

Women and Pennsylvania Working-Class History

Maurine Greenwald
University of Pittsburgh

My topic is women and Pennsylvania working-class history. The current interest in gender as a category of historical analysis has produced little scholarship as yet in labor history, but many case studies exist in women's history. The study of labor history is often synonymous with organized labor or male workers. Working-class history, a more inclusive term, broadens discussion to all facets of workers' lives from the shopfloor to the parlor, tavern, church, schoolroom, ethnic society, and picture show. Using examples from Pennsylvania's past, I will discuss how the study of women has transformed working-class history. I will focus on the conceptual breakthrough of the past twenty years rather than on work-in-progress.¹

In the past three decades the study of American social history has shifted toward an interest in people's day-to-day experience and away from the former emphasis on narrative accounts of institutional developments and biographies of prominent individuals. This broader social approach has reshaped the fields of labor history and women's history.

Until recently, American labor history was studied mainly from the point of view of institutional economics to the neglect of the social history of working people. The John R. Commons school, which previously dominated the field of labor history, focused attention on trade unions and labor legislation. The majority of American workers, who were seldom—if ever—in unions, received but scant scholarly attention. The very term "labor" continues today in popular usage to mean organized labor. A new stress on working-class culture and social patterns has altered this picture in the past two dozen years, most notably through the work of E. P. Thompson, Eric Hobsbawm, David Montgomery, Herbert Gutman, David Brody, and their many graduate students. These labor historians have sought to blend the component parts of work and home life in an industrial society into a coherent picture of the changing patterns of working class life as a whole, under the impact of different stages of industrialization and, more recently, deindustrialization.

Social history reshaped the newer field of women's history, which at first emphasized the common oppression of all women and the contributions of prominent individuals to American reform movements. The broader social historical approach shifted women's history towards analyses of women's diverse experiences in terms of class race, and ethnicity. Since the

early 1970s, women's historians have promoted the new interest in social history, pressing historians of American labor to consider how women's experiences change the locus of research and understanding of social relations within the working class and between the working class and other social classes.

By making women more visible in working-class history, women's historians have broadened and refined our understanding of class formation, survival, militancy, and organization. Women's history allows us to explore several theoretical propositions. 1) Women's historians have implicitly critiqued the artisan to wage earner model for understanding class formation in the nineteenth century. They have shown that working-class formation involved many sources of labor in the nineteenth century as well the twentieth. 2) By bringing the home out of the shadows of working-class life, women's historians have clarified the role of housewives in the family economy and the role of the family and neighborhood in working-class survival and class militancy. 3) In their case studies of trade unions women's historians have demonstrated the general point that the working class only advances when it overcomes hierarchies of sex, ethnicity, and race.² Let's explore each of these ideas at greater length.

1) Class formation. Working-class formation holds particular importance for Pennsylvania's history because of the state's rapid industrialization in the nineteenth century. As industrial enterprises multiplied between 1820 and 1900 the share of employed Pennsylvanians in agriculture dropped from 68 to 17 percent. Early in the nineteenth century journeymen apprentices in tailoring, shoemaking, barrelmaking, tanning, blacksmithing, printing, cabinetmaking, and carriagemaking faced new barriers to their aspirations for shop ownership. The increase in disposable farm income and the rapid extension of transportation to the countryside stimulated business and industrial growth. Canals and railroads expanded potential markets so that by 1860, 38 percent of Pennsylvania's workers earned their living in manufacturing, mining, construction, and transportation, increasing to more than 50 percent of the Commonwealth's workers by 1900.³

The particular economic activities for which the state developed its international reputation—petroleum and coal, primary metals, stone, clay and glass, machinery, and transportation equipment—featured male labor. The heavy concentration of these industries meant that women's employment in Pennsylvania remained below the national average throughout the nineteenth century and most of the twentieth. Still, female labor played a significant, if not numerically dominant, role in Pennsylvania's economic and working-class history.

