INTRODUCTION

Funding Women's Political Struggle – a Matter of Gender and Class?

Pernilla Jonsson & Silke Neunsinger

This is a book about women's organizing, and what is rarely mentioned in relation to women's organizing: money and other resources. We want to know how access and the strategic use of resources over time have mattered for women's struggle for equality. We want to find out what kinds of resources were available for the early liberal and social democratic women's movement and how they were used. We also want to know if any class- or gender-specific financial strategies can be discerned and, if so, how they mattered for women's organizing. This book is also a contribution to the discussion on the importance of class and gender perspectives in social movement theory.

During the nineteenth century women all around the Western world joined associations to work for reforms at a time when they had access to neither full political nor economic citizenship.[1] During a time when few could imagine individualism separated from gender or a right to work not conditioned by gender, some women began to mobilize for emancipation. However, lack of economic rights and higher education, and limited access to the labour market, gave women's organizing special obstacles to overcome in their political struggle.

Resources and especially money, as well as the strategic use of them, are of particular interest from a gender perspective since access, but also the very concept of it, is highly gendered.[2] As well, resources matter for organizing, although how much is under discussion.[3] Despite these special restraints of money in relation to women, just a few studies have dealt with the subject.[4] Most of the feminist research has for a long time been concerned with legal restrictions, and recently even with women's use of

Notes for this chapter begin on page 20.

networks under the influence of Bourdieu's theoretical concept. Although his model suggests four different forms of capital, economic capital has not been at the centre of these studies. The lack of interest in money in women's organizing may as well be a result of the belief that women should not 'sully their hands' with money and that, as Gilla Dölle puts it, scholars like to associate the women's movement with a superior goal rather than with the 'schnöden Mammon'.[5] It might, as well, have to do with an idea of money as connected to a male sphere and a gendered concept of money and business, where women are not defined as financial agents.[6]

Similar to the disappearance of class in historical feminist studies, this can be regarded as the result of the cultural turn in feminist history.[7] Since the breakthrough of the linguistic turn in feminist history, less and less research has been concerned with the material realities that men and women were confronted with. Our starting point is that we need to take both the material realities and the cultural constructions into account if we want to explain historical change and continuities.

Collective Action and Resources – Earlier Research

Social movements have to rely on a mass base of people with grievances. However, grievances are not sufficient to induce organizing. Mobilizing implies a range of problems, which social movements have to solve in order to make their political action successful. Social movements adopt in many ways the same survival strategies as more accepted and institutionalized organizations. They need to recruit new members and keep up commitment and solidarity among members. As well, they have to face the process of mobilization in order to gain attention and in the best of all worlds even consensus on an issue, not only among their own members but also among the general public. However, mass mobilization might not develop by the force of oppression and grievance alone.[8] Instead the process of insurgency is shaped by broad social processes, usually over a longer period of time, through political opportunities, mobilizing structures and the repertoire of contention.[9] At the centre of all these processes of insurgency are communication and legitimacy. Communication is dependent on mobilization structures, resources and legitimacy.

Resource mobilization theory emphasizes the need for interjection of resources. Increased strain is necessary, but also the number of social resources available to the aggrieved groups is decisive for social movements to evolve.[10] Every attempt to engage in collective action – whether the action is a street demonstration, a petition, or practical social work – demands some kind of resources. Since the 1970s, resource mobilization

theory has emphasized resources when discussing variation in social movement activity.[11] Resources are regarded as crucial for organizations to make their voices heard. Resources are needed for mobilizing and to keep an organization going. Resources play an important role for the use of power. Access to resources also has an impact on an organization's external strength.[12] However, the volume of resources available is not sufficient to build a movement. Decisions on how to use and invest resources,[13] key strategies[14] and framing,[15] as well as external factors such as the political context,[16] have been stated as crucial. Resource mobilization theory has been criticized for the vagueness of the definition of the concept of resources, incorporating anything that could affect an organization. As well, the model fails to acknowledge the political capabilities of a movement's mass base and risks overemphasizing the importance of influential allies. The risk of co-optation, where the established elite tries to neutralize the insurgency, is not discussed. Even in the case of moderate reform movements, support from groups possessing sufficient politico-economic resources to ensure that their interests are routinely taken into account in decision-making processes could be detrimental to the goals of the movement in the long run. It could be expressed as '… the lower the share of membership contributions to an organization's budget, the more autonomous it is with respect to its members and the greater the likelihood that goals which are not of immediate concern to its members are playing an important role in the considerations of the organization's dominate coalition'.[17] Moreover, the strength of the ties between an organization and its individual members also has consequences for the payment of membership fees; strong ties will create a good payment discipline.[18] And even though resources from outside to support collective protests have been the key to success for some movements, elite involvement often proves to occur as a response to the threat posed by the generation of a mass-based social movement.[19]

In contrast, political process theory emphasizes the resources within the oppressed group. Mobilization is dependent on the level of organization within the aggrieved population (readiness); collective assessment of the prospects for successful insurgency within the same population (insurgent consciousness); and the political alignment of groups within the larger political environment (structure of political opportunities).[20] The social movement could increase its opportunities by expanding its repertoire of collective actions. The strength gained is a result of the fact that each new form of collective action finds authorities unprepared. Collective actions could also expand the opportunities of other groups by placing new frames of meaning on the agenda as the notion of rights. On the other hand, collective actions create opportunities for opponents' counter-mobilization.

To succeed, a social movement has to be able to convert a favorable structure of political opportunities into an organized campaign of social protest.[21]

The choices that are made to pursue change have consequences for its ability to raise material resources, mobilize, and achieve legitimacy in society. It could involve the choice of protest repertoires as well as organizational forms.[22] The choices are affected by the political, cultural and social structures of the surrounding society. On the one hand, a closed society could encourage less formal organizing and a confrontational protest repertoire. On the other hand, an open society facilitates social movements to operate largely within institutional channels, which could encourage more formal organizing and centralized professional interest groups within the movement.[23]

Studies of social movements have emphasized 'frames' and 'cultures', rather than access to resources to explain outcomes of organizations. However, new approaches have stressed that frames and political opportunities can be created by activists; here a more dynamic model has been suggested instead of the earlier static model that listed a number of ingredients.[24] Social movements are embedded in all aspects of society. Individuals in the movement act in relation to what is culturally given. The existing cultural context provides the limits of the thinkable, even if the thinkable is a reaction against the dominating culture. Meaning and collective identity are constructed through public discourse, persuasive communication, rituals and political symbols.[25] Networks of friends and kinship are often important in the early phase of recruitment and in facilitating the forming of a collective identity.[26] This shaping of a collective identity and how it is communicated is decisive. To be successful, culturally acquired understandings of which models are appropriate to which actors and situations are needed. Habitus, or a repertoire of rules and internalized disposition, of individuals who may provide support could facilitate or restrict the forming of collective action.[27] This means that we, as well as differences in access to resources, can also expect variation in both the use of these resources and forms and developments of collective action depending on gender, class and ethnicity of those mobilized and the historical context.

