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– Lo que no puede ocurrirle a la Historia de las Mujeres es que el enunciado género sea sólo una apelación, un marco que se dispone ceremonialmente, que fija la escena, pero con el que no se interactúa.

– What cannot happen to Women’s History is that the label gender be only an appeal, a framework displayed ceremonially, that sets the scene, but with which [scholars] do not interact.

– Dora Barrancos, 2004

As Dora Barrancos pointed out in her 2004 state-of-the-field essay, since the early twentieth century, a small number of Argentine scholars have dedicated themselves to writing histories about women. The 1980s witnessed a significant increase in female-focused scholarship across the world; and Argentina, especially after the fall of the military dictatorship in 1983, was no exception. In Argentina, as elsewhere in Latin America, scholars from other social science disciplines were among the first to employ gender-based analysis. By the end of the decade, feminist scholars in Argentina founded the first interdisciplinary institutes of women’s studies in national universities. And during the early 1990s, scholars at a number of these institutes began to publish interdisciplinary feminist journals including La Alijaba: Segunda Epóca, Mora, and Zona Franca. In 1991, the Universidad de Luján hosted the first academic meeting focused squarely on
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women’s history. The following year, historians at the Universidad de Buenos Aires hosted the second iteration of this workshop, adding gender into the new title, “II Jornadas de Historia de las Mujeres y Estudios de Género.” Ever since, a growing number of (primarily Argentine) historians have met at this annual conference to present new research on women and gender.

For feminist historians in Argentina, adding gender into the mix has sparked as many questions as it did answers. In her 1995 assessment of women’s history, historian Marcela Nari explained that in contrast to scholars in the United States and Europe, a relatively small number of Argentine scholars were employing gender as a category of analysis. By the mid-1990s, some Argentine historians began to replace the term “women” with “gender” and bookstores now offered a new, eclectic table of books “for and about women” from a variety of disciplinary perspectives. Still, gender-based analysis was more frequently found in histories written abroad, a small portion of which were translated into Spanish. Nari expressed her concern about applying theory stemming from different realities and historiographical trajectories without grounding it in the local Argentine context and historiography. Still, she argued that U.S. historian Joan Scott’s treatise on gender (which had been translated into Spanish by 1993) and French historians Georges Duby and Michelle Perrot’s influential compilation Historia de las mujeres en occidente (available in Argentina since 1993) illuminated the benefits of infusing Argentine women’s history with gender-based analysis. And then a few years later, historian Valeria Pita would add her own 1998 reflection on the state of the field, arguing that gender must not be employed as a category that was “tacked on” as the latest thing “en vogue.” Citing Joan Scott as well, Pita explained “there is a difference between studies about women and those on gender,” in that only the latter effectively reveal and challenge the “premises of historical production.”

As these and other historiographical review essays on the broader field of Latin America history attest, scholars trained in the United States and Europe were more likely to use gender as a category of analysis than their counterparts in Argentina and elsewhere in Latin America during the last quarter of the twentieth century. Nevertheless, during the 1970s and 1980s, most U.S.-based Latin Americanists published books with little or no gender analysis and instead focused on providing biographies of “important” women, histories of the feminist movement, and analyses of familial structures. In their respective review essays of the field, Sueann Caulfield and Elizabeth Hutchison explain that it was not until the 1990s and early 2000s that U.S. scholars released a sophisticated range of monographs that applied gender-based analyses to different aspects of Latin American history. Donna Guy’s 1991 book Sex & Danger in Buenos Aires: Prostitution, Family, and Nation in Argentina (translated into Spanish in 1994)
served as a particularly important trendsetter and indicator of this trajectory for Argentine history in particular and Latin American history more broadly.\textsuperscript{16} Inspired by the cultural turn and armed with the theories of Michel Foucault and Joan Scott, Guy employed a gender-based analysis of the \textit{higienista} discourse directed at prostitutes, in particular, and women, in general, by (primarily male) doctors, politicians, and moral reformers.\textsuperscript{17} She showed, as Joan Scott had theorized, how gender constructed politics and how politics constructed gender in early twentieth-century Argentina.\textsuperscript{18}