Women's history underscores the fact that working-class formation in the nineteenth century derived from traditional unskilled occupations and

large-scale, capital intensive industries as well as the traditional crafts (of which women were not a part). Despite the well-known theme of skilled craftsmen transformed into semi-skilled wage earners featured in surveys like Bruce Laurie's *Artisans Into Workers*, craftsmen constituted only one of several groups of workers forged into a separate class between 1800 and 1850.

The first stage of industrial growth in the Northeast depended heavily on women's wage labor. According to Claudia Goldin and Kenneth Sokoloff's calculations, females constituted approximately forty percent of the manufacturing labor force in the Northeast as early as the 1830s. In firms employing over fifteen workers, women produced, among other commodities, cotton and woolen textiles, shoes, brushes, buttons, carpets, clothing, paper, and rubber goods. Nationally, the female proportion of the manufacturing labor force only decreased after 1840 with the growth of male-intensive manufacture of flour, glass, iron, nails, and hides.⁴

Throughout the antebellum period females constituted the backbone of highly capitalized, labor-intensive, large manufacturing firms in textiles, shoes, and paper production fueled with steam or water power. Although New England has received special attention for its numerous textile factories, women labored in the textile industries of Philadelphia and Montgomery counties. In Allegheny City in southwestern Pennsylvania [now Pittsburgh's North Side], women also worked in textile mills before the Civil War. According to accounts of the 1848 factory riots in Allegheny City and the 1850 manufacturing census, the cotton mills employed about fifteen hundred people, most of whom were probably single Irish women whose families counted on their support.⁵ Textiles continued into the twentieth century to employ large numbers of women in silk mills in the anthracite mining region in eastern Pennsylvania.

Women's economic activity ranged even wider. According to government data women comprised nearly one-fourth of Centre County's iron workers in the early nineteenth century. By 1850 women were also employed in Forest County's lumber industry.⁶

Despite women's presence in industry, the numerically most important occupation for women in the United States until 1880 was domestic service. New household innovations and higher standards of housewifery put a premium on domestic servants in middle-class households. To be sure, women had been members of the servant population since the earliest days of English migration to British North America. But the definition of servant changed between 1800 and 1850 from anyone dependent on another for employment, including domestic, agricultural, and industrial workers, to a more limited reference to household labor. The field of domestic service burgeoned in the early 1800s, creating thousands of jobs for native-born and foreign-born female adolescents.⁷ After emancipation from slavery African-

American women concentrated in the field of domestic and personal service throughout urban communities.⁸

The home provided wage work in yet another way—the manufacture of marketable goods. Industrial homework allowed impoverished wives and children in cities, urban villages, and the rural hinterland to earn wages. Outwork, as it was known, flourished in the nineteenth century in the east coast metropolises of Philadelphia and New York, as well as rural Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine, where enterprising middlemen arbitrarily set the terms of labor, often slashing piecework rates at will and wreaking havoc on poverty-stricken families. Married women with and without husbands bound shoes, made palm-leaf hats, assembled brooms, and sewed garments. As industrialization progressed, homework became a mainstay among native-born and immigrant working-class families. Such family-based work in the needle trades flourished until the passage of prohibitory legislation in the late 1930s.⁹ Homework has continued in Pennsylvania since the 1940s with a state permit system that allows homeworkers to produce “toys, gloves, rugs, jewelry boxes, hand-decorated novelties, pens and pencils, book bindings, leather goods, wigs, suspenders, and luggage tags.”¹⁰

The importance of women’s work to working-class formation continued into the twentieth century as the second stage of industrialization (1865-1920) reconstituted a working class of northern and western Europeans with immigrants from southern and eastern Europe and Asia and changed the nature of working-class jobs. New technology and scientific management transformed manufacturing jobs from skilled to semi-skilled. At the same time sales, clerical, and communication work became handmaidens of oligopolistic manufacturing enterprises. The sale and marketing of steel, electrical goods, glass products, commercial foods, and clothing, to name but a few, depended on employees in sales, clerical work, and communications, among whom women played an increasingly important role in the twentieth century. By 1920, women comprised 45 percent of clerical workers in the United States.¹¹ And the majority of sales and office jobs were decidedly working class—low skill, routinized, usually dead-end employment.