Women's Mobilizing, Class, Resources and Political Opportunities – our Theoretical Point of Departure

Social movement theory has been concerned with the rise and fall of social movements, starting with grassroots mobilization and ending with the demobilization of movements when the struggle was over. Our study is

limited to the stage when the mobilization of consensus is not enough to reach any political change, but when long-term strategies are needed and part of a movement begins to transform into one or several more formal organizations. Moreover, social movement theory and especially resource mobilization theory have, for a number of years, been dealing with the importance of resources for political action, but gender and class have not been at the centre of its explanations. We assume, similar to Dorothy Sue Cobble in her introduction to *The Other Women's Movement*, that class differences affect the lives of women and men and that their demands for reforms were shaped through this. Class is, therefore, not the only difference between people, but as long as economic differences matter for definitions of ourselves and others and transfer into cultural expressions of class, this affects our lives.[28]

Susan E. Marshall states that the notion of gendered class position in the women's movement highlights the contradictory effects of class – both opportunities and constraints – on the behaviour of women.[29] The first wave of the women's movement was divided into socialist and middle-class liberal or more conservative wings.[30] The division between 'bourgeois' and 'socialist' wings of the women's movement is a historical construction initiated by socialist women's leader Clara Zetkin. Recently Marilyn Boxer has criticized feminist historians for using this concept uncritically even for later periods and, by this, creating a theoretical division that did not exist in reality.[31]

It could be questioned to what extent the women active in the different women's organizations, and women walking in and out of different organizations and sometimes even cooperating in the same organizations, defined themselves or could be fitted into this dichotomy. At the same time this dichotomy indicates that multiple forms of feminism existed at the same time and that they included different strategies on how to reach equality. Although the historicization and validation of the use of these concepts is an important task for every historian, we still use the terms 'bourgeois' and 'socialist' in citation marks in this book.[32] The reason for this is that the organizations we have studied regarded themselves as belonging to two different political movements. Socialist women regarded themselves not as part of the women's movement but as members of the labour movement. To use the concept of 'women's movement' for both organizations means using the result of later historical research that has shown that socialist women activists, who organized as women, were interested in matters of equality. One important difference between the two types of women's organizations is their autonomous organizing or their integration into a party organization.[33] These different ways of organizing are the product of different political strategies developed in some ways by

socialist leader Clara Zetkin. Many socialist women, especially during the early period of socialist women's organizing, were convinced that gender equality could only be reached through the end of capitalism; this meant that the struggle for gender equality was part of a larger political struggle.

The two wings can be understood in terms of class and gender during the historical period studied here, especially when referring to class as process and identity infused with other processual identities,[34] differently from Marx and Weber's concepts of class as a relationship between the process of production and a corresponding social identity.[35] Both the actual resources an individual woman has access to and her identification with the liberal feminist or the socialist movement create differences in attitudes towards the use of money and other resources.

Most of the socialist women came from the lower social strata, although we know not all of them did, while most of the women in the early liberal women's movement came from the middle and upper classes. These differences in the material situation of everyday life should put limits to how much money and time could individually be spent on political activity. However, social strata are also discursive constructions, differing in time and space.[36] This means that the monetary resources available for the early socialist and liberal women's movement could vary with who they mobilized and was dependent on, amongst other things, the nation's wealth. Thus, the relation between class and resources is not clear cut and not given once and forever, but needs instead to be investigated.

Since both resource mobilization theory and political process theory risk being 'grab bags of ad hoc residual categories',[37] it is important to define what it includes and differentiate the concepts we use and how they are linked to social movement theory. We take our departure from the resource mobilization theory but are as interested in indigenous resources as in influential allies' contributions. In order to analyse the strategic use of resources, we also need to problematize the value of different kinds of resources over time and in relation to class and gender.[38]

For the American women's suffrage movements, Holly J. McCammon et al. claim that success in fundraising helped them to achieve their goals, while Lee Ann Banazak rather emphasized the importance of how funds were used.[39] Hence, both the source of resources and what was given priority when spending them ought to be considered.

What kind of resources are we then talking about? Monetary resources are important, and are seen by some as the most important.[40] What makes money important in politics is its convertibility – the fact that it can easily be transformed into other valuable political resources.[41] Money could buy paid staff or hire experts, and thereby give opportunities to provide the organization with opportunities to do its own investigations as well as write

reports, pamphlets and petitions.[42] Money could also buy possibilities to communicate externally with potential or existing members or internally with periodical mass mailings, and such like. Money could even give opportunities to buy the ear of those in powerful positions.[43] Also coalitions with other organizations seem to be dependent on monetary resources, where Kevin W. Hula argues: 'financial resources are one of the key elements required of core members in a coalition'.[44] However, the access to funds is restricted by circumstances, such as social wealth and background as well as class identity of the mobilized people in the organization. Moreover, income distribution and business cycles in society affect an organization's ability to raise funds. Sydney Tarrow has, in his study on transnational activism, shown that social movements vary in their 'meaning work'. The reason for this, according to Tarrow, is that the activists work within their own countries power structures and political culture. Resources, opportunities and relative power positions can differ between the countries and are decisive in how the meaning work is framed.[45]

We can expect that the rank and file among liberal middle-class feminists would have access to larger amounts of money than the rank and file of socialist women's organizations. However, money could be divided into a wide set of different categories of currencies, where the uses are highly dependent on social relations, gender, class and ethnicity.[46]

In relation to the women's movement, the access to money was circumscribed, due to women's weaker property rights and less access to education and the labour market than men. Moreover, money's social value is also dependent on the source of income. For example the kind of money – pin money, a gift, or salary – involved may put limits on how money could be used, at least according to the dominant societal norms.[47] In this way the very concept of money could be affected by gender, class and ethnicity of the user.[48] Thus, in women's organizations income and income sources, as well as how to spend or invest money, could have been influenced and circumscribed by the historical context.

Limited access to resources, or restrictions of use by social values of money, can be compensated for. Money does not, however, buy everything. Other resources can also be mobilized without a large budget: members, solidarity, strategic allies, and so on. The members' social and cultural capital could open doors to important networks, such as allies in government, political parties, and media or other influential organizations, that otherwise would have demanded many financial resources or would have been impossible to open. A strong organization, administration, and in particular a skilful and dedicated staff, are also instrumental.[49] An example of the use of already established older organizations positive to the stake of newer movements is how newer women's organizations have

been able to take advantage of older, more established ones – by using their networks of communication, their premises and their constitutions.[50]

Different kinds of resources could affect the possibility of achieving the goals of the organizations in different ways and in different situations. On the one hand, monetary resources set the standard for what could be done. On the other hand, members and allies as such could be crucial for the success of social movements in both democratic and undemocratic systems.[51]

However, mobilization is a precondition for both income and supporters. Irrespective of nationality and the political subjects mobilized by organizations or social movements, there are the same problems: to legitimize both the goals and strategies of the organization. To attain these mobilizing structures, organizations must be able to stand up for their political demands. New members have to be recruited and solidarity among existing members must be kept up. Interests have to be framed in such a way that the public pays attention to the organization's claims. Support from other organizations and groups has to be obtained. In order to get support, information has to be distributed to members and potential members. Having more sympathizers provides more chances to make one's voice heard. However, having a growing number of members increases the administrative costs. An organization is more expensive to run than a loose network, but it gives the movement better ability to survive and act for longer periods.[52]

Thus, monetary and human resources are interwoven. To be able to handle different kinds of resources, we take our departure from Jo Freeman's scheme of resources used for her study on American women's organizations.[53] Table 1 illustrates how she separates tangible and intangible resources into more detailed categories. Examples for tangible resources are money, an office and a journal. Intangible resources could mainly be regarded as human resources. Members themselves can here be seen as contributing human resources, which can be split into 'unspecialized' and 'specialized' resources.

'Unspecialized' resources include, for example, members' time, their convictions, and their solidarity. Their names and bodies can be useful in demonstrations or as human shields in non-violent protests, although they might have other personal resources that can be used to legitimize action and organization.[54] Organizations or movements can use members' unpaid labour, including their time.[55]

Even temporalities restrict access to free time. While workers can buy and sell time, it is not possible for housewives to commodify their time and separate between free time and work. This means that there are differences between groups in their individual relation to time, their use of time and the degree of control over time in relation to paid employment and domestic work.[56]

Table I.1. *Resources possible to mobilize for the first wave of women's movements. Created by the authors.*

Tangible resources	Money
	Space
	Press organ
Intangible resources	People
Unspecialized human resources	Time
	Commitment
Specialized human resources	Expertise
	Access to decision makers; allies in government, political parties, and media or other influential organizations
	Status in polity
	Status in group

Source: This is a modified model of what Jo Freeman has presented in: Freeman, Jo (1999), A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations. In *Waves of Protest*, J. Freeman and V. Johnson (eds); Lanham, MD and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, p. 225.