In the past couple of decades, a growing number of histories of Argentina—written in both Argentina and abroad—have used gender to frame their historical accounts. Still, it bears remembering that during this period most historians who have studied Argentina have not conducted gender-based analysis, leaving unmarked male subjects at the center of the canon. Starting in the 1990s and especially since the turn of the century, a small but committed group of feminist historians in Argentina began to challenge such a male-dominated and “positivist” historiography by publishing compilations, conference proceedings, and articles that centered on female subjects and employed gender-based analysis.\textsuperscript{19} In the year 2000 alone, Argentine scholars published two compilations that did just that: the three-volume \textit{Historia de las mujeres en la Argentina} edited by Fernanda Gil Lozano, María Gabriela Ini, and Valeria Silvina Pita, and \textit{Cuerpos, géneros e identidades: Estudios de género en Argentina} edited by Paula Halperin and Omar Acha.\textsuperscript{20} That same year Marcela Nari completed an impressive doctoral thesis that revealed the deeply gendered political and social history of maternalism in Argentina.\textsuperscript{21} Also in 2000, the acclaimed British-born, U.S.-based labor historian Daniel James published \textit{Doña María’s Story: Life, History, Memory, and Political Identity}, which used gender-based analysis and oral history to explore the life story of a female meatpacker, labor activist, and ardent Peronist.\textsuperscript{22}

In 2004 and 2005, first Dora Barrancos and then Adriana Valobra provided an updated assessment of the accomplishments, challenges, and shortcomings of historical scholarship on women and gender in Argentina. Barrancos explained that most works focused on the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, centered on Buenos Aires (largely ignoring other settings), and emphasized feminist and women’s movements and the Peronist era, with some attention to women’s work in certain industrial settings and as prostitutes. Both Barrancos and Valobra pointed to the noticeable lack of scholarship focused on the period after 1955, when the Peronist government was overthrown.\textsuperscript{23} Barrancos cautioned that going forward, practitioners of women’s history must use gender not only to “set the scene” but also to guide their analyses.

In this historiographical review essay, I will address how histories centered on Argentine women and published since the mid 2000s have incorporated gender
into their analyses of the national period. Fortunately for the field, it would be nearly impossible to address all the articles, book chapters, and books that have been published during this time both outside of Argentina, and especially within it, where production has been particularly robust. For example, in the last decade, Dora Barrancos has produced three important and engaging books that draw from many feminist scholars’ work and present in broad strokes Argentine women’s history for both academic and popular audiences. Here, I will concentrate on illuminative examples of recent books in two central and sometimes overlapping fields of study: first, labor and everyday life, and second, politics and state building. In both cases, I will briefly contextualize these fields by pointing to some key prior scholarship, and will examine histories of Argentina written by scholars both within and outside this nation. While local and foreign scholars have navigated their own local historiographies and preoccupations, there has long been considerable back and forth.

This review essay will seek to demonstrate that in the last few years gendered histories of Argentina written by those in the country and those abroad have become more proximate. Argentine historians have employed richer gender-based analyses that offer insightful corrections to mainstream Argentine historiography. In turn, North American historians of Argentina have focused more fully on using gender to historicize women’s lives rather than primarily the discourses and power dynamics surrounding them. While the field of women’s and gender history in Argentina is still what Valobra characterized as “a path in the making,” considerable ground has been gained through works that reveal the gendered underpinnings of the state, labor, and everyday life, as well as women’s agency in their capacities as political actors, workers, and caretakers.

**Gendered Histories of Labor and Daily Life**

When Argentine historian Mirta Lobato began to study female factory workers during the late 1980s, she was met with considerable skepticism. As she later explained, upon hearing of her topic, a renowned Argentine labor historian apparently remarked, “No sé por qué te preocupás por las mujeres en el trabajo y en el sindicato, no están, y si no están, no hay nada que explicar” (I don’t know why you are concerned with working women and women in the unions; they aren’t there, and if they aren’t there, then there is nothing to explain). Over the ensuing years Lobato and others (including Daniel James, with whom she would collaborate closely) would demonstrate that women were not only working in factories and participating in unions, but there was much to explain about their
actions and experiences in these and other settings—as well as their subsequent erasure from the historiographical record.