The structural changes in the economy involving large-scale corporations, manufacturing enterprises, and services to support the fabrication of goods blurred the distinctions between blue-collar and white-collar families. Within the same family sons and daughters could earn their livelihoods at blue-collar and white-collar jobs. Ileen DeVault’s study of the social origins of Pittsburgh clerical workers from the 1870s to the 1910s clarifies this development. The high-school students enrolled in commercial education came from diverse backgrounds. Unskilled workers, skilled manual workers,

clerical and sales workers, proprietors, and widows deliberately chose to further their children's education at a time when elementary school was the norm. At least half the commercial education students came from working-class families—those of glass blowers, machinists, carpenters, railroad conductors. DeVault argues that the meaning of the clerical education program was shaped by the families' material conditions and social status. Labor aristocrats (skilled workers) saw commercial education as a means of protecting their privileged status within the working class. Facing Taylorism and new high-speed equipment at work, labor aristocrats decided their children should take a different occupational path. For unskilled workers it was "an avenue of escape from narrow and often impoverished lives." For skilled workers it served to reinforce their superior position within the working class. For widows clerical work may have been "a form of insurance" for daughters who might some day face widowhood and the need to become self-supporting. Within the same family children worked as sales clerks, needleworkers, teachers, or clericals, blurring the line between working-class and lower middle-class status.¹² No one can say for sure what crossing the collar line meant to people's consciousness of their status in the United States, but DeVault underscores well the ambiguity of class identity once white-collar employment penetrated blue-collar families.

These examples broaden our understanding of working-class formation in the United States: women's inclusion broadens the diversity of occupations and avenues from which the working class was made in the nineteenth century and remade in the twentieth century. Working-class formation includes not only the transformation of the artisan into a wage earner, but also the story of rural laborer to mill worker and industrial homemaker, rural immigrant to urban domestic servant as well as industrial worker to clerical employee, sales clerk, and telephone operator.

2) Class survival. By bringing the family and neighborhood back into the history of the working class, women's history has provided an intellectual bridge connecting the workplace to the family and community. The scholarship on women as housewives, homeworkers, and consumers has demonstrated that working class history must be viewed from the point of production in the home and the labor force as well as the point of consumption in the home and marketplace.

The recent focus on workers' families clarifies how the majority of workers survived during the century before the United States government provided a safety net for wage earners with social welfare legislation in the 1930s. The role of housewives looms large in the economic survival of the working class because the majority of men earned too little to provide adequately for their families. Although workers subscribed to the family wage ideal by which the male breadwinner would earn enough to support his wife

and children, few workers' families could live according to this notion. Working-class families depended on wives' and children's contributions to make ends meet. Wives' work, whether as budget managers, boardinghouse keepers, industrial homeworkers, or wage earners outside the home provided essential, not supplementary, support to the family economy. Sociologist and historian Ewa Morawska has calculated that the wives of steelworkers in Johnstown, Pennsylvania, contributed as much to the family economy in the early twentieth century as their husbands did. By keeping boarders, tending gardens, and canning food, Morawska figures that married women's contributions equaled their husbands' monthly wages. S. J. Kleinberg's study of working-class families in Pittsburgh in the same period of time echoes Morawska's findings.¹³ Recognition of women's unpaid labor took until the women's liberation movement of the 1970s first raised the issue. As feminists have demonstrated, federal statistics tell little about married women's contributions to family income unless wives or widows worked for wages.¹⁴ Fortunately, oral history and pioneering social investigations, such as Margaret Byington's *Homestead: Households of a Mill Town* published in 1910, have made women's contributions to the family economy more visible. Byington's detailed household budgets tell us that working-class housewifery involved "constant watchfulness," much "patience," "practical skill," and sacrifice just to limit indebtedness for daily necessities. Housewives stretched the family income during the many decades when there was virtually no disposable income for extras of any kind.