'Specialized' resources include, for example, expert knowledge and access to important decision makers – allies in government, political parties, media, or other influential organizations.[57] The importance of different allies may vary, depending on the context. Research on social movements has emphasized the importance of allies, such as political parties, for new organizations. Sidney Tarrow emphasizes the role of influential allies as an extraordinary resource, for example, in non-democratic or repressive systems where organizations or social movements only have few internal resources. We know that even after women formally had received the right to vote, they were under-represented and sometimes not present at all in parliaments, which made them still dependent on men in parliament.

Relations with the press have been important for a long time, even if access to media might be more decisive today.[58] Here also the state could facilitate or obstruct opportunities by legislation and economic support. We can also expect that access to or restrictions in the access to higher education make a difference in men's and women's human resources, such as expert knowledge, which is of course also affected by their class.

Most groups raise money from many sources – not just one source. Income sources could be monetary bequests or donations, membership fees, staff-generated revenue such as the sale of pamphlets or organizing meetings giving revenue, fundraising, investments giving good return, or state subsidies.[59] Yet all resources are not always available, and even if they are they cannot always be used for all types of organizing in all

historical situations. Vivianne A. Zelizer has discussed the social value of money, depending on the source of income and the use of it.[60] Orsi Husz has, for example, shown how a debate on taxes in Sweden during the 1950s made a point that middle-class families had less money left after having paid taxes than what was necessary for their living, including a big house, a maid, etc., than ordinary workers who did not have to pay for a luxury lifestyle.[61] Here the demands on a certain standard of living, due to a certain class background, were the reason why less money was suddenly more money. This is especially interesting when we are looking at women's organizations, and women of different classes, since the ideological division of the private sphere as female and the public sphere as male have made economical agents male gendered.[62] We have to take into account not only what resources the women's organization had access to but also what was regarded as 'legitimate' or 'respectable' dependent on gender, class and the historical context.

The value and legitimacy of different resources will be influenced by the 'cultural context', or dominating attitudes within groups and societies. 'Social context' is the social milieu and networks in which the social movement is embedded. If an organization is sensitive to these attitudes, it will be able to frame a problem in a way that mobilizes individuals and hence also generates support, money, or participation in protest actions. In this context, it seems possible that for women's organizations attitudes towards what is regarded as appropriate according to gender and class are important for the way protests can be and actually are conducted. This means that the formulation and framing of goals could be dependent on the cultural context as well.

The 'political context' is also central. Access to political influence and powerful allies is important, as are conflicts between elites in society. The political context and the actions of opponents are decisive for collective action, for legitimizing activity, and for determining the prospects of winning or losing.[63] The outcome may be dependent on whether a less established organization is ideologically placed far from the political establishment or not.

Comparing the Swedish Case

Sweden today is well known for its welfare state promoting gender politics and its state feminism. However, Swedish women's organizations still have less access to major financial resources than male-dominated or mixed organizations. At the turn of the twenty-first century, Swedish women's organizations also had lower state subsidies per member than other kinds of organizations.[64]

We have chosen to study one middle-class emancipatory women's organization, the Fredrika Bremer Association (FBA), and one socialist women's organization, the Social Democratic Women's Federation (SSKF) and its predecessors. Both have been important women's organizations in Sweden's political life and organized mainly white Lutheran women. The FBA was the first national women's organization, founded in 1884. For several decades it was the dominant women's organization and could be regarded as a liberal women's organization mainly for middle-class women. By 1925 the organization had matured and found its organizational structure, with development from a centralized organization dominated by a network in the capital city to the structure with local clubs formally represented on the board that still remains today. The SSKF was officially founded about forty years later, in 1920, but had since 1906 a predecessor which also is taken into account in this study, as it was an earlier form of organizing that probably for strategic reasons was not called an organization. The organizations are studied during their initial phase of organizing until they were more or less consolidated: the FBA from the 1880s to 1925 and the social democratic women's movement from 1906 to 1933. This comparison between two different organizations is also a comparison between slightly different historical periods. The question is if a comparison is meaningful under these circumstances – our answer is yes, of course.

This study is based on extensive comparative research. When we started our research we planned for a systematic comparison between similar organizations in Sweden, Great Britain, Germany and Canada, all connected with the same international movements the Swedish organizations were members of as well. Although many historians have regarded comparisons as the golden way to knowledge and have likened historical comparisons with laboratory experiments, the experience of many historians down in the basements of archives differs much from these glorifications of comparisons. The reason is very simple: many times archival material that at a first glance seems to be comparable is, when examined more closely, not comparable in all respects or not at all, which is an interesting first result.[65] Our intention was also to limit our comparisons to monetary resources for each case, as it seemed that money would be a perfect unit to compare and because it would be difficult to make the same extensive network studies as in the Swedish case.

The results of our comparative approach are as much a result of this research as the starting point for this book. Our comparative approach has forced us many times to rewrite the aims of our studies as insights from our comparisons showed that our starting points were very Sweden-centred.

One of the most important results of our research was that we found out how special Swedish organizations were in comparison with the

organizations in other parts of the Western world. First of all, FBA was one of the few member organizations of the International Council of Women (ICW), the umbrella organization of non-socialist women's organizations that was not initiated by the international organization. Differently from other member organizations, FBA was not an umbrella organization of Swedish women's organizations. In Germany, Canada and Great Britain, ICW had initiated a congregation of national women's organizations in one umbrella organization. Second, Swedish socialist women were one of the few socialist women's groups during the period of study that had a women's organization with its own budget and that was formally financially independent from the Swedish social democratic party. The finances of socialist women were in most of the cases embedded in the finances of the different social democratic parties, making it impossible to study access to money without diving into the archival material on a level of verifications which are seldom kept in archives. As a result of this we were not able to compare the exact access to financial means between the socialist women's organizations in these countries, with the exception of a few years in the case of the British Women's Labour League. Our ambition to combine cross-class and cross-national comparisons in a systematic way was therefore difficult to fulfil the way we originally planned it. One of the questions that remains from this comparative experience is why were Swedish organizations so different, although they belonged to the same international movements during a period of time when synchronicity was one of the characteristics of a wave of globalization at the turn of the century? We have chosen to use minor comparisons in our summarizing chapters, whenever comparisons were possible to make. These comparisons are first of all used to contextualize the Swedish cases, to highlight both what can be discerned as a general pattern and also what can be discerned as shaped by the specific Swedish context studied here. We have also been able to compare how a specific situation, the lack of available money, has been treated in the different organizations, as strategies to engage in politics with little or no money were necessary to develop for all of the organizations, whether they were part of a political party or an independent organization.

We have already emphasized political and economic rights as being important for women's political struggle. These laws were made by the nation-state – in this regard the different nation-states are an important framework to understand part of the mobilization process of the women's movement, but we also need to find out how much they mattered as mentioned earlier: political rights did not automatically lead to political power, but of course they could. Comparisons often keep to explanations that tend to overemphasize the nation-state as an explanatory factor.