Of course, women’s daily lives in Argentina—as elsewhere—have been punctuated by paid and unpaid work. Still, most labor histories in Argentina have focused on men who were paid wages for their work in industrial, and to a lesser extent, rural settings. However, since the 1980s, feminist scholars have pointed out that women’s unpaid or low-paid work has formed (and continues to form) a huge part of the economy. Social scientists Catalina Wainerman and Zulma Rechini de Lattes collaborated together and with other scholars (including U.S.-based historian Maryssa Navarro) to publish groundbreaking studies that showed the gender bias of census data and revealed the presence and economic impact of women’s work. Reading such census data over time, Donna Guy published a 1981 article that demonstrated that census takers classified the majority of women as working during the mid-nineteenth century in Argentina, and argued that the low numbers of “economically active” women registered in twentieth-century censuses was a new phenomenon and one linked to industrialization and the ideal of the family wage. Argentine scholars also published the first book-length studies of domestic service in the city of Buenos Aires during the 1980s. In 1986, Isabela Cárdenas published a book on domestic servants in elite neighborhoods, and two years later Estela Pagani and María Victoria Alcaraz published a book on wet-nurses. This scholarship highlighted the importance of poor women’s low-paid domestic work in the functioning of elite households in the capital.

During the 1990s and early 2000s, newly gender-conscious labor historians shifted their attention to women’s work in factories and other more “public” twentieth-century workplaces, which previous scholars had implied were exclusively male. (A much smaller number of scholars including Marcela Nari continued to advance our understanding of women’s unpaid labor as mothers and caretakers, who provided essential “reproductive” labor for such “productive” work.) In 1997, John French and Daniel James edited a volume called The Gendered Worlds of Latin American Workers, which marked a significant turning point in understandings of labor history for the region as a whole. This presaged the nuanced gender-based analysis that James would employ in Doña María’s Story (2001) and that Mirta Lobato would incorporate in her 2001 book on factory life in Berisso, La vida en las fábricas.

While labor histories that centered on women published during the early 2000s primarily focused on factory workers, recent scholarship has attended to the broad range of work women have undertaken in a wider variety of locales. In 2007, Mirta Lobato published the most comprehensive study of women’s work in Argentina to date entitled Historia de las trabajadoras en la Argentina (1869-
Aimed at a broad audience, this book synthesizes the history of women and work in Argentina during the late-nineteenth through the mid-twentieth century. Lobato is clear that her aim is not only to bring women back into history, but also to enrich our understanding of the deeply gendered changes that occurred in Argentina during this period. She explains,

\[\text{The transformation of women into homemakers and laborers is the result of a complex network of ideas and practical actions related to the attitudes of the time, the action of the State, and the numerous conflicts that emerged in trying to distinguish between men’s and women’s work, place, roles, and attributes, as well as the ways of representing the working woman.}^{34}\]

As this quotation suggests, Lobato is attentive to the social, political, and economic dynamics that shaped women’s (and, to a lesser extent, men’s) labor and attitudes about what each sex should be doing.

\[\text{Historia de las trabajadoras en la Argentina effectively refutes the notion that Argentine women did not work by showing that women were indeed working in a wide range of capacities across the country. Lobato emphasizes that women dominated certain formal parts of the economy, including clothing industries, teaching, and nursing, as well as more informal sectors, such as trabajo a domicilio (piece work at home), domestic service, and prostitution. Further, even when women were not registered as “economically active” by census takers, she notes that their labor at home supported members of their families’ and communities’ abilities to work for wages.}^{35}\]

Nevertheless, popular representations, protective labor laws, and moral and health-related concerns about women’s work contributed to the supposedly “primordial” association of women with domesticity. Such that, during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, many Argentines came to view women’s extra-domestic work as morally compromising while concurrently envisioning men’s remunerated work as a praise-worthy male prerogative.\(^{36}\)

To trace the experiences, conflicts, and discourses surrounding female (and male) workers, Lobato assembled and assessed a range of primary and secondary sources. Her primary material included traditional sources such as censuses and government reports, along with less traditional sources, including photographs, literature, and oral histories. Still, this book possesses less of the fine-grained primary-source-based analysis so evident in Lobato’s masterful study of Berisso, especially when she moves away from discussing twentieth-century factory work. Instead, the author supports many of her claims with previous scholars’ histories of women’s work in more specific contexts. Indeed, such an inclusive
synthesis would have been a nearly impossible first-generation project for a historian of Argentine labor history.