3) Working-class militancy. The focus on family and community in women's history has shown that point of production struggles resonated throughout the family and community. Labor historians have often viewed class consciousness from the perspective of men's workplace grievances, demonstrating that wages, hours, safety hazards, or other shopfloor issues precipitated workers' collective actions. Women's historians have added other vantage points from which to understand class consciousness. They have highlighted the nature of housewifery, the prevalence of industrial homework, and the standard of living as indices of class experience. Workers' motivation to strike or boycott could originate in the home as well as the workplace. And working-place militancy depended on the mobilization of like-minded families in the same neighborhoods until the extensive dispersion of workers into suburbs after the Second World War.

Gender identity and gender experience informed workers' collective actions. Working-class women played an especially important role in preserving and promoting the welfare of their households and neighborhoods. Women's group efforts to protect their families' standard of living derived from the gendered division of labor, a socially constructed arrangement by which men took primary responsibility for breadwinning, while women

managed the household, raised children, and contributed to income earning. Temma Kaplan has coined the term "female consciousness" to name women's collective actions, such as food protests and related strikes by Barcelona housewives in early twentieth-century Spain. Female consciousness emerges from the gender segregation of women's daily lives.

In assuming responsibility for their homes and communities, women have vigorously defended their turf at different times with riots, boycotts, and strikes. Such was the case in the Homestead strike of 1889, the Homestead lockout of 1892, and the great steel strike of 1919. Women's collective actions drew their power from extensive female networks forged during the daily chores of shopping, laundering, caring for children, and going to church. In times of crisis women could call on the trust and good will of their daily associates. Women also used whatever means were at hand to defend the welfare of their community. When Henry Clay Frick hired hundreds of Pinkerton detectives to lock Homestead steelworkers out of the mills in 1892, elderly women and mothers with babes in arms and children in tow joined the crowd actions. As Paul Krause has shown, women released their "pent-up rage" by shouting "the vilest profanity" and jostling the Pinkertons with umbrellas, brooms, and blackjacks. The women asserted a rough equality with their menfolk by fighting side by side with them. This example suggests that women retaliated with uncharacteristically aggressive behavior when employers used excessive force and/or state power to fight workers' demands.¹⁵ Female consciousness and women's neighborhood networks mattered less when working-class activism centered on electoral politics and workplace organization. As successive waves of suburbanization throughout the twentieth century physically separated worksites from residences, the importance of women's networks in working-class struggles declined.

Lastly, women's history has also demonstrated the strengths and weaknesses of the episodic surges in organized labor. Women's history supports the general proposition that the working class advanced the most when it overcame hierarchies of skill, gender, and race. When it did not, working-class power to meet corporate challenges eroded. Despite workers' periodic calls for solidarity for one and all, American labor has been more likely to fragment than unite. Workers in the United States have seldom embraced diversity of skill, race, and gender as a trade union goal and even less so in practice.

From the 1830s to the 1990s, five cohorts of labor organization defined five different relationships with women.¹⁶ Nineteenth-century craft unions, the first cohort, associated women's employment in their fields with skill and wage degradation as well as a loss of dignity and autonomy. Shoe makers, cigar makers, and printers associated women's employment with

employer attacks on their customary practices and artisanal skills. Male printers viewed the influx of female compositors in the 1850s and 1860s as “reversing the order of nature” and unsexing women. Greeting women with a mixture of suspicion, animosity, arrogance, and paternalism, craftsmen admitted women to their unions only as a defensive action against employers’ strategies to transform their labor, but their ambivalence and hostility towards women weakened the potential solidarity between the two groups. By treating women as interlopers, craftsmen made gender conflict a perennial problem. Instead of joining forces with women, craftsmen devised apprenticeship rules and protective labor laws to exclude women legally from their occupations.¹⁷

