin America remain skeptical of paradigms that (at least in some hands) suggest abandoning quests for national sovereignty as a progressive goal. This is not to justify the tiresome and reactionary admonishment from traditional leftist and nationalists that feminists (and post-modernists) »wait until after the revolution« to complicate the categories. Rather, it is to recognize that the tenacity with which Latin American historiography has guarded modernist paradigms, including Marxist ones, flows from geopolitics not epistemological backwardness.

Feminist Trajectories in Latin American History and Labor Studies

Modernist universals and classic Marxist narratives have not gone unchallenged in Latin American history. Indeed, they have been greatly transformed by both feminist theory and post-structuralism. But they have more often blended materialist and linguistic approaches, modernist and post-modern methodologies, social and cultural histories. Precisely because of Latin American labor history's relatively later focus on women workers and its hesitancy to abandon Marxism or other materialist frameworks, the books that have been published in the last decade on women workers or the gendered nature of labor, undertook an analysis of gender and sexuality as pervasive discourses and technologies of power as part of asserting claims about women's and men's experiences within capitalism. There has been far less of a split between feminists who see the object of study as »women« (or »men«) and those who see it as »gender ideology.« Of course, creative blending has also been done in US and European gender and women's history, especially in labor studies; but the dichotomy between social and cultural history has been far less exaggerated in the literature on Latin America.

Consider, for example, the very different receptions of Joan Scott's seminal 1988 essay on »gender as a useful category of analysis.« Scott proposed that we think of gender as diffuse power relations that both shape and are shaped by other politics. She likewise argued that gender's potency lay in its symbolic, representational, and rhetorical authority to generate hierarchies and categories of difference throughout society.[7] For many feminists in US-American Studies and Europeanist circles, Scott's work marked the »linguistic turn« towards the study of cultural discourse *as opposed to* the empiricist claims of social history, especially its Marxist variants. But in Latin Americanist circles, Scott's work inspired a wave of feminist histories of women and gender that were profoundly materialist and social historically-oriented. Her work was especially important to new labor historians, many of

7 Joan Wallach Scott, Gender and the Politics of History, New York 1988.

whom used her concept of »gender politics« to interrogate how gender discourses were fundamental to sexual divisions of labor in factories, the family, working-class social movements, and national modernization programs. This tended to rework Marxist idioms of class formation and struggle rather than abandon them. It is not that Latin Americanists failed to grasp Scott's essay, but that the questions being asked about Latin America compelled different uses.

Combinations of discursive and materialist methodologies in feminist histories of Latin America are especially evident in four distinct, overlapping areas of attention: 1.) studies of gender and state-formation; 2.) histories of labor and sexuality; 3.) considerations of transnational and world-historical dynamics; and 4.) recent work on racial formation. While each of these thematic areas has also been a focus to greater or lesser degree in other regional literatures on gender and women's labor history, they have had a very specific articulation within Latin American historiography which flows from both the timing of Latin American feminist studies and the particular political concerns that have constituted Latin America as a region. At the same time, the various directions Latin Americanist feminist scholarship has taken suggest how porous and flexible regional epistemologies can be. Latin American history, like other fields, has become more interdisciplinary and more restless within the confines of area studies. So while its particular strengths may be rooted in academic and political contexts specific to »Latin America,« the meanings of these strengths should be quite relevant elsewhere.

Gender and the State

The state has been a focus of Latin American Studies since their inception in the 1950s. Modernization theory, the foundational logic of area studies, saw the state as playing a key role in national development, and this tenant remained largely unchallenged by the concurrent and vibrant leftist critiques of capitalist development. Indeed, throughout most of the 20th century, Marxist theorists, in particular, were busy elaborating models for thinking about the state and making up for Karl Marx's own neglect of the topic. As a result, Latin American labor historians narrated stories of working-class politics in terms of class struggles over the state, a narrative that took many forms. In the 1960s, labor history mapped the institutional politics of labor unions and leftist parties. In the 1970s, dependency theory inspired histories that blamed underdevelopment on colonial international relations and the structural impossibility of a national bourgeoisie. By the 1980s, historians were obsessed in creative ways with Gramsci and the relevance of »hegemony« for explaining the mass appeal of such authoritarian populist projects as Peronism and the Mexican PRI.[8]

Feminist scholarship on labor and the state entered in the 1990s just as Gramscian debates were peaking, and took them in new directions by arguing that patriarchal families were central to creating cross-class coalitions and political rule. Historians such as Susan Besse, Mary Kay Vaughn, Barbara Weinstein, and Jocelyn Olcott, have provided a foundational model for thinking about the »modernization of patriarchy« and feminist impact on

8 Especially fine examples are Daniel James, Resistance and Integration: Peronism and the Argentine Working Class, 1946–1976, New York 1988; William Roseberry, Anthropologies and Histories: Essays in Culture, History, and Political Economy, New Brunswick 1989; Gilbert Joseph/Daniel Nugent (eds.), Everyday Forms of State Formation: Revolution and the Negotiation of Rule in Modern Mexico, Chapel Hill 1994.