Nation-states are simply very handy units to make comparisons between. Nation-states have been important for the development of women's movements, but so have other networks as well. Women's organizing was to a large extent a transnational phenomenon and was not created in a national vacuum. During the nineteenth century women mobilized in many countries all over the world. The first wave of women's movements started not only due to transnational processes; it also created transnational space and transferred ideas and strategies between different countries. The women's movement could be regarded as an expression and consequence of developments in the history of the Western world, giving echo far beyond the national or continental borders.[66]

Thus, women's organizing and the goals women fought for were similar in many countries.[67] Despite these similarities, due to transfers between nations and larger global changes regarding economic and political development, the nation-state provided a frame that modelled transnational subjects in a specific national context. This means also that both the nation-state and the entanglements between a local development and larger networks need to be analysed in order to understand how they mattered for specific organizations. This helps us to understand single and very specific cases.

Another way to contextualize a historical development is to analyse a phenomenon during different periods of time. The studied time periods are even in our case not coherent, as we wanted to highlight general patterns of strategic use of resources during the start-up of women's organizations. Earlier research has stressed that independently of when an organization is started it has to handle similar problems. In the beginning, the focus is on mobilization and how to formulate a problem and reach consensus on the problem and future goals, often in a relatively homogenous group of people.[68] Then a more outward and broader mobilization starts in order to build a more formal organization.[69] At a later stage, administration and the maintenance of internal identity and solidarity might be more important. Striving for survival becomes a dominant issue, and in this, organizations can be more of a party or interest group. Focus is now on supportive service to members, and the mobilization becomes more exclusive than before.[70] The chosen time period could in both cases be regarded as the initial phase of organizing until the organizations were more consolidated.

The difference in time gives us the advantage of studying what was similar for the start-up, despite differences in cultural, social and political contexts, which opens up the opportunity for more general conclusions on the strategic use of resources and their meaning for social movements.

Economic and Political Citizenship in Sweden

Sweden, together with other Scandinavian countries, has provided a model for feminist activists. Nordic feminism was according to Evans (1977) 'probably the most successful in Europe before the First World War'.[71] In policy and practice Sweden has never developed a strong 'male breadwinner model'. Relative poverty in Sweden in the nineteenth century, with big income gaps and a thin middle class, is one part of the explanation. However, the low standard of living kept most Swedish women busy with a mix of household work and gainful employment until the 1930s.[72] This might have negatively affected the possibilities for doing social and political work as volunteers, albeit facilitating class-crossing strategies.

In the late nineteenth century, Swedish men and women had to face the same social changes as in many other European countries in the periphery. The population growth was high: from 4.5 million in 1890 to 6.5 million in 1930. The country was an industrial latecomer in Western Europe and industrialization had just taken off. A radical change from employment in agriculture to work in town mills and workshops had begun and altered many people's everyday lives, even though most Swedish towns remained small. Export of raw material-based products was still dominant, but the ground was laid for more diversified industry. Still, in 1900 Sweden was one of the poorest and most debt-burdened countries in Europe. To escape poverty, many made the decision to leave the country; emigration peaked during the last decades in the nineteenth century and continued until the 1920s.[73]

In just a few decades the situation had, however, changed. In the first half of the twentieth century, Sweden turned into one of the fastest growing and most stable economies in the world. The demand for labour combined with decades of emigration provided a high growth in real wages and altered social power relations. Sweden did not take part in the First World War, but the secondary effects of the wartime did, as in other parts of the world, lead to social unrest and political reforms. The crisis of the early 1920s was dramatic and severe in Sweden. Yet Sweden came out of it with a favourable financial and industrial structure.[74]

The rapidly altered economic and social situation affected both men and women, though in different ways. In the second half of the nineteenth century, the female ratio increased when more men than women emigrated. An increased number of women, especially in the capital city, Stockholm, did not marry or re-marry. To avoid the growing problem of 'unsupported' women, the legal status of unmarried women was reformed. Around 1850 unmarried women achieved the same right to run trade and business and inherit and own property as men. In 1862, they also attained a property-

based municipal franchise. Married women attained in 1874 the right to their own income and property, if the spouse had a marriage settlement, and unmarried women attained full majority in 1884. These reforms were leaving more women able to gain influence over their own economic situation. Yet both married and unmarried women were excluded from many kinds of gainful employment and full economic citizenship.[75]

Higher education was open for women in the 1870s. Even though many women entered an academic or professional career in the following decades, higher education remained a strictly class-bound choice in Sweden. Not until the 1920s were state secondary grammar schools and jobs in the civil services opened up for women.[76]

Many of these reforms were passed before Swedish women had founded organizations. Loose organizing for women's emancipation could be discerned in the mid-nineteenth century, while women's emancipatory organizations first emerged in the 1870s and 1880s. The political context for the studied women's movements altered rather dramatically during the studied period, 1885–1933.

The labour movement challenged the political elite and the pressure for demarcation was high in the 1890s. In 1896 the first social democrat was elected to the Parliament, and a few social reforms were carried out in the field of industrial safety. However, more repressive labour legislation was also enacted. During the first decade of the new century, Sweden moved further in a democratic direction, with suffrage for all men in 1909. The liberal and right-wing parties took turns governing. The first liberal and social democratic coalition government was elected for the period 1917 to 1920. The 1920s were characterized by political instability, with short-lived minority governments with social democratic rule as well as liberal and right-wing governments. The 1930s saw a new era, with social democratic governmental hegemony for decades and the emergence of a general welfare state. Instead of a weakened social democratic party and trade unions in the 1920s and 1930s, the Swedish labour movement got its breakthrough.[77]

The first decades of the twentieth century also consolidated a corporative system. From the late nineteenth century, associations, mainly trade organizations, had been active in taking initiative to introduce bills and had been invited to join legislative committees. Around 1910 popular movements also started to get into this cooperation with the state, and by the end of the 1920s a quarter of the members of legislative committees came from associations, mainly trade unions and employers' associations.[78] During the 1920s and 1930s, the Social Democratic Labour Party of Sweden (Socialdemokratiska Arbetarepartiet, SAP), after the split from communists, strengthened their relation to the Swedish Confederation of Trade Unions (Landsorganisationen, LO).[79]

When Swedish women founded organizations to achieve their goals, they had to overcome the obstacle of a rather large sparsely populated country and an undemocratic conservative political structure. Development into more radical feminism and demand for women's suffrage was late in Sweden, even later than in other Scandinavian countries. Economic rather than political rights were emphasized until the turn of the century. Only then did women's suffrage come into focus.[80] In 1903 the first national organization for women's suffrage was established. Yet Swedish women had to wait until 1921 to get their vote, once the social democrats and radical liberals had managed to get a majority and after several other countries had led the way. Instead the corporatist model has been regarded as an important door-opener for Swedish women activists and what has been called Swedish state feminism. Women became members of state committees before they had gained general suffrage. This can also be regarded as the reason for progressive Swedish family law introduced in 1921. Swedish family law put both spouses on an equal footing; both were made responsible for family income and the education of their children. Although we know today that gender-neutral legislation can also be used against women, the law was regarded as very progressive at the time when it was introduced.[81] In 1939 another law was introduced under the leadership of famous Swedish feminists, which turned marriage bars illegal. This law must also be regarded as rather radical compared to other European countries, and was similar to the family law used as a model by feminists in other countries.[82] Even after the general franchise had been introduced, Sweden had only five women (1.3 per cent) in parliament divided between two chambers. In comparison with, for example, Germany, with forty-one women (10 per cent) in parliament and the highest women's representation in Europe at this time, the Swedish women's representation can be regarded as rather low.[83] The success of the 'women-friendly' Swedish state cannot therefore be understood without the considering the importance of the corporatist state. State commissions, rather than the parliament, provided Swedish feminists with important political arenas for a long time. Today Swedish parliament can be regarded as one of the most equal in the world.[84]

Sources

Financial statements could be found in the treasurer's columns, minutes from board meetings, and other traces of daily work of organization members. Strategic decisions and discussions about resources, or lack of them, are also possible to find fragmentally in letters, notes and diaries, as

well as in the organizations' journals or in the press. However, here we are limited by what has been left to the archives.