The Knights of Labor of the 1880s, the largest voluntary organization of the nineteenth century, reacted to economic and social change just the opposite of the old-line craftsmen. The Knights welcomed women as well as other honest toilers regardless of sex, race, color, nationality, or creed, although the organization was extremely racist in its attitudes and policies towards Asians. The organization gave community expression to the traditional tenets of America’s republican heritage. At the center of that heritage was the belief in political liberty as inseparable from economic independence. By focusing on the emerging corporate order as a radical threat to that independence, the Knights successfully portrayed themselves as the protectors of American republicanism. Accepting industrialization but not the wage system, the Knights envisioned replacing wage labor with worker-owned cooperatives that would more equitably distribute the wealth produced by labor. Their vision of a cooperative commonwealth provided a powerful alternative culture to the mainstream emphasis on acquisitive individualism and unfettered competition. The Knights also supported women’s suffrage, equal pay for equal work, and special respect for women’s domestic as well as paid labor. The largest group of lady Knights, numbering in the thousands, was composed of factory operatives—shoe stitchers, carpet weavers, garment makers, and textile operatives from eastern industrial towns. Small groups of women, no one knows how many, from the Midwest, South and West who earned their living as school teachers, waitresses, farm hands, domestic servants, housekeepers, and tobacco workers also joined the organization.¹⁸

Without question, the Knights surpassed every other labor organization in the nineteenth century in its vision and commitment to equality for women. But it nonetheless ran its affairs in a patriarchal fashion. Despite the Knights’ efforts to protect women from exploitation in the marketplace, women remained outside the “daily business of trade union organization [and] labor politics.”¹⁹ More importantly, the Knights could not maintain its membership. The organization disagreed over whether strikes worked and

faltered in the face of state power.

The new unionism of the 1910s, the third cohort of unions, organized on an industrywide basis for better wages, working conditions, and workers' education programs. Principally successful in the garment industry, the clothing unions recruited thousands of young women before World War I. Female activists played prominent roles in the organization of the garment unions, daily life on the shopfloor, and strikes that swept entire neighborhoods into labor insurgency. Despite the large numbers of women in the rank and file, women's representation "did not extend up the ladder of union bureaucracy." According to Susan Glenn "women had little say in the making of national union policy or the structuring of union life, and they generally fared less well than men in the bread-and-butter gains that contracts provided."²⁰ The partnership of men and women that distinguished the garment unions from other early twentieth-century labor unions fell short of full equality because of women's short-term employment and men's reluctance to share power.²¹

During the 1930s and 1940s the fourth cohort of unions developed with the founding of the Congress of Industrial Organizations centered in the mass production industries of steel, automobile, electrical, rubber production, and meat packing. Although industrial unionism flourished in predominantly white, male-dominated industries, the CIO promoted "a culture of unity" to involve all members of the working class in the new union movement. Industrial union leaders tried to build a diverse movement of men and women from different races, ethnicities, and regions. Unusual for the labor movement, the industrial unions went on record against sex and racial discrimination and made a concerted effort to win the hearts and minds of women. The Steel Workers' Organizing Committee (SWOC), for example, promoted family-oriented social activities to bring women and children together with their menfolk after work. Like other CIO organs, the SWOC newspaper, included a woman's page to interest wives' and daughters' in union business. In the electrical industry, where large numbers of women earned their living, the CIO unions organized women and promised them equal pay for equal work. During World War II, when even larger numbers of women entered mass-production industries the CIO unions also made a commitment to seniority rights and union representation in leadership positions.²²

Despite the social revolution that the CIO was making in many industries and working-class communities, the culture of unity failed to institutionalize gender equality. The language of CIO labor sent a double message: women should be organized if they worked, but they really belonged in the home where they could do the most for the union movement. The contract provisions did not always live up to the CIO ideals. Collective bargaining

agreements usually limited women to separate seniority tracks, blocking women's right to apply for "male" jobs. By promoting gender segregation at work, the CIO reinforced women's second-class economic status.

