

Fax to Dr Walter Pehle 18-19 juli 1998
 from Ulla Wikander +46 8 650 44 46

 Dear Dr Pehle,

Thank you for the fax. Good that the titel remains *Von der Magd zur Angestellten, Macht, Geschlecht und Arbeitsteilung 1789-1950*.

I told you long ago that I considered a "Zeittafel" unnecessary and you did not answer me at that time. You say that all the books in the serie have such a one: not Ulrich Linses *Geisterseher und Wunderwirker*, which is one of two books you sent me. Anyhow I am so sad and upset about the translation, and all the corrections I have had to do, that I have no time to spare for a timetable.

I am surprised of the late arrival of the manuscript. You had annoned the beginning of June, and I had taken two weeks aside to deal with it then. It is sheer luck that I am not on vacations! But I am expecting my American translator (for another book) in the beginning of August and have little time to deal any more with this manuscript, and *it would need a lot of time*.

The translation is not to my liking. I give detailed criticism for some parts (chosen as important or at random) but also try to formulate more precisely what did go wrong. I have spent several days now on this and feel frustrated.

I have some general critical comments and give then some examples:
 Firstly. The style of the book is very different from mine, that is more academic. As this is a book for a broader audience, I had chosen a more "essayistic" style. As you correctly introduce the book as an "Essay" I am surprised of this change of style. I know that German academics tend to be more formal than for example English ones, but a publishing house cannot have any stakes in keeping up such a (fairly boring) tradition. The very tone of the translation is a disappointment but I suppose it is too late to do anything about that. Alas. *I find it remarkable that the translator would not show me the translation when it was under way*.

Secondly. Important words, half or full sentences or *even full paragraphs* (several summing up ones or in other respects *important* ones) have been excluded. Others are introduced. Special terms are neglected, others are invented (e g "social construction" taken away and "Frühsozialismus" introduced) There seems to me to be a tendence in the exclusions as well; it might depend on a preconception of the topic, which disturbs the perception of what I am writing and how. *This is my serious complaint and here you would ask you to put in back some of the exclusions*.

Thirdly. Generalisations have been made of examples - that is distroying the weave I have been trying to make of differences, which is one of the points in my story. Ex. p 38 about the "Vorwurf" that working women push their husbands to the "Bierstube". Here was excluded "or to the cabaret depending on the country in which these fears were formulated" (excuse my bad English !). Anyhow, this is a stereotype in most part of Europe and the intention I had was to give such an impression of general (in this case) but local. This is a minor example but very telling of the tendency of remaking the text in a direction I have not intended!

Restructuring and reordering the text have sometimes done away with a structure that was intended to show process and variability or to put discourse before concrete change.

About the Introduction

p 9 (manuscript p 1) the very description of washing clothes is expanding in an odd way my text, where as my way of trying to describe two zigzag-movements of women's work generally (in and out of the paid labour market and back and fro between male and female) is not coming out clearly.

Two sentences of more general content are excluded. **One** is about how the content of a work even if it keeps the same label, can change and might make possible a change in gender (sv Över en längre tid ... "manligt".) **The other** exclusion is my introduction of the concept of an ongoing "social construction" of male and female in working life. (sv Istället ... arbetslivet).

On top of this a sentence is added: "Diese Zuweisung aber ist immer auch mit dem Wert einer Arbeit verknüpft". In this context I do not think that is clarifying but the contrary. I am just trying to instabilize the meaning of "Wert einer Arbeit" and here it seems there is such a one...! I want to express that a work has no inherent work, but the addes sentence says the opposite.

So far the first page

p 10 It might just pass but is not good.

But ; I am not saying that everyone during the last 200 years have had better "materiellen Bedingungen" but that **a majority** had that!!!! Some generalizations are important but this one seems to me arrogant.

But; I am **not** writing that women "auf eine eigene Familie verzichten, *um in der Arbeitswelt zu bestehen*" - I wrote "to obtain more personal freedom" (p2 "för att uppnå större personlig frihet") There is a difference !

p11: 11 (=line 11)

exclusion of an important qualification in half a sentence, in which I wrote that women's less good jobs have been socially constructed in an ongoing and sometimes questioned process (manus p 3 I en pågående... social konstruktion) - process and not determination is important! You excluded it-

p 11: 25. In this context I got into a historical dimension of service; even when it was in earlier times done by men, it was looked down upon. Even in the time before immigrants were prevalent, men *did* clean and serve.