In the study of the FBA, access to resources, financial strategies and how the resources were used have been searched for in the annual reports with treasurer's reports, minutes of the board, minutes of the executive board, general ledgers (*huvudböcker*), account books, and petitions from 1884–1925. More sporadic sources have also been used. Firstly, is the correspondence between Sophie Adlersparre and her friends and later on members of the FBA from 1877–1890. Secondly, we have used the official correspondence of the FBA, mainly 1887–1888. Finally, correspondence, minutes and other scattered reports on the periodical *Dagny* have also been used.

For the first years of social democratic women's organizing, we have used the committee minutes from 1907–1920 and their annual reports including their annual treasurer's reports from 1907–1933. Unfortunately the printed treasurer's reports are not complete for the period 1907–1919. This means we could only use the reports for 1907, 1908, 1911 and 1914–19. The treasurer's reports, for example 1914–16, include several years, as the congress was only held every third year, but this means also that it is very difficult to analyse single years during this period and makes them not comparable to the reports from the FBA. Another important source for the first years of organizing is Hulda Flood's history on the organization. While Flood is writing openly about the difficult relationship with the party, she does not write about internal conflicts of the committees at all, although she also has used the minutes, which clearly show conflicts between the members. In contrast to the FBA, letters do not exist to the same extent for social democratic women, and this leaves us with fewer sources on the choice of strategies.

The main source for discovering their use of monetary resources is accounting. The annual reports with treasurer's reports are in both these cases printed. In most instances the accounting is placed at the end of the report, and its connections to the bulk of the report about what has been done and achieved, ideas, plans and goals were not remarked upon. They give a good overview of income and spending, and how assets and liabilities were held. When only balances were published and when a more detailed view is needed, general ledgers and account books provide the set of monetary resources and how they were used. The account material seems for the studied period to have been well kept and most of the transactions could be checked against the minutes. However, social democratic women had serious problems with their accountant during the 1930s. Because of this, there are no reliable records on the finances for the period after

1933, which made it impossible to extend the studied period. In order to make the accounts comparable over time and between organizations and nations, we have chosen to deflate the amounts with the base year of 1914 and to convert them into USD.[85] However, the treasurer's bookkeeping does not give any information on explicit strategies, such as how the decisions were reached, who took the initiatives, and so on. To compensate for this, minutes and letters have been helpful.

Letters have a special advantage of relating to involved persons, time and space. A letter is addressed to somebody, signed and usually dated, and has a place associated with it. In this way letters are an enormously rich source from which to get answers on how the work of the organization took its shape and which contacts were made, and they can also give some clues about the strategies of individual members. Yet an uninvited reader, such as the researcher, can have problems in reaching the meaning of the message sent in the letter that would have been obvious for the person to whom it was addressed. Another problem is of course that only written words are traced in this way, which means that it is just a small part of the historical present. Still even if the women were living in the same town, letters, small written cards and notes to each other were not unusual. What was formal or informal is impossible to separate in these letters. A personal address could be mixed with formal issues. However, correspondence reveals information on initial mobilization and strategies that is otherwise impossible to obtain. To get more information about the persons involved and their personal 'resources', for example family background, education and marital status, we have used biographic handbooks and biographies.

The comparison with women's organizations in Britain, Canada and Germany is mainly based on correspondence, annual reports and minutes.[86] The 'bourgeois' organizations are represented by the National Council of Women of Great Britain and Ireland (NCWGB), the National Council of Women of Canada (NCWC), and the National Council of Women of Germany (Bund Deutscher Frauenverein, BDF). Together with the FBA, all these organizations took part early in the work of the ICW; this allows us to follow their histories during more or less the same timeframe and state of organization. The social democratic organizations are represented by the German social democratic women, the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) in Canada, and the Women's Labour League (WLL) in Great Britain.

Disposition

In this book we will focus on what kind of resources the organizations had access to, and the strategic use of them during the formative years of two Swedish women's organizations.

The two parts are constructed in parallel, trying to explore the same questions, but also leaving space for differences between the two studied organizations according to their different historical contexts, and differences between classes and organizational structure.

The first part of the book deals with the FBA from the mid-1880s to 1925, and was researched and written by Pernilla Jonsson. In Chapter 1 is a presentation of the first national women's organization in Sweden with emancipatory goals. It deals with how the organization was established, its leadership, ideology and goals. Chapter 2 explores the financial situation of the organization. In focus is what kind of income sources the organization had and how they varied over time, what outlays were prioritized, and financial strategies. Of special interest here is also how economic matters were discussed and what were discerned as 'respectable' ways of raising funds, and spending and investing money. In Chapter 3 the compensation of money or the possible exchange into other kinds of capital are discussed. It deals with the members' human capital, friendship and access to politics, press and other organizations, and how the use varied over time.

The second part of the book deals with the social democratic women's organization in Sweden, and was researched and written by Silke Neunsinger. It explores the differences between the SAP and the SSKF, but also the differences between local, national and international levels, and tries to give some international outlook by comparing the Swedish development with the German social democratic women, the CCF in Canada and the WLL in Great Britain. Chapter 4 deals with a comparison between the development of the SAP and its women's organization, but also with the development of social democratic women's movements in other countries. In which ways was the organizational development in Sweden different from other countries? How did women mobilize consensus for a separate women's movement? How did they frame this case? What was on the agenda? This chapter covers the period between the 1880s and the 1930s. Chapter 5 deals with the monetary resources, income and outlays, as well as financial strategies between 1907 and 1933. Chapter 6 is concerned with the development of access to human resources, both on a national and an international level. How could they be used to organize and to compensate for the lack of income?

In the conclusion of the book the two movements are compared, trying to explore how gender, class and organizational structure mattered for the start-up of women's organizations at the beginning of the twentieth century, in a more general way. Although we wish we could, this book does not offer any insight into how much money in detail mattered for single political activities of women. However, we hope that this is a start to reconsider the use of tangible and intangible resources in future studies on social movements.

Notes

1. We use Alice Kessler-Harris's notion of economic citizenship, in the sense of economic autonomy for women, to capture how both legal economic inequality and the positioning of women within imaginary families categorically denied them full citizenship. See, e.g., A. Kessler-Harris. 2001. *In Pursuit of Equity: Women, Men, and the Quest for Economic Citizenship in 20th-Century America*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 5.
2. V.A. Zelizer. 1994. 'The Creation of Domestic Currencies', *The American Economic Review* 84(2), Papers and Proceedings of the Hundred and Sixth Annual Meeting of the American Economic Association; V.A. Zelizer. 1994. *The Social Meaning of Money*, New York: Basic Books; See also G. Dölle. 1997. *Die (un)heimliche Macht des Geldes: Finanzierungsstrategien der bürgerlichen Frauenbewegung in Deutschland zwischen 1865 und 1933*, *Siegener Frauenforschungsreihe*, Frankfurt am Main: dipa-Verl, 18–19; A.M. Boylan. 2002. *The Orgins of Women's Activism: New York and Boston 1797–1840*, Chapel Hill, London: The University of North Carolina Press, 186.
3. E.g., M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy. 1979. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics*, Cambridge, MA: Winthrop; C. Tilly. 1978. *From Mobilization to Revolution*, New York: Random House; J. Freeman. 1975. *The Politics of Women's Liberation: A Case Study of an Emerging Social Movement and its Relation to the Policy Process*, New York: McKay; J. Freeman and V. Johnson. 1999. 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', in J. Freeman and V. Johnson (eds), *Waves of Protest: Social Movements since the Sixties*, Lanham, MD; Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield; J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald. 1988. *The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics*, Lanham: University Press of America; K.L. Schlozman and J.T. Tierney. 1985. *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, New York: Harper & Row; D. McAdam. 1982. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press; L.A. Banaszak. 1996. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*, *Princeton Studies in American Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
4. E.g., Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation* studies the second wave American women's movement; Dölle, *Die (un)heimliche Macht des Geldes* studies the middle-class liberal and conservative German women's movement 1865–1933; Boylan, *The Orgins of Women's Activism* studies local women's associations in Boston and New York in the early nineteenth century; Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*; H.J. McCammon et al. 2001. 'How Movements Win: Gendered Opportunity Structures and U.S. Women's Suffrage Movements, 1866 to 1919', *American Sociological Review* 66(1) studies success in relation to resources, political opportunities and collective beliefs women's suffrage movements; and L. Tetrault. 2010. 'The Incorporation of American Feminism: Suffragists and the Postbellum Lyceum', *The Journal of American History* 96(4). Marketing techniques and business management in the