A fifth cohort of unionization features service and clerical occupations where women comprise the majority of employees. Since 1949 Pennsylvania's industrial concentration has dramatically declined. Between 1949 and 1983, tobacco manufacture decreased 90 percent, textile mill products, 73 percent, petroleum and coal products, 70 percent, primary metals, 62 percent, apparel and textiles, 28 percent, transportation equipment, 14 percent, and so on.²³ As the mainstay of AFL-CIO unionism declined, the labor movement looked elsewhere for potential members. Since 1950 union growth has come from hospital and state, county, and municipal employees. This wave of unionism coincided with a demographic revolution in women's lives. Because women are working outside the home for longer periods of time, marrying later, limiting family size, and divorcing more, they are more job and career conscious.²⁴ They want better wages, working conditions, and benefits including pregnancy and family leave, day care, and equal pay for comparable work. Women's issues have become key concerns of contract negotiators. An excellent case study of this development can be found in Susan Leighow's dissertation on nurses in the postwar period. Leighow found that many nurses developed new attitudes towards their work, male physicians, and employers as they stayed in the labor force after marriage and childbirth and acquired college training for their professional work. Pennsylvania became a leader in the feminist movement among nurses in the 1970s. A traditionally low-profile group became highly visible with demands and lawsuits to abolish sex discrimination and improve their working conditions in other ways.²⁵ Ironically, women's importance in the labor movement has swung upwards just as men's has plummeted. Despite women's new importance to the survival of organized labor, the labor movement is a mere shadow of its former self.

Women's history has enriched working-class history by broadening its scope at the point of production and to the point of consumption. No history of working people in Pennsylvania or anywhere else can fairly represent the complexities of working class formation, experience, and organization without evaluating the contributions and consciousness of women as well as men.

This essay was written for a special staff seminar in labor history for the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission, January 25, 1993.

Notes

1. For discussions of gender, see Joan Scott, "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis" in her *Gender and the Politics of History* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), pp. 28-50; Ava Baron, "Gender and Labor History: Learning from the Past, Looking to the Future," in Ava Baron, ed., *Work Engendered: Toward a New History of American Labor* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 1-46.
2. My thinking about these theoretical propositions has been influenced by Richard Oestreicher's "Working-Class Formation, Development, and Consciousness in Pittsburgh, 1790-1960," in *City at the Point: Essays on the Social History of Pittsburgh*, edited by Samuel P. Hays (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), pp. 111-50.
3. A brief overview of Pennsylvania's economic activity can be found in *The Atlas of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989); see the section on entitled economic activity.
4. Claudia Goldin and Kenneth Sokoloff, "Women, Children, and Industrialization in the Early Republic: Evidence from the Manufacturing Censuses," *The Journal of Economic History* 42 (Dec. 1982): 741-74, esp. 743, 766.
5. Monte Calvert, "The Allegheny City Cotton Mill Riot of 1848," *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* 46 (April 1963): 97-103, esp. 99.
6. See *The Atlas of Pennsylvania*, p. 107.
7. The best study of service before the Civil War is Faye Dudden, *Serving Women: Household Service in Nineteenth-Century America* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1983). For the period after the Civil War see David M. Katzman, *Seven Days a Week: Women and Domestic Service in Industrializing America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978). The departure of men from the servant population is integrally tied to the decline of indentured servitude. See Sharon V. Salinger, "To Serve Well and Faithfully": *Labour and Indentured Servants in Pennsylvania, 1682-1800* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).
8. A brief discussion of the occupations of African Americans after emancipation can be found in Gary B. Nash, *Freedom by Degrees: Emancipation in Pennsylvania and Its Aftermath* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
9. The best descriptions of nineteenth century outwork can be found in Mary Blewett, *Men, Women, and Work: Class, Gender, and Protest in the New England Shoe Industry, 1780-1910* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988), pp. 44-51; Christine Stansell, *City of Women: Sex and Class in New York* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1986), pp. 105-29. Homework in the twentieth century is examined in Eileen Boris and Cynthia R. Daniels, eds., *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1989).
10. Jamie Faricella Dangler refers to the permit system for homework in Pennsylvania in the 1980s in "Electronics Subassemblers in Central New York: Nontraditional Homeworkers in a Nontraditional Homework Industry," in *Homework: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on Paid Labor at Home*, pp. 149-50.
11. U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, *Women's Occupations through Seven Decades*, Bulletin no. 218 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 78.
12. Ileen A. DeVault, *Sons and Daughters of Labor: Class and Clerical Work in Turn-of-the-Century Pittsburgh* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 73-143.
13. Ewa Morawska, *For Bread With Butter: The Life-Worlds of East Central Europeans in Johnstown, Pennsylvania 1890-1940* (Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 135; S. J. Kleinberg, *The Shadow of the Mills: Working-Class Families in Pittsburgh, 1870-1907* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), chaps. 4 and 5.
14. Margo Anderson, "The History of Women and the History of Statistics," *Journal of Women's History* 4 (Spring 1992): 14-36.