state formation.[9] In studies of industrial Brazil and post-revolutionary Mexico, such authors have argued that the state and industrial leaders aggressively pushed a cross-class ideal of harmonious domesticity in which men of all classes were breadwinners and women dedicated themselves to scientific motherhood. Although never a reality for most poor people, and in many cases hotly contested, the policies underlying this ideal had wide appeal to working-class and middle-class people alike and helped states generate political legitimacy and a relative social peace. Even labor histories that did not explicitly focus on »political hegemony« found it useful to think in terms of the cross-class ideal of male-headed family. Elizabeth Quay Hutchison's exemplary work on women's industrial labor in early 20th century Chile wields Joan Scott's insights to explore the converging gender ideologies of government agencies, Catholic reformers, working-class radicals, and even feminists who emphasized empowering men as breadwinners and assigning women to »labors appropriate to their sex.«[10] Such modernized patriarchy both helped and hindered women: it critiqued overt forms of male domination while confirming men's positions as heads of household; it encouraged female education, but slotted women into inferior wage labor jobs.

Historians of earlier periods have also stressed patriarchy's central role in state and class formation. Elizabeth Dore argued that 19th century liberalism's emphasis on private property and the republican family stripped many women of legal and financial entitlements enjoyed under Spanish law. She also underscored how republican patriarchy, which gave men authority over women's land and labor, conditioned the ways export-capitalism generated new forms of coerced family labor (debt-peonage, etc.) as opposed to free labor.[11] Historian Ana María Alonso stressed the importance of state-promoted patriarchy in her history of Mexico's 19th century military campaign against the Apache and settlement of the country's northern frontier. Alonso argued that the government recruited men as soldier-farmers, granting them homesteads, guns, and a racially »white« masculinity that presumed their authority over the bodies of women and conquered Indians.[12] Historian Steve Stern's important work on colonial Mexico examined state politics and patriarchy from a more bottom-up perspective. Posing the now much-used concept of »patriarchal pacts,« Stern argued that poor men and women understood political power in terms of daily negotiations over gender obligations and responsibilities. Such patriarchal pacts, Stern maintained, were

9 Susan K. Besse, Restructuring Patriarchy: The Modernization of Gender Inequality in Brazil, 1914–1940, Chapel Hill 1996; Barbara Weinstein, Social Peace in Brazil: Industrialists and the Remaking of the Working-Class in Brazil, 1920–1964, Chapel Hill 1996; Mary Kay Vaughan, Cultural Politics in Revolution: Teachers, Peasants, and Schools in Mexico, 1930–1940, Tuscon 1997); Mary Kay Vaughan, Modernizing Patriarchy: State Policies, Rural Households, and Women in Mexico, 1930–1940, in: Elizabeth Dore/Maxine Molyneaux (eds.), Hidden Histories of Gender and the State in Latin America, Durham 2000, p. 194–214; Jocelyn Olcott, Revolutionary Women in Post-Revolutionary Mexico, Durham 2005.

10 Elizabeth Quay Hutchison, Labors Appropriate to Their Sex: Gender, Work, and Politics in Urban Chile, 1900–1930, Durham 2001.

11 Elizabeth Dore, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back, in: Dore/Molyneaux (eds.), Hidden Histories, p. 1–44; Elizabeth Dore, Patriarchy from Above, Patriarchy from Below: Debt Peonage and Nicaraguan Coffee Estates, 1870–1930, in: William Gervase Clarence-Smith and Steven Topik (eds.), The Global Coffee Economy in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, 1500–1989, Cambridge 2003, p. 209–235.

12 Ana María Alonso, Thread of Blood: Colonialism, Revolution, and Gender on Mexico's Northern Frontier, Tuscon 1995.

always contested and provided the logic of men and women's engagement with Spanish elites and colonialist authorities.[13] Although not cast as a »labor history,« Stern's work emphasized that the nature of patriarchal politics differed significantly according to different regimes of labor and ethnicity: Indian-led agrarian communities in Oaxaca had more fluid gender relations than the mestizoized sugar plantations of Morelos, and male violence was most exacerbated and misogynist in hispanicized Mexico City where many women earned wages that allowed some independence from male authority.

