

## 15. STUTTGART & COPENHAGEN 1907 & 1910: DISAGREEING SOCIALIST WOMEN

Those women who began to identify their interests as coinciding with other women rather than, or as well as, with men of their own strata, were in a particularly stressful position.

Leonor Davidoff 1998

The Second Socialist International had convened a congress in London in 1896. There a small group of women privately discussed the possibility to create an international organization to keep contacts between socialist women alive over national frontiers. The idea was not realized until later. At a national meeting in Mannheim ten years later, German Social Democratic women took the initiative for an internationalization. They summoned women in connection to one of the reoccurring international socialist congresses<sup>1</sup>, the one in Stuttgart in 1907. It was the first time for such a congress to be held in Germany. And it became the first time for a small women's congress, before it.

At the seventh conference of the International in Stuttgart, labor legislation and social policies were not any longer high on the agenda. In Amsterdam 1904, social insurances and labor protection had been on the program. Men and women had been integrated in the same resolution about an insurance policy for work. The night work prohibition had not been repeated then but demands had been raised of insurances covering pregnancy and motherhood.<sup>2</sup> The wordings had been vague and without details.

The congress in Stuttgart started on a Sunday in August. In a big hall, Liederhalle, the Belgian Emile Vandervelde ceremonially opened the meeting for socialists from all over the world. The first day ended with a mass meeting, when "in thousands workers with wives and children were pouring in" to the festival park Cannstatter Wasen. Six different platforms for speakers were set up. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Haupt writes that the women in 1896 wanted to "établir une correspondance internationale". Haupt 1964:346; This formulation can be of interest to remember when reading about the meeting and founding of such an organization during the IWSA congress in Stockholm in 1911. Is there a connection?

<sup>2</sup> Haupt 1964:181, 185f; *Congrès socialiste international. Amsterdam, 14-20 août 1904. Histoire de la IIe Internationale*. Tome 14, Geneva: Minkoff Reprint p 290, 305ff, later = *Histoire...* Tome 14.

visitors could stroll around in the late summer evening from the one to the other and listen to inflammatory speeches by leading Social Democrats, speakers such as Jean Jaurès from France, Hjalmar Branting from Sweden and James Ramsay MacDonald from England. Famous German speakers were Clara Zetkin, Eduard Bernstein and August Bebel and Victor Adler from Austria.<sup>3</sup>

Did the congress in Stuttgart take up the question of women's role in the labor market? Hardly at all. And what opinion did it take to the question of equality between men and women in a more concrete sense; was there a strategy of how trade unions should handle the question and its tensions? No, none of that was of immediate interest. We know that socialists were positive to the introduction of special legislation of women's work. The question was still of importance but not discussed. It was considered settled. Woman suffrage had been accepted by the Second International already in Amsterdam and the support of it was renewed in Stuttgart.<sup>4</sup> Clara Zetkin spoke for a resolution on suffrage. In front of the mainly male public she was hardly at all talking about women as mothers. Her argument for woman suffrage was founded in women's participation in production. Women's achievements in society gave them rights to a political equality. In passing she mentioned that women could experience a conflict between motherhood and working life. As usual she condemned cooperation with the bourgeois women's movement; women from the working class had to show solidarity with men of their own class. In return it was of importance that the Social Democratic parties – and with this she meant the men in these parties! – did support woman suffrage. Zetkin spoke for a general suffrage for men and women on equal conditions and without restrictions.<sup>5</sup>

It is striking how seldom woman's marital status or biological difference were used in the discussions on suffrage at this male dominated congress. In this area there existed a tacit acceptance of equality between men and women. But political equality did not need to have consequences in the labor market.

---

<sup>3</sup> *Congrès socialiste international. Stuttgart, 16-24 août 1907. Histoire de la IIe Internationale.* Tome 17, Geneva: Minkoff Reprint 1978:327ff, later = *Histoire ...* Tome 17; "Zu tausenden strömten die Arbeiter mit ihren Frauen und Kindern ...", (quote p 173 is said to be from the newspaper *Vorwärts*) *Histoire ...* Tome 17:173ff.