15. Maurine Weiner Greenwald, "Women and Class in Pittsburgh, 1850-1920," in *City at the Point: Essays in the Social History of Pittsburgh*, ed. Samuel P. Hays (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1989), pp. 49-52; Paul Krause, *The Battle for Homestead, 1880-1892: Politics, Culture, and Steel* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1992). Other instances can be found in Paula E. Hyman, "Immigrant Women and Consumer Protest: The New York City Kosher Meat Boycott of 1902," *American Jewish History* 70 (1980): 91-105; Ardis Cameron, "Bread and Roses Revisited: Women's Culture and Working-Class Activism in the Lawrence Strike of 1912," in *Women, Work, and Protest*, ed. Ruth Milkman (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), pp. 41-61; Priscilla Long, "The Women of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Strike, 1913-14," *ibid.*, pp. 62-85; Dana Frank, "'The Labor Woman Fights at the Point of Consumption': Gender, Consumer Organizing, and the Seattle Labor Movement, 1919-1929," in *Work Engendered: Toward a New Understanding of Men, Women, and Work*, ed. Ava Baron (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1991), pp. 273-95.
16. The cohort notion comes from Ruth Milkman, "Gender and Trade Unionism in Historical Perspective," in Louise A. Tilly and Patricia Gurin, eds., *Women, Politics and Change* (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1990), 94-107. I have added the cohort of the Knights of Labor to Milkman's list of four.
17. Blewett, *Men, Women, and Work*, p. 322; Cooper, *Once a Cigar Maker*, pp. 254-5; Ava Baron, "Questions of Gender: Deskilling and Demasculinization in the U.S. Printing Industry, 1830-1915," *Gender & History* 1 (Summer 1989): 184. For examples of exclusionary apprenticeship rules and protective labor laws, see Maurine Weiner Greenwald, *Women, War and Work: The Impact of World War I on Women Workers in the United States* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980), pp. 117, 123-24.
18. Susan Levine, "Labor's True Woman: Domesticity and Equal Rights in the Knights of Labor," *Journal of American History* 70 (Sept. 1983): 323-39; Levine, *Labor's True Woman: Carpet Weavers, Industrialization, and Labor Reform in the Gilded Age* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1985).
19. Levine, *Labor's True Woman*, p. 148.
20. Susan A. Glenn, *Daughters of the Shtetl: Life and Labor in the Immigrant Generation* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), p. 227.
21. Alice Kessler-Harris, "Problems of Coalition-Building: Women and Trade Unions in the 1920s," in *Women, Work and Protest: A Century of U.S. Women's Labor History* ed. Ruth Milkman, pp. 110-38.
22. I am borrowing the phrase "culture of unity" from Lizabeth Cohen. The information on the CIO in steel and meatpacking comes from Cohen: the electrical industry is discussed in Ruth Milkman's work. Lizabeth Cohen, *Making A New Deal: Industrial Workers in Chicago, 1919-1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), pp. 346-8; Ruth Milkman, *Gender at Work: The Dynamics of Job Segregation by Sex during World War II* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1987), pp. 137-45.
23. For these figures, see *The Atlas of Pennsylvania*, p. 212.
24. For an excellent overview of this demographic revolution, see Steven D. McLaughlin et al., *The Changing Lives of American Women* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1988).
25. Susan Leighow, "Nurses Questions, Women's Questions" (Ph.D. diss.: University of Pittsburgh, 1992).