P 11: 30 "Rasse" is not there, but I wrote ras/Rasse. Race was an important category in those days and is still. Ethnicity is not really the same. Is there a policy of not using the word, then I do not agree with that.

P 12: the restructuring; you have altered the paragraphs; it is possible to do and I will not object. But I would like to point out that I had put the paragraphs in my order to lift up the discursive element and let the material come later in the text, as my way of pointing to the importance of the discourses (in religion, sciences and ideology).

P 12: 2 (manus p 4) **must be changed** to "heute formal /**politisch**/ gleichberechtigt sind" which I wrote. That is important. There are still gender inequalities in other respects, even formally!! Here is also half a sentence excluded about marriage legislation.

P 12:2 exclusion of half a sentence, which could pass but makes the text duller.

P 12:5 included "- mit dem Ziel, sie zu bewahren". **I did not write this and it must be taken away.** It also in some way contradicts what is written on **p12:9/10**.

P 12:9/10 also a half sentence is taken away, which uses the concept "normative discourse" and explains it. I think that is a pity that you took it out (manus p 4 Den normativa ... i ett samhälle...")

P 12:18 "junge" is an invention by the translator - this was a regulation for *all* women giving birth and "young" seems odd. **Please change**

P 12: 28 I am not making a value judgement here but I say: it must have been felt like a "Hohn" to *a woman* (not pluralis) who tried etc

P 12 :31/32 One of the "steering rods" (nb metaphore!) of my text is **paradox** and I try to point them out in the intro. Here I have pointed to the paradox between work being *debated* (as a given thing more or less) and as something *odd and strange*. The translation has underplayed that paradox in my view. I also wonder why the word Paradox is not used. (It is not introduced until p 14) Es gibt ja auf Deutsch and is now a very accepted concept in gender studies in trying to understand women's positions.

P 13: 18 Half a sentence taken away stressing that:... men were not to be ashamed of their wage work. On the contrary... (manus p6: men män drabbades inte av fördömelse för detta)

P 13: 32 I should prefer another word to "Ablehnung" because it was more of a "Unfreundlichkeit oder Feindlichkeit", not the activity that goes with Ablehnung. The work was tolerated, not liked. **Please change!**

P 14: 32 Die Auffassungen is not the right word, I am not writing about an understanding of gender here but about "the gender relations" - Beziehungen? Relation? **Please change**

P 15: last paragraph; I wrote that power relations were /mostly, foremost/ (manus 9:2 sv främst) defined by those in power. Not totally as the sentence now has to be read. **This is for me a very important distinction! Please change**

P 16:6 I am not so generalizing here either but I write about a new discourse accepted by smaller or larger groups (e g the women's movement is in my mind). There can be no general acceptance easily about such a discourse. **Please correct.**

P16: after the first paragraph: one paragraph excluded, which I consider important. **Please put it in.**

P 16:first line after new title. "beschreiben" is not right - rather "feststellen oder erforschen". We are many, who have been describing it - my point is that this has not been easy to do correctly (manus p 9 sv kartlägga) **Please change**

P 16: 27 Two full sentences excluded. Contains important information, which is part of the coming argument. (manus p 10: Förädling ... systemet)

P 16: 28-30 I am not using the word "typische" and I do not like it, because its connection to a view that women are always doing similar jobs. And I do not write that this kind of jobs have not been commented on. That would be to deny a lot of research that has been made. I am writing that it is hard to get this kind of work into descriptions of what women did. **This is a misinterpretation of what I wrote and has to be rewritten.** (manus p 10 Denna för kvinnor ... kvinnoarbetenas villkor.) Take away "jedoeh".

P 17: bottom, you have not included my lack of linguistic knowledge as a reason for the limits of the study. Well...

p 18 : 2 I am not having as "These" similarities. I have as a **premise** that there exist similarities. The first thing means that I am about to argue and prove that such similarities are existing, the second that I am taking as my starting point such similarities and write about them as such (whereas it might also exist dissimilarities). **Please change**

P 18:14 "idealtypisch" is not a word I like. On the contrary I write about the ongoing ideological construction, maybe "fortdauernde" could be the German possibility? If there was an "idealtypische Konstruktion" it should come back in the same way again and again. This is not my meaning. I am not a determinist. I am convinced that it might change, because it is a process (manus s 12 Den pågående ideologiska konstruktionen ... jämlikheten.) **Must be changed.**

P 18: second paragraph: I am not happy about the translation of that fairly important paragraph. Also, the last two sentences of it are excluded. **Has to be revised and included.**