Some three years later, U.S. historian Sandra McGee Deutsch published the first in-depth history of Jewish women in Argentina entitled, *Crossing Borders, Claiming a Nation: A History of Argentine Jewish Women, 1880-1955*. As a scholar whose previous work did much to advance understanding of South American gender and political history, she is keenly aware that her shift to focus on women’s history “may buck the historiographical tide”—a tide, which as previously mentioned, has been more predominant in U.S. gender histories of Latin America than those composed in the region. Also aware of the critiques of an earlier generation of women’s history, she stresses that hers is not a “compensatory exercise.” Instead, like Lobato, Deutsch uses gender-based analysis as a tool to understand women’s lives. She explains that historicizing women’s “familial, political, professional, and associational roles” is crucial to writing well-informed histories, with or without a gender focus.37 Tracing a similar time period as Lobato, Deutsch’s study of Jewish women begins during the 1880s, when large-scale Jewish migration to Argentina commenced, and continues until 1955, by which point it had dwindled. Unlike Lobato’s text, Deutsch’s book is not a labor history per se, but rather a study that provides a nuanced account of Jewish women’s work and daily lives as well as their political activism.

*Crossing Borders, Claiming a Nation* draws from a wide range of primary sources, including oral histories, autobiographies, and the files of Jewish community organizations. Deutsch points out that “the historian who uses such sources faces a gender-related problem” as men have been more likely to be asked to record oral histories and to write published memoirs.38 Therefore, she sought out Jewish women and conducted her own oral histories with them. Deutsch uses these and other sources to humanize this history, fleshing out specific women’s lives from the diverse Jewish Diasporas that made their way to Argentina from Eastern Europe, Iberia, Northern Africa, and the Middle East. Deutsch’s central argument is that Jewish women were both outsiders and insiders who regularly navigated and shaped political, cultural, and social borders in Argentina. In her words, “Argentine Jewish women were foreigners as well as disseminators of national culture.”39 That is, their Jewish background and migratory status placed them in an ethnic minority and at the same time their position as women placed them in a subordinate position to men, both Jewish and non-Jewish. Still, despite suffering multi-pronged discrimination, Jewish women carved out a place of influence and belonging for themselves and their families, and in so doing, helped forge the Argentine nation.

In another shift away from previous scholarship, Deutsch does not begin (and end) her story of Jewish women with the “white slave trade” and prostitution,
which she points out was not how the majority of Jewish women became involved in their new homeland. Instead, she starts as many late-nineteenth-century Jewish women did in the countryside, where Jewish women served as hardworking homemakers and farmers and adopted new roles as teachers, religious instructors, and social organizers. Shifting her analysis to urban areas during the twentieth century (as most Jews resided in cities by 1914), Deutsch explains that the majority of Jewish women in Buenos Aires were poor and worked in a number of capacities. Many labored in family businesses or as seamstresses, and all were expected to do housework as well. Some, but not nearly as many as popularly imagined, worked as prostitutes, which Deutsch (like Guy before her) points out could be more lucrative than “other low-skill jobs earmarked for women.”

Due to their association with prostitution and sensuality, Jewish women played a central role in defining (and potentially compromising) the Jewish community’s honor. As a result, Deutsch suggests that Jewish men sought to exert even tighter control over their wives and daughters. Perhaps partially as a result, by 1960, Deutsch finds that a relatively high proportion of Jewish women had carved out professional careers, which she suggests, stemmed from their efforts to make the most of their education, liberate themselves from male control, and find a place in the “center.” Further, as the Jewish community faced increasing hostility from the 1930s on, women played key roles as political activists who challenged anti-Semitism and fascism both at home and abroad.

Deutsch and Lobato’s methodological approaches suggest the need for scholars who seek to study a diverse group of women’s lives to assess and create a broad range of sources that might include oral histories, memoirs, and photographs. On an analytical level, their studies enrich our understanding of the gendered ideals and practices surrounding women’s paid and unpaid labor, community organizing, and politics. While both pay attention to women of differing social status and in both urban and rural settings, we still know far more about women’s lives and work in Buenos Aires than anywhere else. And while we now have a rich picture of Jewish women’s experiences, it remains unclear how they compare to the experiences of women and men in other marked ethnic groups, as well those considered ethnically un-marked, during this time. Further, the post-1955 era and women’s unpaid reproductive work still merits far greater attention.

Scholars have recently begun to publish studies that incorporate this era and foreground histories of domestic labor and everyday life. In 2012, Argentine historian Inés Pérez published a book entitled El hogar tecnificado: familias, género y vida cotidiana, 1940-1970 which provides a fascinating history of how technology changed (and did not change) the ideas and experiences of domestic work in mid-twentieth-century Mar del Plata. And in 2013, my book Creating a Common Table in Twentieth-Century Argentina: Doña Petrona, Women and
Food was published, which explores the domestic experiences of Argentines in relation to their most famous culinary expert, Doña Petrona C. de Gandulfo (c. 1896-1992). Both of these books draw from a wide variety of more and less traditional sources including oral histories, magazine articles, cookbooks, and government documents, and highlight women’s crucial roles as consumers, caretakers, cleaners, cooks, and community builders in twentieth-century Argentina.