<sup>4</sup> *Histoire ...* Tome 17:595f (resolution, in original 265ff) & Clara Zetkin's speech 659-673 (in the original 329-343); Haupt 1964:199; *Histoire ...* Tome 14 u à:582, Tome 17:210ff, 290ff

<sup>5</sup> Only the English Murby defended a demand on a limited suffrage, rather than no suffrage at all for women. *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 595f, 659ff.

## A socialist women's congress in Stuttgart 1907

During two days before the congress of the Second International in Stuttgart 1907, a separate international socialist women's congress was held. It was called the First Congress of Socialist Women. Participants came from 15 countries.<sup>6</sup> Even if not mentioned often in discussions on suffrage, motherhood was implied in all arguments at this congress for women only.

The influential Margaret MacDonald – married to James Ramsay MacDonald, one of the founders of the English Labor Party and leader of it – has written down her expectations before the congress of 1907. Her hopes can give us a insight into the expectations socialist women had on their party. Or, her reflections shows us what a leading activist wanted women to get from socialism. MacDonald thought that socialism was near to women's hearts because it was a support for the home-and-family ideal; socialism was equal to better living conditions for children, better protective labor laws, better wages and better housing. Socialism promised to give

to us women, us mothers, us wives, daughters and sisters progresses, and therefore needs our special knowledge and experiences, so as to be able to create such reforms.

Margaret MacDonald spoke about women in the way they were attached to men, as mothers, wives, daughters etc, and wanted them to be treated accordingly. It was important that they were given suffrage and protective labor laws, because of their special experiences and needs. She worried, that her intervention might be seen as a critique of men: socialist women wanted to act in harmony with men of their own class, contrary – she remarked – to bourgeois women. MacDonald said she promoted equality<sup>7</sup>, which meant to cooperate with Social Democratic men in accordance with their view of society. Her way of underlining women as related, biologically or by marriage, to men and children, with the family centrally, was in accordance with a strong trend of reasoning in Social Democracy.

The agenda at the women's congress had three themes: 1) reports sent in beforehand from socialist women's organizations, 2) the creation of regular

---

<sup>6</sup> Erste internationale Konferenz sozialistischer Frauen was held Saturday 17 August and Monday 19 August 1907. Otilie Baader had put her name under the invitation, made in the name of German socialist women. *Histoire ...* Tome 17:303-325; Dornemann 1974:211.

<sup>7</sup> "... uns Frauen, uns Mütter, uns Ehefrauen, Töchtern und Schwestern diese Wohltaten und verlangt dafür unsere besonderen Kenntnisse und Erfahrungen, um diese Reformen in die Wege zu leiten."(quote 663) MacDonald 1907:663ff.

connections between the organized comrades in the world and 3) suffrage.<sup>8</sup>

Interesting is that Clara Zetkin tried to give the impression of an international unity on labor protection for women in her summary of the reports from the countries:

The principal demands in all of the reports from different countries can be summarized in a few words: more protection against the exploitation of woman as worker, as mother, as wife, as citizen on the one side and on the other side to conquer the political equality, so that what women want to say can help the class conscious proletarians in their fight against the bourgeois society to overthrow today's order of society (vivid acclamations).<sup>9</sup>

Clara Zetkin categorized women in her speech: they were mothers and wives but also citizens and workers. In all of these categories, women needed "protection", more protection than they already had. A political citizenship for women meant that they could help the struggling "class conscious proletarians": thus proletarians were men. The proletarians protected women, who in return should give these men their political support in elections, for a better society. Zetkin followed close the rhetoric of the time, which is odd in an anachronistic historical perspective, especially when a woman is using it. But in the socialist rhetoric the worker was a man and the woman his help and wife. Zetkin stayed within that discourse.