All of the Latin American scholarship on patriarchy and the state employ methodological hybrids. Gender is addressed as an ideological and cultural formation of difference and hierarchy that informs the politics of class formation and state-domination, and which creates subjectivity as a basis of social experience as well as political rule. The union of structuralism and post-structuralism is perhaps most visible in those histories that pointedly insisted that Gramsci and Foucault are both necessary to thinking about the state. In her study of the contested meaning of political liberalism in 19th century Peru and Mexico, Florencia Mallon ingeniously disrupted a classic tale about the politics of hegemony by showing how discourses of gender and generational right shaped the internal hierarchies and fissures of indigenous and peasant communities.[14] Similarly, Karin Rosemblatt's book on feminism and popular front Chile (1938–1952) argued that class coalitions between workers and industrialists were achieved through the promotion of male-headed families, a goal shared by the Marxist labor movement as well as leftist and reformist political parties.[15] Employing a Foucaultian analysis of the welfare state, Rosemblatt contrasted the ways government-sponsored social workers encouraged the idea that poor women were entitled to »state charity« with the ways the medical establishment and labor movement articulated male workers' need for healthcare and pensions in terms of »citizen rights.« Rosemblatt then turned back to Gramsci to argue that such gender ideologies were constantly contested and reshaped by class-based struggles between middle-class and working-class feminists for dominance within the national women's movement.

Feminist scholarship on the state is also illustrative of the Latin Americanist engagement with post-colonial theory. Borrowing in particular from South Asian subaltern studies, which also took initial inspiration from Gramsci to revise orthodox Marxism, Latin Americanists have rethought the meaning of »the worker,« »the poor,« or »the indigenous« in terms of the contested and partial construction of subjectivities that are forged through local, national, and international politics of state-formation. Feminists have argued that constructions of gender are crucial to these subjectivities and to how states rule. Moreover, the feminist insistence on looking at »difference« has added conceptual fuel to the post-colonialist assertion that capitalism and modernity have multiple meanings structured by empire.

One perhaps could criticize Latin Americanist considerations of gender for focusing *too much* on the state and its presumed powers. Latin American Studies are always haunted by

13 Steve J. Stern, The Secret History of Gender: Women, Men, and Power in late Colonial Mexico, Chapel Hill 1995; Sarah C. Chambers, From Subjects to Citizens: Honor, Gender, and Politics in Arequipa, Peru, 1780–1854, University Park 1999.

14 Florencia Mallon, Peasant and Nation: The Making of Post-Colonial Mexico and Peru, Berkeley 1995; Florencia Mallon, The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from Latin American History, in: American Historical Review 99 (1994) 5, 1491–1515.

15 Karin Alejandra Rosemblatt, Gendered Compromises: Political Cultures and the State in Chile, 1920–1950, Chapel Hill 2000.

a tendency to see »Iberian« and »third world« political cultures as essentially state-driven and authoritarian and as juxtaposed to the civilian republicanism and pluralism of the US and some parts of Europe. But precisely because of this problematic dichotomy, considerations of the state's role in gender and class formation have been much less considered in many social histories of the US and Europe (German history being a notable exception) and beg far greater attention. Struggles over state power are no less acute in contexts where political power appears more present in »civil society« or less centralized. Indeed, a great strength of Latin American feminist history has been to show how states use gender on multiple institutional and cultural levels to naturalize hierarchies of public and private, capital and labor, to constitute national political orders.

Gender and the Transnational

Along side Latin American Studies' concern with the state has been a longstanding focus on international dynamics. Latin America's very constitution as an »area« meriting special study emphasized its »regionness« and location within a wider world. Efforts to identify the shared traits of what made different societies »Latin American« were always strained and homogenizing, but they also encouraged comparative analysis between national histories as well as considerations of how Latin America was historically »different from« or »related to« the normative examples of Europe and the US. Latin American histories of labor and capitalist development have paid particular attention to transnational histories of political and economic domination. Dependency theory's thesis that developed countries systematically under-develop the third world periphery anticipated contemporary discussions of globalization by some thirty years. Rejections, qualifications, and improvements of the dependency thesis, in turn, produced an outpouring of scholarship on colonialism and imperialism. Most of these works have been nuanced national histories that keep one eye on the international, stressing how local dynamics unfold within wider global matrices of inequality and alliance.

Recent feminist histories that examine international dynamics have paid special attention to the ways gender informs imperialist projects. One especially fine example is Thomas Miller Klubock's story about Chilean miners in a US-owned and operated copper mine during the first half of the 20th century.[16] Klubock complicates a classic Marxist story about proletarianization and the rise of working-class militancy by arguing that one of the chief ways the US Braden Copper Company created and controlled its workforce was through the imposition of marriage and a modernized domesticity in which husbands provided for housewives and children. The sober masculinity implied by this model was both a source of worker resistance (men drank, gambled, and whored) and class mobilization (leftist unions also encouraged male-headed families as the basis for demanding higher wages). Contests for political hegemony were waged in terms of competing masculinities. Klubock creatively explores the contradictions of welfare capitalism, suggesting how it modelled for the welfare state, and stressing how these were transnational phenomena in which class struggles were waged through gendered battles over international capitalism's efforts to sexually tame men.

16 Thomas Miller Klubock, Contested Communities: Class, Gender and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904–1951, Durham 1998.