This recent scholarship suggests the importance of analyzing women’s domestic roles within and beyond Argentina. To date, most English-language histories of women in Latin America have highlighted their contributions as factory workers, political figures, or members of social movements, and yet nearly all Latin American women have worked in and been expected to focus on the home, even when they also worked for wages or struggled against social injustices.

**Gendered Histories of Politics and State Building**

While gendered histories of women’s labor and everyday life are rising in methodological and analytical quality, perhaps no field of Argentine history has been more frequently studied than that of state politics. The major impact of the Peronist government looms particularly large in Argentine historiography, and studies of women are no exception. In fact, authors began to compose popular (and often elegiac or derogatory) histories of first lady Eva Perón during the 1950s. By the late 1970s and early 1980s, scholars began to write more nuanced accounts. In 1979, anthropologist Julie Taylor published *Eva Perón: The Myths of a Woman* (released in Spanish two years later), which addressed the class-based ideas that surrounded this polarizing first lady in different neighborhoods of Buenos Aires. The following year, Marysa Navarro published the first seriously researched biography (co-written in English with journalist Nicholas Fraser) of Eva Perón, which traced her life from her childhood through her death and beyond. And in 1981, Susana Bianchi and Norma Sanchís published the first history of the extremely popular *Partido Peronista Feminino* headed by the first lady.

For feminist historians researching women’s history during the 1980s and 1990s, earlier feminist movements proved a particularly appealing topic as well. In Argentina, a few scholars published articles about key protagonists in this movement. In the United States, where early feminist movements captivated historians’ attention to a greater extent, two scholars published full-length monographs. In 1988, Marifran Carlson released the first book-length study of feminism, *Feminismo! The Women’s Movement in Argentina from its Beginnings to Eva Perón.* And in 1995, Asunción Lavrin published the first comparative
analysis of feminism in South America entitled Women, Feminism, and Social Change in Argentina, Chile, and Uruguay, 1890-1940.\textsuperscript{51} Taking an even broader regional scope, Jane Jaquette compiled an edited volume on feminism throughout Latin America that included an essay on Argentina by historians María del Carmen Feijóo and Marcela Nari.\textsuperscript{52} Such comparative work helped illuminate the regional commonalities and particularities of Argentine feminist history.

In the more recent past, feminist movements of both the turn-of-the-century and the Peronist era have attracted the attention of a new generation of historians. Scholars in Argentina recently published three books that enrich our understanding of women and gender during the Peronist era, specifically Generando el Peronismo: Estudios de cultura, política y género (1946-1955), Cuando las mujeres reinaban: Belleza, virtud, y poder en la Argentina del siglo XX, and La Fundación Eva Perón y las mujeres: Entre la provocación y la inclusión.\textsuperscript{53} More recently, Carolina Barry published the first book on the Peronist Women’s Party in three decades, entitled Evita capitana: El Partido Peronista Femenino, 1949-1955. Combining the tools of oral historical and gender-based analysis, Barry seeks to explain how the Peronist government and especially First Lady Eva Perón drew such large numbers of women into politics.\textsuperscript{54} And in 2011, U.S. historian Gregory Hammond published The Women’s Suffrage Movement and Feminism in Argentina from Roca to Perón, which stresses the importance of Juan Perón’s political opportunism in explaining the timing of female suffrage as well as the critical reaction of previous suffragists to his new voting law.\textsuperscript{55} The following year Argentine historian Silvana Palermo published Los derechos políticos de la mujer: Los proyectos y debates parlamentarios 1916-1955, which provides a more nuanced account of the politics and practice of women’s legal rights both before and during the Peronist era.\textsuperscript{56} Palermo, Hammond, Barry, and other scholars’ recent contributions enhance the understanding of legislation, prominent feminists, the gendered dynamics of the Peronist state, and the impact of Eva Perón. Hopefully, future scholarship will reveal the agency of an even broader range of lesser-known “common” women and men who shaped the gender politics of their time.