The reports from different countries had been interpreted by Zetkin so, that they were in accordance with her own and the German party's view on protective legislation. As a matter of fact, only two reports, the German and shortly the Austrian, mentioned labor legislation for women positively. The Finnish report mentioned that labor legislation had been discussed in Finland but not the result, which was that it had not been accepted as a law after an inquiry among women workers. No other report mentioned labor legislation. Clara Zetkin transformed her own wishes into words when she had put "protection" of women as the "principle" demand. In that wish she mixed woman's position in the family ("mother" and "wife") with those as a working person in society ("working woman" and "citizen"). What protection she asked for remained vague.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 304.

<sup>9</sup> "Die zunächstliegenden Forderungen aus den Berichten aller Länder lassen sich in die Worte zusammenfassen: Mehr Schutz der Frau als Arbeiterin, als Mutter, als Gattin, als Staatsbürgerin gegen Ausbeutung, und auf der anderen Seite Eroberung der politischen Gleichberechtigung, damit sie die klassenbewussten Proletarier in ihrem Kampfe gegen die bürgerliche Gesellschaft darin helfen kann, die heutige Gesellschaftsordnung über den Haufen zu werfen. (Lebhafter Beifall.)" *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 312.

In every country report woman suffrage was mentioned as desirable. In that respect, Zetkin's summary was accurate. But that suffrage was mentioned in the participants' reports was not surprising. That topic was on the agenda of the congress,<sup>10</sup> which everyone knew when they formulated their reports.

After a vivid debate at the congress, the German Social Democratic journal *die Gleichheit* was chosen to function as the uniting medium for internationally organized women. An organization was established and Clara Zetkin became its secretary. She was also the editor of the journal. Its office should coordinate the national organizations via *die Gleichheit*. Clara Zetkin's influence became double; writing the protocols and spreading their content in her journal, with comments. She formulated socialist women's positions and decisions and disseminated them internationally. She painted the image of what was good and right for socialist women to think and how they should act. The story of the congress as told in *die Gleichheit* became the truth about the congress to those who were not there, then and later. Luise Dornemann, a biographer of Clara Zetkin, writes that plots had tried to hinder the election of Clara Zetkin as international secretary. Dorneman hints at a breach between a right fraction and a left one. But she is not going deeper into the cause of the split; she only remarks that Lily Braun had wished to tie the Central Office of women to the Office of the Second International in Brussels.<sup>11</sup> Why is unclear. The end result was an Office standing by itself, placed near to the journal. Could the split have to do with the night work prohibition and equality? Probably not.

The most important question at the congress was woman suffrage. The claim was general suffrage without limits. Motherhood was not mentioned. Verbal attacks were launched at bourgeois suffragists, especially the English suffragettes, accused of working for a class egoistic suffrage for upper class women to protect private property and the prevalent society. The leading German Social Democratic women were without compromise in their demand on equality with men when it was about suffrage. That demand was also accepted by the congress, even if the unity was not total.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 304.

<sup>11</sup> *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 311ff; Dornemann 1974: 210ff.

<sup>12</sup> *Sozialistische Monatshefte* 1907:890; *Histoire ...* Tome 17: 311ff.

## The socialist feminist coup in Copenhagen in 1910

Finland and Norway had sent delegates to the socialist women's congress in Stuttgart in 1907. But no woman neither from Sweden nor from Denmark had been present. They could not afford to go. Their absence might explain that there was no debate at all about protection of working women. It would be different at the congress of the Second International in Copenhagen in 1910. Then Danish and Swedish women were to put into question the positive attitude towards special legislation for women, confronting all other delegates. Their minor coup caused an excitement which quickly was silenced and later on have been absent from history writing. The first one to diminish the resistance to the protective legislation was Clara Zetkin in *die Gleichheit*, where the action was described as almost immature. Writing on Zetkin, Louise Dornemann avoids the controversy, although she writes that protection was mentioned in the inaugural speech. The Danish historian Anna-Birte Ravn has uncovered the controversy that exploded near the end of the congress.<sup>13</sup>