Eileen Findlay's study of Puerto Rico before and during US occupation also considers the international dynamics of gender and labor.[17] Like Klubock, Findlay emphasizes the connection between contests over political rule and models of male-headed nuclear family imposed from the US, but she is more focused on state policy and the sexual control of women. Findlay explores the transnational nature of labor and feminist activism, tracing the intricate discussions about »the women worker« and »the prostitute« which circulated between Puerto Rico, Cuba, Florida, and New York. Like Klubock, she combines a post-structuralist discourse analysis with a structuralist mapping of changing industrial labor relations and class-based conflicts. Gender and sexuality are treated as modes of power that fundamentally rethink how class and class conflict are constituted. At the same time, both books centrally feature Marxist narratives about class formation, national struggles over state power, and the importance of imperialism to world capitalism.

As many historians and feminist scholars move away from the single-country study to address more transnational and global dynamics, Latin Americanist scholarship on international dynamics may prove especially instructive.[18] In particular, Latin American Studies' long tradition of writing national histories while thinking about international economies and politics suggests the imperative of thinking about the transnational without abandoning »the nation« as an analytical category or historical space where transnational dynamics specifically play out. Relatedly, the narratives about imperialism and colonialism that so dominate Latin Americanist approaches to the international cautions against the tendency in much literature on globalization to collapse discussions of politics into an amorphous, all-powerful, and borderless capitalism. Of course, empire and capitalist spread need not be the only way to think about the transnational, and even where geo-political domination is privileged this need not be seen as solely top-down. As some scholars within area studies have already suggested, we may gain a great deal by thinking across Cold War-era regional fields: gender and labor histories of »the Americas,« for example, or of the »Pacific« and »Atlantic Worlds« might be especially productive.[19] But whatever the new »area« of study, recent Latin American historiography suggests the continuing importance of narratives about world capitalism that pay attention to how local class politics (whatever the »locality«) are constituted through contests over other modes of power, especially gender.

Sexuality and Class

»Sex« and »class« are terms that rarely mingle these days, although they once did and the story of their divorce is instructive. In the 1960s and early 1970s, radical feminists revamped Frederick Engels' thesis to propose that the »sex« was an a priori »class« in which men

17 Eileen Findlay, Imposing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico, 1870–1920, Durham 1999.

18 Other works that touch on gender and labor in an imperialist or colonialist context include, Gilbert Joseph/Catherine LeGrand/Ricardo Salvatore (eds.), Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U. S.-Latin American Relations, Durham 1998.

19 Sandhya Shukla/Heidi Tinsman (eds.), Our Americas: Political and Cultural Imaginings, special issue of *Radical History Review* 89 (2004) 3, p. 1–10; Heidi Tinsman/Sandhya Shukla, Thinking Across the Americas, in: Sandhya Shukla and Heidi Tinsman (eds.), Imagining Our Americas: Nation, Empire, Region, forthcoming Durham 2007, p. 3–36; Masao Miyoshi/H. D. Harootunian, Learning Places: The Afterlives of Area Studies, Durham 2002; Paul Giles, Virtual Americas: Transnational Fictions and the Transatlantic Imaginary, Durham 2002.

were akin to a bourgeois that owned the means of (re)production by controlling women's bodies.[20] Marxist-feminists, by contrast, proposed that »sex« and »class« were dialectically connected systems in which patriarchal divisions of labor within the family translated into sexual divisions of labor within capitalism and visa versa. By the 1980s, »gender« became more widely used to connote the cultural construction of masculine and feminine difference (including class-specific versions of this), while »sex« referred to biological difference (shared by physical bodies regardless of class) upon which gender meanings were built. Yet the gender-sex binary quickly came under revision by those who argued that »biological difference« itself had no social meaning outside culture, and that »gender identity« and »sex difference« did not always correlate. Considerations of »sex« gave way to »sexuality,« the cultural meanings of the sexual body and sexual practice, and as distinct from gender constructions of masculine and feminine. The shift from sex to sexuality was enabled by (and helped generate) the post-structuralist and psychoanalytic emphasis on language and the symbolic as distinct power relations and sites of subject formation. In many US and European feminist studies circles this shift also marked a turning-away from class analysis and a specific shunning of Marxism.

But sexuality has had a different life in Latin American history. Because of the later timing of feminist scholarship on labor, Latin Americanist efforts to explore the gendered nature of working-class lives happened simultaneously with debates over sexuality. Recent histories of gender and labor in Latin America, including each of the works discussed above, give specific attention to sexuality as a mode of power and practice distinct from gender. The literature on »the modernization of patriarchy« stresses how class formation and political struggle over state politics are tied to men's access to female bodies, conjugal fights over sexual obligation, and/or the state or business's investment in controlling both men and women's sexuality. So too, feminist works on transnational dynamics have stressed how colonial empires, the US government, and capitalist enterprise differently policed sexuality as a means of maintaining order and extracting wealth.