American suffrage movement has been recognized in M.M. Finnegan. 1999. *Selling Suffrage: Consumer Culture and Votes for Women*, *Popular cultures, everyday lives*, New York: Columbia University Press. In Swedish research there are few studies addressing the use of resources and official reports on the economic resources of the women's organizations in Sweden today: B. Björkenlid. 1982. *Kvinnokrav i manssamhälle: rösträttskvinnorna och deras metoder som opinionsbildare och påtryckargrupp i Sverige 1902–21*, Uppsala: Uppsala univ.; SOU 2000:18. *Statligt stöd till kvinnoorganisationer och jämställdhetsarbete: slutbetänkande*, *Statens offentliga utredningar*, Stockholm: Fritzes; SOU 2004: 59. *Kvinnors organisering: betänkande*, *Statens offentliga utredningar*, Stockholm: Fritzes. Resources in organizations during the early twentieth century more generally have been studied in S. Hollari. 2000. *Barnens dags förening 1905–1925: de välgörande entreprenörerna?*, Stockholm: Univ. Ekonomisk-historiska institutionen; L.-E. Olsson. 1999. *Från idé till handling: en sociologisk studie av frivilliga organisationers uppkomst och fallstudier av Noaks Ark, 5i12-rörelsen, Farsor och morsor på stan*, *Stockholm studies in sociology, N.S, 8*, Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International; F. Wijkström. 1996. *Den svenska ideella sektorn och pengarna!*, *Research report – Ekonomiska forskningsinstitutet vid Handelshögskolan i Stockholm*, Stockholm: EFI. Some historical studies on party financing to mention have been made by G. Gidlund. 1992. 'From Popular Movement to Political Party: Development of the Social Democratic Labor Organization', in K. Misgeld, K. Molin and K. Åmark (eds), *Creating Social Democracy: A Century of the Social Democratic Labor Party in Sweden* University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press, 97–130; N. Stenlås. 1998. *Den inre kretsen: den svenska ekonomiska elitens inflytande över partipolitik och opinionsbildning 1940–1949*, *Arkiv avhandlingsserie, 48*, Lund: Arkiv.

5. Dölle, *Die (un)heimliche Macht des Geldes*, 8; N.M. Robertson. 2005. '"The Disagreeable Experience of Handling Soiled Money": Women and Banking in the Turn-of-the-20th-century United States', Thirteenth Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Scripps College, Claremont, CA, 4.
6. Wendy Gamber states that scholars still unwittingly connect business with men or as genderless. Businesswomen are still absent or seen as exceptions. W. Gamber. 1998. 'A Gendered Enterprise: Placing Nineteenth-Century Businesswomen in History', *Business History Review* 72(Summer), 188–194. With regard to the metaphor of separate spheres more generally affecting what is selected by historians to study and how to report their findings, see L. Kerber. 1988. 'Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman's Place: The Retoric of Women's History', *Journal of American History* 75(June), 11.
7. B. Skeggs. 1997. *Formations of Class and Gender. Becoming Respectable*, *Theory, Culture & Society*, London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage.
8. S.G. Tarrow. 2005. *The New Transnational Activism*, *Cambridge Studies in Contentious Politics*, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
9. E.g., McAdam. *Political Process*, 41 and there referred studies.
10. J.C. Jenkins and C. Perrow. 1977. 'Insurgency of the Powerless: Farm Worker Movements (1946–1972)', *American Sociological Review* 42, 250.
11. E.g., A. Oberschall. 1973. *Social Conflict and Social Movements*, *Prentice-Hall series in sociology,* Englewood Cliffs, NJ; Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*; S. Tarrow. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, *Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 112; Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations'; McCarthy and Zald, *The Dynamics of Social Movements*, 1216 (money, facilities, labour, and legetimacy); J. Freeman. 1979. 'The Dynamics of Social Movements: Resource Mobilization, Social Control, and Tactics', in M.N. Zald and J.D. McCarthy (eds), *Dynamics of Social Movements*, Cambridge, MA: Winthrop, 167–89, 172–5 (more detailed and separating tangible resources).
12. See e.g., Jenkins and Perrow, 'Insurgency of the Powerless', 264; S. Rokkan and B. Hagtvet. 1987. *Stat, nasjon, klasse: essays i politisk sosiologi*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 206; Schlozman and Tierney, *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, 396.

13. Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 96–97.
14. E.g., J.D. McCarthy and M. Zald. 1977. 'Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory', *American Journal of Sociology* 48; C.N. Degler. 1980. *At Odds: Women and the Family in America from the Revolution to the Present*, New York: Oxford University Press.
15. E.g., S.G. Tarrow. 1994. *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*, Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics series, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; D. Snow et al. 1986. 'Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation', *American Sociological Review* 51.
16. D. Rucht. 1996. 'The Impact of National Context on Social Movements Structures', in D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 185–204.
17. As expressed by H. Kriesi. 1996. 'The Organizational Structure of New Social Movements in a Political Context', in D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 177.
18. M.v.d. Linden. 2008. *Workers of the World: Essays Toward a Global Labor History*, *Studies in Global Social History*, 1, Leiden: Brill, 235.
19. See e.g., discussion in McAdam. *Political Process, 1930–1970*, 27–35.
20. See e.g., Ibid, 40–44.
21. S. Tarrow. 1996. 'States and Opportunities: The Political Structuring of Social Movements', in J.D.M. Doug McAdam and Mayer N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspective on Social Movements. Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 42–61, 58–59.
22. J.D. McCarthy. 1996. 'Constrains and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting, and Inventing', in D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, xiv, 426, 141–3.
23. Rucht, 'The Impact of National Context on Social Movements Structures', 192–202; H.P. Kitchelt. 1986. 'Political Opportunity Structures and Political Protest: Anti-Nuclear Movements in Four Democracies', *British Journal of Political Science* 16, 57–85.
24. D. McAdam. 1999. *Political Process and the Development of Black Insurgency, 1930–1970,* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, xv.
25. See e.g., B. Klandermans. 1992. 'The Social Construction of Protest and Multiorganizational Fields', in A. Morris and C.M. Mueller (eds), *Social Movement Theory*, xii, 368; Tarrow, *Power in Movement*; W.A. Gamson and D.S. Meyer. 1996. 'Framing Political Opportunity', in D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy and M.N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press; D. and D. McAdam. 1992. 'Collective Identity and Activism: Networks, Choices, and the Life of a Movement', in A.D. Morris and C.M. Mueller (eds), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, xii, 382; Snow et al., 'Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation'; Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 96.
26. Rucht, 'The Impact of National Context on Social Movements Structures', 189–190.
27. E.S. Clemens. 1996. 'Organizational Form as Frame', in J.D.M. Doug McAdam and Mayer N. Zald (eds), *Comparative Perspective on Social Movements. Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural Framings*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 205–26. For the concept habitus see P. Bourdieu and L.C. Clough. 1996. *The State Nobility: Elite Schools in the Field of Power*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 101–2.
28. D.S. Cobble. 2003. *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America*, Princeton, NJ; Woodstock: Princeton University Press, 1–2.