On the agenda in Copenhagen were almost the same points as in Stuttgart: a network for women socialists, woman suffrage and lastly social care for mothers and children. The debate on suffrage went on longer than the allotted time because the English Fabians defended a restricted suffrage in the same way as the bourgeois suffrage movement did in England. They were of the opinion that it was right to demand the vote for women on the same conditions as men. If men's political right had restrictions (related for example to income, capital, education) then women should accept the vote with the same restrictions. They asserted a neutral feminist equality, but not in those words. All other delegates wanted to struggle for a general suffrage reform including all adults on the same conditions.<sup>14</sup>

Little time that day was left when the last point on the agenda, the one on protection for mothers and children, was to be treated. At that very moment a group of women made a coup. They distributed a pamphlet in three languages, demanding another kind of resolution by the congress. Probably it was a quick

---

<sup>13</sup> *Reports to the first International Conference of Socialist Women ... 1907*; Zetkin 1910a and b; Dornemann 1974: 232; Here I am using the research of Ravn 1995; 97 delegates came to the congress, from 17 countries. The German delegation consisted of 14 persons, the Swedish probably as many as 12 and the Danish were 37 or maybe 40; Two handwritten lists of participants exist, with different letter-heads. One from *die Gleichheit*, the other with "International socialistisk Kvindekongference, København 26.-27. August 1910". They have not totally the same names. 33.536/Kasse 770 ABBA; for Sweden see, Karlsson 1995.

<sup>14</sup> Zetkin 1910a och b.

action as all Swedish and the majority of Danish delegates were involved. The pamphlet was directed *against* a special protective labor legislation for women, at the same time as it asked for social reforms, such as insurance of motherhood and free time at childbirth. The resolution was particularly hostile to the night work prohibition. The coup, which must have been well planned, with a printed leaflet to distribute, came as a total surprise for the other delegates. The question was not on the agenda. Why not? The coup might be seen as a sign of distrust of the organizers. The three languages were Danish, German and English, written in the spirit of socialist feminism. In the same way as the socialist feminists, who had arranged congresses in Paris in the 1890s, the signers were positive to general worker protection for all, but they did not want a night work prohibition for the category "women". That would be an obstacle for women workers in their "struggle for the bread". The resolution was signed by fourteen women. Among them were Henriette Crone, Hildora Mouritzen, Gudrun Bodö and Marie Christensen, all centrally placed in trade unions or Social Democratic organizations in Denmark.<sup>15</sup> These Danish activists begged the congress to support their resolution, which as a whole was formulated as follows below. The English version is linguistically miserable whereas the Danish and German versions were in very correct language. Here is the English version, as in the original:

This conference resolves that as under Capitalism and its exploitation the woman is not only a wife and mother, but is also forced in ever greater numbers into the labour market /as a wage-earner; my correction./ The a wage-earner, we lay down the following inexorable lines of development.

It is first recognised that the only way to obtain equality between the sexes is to establish Socialism in our midst.

As a means to this end this Conference demands that the woman should first be protected as a mother, and all the attempts to carry out this protection should be fully recognised. The protection of women and children, as opposed to the exploitation of capitalism, as opposed to misery and want, these are the measures which Social Democracy always places and keeps to the front.

The Conference opposes legislative which places either men or women in an unfavourable position in their struggle as bread- winners, and makes the economic struggle harder.  
We are against the forbidding of night work for adult women only; when not accompanied by legislation forbidding night work for all.

---

<sup>15</sup> The signers were : Henriette Crone (1874-1933), Hildora Mouritzen, Alfrida Petersen, Gudrun Bodö, Johanne Jensen, Fru Bötcher (13.Kreds), Louise Wuertz, Alvilda Jensen (Hörsholm), M Camilla Nielsen, Louise Anderberg-Jensen, Marie Christensen, N Hansen (Esbjerg), Gram Petersen, Ella Rasmussen. Pamflett "Dagsordenens Punkt 4", 33.536/Kasse 779, ABBA.

The Conference demands therefore that international Social Democracy should agitate for the passing of laws forbidding night work for both men and women.<sup>16</sup>

The central argument in the resolution was that a night work prohibition should worsen the possibilities for women to support themselves. The last two paragraphs focused on a protest against a night work prohibition which did not include men, stressing that women were "adults" and in need of economic independence.