One especially fine example of feminist labor history's attention to sexuality is Anne Farnsworth-Alvear's study of women textile workers in Colombia during the early 20th century.[21] The book documents the efforts of Medellín industrialists and Catholic reformers to create a respectable female workforce by imposing strict codes of sexual morality, including complete prohibitions on employee marriage, pregnancy, sexual activity, even flirting. Bringing feminist analysis to bear on Bourdieu's notion of *doxa*, Farnsworth-Alvear argues that the sexual vigilance of Catholic welfare-capitalism was successful not only because of employers' class power, but because aspects of the *La Moral* (as the moral code was known) tapped into women's and men's own sexual identities, desires, and needs. She departs from the favored Gramscian script, maintaining that while clandestine flirting and love affairs defied *La Moral,* they did not amount to a »resistance to hegemony« or a rejection of the code's basic tenants about female virtue.

Also departing from narratives of domination and resistance is Daniel James' elegant interpretation of the life history of Doña María, a former meat-packer and union leader in

20 For an excellent discussion of debates within early second-wave feminism in the US, see Alice Echols, Daring to Be Bad: Radical Feminism in America, 1967–1975, Minneapolis 1989.

21 Anne Farnsworth-Alvear, Dulcinea in the Factory: Myths, Morals, Men and Women in Colombia's Industrial Experiment, 1905–1960, Durham 2000.

Peronist Argentina.[22] James draws heavily on literary criticism and cultural anthropology to deconstruct the interview text and lay bare the distinct scripts – Peronist, anarchist, Catholic, and others – that his subject mobilizes to reveal and obscure herself. All of these scripts imply conflicting narratives of sexual morality, vulnerability, or rebelliousness. But rather than reading the working-class woman as entirely scripted by ideological projects outside her agency, James brilliantly deciphers Doña María's own voice as emerging in places where she defends working-class women's sexual virtue in ways that poignantly reject both the sexual hypocrisy of bourgeois women and the misogyny of working-class male radicals. Discourses of sexuality become places were the female subaltern speaks.

My own scholarship on Chilean peasants and agrarian reform during and before Salvador Allende's government has also been especially interested in linking sexuality to class politics. I argue that the intense class conflicts driving massive land redistribution was experienced by men and women in terms of fights over appropriate sexual conduct.[23] Focusing on issues of escalating domestic violence, rape, adolescent pregnancy, birth control, and extra marital affairs, I explore how male authority over women's bodies and labor was central to the agrarian reform's goal of turning peasant men into »their own bosses.« I argue that the equation of working-class militancy with male sexual bravado increased men's social license at the expense of women's security and clashed with the agrarian reform's simultaneous promotion of a modern domesticity that encouraged women to expect greater male fidelity.

Conceptually, my work draws on debates over sexuality to resurrect and reinvigorate older Marxist-feminist insights about the dialectic of patriarchy and capitalism, especially the idea that family-based divisions of labor shape divisions of labor outside the family. By the early 1990s, when I first started thinking about Chile's agrarian reform, Marxist-feminism had long been out of favor and criticized (quite rightly) for structural determinism and ethnocentrism. Yet to me it seemed entirely possible, and necessary, to recover what was most innovative about the Marxist-feminist move – the dialectic of class and sex – while letting go of some of its baggage and utilizing more post-structuralist approaches to gender and sexuality (as opposed to »sex«). Instead of two interlocking gears, I proposed thinking about rural Chile in terms of multiple, mutually articulating, »dynamics« or »sets of meaning« whose relationship to each other was always partial and contingent, and which created both subjectivities and social divisions of labor. This meant multiplying the objects of study: not only hacienda fields and state farms versus patriarchal families, but other institutions (agricultural schools, literacy projects, state birth control programs), cultural practices (courtship, teen dances), and archival sources (popular music, court records on domestic violence).

My efforts to make sexuality more central to feminist materialism also drew inspiration from the older concerns within radical feminism – via Kate Millet and Gayle Rubin, who argued that it was impossible to understand what »patriarchy« was really about without a notion of men's sexual control of women's bodies. If today this is too essentialist, the central problematic radical feminists raised still rings true. Mapping the »production of sexual divisions of labor« via patriarchy is not enough, and simply begs the question of what patriarchy is about, where it comes from and what makes it tick. I proposed bridging radical and Marx-

22 Daniel James, Doña María's Story: Life History, Memory, and Political Identity, Durham 2000.

23 Heidi Tinsman, Partners in Conflict: The Politics of Gender, Sexuality, and Labor in the Chilean Agrarian Reform, 1950–1973, Durham 2002.

ist feminisms, to see sexuality and gender as having a very specific dialectic in which gender divisions of labor take shape from and shape meanings of sexuality.[24]

For example, I argued in my work on Chile's agrarian reform that the sexual divisions of labor which gave men paid, permanent jobs on state farms while assigning most women to subsistence farming and domestic work flowed not only from the gendered ideals of creating male breadwinners and maternal housewives, but from cross-class assumptions that husbands should have exclusive access to, and control over, wives' bodies, a sexual arrangement that was threatened by women's equal inclusion in state-farms and labor unions. Likewise, I argued that peasants understood the benefits and problems of the agrarian reform in terms of gendered subjectivities that drew their meaning from changing relations of sexuality. Men associated the class-empowerment of successful labor campaigns and access to land in terms of transcending the emasculation of the latifundia peonage system and as having expanded sexual opportunities with multiple women, including the taking of second families. Married peasant women, in contrast, associated labor activism and heightened class conflict with sexual violence and men's economic and sexual betrayals to family.