29. S.E. Marshall. 1997. *Splintered Sisterhood: Gender and Class in the Campaign against Woman Suffrage*, Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 12, who refers to studies on upper-class organizations. About charity work and gendered class positions effect on upper-class women's behaviour see also T.J. Odendahl. 1990. *Charity Begins at Home: Generosity and Self-Interest among the Philanthropic Elite*, New York: Basic Books; A.K. Daniels. 1988. *Invisible Careers: Women Civic Leaders from the Volunteer World*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
30. R.J. Evans. 1977. *The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America and Australasia 1840–1920*, London, New York: Croom Helm; Harper & Row, see 184ff. (Swedish edition).
31. M.J. Boxer. 2007. 'Rethinking the Socialist Construction and International Career of the Concept "Bourgeois Feminism"', *American Historical Review* 112(1).
32. For a debate on the need to historicize points of departures and concepts see M.W.B. Zimmermann. 2003. 'Penser l'histoire croisée: entre empirie et réflexivité', *Annales: histoire, science sociales* 58(1), 30–32. M.W.B. Zimmermann. 2002. 'Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: der Ansatz der histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen', *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 28(4), 609.
33. For a discussion of the German dominance in the Second International and its consequences for women's organizing see J. Hannam and K. Hunt. 2002. *Socialist Women: Britain, 1880s to 1920s*, London: Routledge, 5f.; Boxer. 'Rethinking the Socialist Construction and International Career of the Concept "Bourgeois Feminism"'.
34. K. Canning. 1992. 'Gender and the Politics of Class Formation: Rethinking German Labour History', *American Historical Review* 97(3); A. Kessler-Harris. 2002. 'Two Labour Histories or One?', in L. Heerma van Voss and M.v.d. Linden (eds), *Class and Other Identities: Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Writing of European Labour History*, New York: Berghahn Books, 250, 135.
35. For a discussion see Canning, 'Gender and the Politics of Class Formation'; J.W. Scott. 1999. 'Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis', *Gender and The Politics of History. Revised Edition*, New York; Chichester: Columbia University Press.
36. Skeggs, *Formations of Class and Gender*. See also U. Holgersson. 2008. 'Hur ska vi förstå klass i historien och idag', *Arbetarhistoria* 132(3–4).
37. The expression is borrowed from Tarrow, 'States and opportunities', 54, but he is only referring to the resource mobilizing theory.
38. D. Knoke. 1990. *Organizing for Collective Action: The Political Economies of Associations*, *Social Institutions and Social Change,* Hawthorne, NY: A. de Gruyter, 89–90; Zelizer, *The Social Meaning of Money*.
39. McCammon et al., 'How Movements Win', 62–64; Banaszak. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*, 96–97.
40. Schlozman and Tierney, *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, 396.
41. Ibid., 89.
42. A.J. Cigler and B.A. Loomis. 1998. *Interest Group Politics*, Washington, DC: CQ Press, 397; J.M. Hansen. 1991. *Gaining Access: Congress and the Farm Lobby, 1919–1981*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 13.
43. Schlozman and Tierney, *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, Chapter 7. See Stenlås, *Den inre kretsen: den svenska ekonomiska elitens inflytande över partipolitik och opinionsbildning 1940–1949*, for an example of monetary support from employers' associations to political parties in Sweden.
44. K.W. Hula. 1999. *Lobbying Together: Interest Group Coalitions in Legislative Politics*, *American Governance and Public Policy,* Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 117–8.
45. Tarrow, *The New Transnational Activism*, 75.
46. Zelizer, *The Social Meaning of Money*, 2–5 and 201–8.
47. E.g., Ibid., 2–5 and 201–8; Dölle, *Die (un)heimliche Macht des Geldes*, 186.

48. See chapter 1 and, e.g., Dölle, *Die (un)heimliche Macht des Geldes*, 18–19 and Boylan, *The Orgins of Women's Activism*, 186.
49. Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 9, 11, 47 and 49.
50. Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', 223; Schlozman and Tierney, *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, 396.
51. Regarding the importance of allies in the case of women's movements see Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 98ff.
52. McAdam, *Political Process*; Tarrow, *Power in Movement*, 123f.; Staggenborg, 1988, quoted in Kriesi, 'The Organizational Structure of New Social Movements in a Political Context', 155; U. Wischermann. 2003. 'Bewegungs(gegen)-öffentlichkeiten. Zur Geschichte der politischen Presse von Frauen', *Adriadne* nov.(44), 22; S. Kinnebrock. 2003. 'Pionerinnen der Öffentligkeitsarbeit. Das beispiel Anita Augsburg', *Adriadne* nov.(44), 22.
53. Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', 223–7.
54. Knoke, *Organizing for Collective Action*, 54–55; Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', 224.
55. Freeman, *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, 232; Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', 224.
56. M. Glucksmann. 2000. *Cottons and Casuals: The Gendered Organisation of Labour in Time and Space*, Durham: Sociology Press.
57. Freeman and Johnson, 'A Model for Analyzing the Strategic Options of Social Movement Organizations', 224.
58. Tarrow, *Power in Movement: Social Movements, Collective Action and Politics*, 80 and 131–2. Tarrow's examples are drawn from the peasant movements of Poland 1970–80 and South American peasant movements.
59. Schlozman and Tierney, *Organized Interests and American Democracy*, 91–93.
60. V.A. Zelizer. 1989. 'The Social Meaning of Money: "Special Monies"', *American Journal of Sociology* 95(2); Zelizer, *The Social Meaning of Money*.
61. O. Husz. 2008. 'Klass, människovärde och pengar', *Arbetarhistoria* 127–128 (3–4).
62. An overview of the historiography of 'separate spheres' and pathbreaking studies are given by L.K. Kerber. 1980. *Women of the Republic: Intellect and Ideology in Revolutionary America*, Chapel Hill: Published for the Institute of Early American History and Culture by the University of North Carolina Press.
63. S.G. Tarrow. 1998. *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*, Cambridge Studies in Comparative Politics series, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 233; Rucht. 'The Impact of National Context on Social Movements Structures', 189–90.
64. SOU 2000:18; SOU 2004:59.
65. H.-G. Haupt. 2007. 'Comparative History: A Contested Method', *Historisk tidskrift* (Stockholm) 127(4), 700; S. Neunsinger. 2010. 'Cross-over!: om komparationer, transferanalyser, historie croisée och den metodologiska nationalismens problem', *Historisk tidskrift* (Stockholm) 130(1).
66. L.J. Rupp. 1997. *Worlds of Women: the Making of an International Women's Movement*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; K.M. Offen. 2000. *European Feminisms: 1700–1950: A Political History*, Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press; B.S. Anderson. 2000. *Joyous Greetings: The First International Women's Movement, 1830–1860*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press; M.H. McFadden. 1999. *Golden Cables of Sympathy: The Transatlantic Sources of Nineteenth-Century Feminism*, Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky; S. Zimmermann. 2002. 'Frauenbewegung, Transfer und Trans-Nationalität. Feministisches Denken und Streben im globalen und zentralosteuropäischen Kontext des 19. und frühen 20. Jahrhunderts', in H. Kaelble, M. Kirsch and A. Schmidt-Gernig (eds), *Transnationale Öffentlichkeiten und Identitäten im 20. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt/Main/New York: Campus-

Verlag, 263–302; U. Wikander et al. 1995. *Protecting Women: Labor Legislation in Europe, the United States, and Australia, 1890–1920*, Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press; U. Wikander. 2006. *Feminism, familj och medborgarskap: debatter på internationella kongresser om nattarbetsförbud för kvinnor 1889–1919*, Göteborg: Makadam. See also ongoing research by, e.g., Eva Matthes, University of Augsburg, on the discourses within ICW and National Council of Women of Germany; and Susanne Schötz, TU Dresden, on 'Allgemeiner Deutscher Frauenverein' and international communication. Most of the research concerns bourgeois women's organizations as Zimmermann, 'Frauenbewegung, Transfer und Trans-Nationalität', 263–302, 265 footnote 6 has pointed out. For exchange between socialist women see K. Hunt. 1996. *Equivocal Feminists: The Social Democratic Federation and the Woman Question: 1884–1911*, New York: Cambridge University Press, 63–70; C. Collette. 1998. *The International Faith: Labour's Attitude to European Socialism, 1918–39*, *Studies in Labour History*, Aldershot: Ashgate.