To make their resolution attractive, to show that it was socialist indeed, the Danish women started out with a well known socialist rhetoric, but they turned it their own way. The beginning of the resolution sounds fairly reasonable and harmless. It could be read in any socialist text at the time. It contained typically socialist phrases as "capitalism and its exploitation". Their view on the development of society was deterministic; that women entered the labor market was inevitable. But they were more specific when they pointed to economic equality as central for future equal relations between men and women.

The authors of the leaflet were using formulations common among socialists. They even used the usual rhetoric mentioning women as related to men, mentioning them as "wives" and "mothers". These words were often used to defend the special night work prohibition for women. Clara Zetkin had used them in Stuttgart; calling a woman "mother" and "wife" but also "worker" and "citizen". To Zetkin these different roles of a woman did not pose any problem, on the contrary she mixed them and made them all easily coupled to being a woman. The Danish opponents did the opposite, when they spoke about "adult women" and their right to an economic independence on equal conditions to men. The signers did not hesitate to use the word "protection" but did not claim it for all women. They asked that Social Democracy should protect "women and children" from "the exploitation of capitalism" and meant by this a special protection via an insurance for pregnant and new mothers, a protection to give them free time with a newborn. But they did not want a special protective legislation including all women all of the times. The protesters made a difference between legislation for real working women, who needed a protection at a certain

---

<sup>16</sup> Pamphlet "Dagsordenens Punkt 4", 33.536/ Kasse 770, ABBA



time and a general legislation for all women as potential mothers; the difference is clear in the proposed resolution.

Between the lines in the leaflet, it might be read that women competed with men about works, exactly as the socialist analysis used to state. The Danish women demanded the right to compete with men on equal conditions, except when giving birth. With this they touched upon the debate on women as unloyal competitors. These women were prepared to compete in the labor market, if the conditions were fair. Implicitly these women promised not to compete with lower wages if men gave them equal conditions. Behind was a demand of equal pay for equal work, which so many women before had asked. Men often complained that women were not fair, competing with lower wages. Here, women answered: we accept an equal competition and as we do so, we reject special protection.

At this time, the debate on a night work prohibition was heated in Denmark. The country had a respite for ratifying the Bern Convention. In 1909 a revision was going on to modernize the Danish Factory Laws, which was not yet concluded. The congress of the Second International was held in the midst of national debates. Opinions ran high. It must have been of importance for the Danish women to show their resistance to the night work prohibition also at the international forum. It was also on the political agenda because the Bern Convention had been accepted in the neighboring Sweden in 1909. There had been protests by organized women, both by bourgeois and socialists, together against this kind of protection. Still the legislation was about to be introduced against the will of women.

Already earlier, in 1900, when new Factory Laws were to be introduced in Denmark, there had been huge meetings, protesting special labour legislation for women. Bourgeois women and Danish Trade Unions for women, as the Woman Section of the Danish Typographer's Association (Danska typografforbunds Kvindelige Afdeling) and Women Workers Trade Union in Denmark (Kvindeligt Arbejderforbund i Danmark) , had arranged meetings against special legislations and such had not been introduced ten years ago. When the new revision was under way in 1909, bourgeois and Social Democratic women united in common protests. They considered the situation more dangerous since the Bern Convention of 1906. A protest meeting in Copenhagen in 1909 had gathered 1 200 persons, mostly women. The male dominated Social Democratic Party was

positive to a night work prohibition for women, and also a leading woman, Nina Bang, who had a position in her Party similar to Zetkin's position in Germany. She had, in a series of articles launched a campaign for the legislation, using wordings and arguments similar to the ones Clara Zetkin used in *die Gleichheit*. On the other side, against a night work prohibition for women were many leaders in Danish Trade Unions for Women. A class transgressing coalition against the legislation was at work at the time of the congress in Copenhagen. Among its leaders were Henriette Crone, president of the Woman Section of the Danish Typographer's Association and on the bourgeois side a Factory Inspector, Julie Arenholt.<sup>17</sup>