Whatever our various specific interventions, feminist labor historians of Latin America have insisted that discussions about sexuality can and should take place as an integral part of class analysis rather as a departure from it. If there is general agreement that sexuality and gender are most productively addressed as distinct modes of power rather than as fixed structures and identities, Latin Americanists emphasize that social divisions of labor are central to how gender and sexuality operate as modes of power and to what they politically mean. This is a double challenge. It insists that any feminist discussion of sexuality is incomplete without an analysis of how it is constituted through class relations. Equally so, it suggests that there can be no labor history (or other history of class) that does not address sexual power and gender as integral to class formation and politics.

Race and Class

One of the most recent and exciting developments in Latin American history has been studies of race and ethnicity. Given the longstanding geopolitical racialization of Latin America as a region, it is perhaps surprising that race has received so little attention beyond early anthropological discussions about »Indian acculturation« and comparative studies of slavery, crucial though these were. The reasons for the general silence on race are similar to those shaping the »later timing« of Latin Americanist histories of gender and labor, including the location of race-based social movements outside the Latin American academy, the strength of Marxist paradigms, and the unified narratives favored by nationalist historiographies. But race also failed to register as a significant analytical category for historians because of the very *history* of race in Latin America, namely the self-projection of many 20th century Latin American countries as thoroughly mixed and/or racially harmonious societies, or as places where the national citizenship was such (i. e. where »real Indians« remained exterior to the nation, awaiting or resisting assimilation). Colonial history always differed somewhat from modern history in that it did centrally narrate a conquest and encounter of »Indians« with »Europeans« (and to a lesser extent, with »Africans«). Yet the meanings of such race-

24 See Heidi Tinsman, Reviving Feminist Materialism? Gender and Neoliberalism in Pinochet's Chile, in: SIGNS: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 26 (2000) 1, p. 145–185.

identifying categories were largely taken for granted and rarely seen as social products of historical processes such as colonization.

Recent social histories of race have taken special issue with Latin American mythologies of *mestizaje* (race mixture) and racial tolerance. Historians of the 19th and early 20th centuries have argued compellingly that *mestizaje* was officially promoted as part of republican liberalism and nation-building. Nationalist leaders throughout the region argued within the eugenicist idioms of the day that a »national race« or »people« (raza, pueblo) had been produced by a unique and productive blending of indigenous and European blood (and very occasionally African blood), and that it was precisely this blending that made the Nicaraguan, Chilean, Mexican, or Brazilian »race« a modern and progressive people. As Nancy Stepan's crucial history of Latin American science proposed, such myths of *mestizaje* answered back to European and US dismissals of Latin America as racially mongrel and anti-modern, while at the same accepting the eugenicist premise that modernity necessitated degrees of racial whitening.[25] Historians have shown how *mestizaje* operated as a script for nation-building in hugely different ways across time and space: Post-revolutionary Mexico celebrated an Indian-European union as forging a superior »cosmic race,« while in 19th century Argentina the national race was premised on a genocidal elimination of remaining indigenous settlements. Sociologist Gilberto Freire's 1930s' thesis that Brazil's plantation slavery had been benignly paternalist and sexually harmonious formed the basis of nationalist claims that Brazil was a »racial democracy;« it positively acknowledged African heritage while holding that the capacity for reason and morality hailed exclusively from the European quotient of the mix.[26]

Narratives about labor and capitalism have been central to many of the best new works on race. But in a critical revision of Marxism's tendency to see »race« as a bi-product of class or as functionalist grid for mapping social divisions of labor, recent social histories about race consider racial formation as a cultural process of political struggle and as partially distinct from, and never reducible to, class formation and struggles. Jeffrey Gould's paradigm-setting book on »the myth of mestizaje« in Nicaragua argued that the late 20th century sensibility (shared by the Somoza dictatorship and Sandinista revolutionaries, alike) that »Indians« were a marginal aberration within the normal (mestizo) Nicaraguan population was the product of a century-long process in which agrarian capitalism stripped indigenous communities of land and political liberalism associated modernity with hispanicization.[27]

25 Nancy Stepan, The Hour of Eugenics: Race, Gender, and Nation in Latin America, Ithaca 1991; Jerry Dávila, Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945, Durham 2003.