P19: beginning of page. This is not good either **line 12** "Frauenrechte" is not my intention . I mention those who wanted to make things better for women (manus p 13 ...de som ville förbättra för kvinnor) That is very different. **Must be changed.**

P19:27/28 "Minderheiten" is wrong, should be "Mehrheit von Männer und Frauen" (manus p 13) **Must be changed.**

P 19: last line: should be "doch gibt es eine /widersprüchliche"/Kontinuität des Frauenbildes und der Bedingungs- **Must be changed.**

P 20:3/4 "die Prostitution freigegeben wurde" has not the value my text has, which talks about the abolition of the regulation of prostitution. Prostitution was not to be legal, only the way legislation was aiming only at women. **Must be changed.**

Politisches Denken etc

p 39 I am writing about "tailoring" (= germ Schneideri, schw Skradderi) and the gender problems when it at an early stage became more rationalized, ("Fertigkleidung" but not yet really "Konfektion"). The translator talks about "Textilbranche" which is wrong. There are in this paragraph also misunderstandings of what I wrote. Women were not "in der Textilfabrikation angestellt" (in my text) but used more and more for sewing parts of the men's dresses, mostly at home or in small workshops. *These facts are wrong. They have to be changed.*

p 40 (my manuscript 35) a full sentence is taken away after the first sentence of the page finishing with Männer. (sv " Att kvinnor varit och var lägre värderade juridiskt sett och underordnade sin far eller man och att de dessutom inte haft någon separat och avgränsad lön inom ett familjeföretag, gjorde att de kunde fås att arbeta för lägre löner än män.") Without this sentence the next one gives the wrong impression.

p42 (my manus 37) **top of the page.** I am writing that in "some countries" the policies of education were to women's disadvantage and by writing that and together with what was earlier written, the meaning is that in some other countries it was not to women's disadvantage. Here you get the impression that not seldom and everywhere this was the case. This is symptomatic for the kind of sliding of my intentions that are frequent and it is impossible for me to mention all the places my text is misunderstood the the translation to German. As it tends to obscure my "essay", I what to point it out.

p 42-50 several exclusions that I find unfair and distorting:

p 42 Three sentences of introduction are taken away.

p 42 (p 38 in my manus: lacking are "Den inflytelsesrike ... komplement." And "...var egentligen ... Rousseau.") What I wrote on Rousseau is taken away. It was interwoven with how I wrote on Wollstonecraft. It was important things about human equality, appraisal of women's difference and Wollstonecraft's polemic with Rousseau, which I had managed to make fairly simple.

p 43 (p 39 in my manus: lacking: "Särskilt viktigt ... omanliga") In this context I am generalising about expressing religious feelings and feelings at death beds. As an odd example of how feelings also might be expressed at more worldly affairs I told about a Swedish businessman shedding tears over a probable bankruptcy of a friend. The last this should not be generalised in my text.

p 44 "Kollektiven Gedächtnis" is an expression very far from what I said. I am not for any collective consciousness or memories, sounds as Jungianismus, oder so was.

p44 here the translator has introduced a thing she calls "Frühsozialismus". I have avoided such rather pejorative expressions and called it "so called Sozialismus etc as this was a movement by themselves called socialism, the first Sozialismus if you want. This goes on when the translator later on p 49 talks about "wissenschaftliche Sozialismus" as if that was somehow the real term for it. I do not think it was "wissenschaftlich" and have made that clear in my writing!!

p44 do not write "Textilkooperative" only Kooperative.

p45, says "Neben der Schule", I have written "the market" beside the school!

p 47 (may manus p 43 excluded "Spanska kvinnor ... offentliga angelägenheter") a piece on how Spanish women in the 1830's were forbidden to meet officially and to protest, and how they were going to be punished as prostitutes if they did so. I see it as important because of the exclusion on sexual grounds of women from politics, a theme that is coming back many times. Also, material from Spain is not frequent - why exclude this????

p49 says "Ausnahmen waren ..." - I do not formulate it so. There can have been others too...

p49 (p 46 in my manus: lacking: "Hans tankar ... organiserings") taken away the influence of Proudhon on the French labour movement and how it acted against women's waged work.

p 49 (p 46 in my manus: lacking: "... där även i princip arbetet ... individer") half a sentence which carries my main point further is not there.

P 50 And also "genderneutral" in excluded as the adjective to the "internationale /Geschlechtsneutrale/ Gewerkschaftsbewegung"

This is all I have time to do. You are the publisher.

Your sincerely

Ulla Wikander