Two recent books bring women’s political agency to the fore, revealing their crucial roles in helping to construct the apparatus of the Argentine state during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In 2009, Donna Guy published Women Build the Welfare State: Performing Charity and Creating Rights in Argentina, 1880-1955. Guy’s scholarship (like Deutsch’s) has been shaped by her long history of collaboration with local Argentine scholars. Also like Deutsch, in her recent book, Guy shifts her attention from a study of gender to a project focused on women that employs gendered-based analysis. That is, Guy moves away from discourse analysis of male politicians and scientists and towards a
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project that seeks to recover women’s agency on behalf of less fortunate women and, especially, indigent children. Guy explains that her project aims to challenge the tradition of historiography that has privileged personalistic histories of male politicians working at the highest levels of national government, and prove that women working at the local and municipal levels constructed the framework for the welfare state before Juan Perón took office. She argues that “in Argentina what emerged as a Peronist welfare state became the scaffolding built around earlier social policies that offered a disjointed but rather effective edifice comprised of national subsidies to philanthropic groups.” In other words, philanthropic groups run by women received subsidies from the national government to do the work of “build[ing] the welfare state,” which the Peronist government gladly co-opted but did not ultimately rebuild.

While Guy is interested in revealing women’s political agency, her original intent was to study children, and this original vision continues to shape the nature of this book and its methodology. Her “child focused, gendered approach to Argentine history” draws primarily from a previously unavailable source base, specifically the archival records of the Consejo Nacional de Niñez, Adolescencia y la Familia, which holds the records for several child welfare institutions, as well as upwards of 5,000 files for children who were admitted to state institutions. Guy and a team of research assistants gained temporary access to this data base thanks to the efforts of Dora Barrancos. And some of the most powerful moments of this book stem from Guy’s decision to “quote freely from the archives so that the children, parents, and agency employees of these institutions have the opportunity to represent themselves.” Through sharing the personal stories of abandoned children or those of parents or relatives seeking to regain their children, she reveals the pressing need for a legal and social structure to protect poor minors, and the way in which female charities led the charge to redress such a vacuum.

Guy’s approach also suggests the diversity of women’s activism in the public sphere. As she states from the outset, her intent is to convey the tensions and the “complex interrelationship between female philanthropic groups and feminists in their advocacy of child welfare programs and family reforms.” Guy’s treatment of female philanthropic groups is far richer than her analysis of feminists. And, in contrast to her earlier work, the writing and analysis is less fluid and fully developed. Nevertheless, she makes several acute observations, including the one that while feminists of all classes lobbied for women’s rights over biological children, middle and upper class philanthropists fought for poor children and their adoption. Both groups were supplanted by the Peronist government, and the association of social policies with this particularly divisive government made
subsequent politicians particularly eager to undo the “welfare state,” and perhaps caused subsequent scholars to ignore the previous actors who helped build it.

In contrast to Guy’s broader study of women’s diverse “charitable efforts,” Valeria Pita employs a micro-historical analysis of a specific institution that provides us with an earlier and even more detailed sense of how women helped build the Argentine state. In *La casa de las locas: Una historia social del Hospital de Mujeres Dementes Buenos Aires, 1852-1890*, Valeria Pita combines social history and gender-based analysis to study the first (female) insane asylum in Argentina. Established by the *Sociedad de Beneficencia* (Beneficent Society) in 1854, it housed a broad range of women, some considered crazy or dangerous, and others indigent and without family support. While past scholars characterized the elite women who ran the *Sociedad de Beneficencia* and oversaw this asylum as undertaking private charity work, Pita argues that such women and their efforts were public and political. She explains in her conclusion:

This research, assembled with the tools of social history and the perspective of gender, proposed understanding how different generations of the Beneficent Society constructed through their administration of a unique public institution, the Hospital de Mujeres Dementes, a space of intervention and tutelage that qualified them to participate politically and actively in the formation of the framework of the state and the nation.

That is, the women of the Beneficent Society played key roles in determining the way in which the state handled public services, especially those directed to women and children. They used their oversight of this (and other) state institutions to establish themselves as a crucial part of the political apparatus that built the Argentine nation.

To develop such an argument about frequently overlooked female historical protagonists, Pita combed state records, hospital documents, newspaper articles, and court cases for insight into women’s agency and the daily life of those within this institution. She applied gender-based analysis to such traditional historical sources to help reframe our understanding of the agents and texture of state building in mid-to-late nineteenth-century Argentina. This approach allows her to demonstrate that it was not just a group of powerful men, but also a savvy group of elite women who set the foundations for the Argentine nation, establishing the range and services of government institutions as well as promoting particular ideas about who should and who should not be included in the Argentine nation.