26 See Alan Knight, Racism, Revolution, and Indigenismo: Mexico, 1910–1940, in: Richard Graham (ed.), The Idea of Race in Latin America, 1870–1940, Austin 1990, p. 71–114; Aline Helg, Race in Argentina and Cuba, 1888–1930, Theory, Politics, and Popular Response, in: Richard Graham (ed.), The Idea of Race in Latin America, 1870-1940, Austin 1990, p. 37-70; Thomas Skidmore, Black into White, Oxford 1974; George Reid Andrews, Blacks and Whites in Sao Paulo, 1888–1988, Madison 1991; Roger Lancaster, Life is Hard: Machismo, Danger, and the Intimacy of Power in Nicaragua, Berkeley 1992; Jeffery Lesser, Negotiating National Identity: Immigrants, Minorities, and the Struggle of Ethnicity in Brazil, Durham 1999. For recent work and citations on *mestizaje*, see Nancy P. Appelbaum/Anne S. Macpherson/Karin Rosemblatt (eds.), Race and Nation in Modern Latin America, Chapel Hill 2003.

27 Jeffery Gould, To Die in This Way: Nicaraguan Indians and the Myth of Mestizaje, 1880-1965, Durham 1998.

But Gould's narrative is not a classic Marxist plot in which capitalism bulldozes traditional societies (Indians) to create the modern (mestizo) proletariat. Rather Gould sees *mestizaje* as resulting from indigenous struggles within different state-led modernization projects were racial formations and identifications were bound up with access to land but not determined by it.

To very different ends, Thomas Klubock innovatively proposes in his history of Chilean copper miners (discussed above) that new class relations were understood through new languages about race. He maintains that, within the context of US imperialism, proletarianization undermined popular-nationalist concepts of *mestizaje* common throughout central Chile at the time in favor of an international-inflected racism that was also profoundly sexualized. The Braden Company's gender-management strategies accentuated the »Indianness« of Chilean miners as sexually deviant or emasculated in contrast to their sexually respectable and more virile »white-gringo« employers.[28]

In his study of K'iche Maya communities in 19th and 20th century Guatemala, historian Greg Grandin also argues that capitalist expansion exacerbated rather than flattened racial hierarchies. As Maya land and labor came under increasing pressure, divisions between indigenous Maya and non-indigenous Ladinos became more acute, and Ladinoness more with whiteness than *mestizaje*. But like Gould and Klubock, Grandin sees these divisions not as the logical outcome of capitalism in an already racist society, but as the result of Maya political struggles to articulate an alternative nationalism in the wake of capitalist expansion. Grandin holds that Maya leaders stressed »indigenous identity« as a means of laying claim to economic and political processes of state-formation rather than of »resisting modernization.«[29]

Even in histories that not are principally conceived of as »labor histories,« race has been discussed as closely related to class dynamics and changing relations of production. Sueann Caulfield's study of honor and sexuality in early 20th century Rio de Janeiro explored how working-class people of color interfaced with state efforts to impose monogamy on the urban poor by criminalizing the sexual »de-flowering« of unmarried women.[30] Caulfield argued that working-class notions of female virtue tended to share more than differ from those of the elite, and that while poor people of all racial identifications usually embraced a race-neutral or even racially-democratic language (as did the courts), they tended to form long-term unions with racially similar partners.[31] The importance of this for labor historians is the implication that the mass rural-to-urban migration that characterized post-emancipation Brazil (as well as most other 20th century Latin American countries) and the creation of an urban working-class did not automatically or completely »mix the races« even among the more fluid relationships and integrated neighborhoods of Rio's poor, and despite the official state promotion of racial harmony.

28 Thomas Miller Klubock, Contested Communities: Class, Gender and Politics in Chile's El Teniente Copper Mine, 1904–1951, Durham 1998; Thomas Miller Klubock, Nationalism, Race, and the Politics of Imperialism: Workers and North American Capital in the Chilean Copper Industry, in: Gilbert Joseph (ed.), Reclaiming the Political in Latin American History: Essays From the North, Durham 2001, p. 231–267.

29 Greg Grandin, The Blood of Guatemala: A History of Race and Nation, Durham 2000.

30 Sueann Caulfield, In Defense of Honor: Sexual Morality, Modernity, and Nation in Early Twentieth Century Brazil, Durham 2000.

31 Sueann Caulfield, Interracial Courtship in the Rio de Janeiro Courts, 1918–1940, in: Appelbaum/Macpherson/Rosemblatt (eds.), Race and Nation, p. 163–186.