In a European perspective it was rare that a Factory Inspector was against a night work prohibition for women but not in a Nordic. The Finnish Vera Hjelt and Norwegian Betzy Kjelsberg, both Factory Inspectors, belonged to the critics. The Swedish Factory Inspector Kerstin Hesselgren was not unambiguously positive to the night work prohibition but had to accept it as the parliament in Sweden decided upon it in 1909. It was to be introduced in the beginning of 1911. A cooperation between socialist and bourgeois women was not common in Europe but we have seen it in France at certain women congresses. And in Denmark and Sweden common activities, by socialist and bourgeois women, were trying to stop the introduction of this new obstacle for women in the labor market.<sup>18</sup>

The resolution against a night work prohibition, which was at the center of the coup at the socialist women's congress, got the support of all Danish women present, except three. All the Swedish women supported it. Together they were the majority at the congress. Still they were not winning. According to the voting rules, each country had only one voice. All other delegates were against the new provocative resolution. The typographer Henriette Crone had ardently and with temperament defended it and she got audible support from Danes and Swedes. But Danish Nina Bang scolded them in the name of the Social Democratic Party and Gertrud Hanna did the same, speaking for the unionized German women.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Ravn 1995:215ff; letter fr Louise Neergaard t M Rutgers-Hoitsema 24/3. and 9/4 1911, Mapp 13 Coll R-H, IIAV.

<sup>18</sup> Hjelt 1909; Karlsson 1995; Ravn 1995; Åkerblom 1998: Chapter 4.

<sup>19</sup> Zepler 1910a & 1910b:1455f; Hagemann 1995: 267; Ravn 1995.

The Danish women had dared to formulate the socialist feminist view of a night work prohibition encompassing all. The surprising way they did it in, shows that they were aware of the compact resistance they had to face. But they made their coup anyhow, probably at the same time making a statement for the national public. Maybe they also hoped that their opinion should be known abroad as the congress was international? Maybe it got spread via national dailies? But it was certainly not spread in a positive and neutral way by *die Gleichheit*, in which Clara Zetkin reported about the woman congress.

In her journal for Social Democratic women in all countries, the incidence was reported as a disturbance. Zetkin used emotionally charged words and wrote about what a "distressing surprise" it was, to find hostility towards the night work prohibition on a socialist woman conference. According to her the Danish and Swedish participants had defended their opinion with "passion". Zetkin judged the coup as "frauenrechtlich", that is to say, she used the adjective which in Social Democrats circles in Germany was used depreciatory about suggestions coming from bourgeois women. Clara Zetkin wrote that the Danish women had expressed views of a mechanical equality between the sexes and that female printers were only thinking of themselves when demanding the right to work at night.

The woman congress in Copenhagen ended with a resolution for peace and one on woman suffrage. Also a longer resolution with demands concerning social care and reforms for mothers and children was taken and the wish for an international Women's Day.<sup>20</sup>

At the following greater congress of the Second International -- with a majority of men and with women as participants as well -- worker protection and the struggle against unemployment were on the agenda. A renewal of the resolution of worker protection "for both sexes" taken in Paris in 1889, was accepted. It asked for a night work prohibition for all workers if possible. Added were demands raised in Amsterdam in 1904 about protection for pregnant women and women giving birth, and other demands concerning widows and children without fathers. The resolution on night work was still unclear on the question of women.

---

<sup>20</sup> "Gleichheit der Geschlechter" ... "leidenschaftlich" ... "eine schmerzliche Überraschung" (388) Zetkin i *Die Gleichheit* 1910:387ff; Zepler 1910b: 1455f; Hagemann 1995: 267.