As past scholars of this period have suggested, Pita acknowledges that emerging scientific ideas shaped practices of governance and efforts to exclude certain
groups and individuals. However, Pita challenges past studies that employ a Foucauldian analysis for taking the disciplinary effectiveness of the emerging medical model for granted. Instead, she emphasizes the multiple actors, everyday negotiations, and intense conflicts that shaped “charitable” institutions such as La casa de las locas, demonstrating that doctors were unable to establish their “scientific” authority in this and other venues until at least the 1870s. Instead, judges and policemen were primarily responsible for sending the so-called crazy women to this asylum, while the women of the Beneficent Society were the ones who exercised ultimate and everyday control (if not always to their full satisfaction) over “a group of ailing and poor women, called demented.”

Further, by focusing her attention on the women within this asylum as well, Pita reveals not only their struggles but also their work as “washing women, servants, seamstresses, and maids” within this institution. For example, in 1882 alone, female residents produced some 2,200 blankets, 2,400 pillowcases, 1,205 shirts for use within the asylum, and 30,000 shirts for outside of it. Like many of their female counterparts, these so-called crazy women were workers, too.

Therefore, both Pita’s and Guy’s books are in a sense not only “traditional” political histories but labor histories, as well. (So too, Lobato’s and Deutsch’s books contribute not just to labor history, but also to political history.) Taken together, Pita and Guy reveal poor women’s unpaid work as inmates and middle and upper class women’s work as organizers of institutions and charitable organizations. In fact, Guy argues that when such better-off women gained access to respectable paying jobs during the mid-twentieth century, they often chose them over respectable but unpaid charity work. Still, the principal goal for Guy and Pita is to reveal the crucial roles that Argentine women played in constructing the nascent Argentine state and laying the groundwork for the welfare state brought under the Peronist government’s control during the 1940s—all this despite the fact that women had limited civil rights and did not enjoy the right to vote until 1947. Both show how local female-run organizations, especially the Beneficent Society, but also in Guy’s case, ethnic organizations and local groups, acted as the primary public officials interested in protecting and controlling other women and children.

In keeping with their source bases, we learn from both of these studies much more about the political agency of relatively well-off women than about their less fortunate counterparts. Hopefully, as Pita suggests, future scholars will study how the women (and children) they targeted responded to and shaped such interactions. Further, while Guy broadens her study to include not only Buenos Aires, but also the provinces of La Pampa and Tucumán, political histories (gendered and otherwise) still tend to concentrate on the capital city leaving much of the rest of the country unexamined. In addition, we still know far more about
women, gender, and politics in the period stretching from the late nineteenth century up through the Peronist era than earlier or especially later. Important exceptions to this claim are the studies by scholars on the Madres de Plaza de Mayo and Abuelas de Plaza de Mayo, which illuminate the gendered dynamics of the 1976-1983 military junta’s campaign of terror and of the Madres’ and Abuelas’ ongoing attempts to secure justice and accountability.67

In addition, historians have recently begun to redress the historiographical gap for much of the second half of the twentieth century. Two edited volumes that contain a broad range of gendered histories during the late twentieth century were recently published in Argentina, one focused on the 1960s, Los sesenta de otra manera: Vida cotidiana, género y sexualidades en la Argentina, and the other on the 1970s, De minifaldas, militancias, y revoluciones: Exploraciones sobre los 70 en Argentina.68 And in 2011, Karín Grammatico published the first book-length study of female revolutionaries during the early 1970s. In Mujeres Montoneras: Una historia de la Agrupación Evita 1973-1974, Grammatico reveals how the young women in this organization were engaged in a politics that was directed not only against the establishment, but also towards helping very poor women.69 In turn, Andrea Andújar in her research on las piqueteras (female picketers), highlights the leadership of poor women in staging public protests to block highways in the provinces during the 1990s.70

Shifting beyond the politics of the state and of protest, Argentine historians have also published recent book-length histories of sexuality and sexual politics during the second half of the twentieth century. In 2010, Isabella Cosse released a book entitled Pareja, sexualidad y familia en los años sesenta that historicizes “the discrete revolution” that reshaped ideas about men’s and women’s roles in their families, bedrooms, and workplaces during the era that stretched from the late 1950s through the early 1970s.71 Cosse’s text is relatively unique within Spanish-language Argentine historiography for its nearly equal attention to both male and female gender roles. Focusing more specifically on women’s reproductive roles but also incorporating ideas about “responsible fatherhood,” Karina Felitti provides a nuanced history of the birth control pill in Argentina in her 2012 book, La revolución de la píldora: Sexualidad y política en los sesenta. Here Felitti demonstrates the complex and deeply gendered relationship between the “sexual revolution,” the anti-contraceptive movement, and the social and political revolutionary currents of the time.
Conclusion