To different ends, historian Marisol De la Cadena argued that the fluid uses of the terms »mestizo« and »Indian« in 20th century Peru reflected patterns of class mobility within rapidly expanding urban centers.[32] Quechua-speaking market women considered themselves »mestiza« in terms of their economic savvy and financial success as vendors but simultaneously embraced the identity of »Indian« in their connection to rural highland communities and in their daily »insolence« towards local city officials. Sarah Chambers' work on colonial and early republican Peru offers an interesting prequel to De la Cadena's work. Chambers argued that the term »mestizo« was widely rejected in Antioquia in favor of shifting strategic deployments of »Indianness« or »whiteness,« depending on state policy. When tax leans were uniquely heavy on indigenous people, Arequipa's number of recorded »white« residents soared; when laws afforded special protections to indigenous lands, the number of »Indians« rose.

Most new writings about race in Latin America follow trajectories that have been especially strong elsewhere in the Latin American historiography.[33] At a time when »class« as a »social division of labor« has lost a great deal of its analytical power in US histories of race and ethnicity, Latin American history's stronger Marxist traditions have retained it, if in pointedly unorthodox ways. For similar reasons, new scholarship on race has more often than not given special attention to the role of the state in promoting racial projects as integral to political rule. So too, many studies have had an explicitly internationalist or transnational dimension, whether that be dynamics of Iberian empire or US imperialism. Lastly, because feminist paradigms were already fairly well-established by the time recent scholarship on race was undertaken (though only more recently represented within labor histories), most recent historical studies of race have considered the role of gender and sexuality in producing and resisting racial boundaries. Though far newer and fewer than the many fine studies of race and ethnicity in US-American Studies, Latin Americanist histories of race and histories of gender have less often developed as separate literatures.

32 Marisol de la Cadena, Indigenous Mestizos: The Politics of Race and Culture in Cuszco, Peru, 1991–1991, Durham 2000.

33 Other important works on race in Latin America include Dain Borges, Puffy, Ugly, Slothful, and Inert: Degeneration in Brazilian Social Thought, in: Journal of Latin American Studies 25 (1993) 2, p. 235–256; Douglas R. Cope, The Limits of Racial Domination: Plebeian Society in Colonial Mexico City, 1660–1720, Madison 1994; Aline Helg, Our Rightful Share: The AfroCuban Struggle for Equality, 1886–1912, Chapel Hill 1995); Edmund T. Gordon, Disparate Diasporas: Identity and Politics in an African-Nicaraguan Community, Austin 1998; Ada Ferrer, Insurgent Cuba: Race, Nation, and Revolution, 1868–1898, Chapel Hill 1999; Lara Putnam, The Company They Kept: Migrants and the Politics of Gender in Caribbean Costa Rica, 1870–1960, Chapel Hill 2000; Sueann Caulfield/Sarah C. Chambers/Lara Putnam, Honor, Status, and Law in Modern Latin America, Durham 2005; Florencia Mallon, Courage Tastes of Blood: The Mapuche Community of Nicolás Ailío and the Chilean State, 1906-2001, Durham 2005; Nancy P. Appelbaum, Muddied Waters: Race, Region, and Local History in Colombia, 1846–1948, Durham 2003; Mary Roldán, Blood and Fire: La Violencia in Anitoquia Colombia, 1946–1953, Durham 2002.

A Productive Union

It would be vulgar to give the survival of Marxism within Latin American historiography all the credit for the exciting new developments within feminist scholarship on labor. Indeed, many of the authors cited in this essay saw their feminist work as a decisive move *away* from the field's Marxist straight-jacket, and many of feminist theory's most significant contributions across all fields have arisen from specific objections to Marxist precepts, including the primacy of class over other social formations, the equation of politics with class struggle, and the desirability of national (or international) socialism. Post-structuralist approaches to gender and sexuality as modes of power that create subjects through languages of difference are a far cry from the idea that History is motored by conflicts between social divisions of labor. And yet most recent feminist histories of Latin America, and certainly those that touch on labor, bear Marxist traces, if not more recognizable Marxist forms. The lament of US historian Heidi Hartmann in 1979 that Marxism and Feminism were »unhappily married« and bound for divorce has been far less the case in the Latin American gender studies of the 1990s and 2000s.[34] Amiable co-habitation, rather than official matrimony, has borne productive results.

It may be that Marxism thrives within Latin American historiography because it is no longer Marxist. At some point, epistemological hybridity transforms its constituting parts into something else. Latin Americanist scholarship on gender and labor might be best understood as drawing on, and producing, theories of feminist-materialism that are shaped by Marxist notions of class but which have remade those ideas in terms of gender and sexuality, language and representation, identity and subject-formation. Yet class is still there, transformed rather than transcended. Latin Americanists have seen the efforts of national states and international capitalists to »modernize patriarchy« as gendered solutions to class antagonisms. They have seen race and sexuality as forms of difference and domination produced in direct relation to social divisions of labor. Whether or not their scholarship passes as »Marxist« (and some would actively reject the label), feminist historians of Latin American labor have successfully used Marxism to make analyses of gender, sexuality, race, and class not only wholly compatible but mutually necessary.

34 Heidi Hartmann, The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a MoreProgressive Union, in: Capital and Class 1 (1979) 8, p. 1–20.