Only one odd person wanted a revision, a rewriting, to underline the equality between men and women: Carl Lindhagen, the mayor of Stockholm, the capital of Sweden. Recently in the Swedish parliament, he had objected the acceptance of a night work prohibition for women. As a former liberal, he had some years ago joined the Social Democratic Party. In Copenhagen Lindhagen tried in vain to persuade the commission that prepared labor market questions, to suggest a new formulation about night work prohibition. He had succeeded in clarifying a resolution on employment, that earlier could be interpreted as negative to women in industrial work.<sup>21</sup> But he met with more resistance when he wanted to introduce a new version of prohibiting night work. Lindhagen suggested formulations in the tradition of the socialist feminists view and also true to the opinions of the Social Democratic women's wish in his home country. It did not demand an invalidation of the Bern Convention but its extension to all workers:

The congress declares that a night work prohibition for all professions should at once be formulated, in all cases when circumstances make it impossible, and that as a consequence of this, that in all countries where such a prohibition have been implemented for women only, it is extended to be equal for men and women, only with the above reservation.<sup>22</sup>

Lindhagen gave as his argument, that the earlier resolution, which referred to decisions taken at congresses in 1889 and 1904, did lack new ideas. But his suggestion was neglected without debate. On the contrary the Swiss delegate, the socialist professor of law Naúm Reichesberg, Berne, wanted the congress to take a stronger position for a night work prohibition for women and children.<sup>23</sup> In the end no changes at all were made and the vague resolution was left as before.

---

<sup>21</sup> Carl Lindhagen, the mayor of Stockholm in 1903-1930; "...pour les travailleurs des deux sexes..." (2594) *Le mouvement socialiste*, Oct-Nov-Dec 1910 *Congrès socialiste international. Copenhague, 28 août - 3 septembre 1910. Histoire de la IIe Internationale*. Tome 21, Geneva: Minkoff Reprint 1982, later = *Histoire ...* Tome 21: 2594f; "...without distinction of sex..."(892) May Wood-Simon "Report of Socialist Party Delegation and Proceedings of the International Socialist Congress at Copenhagen 1910" *Congrès socialiste international. Copenhague, 28 août - 3 septembre 1910. Histoire de la IIe Internationale*. Tome 19, Geneva: Minkoff Reprint 1981, later = *Histoire ...* Tome 19; The French protocol (Haupt considers this protocol the best) *Histoire ...* Tome 19: 14, 456, 466.

<sup>22</sup> "Le congrès déclare qu'une législation sur le travail de nuit dans toutes les professions doit être élaborée immédiatement, à moins que les circonstances ne le rendent inévitable et que, par conséquent, dans les pays où pareille législation n'a pas été créée en même temps pour les hommes et les femmes, une pareille législation pour les hommes devra, sous les réserves indiquées ci-dessus, suivre l'exécution de cette interdiction du travail des femmes, conformément à la convention de Berne." (in the original protocol p 229f) *Histoire ...* Tome 19: 471f.

<sup>23</sup> *Histoire ...* Tome 19: 471ff.

Carl Lindhagen spoke up for a more clear formulation on what socialists in the beginning had pronounced as the final goal with the night work prohibition for women: that it was meant to spread to men. But the awareness of such a long term aim was disappearing. Lindhagen probably acted as the spokesperson for the organized Swedish Social Democratic women. He must have known about the coup at the woman congress some days earlier. Swedish women had many times before publicly denounced special legislations for women, at for example at the first national congress by Social Democratic women, held in 1907. The mayor's sister Anna Lindhagen, was one of their leaders. Carl Lindhagen was since long close also to the Swedish bourgeois woman movement, as well negative to the special night work prohibition for women.<sup>24</sup>

Probably other men at the congress in Copenhagen knew about the hullabaloo at the pre-congress for women and did not want to have anything to do with the question. To alter the wordings at the larger, the real congress, should be to repudiate the decision taken by women earlier.

During the socialist congress for women in Copenhagen, a decision was also taken to introduce and celebrate a Women's Day. All did agree. The first Women's Day should be held the 19th of March the following year.<sup>25</sup> That summer an international congress on woman suffrage was to take place in the neighboring Sweden. There again a night work prohibition for women should be brought to the fore, but not even then as a topic on the agenda.

---

<sup>24</sup> Karlsson 1995:248.

<sup>25</sup> Dornemann 1974:232f.