67. Evans, *The Feminists*; A. Kloosterman and M. Bosch. 1990. *Politics and Friendship: Letters from the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, 1902–1942*, Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1902–1942; U. Wikander, A. Kessler-Harris and J. Lewis. 1995. *Protecting Women Labor Legislation in Europe, the United States, and Australia, 1880–1920*, Urbana: University of Illinois Press; Rupp, *Worlds of Women*; G. Bock. 2000. *Frauen in der europäischen Geschichte: vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, München: Beck; Zimmermann, 'Frauenbewegung, Transfer und Trans-Nationalität'.
68. McCarthy, 'Constrains and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting, and Inventing', 142.
69. On the importance of networks in the early mobilization, to create legitimacy and to survive, see e.g., Freeman. *The Politics of Women's Liberation*, 7–8; M. Diani and D. McAdam. 2003. *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press; McCarthy. 'Constrains and Opportunities in Adopting, Adapting, and Inventing', 142; N. Rosenthal et al. 1985. 'Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State', *American Journal of Sociology* 90(5), 1022–54.
70. Kriesi. 'The Organizational Structure of New Social Movements in a Political Context', 156.
71. Evans. *The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America and Australasia 1840–1920*, 69.
72. L. Sommestad. 1994. 'Privat eller offentlig välfärd?: ett genusperspektiv på välfärdsstaternas historiska formering', *Historisk Tidskrift* (Stockholm) 4, 611–29.
73. A. Maddison. 1982. *Phases of Capitalist Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 44, Table 3.1.
74. L. Schön. 2000. *En modern svensk ekonomisk historia: tillväxt och omvandling under två sekel*, Stockholm: SNS förl, 220–6, 269, and 287–93.
75. K. Widerberg. 1978. *Kvinnans rättsliga och sociala ställning i Sverige 1750–1976: Women's Legal and Social Position in Sweden 1750–1976*, Report series / Department of Sociology of Law, Lund University, Sweden, 1978:3, Lund; M. Ågren. 1999. 'Fadern, systern och brodern: makt- och rättsförskjutningar genom 1800-talets egendomsreformer', *Historisk Tidskrift*; G. Qvist. 1960. *Kvinnofrågan i Sverige 1809–1846: studier rörande kvinnans näringsfrihet inom de borgerliga yrkena*, *Scandinavian university books,* Göteborg; G. Qvist. 1978. *Konsten att blifva en god flicka: opinioner i kvinnofrågan under 1800-talets förra hälft*, Stockholm: Liber Förlag, 101 ff; U. Manns. 1997. *Den sanna frigörelsen: Fredrika-Bremer-förbundet 1884–1921*, *Kulturhistoriskt bibliotek,* Eslöv: B. Östlings bokförl. Symposion, 42–45.
76. Widerberg, *Kvinnans rättsliga och sociala ställning i Sverige 1750–1976*.
77. L. Olsson and L. Ekdahl. 2002. *Klass i rörelse: arbetarrörelsen i svensk samhällsutveckling*, *Arbetarhistoria,* 2002:1/2, Stockholm: Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibl.: Arbetarnas kulturhistoriska sällsk, 74ff.
78. G. Heckscher. 1946. *Staten och organisationerna*, Stockholm: Kooperativa förbundets

bokförlag, 140ff. and 230ff.; N. Elvander. 1969. *Intresseorganisationerna i dagens Sverige*, Lund: Gleerup, 24 and 46; N. Elvander. 1974. *Näringslivets 900 organisationer*, *Studier och debatt, 1974:1*, Stockholm: Studieförb. Näringsliv och samhälle, 16ff.; S. Lundkvist and H. Friman. 1977. *Folkrörelserna i det svenska samhället 1850–1920*, Stockholm: Sober, 222; B. Rothstein. 1992. *Den korporativa staten: intresseorganisationer och statsförvaltning i svensk politik*, *Riksdagen och de organiserade intressena, 2*, Stockholm: Norstedts juridik: Allmänna förl. distributör, 82f. and 88.

79. B. Schüllerqvist. 1992. *Från kosackval till kohandel: SAP:s väg till makten (1928–33)* Stockholm: Tiden.
80. Evans, *The Feminists*, 71ff.
81. Dorothy Sue Cobble has emphasized the need for looking at multiple feminism in order to move beyond an equal rights theology for the American contexts, in Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement*, 7.
82. K. Melby et al. 2006. *Inte ett ord om kärlek: äktenskap och politik i Norden ca 1850–1930*, *Centrum för Danmarksstudier, 11*, Göteborg: Makadam i samarbete med Centrum för Danmarksstudier vid Lunds universitet, S. Neunsinger. 2001. *Die Arbeit der Frauen – die Krise der Männer: die Erwerbstätigkeit verheirateter Frauen in Deutschland und Schweden 1919–1939, Studia historica Upsaliensia, 198*, Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, 64–6.
83. Neunsinger, *Die Arbeit der Frauen*, 70.
84. After the election in 2006, of the 349 parliament members, 47 per cent (164) are women; the most gender-balanced parliament in the world at the moment is Rwanda, where 48.8 per cent of representatives are women, according to the Inter-Parliamentary Union. http://www.ipu.org/wmn-e/world.htm [2010-04-07].
85. To deflate the values into the real value of 1914 we have used G. Myrdal and S. Bouvin. 1933. *Wages, Cost of Living and National Income in Sweden 1860–1930*, *Stockholm economic studies*, 2, London, Stockholm: P.S. King; Norstedt (distr.). For the currence rate we have have used 'Finans och monetära förhållanden', Portalen för historisk statistik – historia i siffror, http://www.historia.se (22 June 2006).
86. Most of the results have been published before in P. Jonsson. 2007. 'On the Women's Account – Finances of 'Bourgeois' Women's Organisations in Sweden, England, Germany and Canada, 1885–1924', in J. Sangster, S. Neunsinger and P. Jonsson (eds), *Crossing Boundaries – New Perspectives on Women's Organizing in Europe and North America*, Uppsala; P. Jonsson and L. af Peterséns. 2007. 'Resources and Swedish Women's Organisations' Participation on the International Scene, 1885–1916', in E. Schöck-Quinteros, et al. (eds), *Politische Netzwerkerinnen: International Zusammenarbeit von Frauen 1830–1960*, Berlin: Trafo, P. Jonsson and S. Neunsinger. 2005, unpublished. 'Funding the Process of Initial Mobilizing: A Comparision of Socialist and Bourgeois Women's Organizing in Sweden and Canada', The Thirteenth Berkshire Conference on the History of Women 2005, Scripps College, Claremont, Califonia.