Since the turn of the twenty-first century, scholars have produced a wide range of elegantly argued and empirically grounded works that use gender-based analysis to historicize Argentine women’s lives and enrich Argentine history. While articles and edited compilations still reign supreme in this and other fields of Argentine history, a growing number of high-quality monographs have been published recently.

This second generation of scholarship on women and gender has emphasized women’s work and their political agency, especially during the period stretching from the late nineteenth century through the mid twentieth century. Perhaps gender-conscious scholars have been drawn to this era due to the major political and socioeconomic changes that dramatically impacted women’s and men’s experiences and prevailing expectations about their proper roles in a modernizing and industrializing nation. Indeed, of the four books under close review in this essay, only Pita’s focuses on the 1850s through the 1890s, with the rest of the books covering the 1870s or 1880s through the 1955 to 1960 period. Still, as we have seen, in the last three years, historians including Isabella Cosse, Karina Felitti, Karin Grammático, and Inés Pérez have also published important books on the 1960s and 1970s. In addition, my recently published book traces a gender history that extends from the late nineteenth century through the early twenty first. Indeed, recent scholars have helped us to better understand gender dynamics and women’s lives over longer stretches of time and during the late-twentieth-century vacuum that Dora Barrancos and Adriana Valobra had pointed to about a half a decade earlier.

Many of the recent histories referenced in this essay employ not only gender-based analysis but also examine how class-based distinctions impact women’s lives. While such analyses help us to appreciate how class has shaped women’s work experiences and everyday lives, we still have less of a sense of how poor women themselves shaped and reacted to politics at a national and local level. As in other fields in Argentine history, we know considerably more about urban settings and especially Buenos Aires than rural locales. In addition, while recent gender-conscious scholars (including anthropologist Eduardo Archetti and historians Pablo Ben, Omar Acha, and Adriana Novoa) have also begun to enrich our gendered understanding of men’s lives, we still know far more about how gender mattered for women. In addition, while Deutsch provided a nuanced account of how ethnicity and race intersected with gender and class in the case of the Jewish community, there is still much to be done in unpacking gendered histories of race and ethnicity for other local groups and migrant communities (especially within South America). In that vein, Cristiana Schettini Pereira has
recently published a pair of articles on the working lives of women who traveled between Argentina and Brazil during the early twentieth century, and appeared to their contemporaries to be linked with networks of prostitution. Finally, while we now have a greater understanding of sexuality between men and women and, to a lesser extent between men, there is still much more to learn about the broader range of sexual ideas and experiences, including same-sex relationships between women.

Nevertheless, most impressive is not so much what remains to be done within this relatively new field, but rather just how much contemporary scholars have advanced our historical understanding of women and gender in the very recent past. The main issue, therefore, is not the direction of this scholarship but rather its impact on other fields and across national borders. In this author’s opinion, all historians of Argentina benefit from being in conversation with one another regardless of locale. To that end, it is important that scholarship published abroad be translated into Spanish, and that researchers based outside Argentina engage with and contribute to Argentine historiography. Within Argentina, while the scholarship under review provides important critiques and corrections to mainstream historiography, it has yet to substantially reshape the historical canon in Argentina. While scholars trained in the United States are increasingly likely to include gender-based analysis or at least to focus on female protagonists in histories that do not center on such subjects, their counterparts in Argentina are less likely to do so. However, there are some important exceptions. For example, in Mariano Plotkin and Eduardo Zimmerman’s recent edited volume on the Argentine state, they solicited a contribution from Valeria Pita on elite women’s involvement in nineteenth-century state-building. Such a trend will continue not only through the work of those who focus on women’s and gender history, but also through the efforts of other historians committed to rigor and reconsideration.

Gender-based studies of Argentina’s past can enable us to radically remake our understanding of the political, economic, and social construction of the nation and of the dynamics of everyday life. As we have seen, women played key roles as paid and unpaid workers, political activists, and caregivers—even as the gendered stereotypes surrounding them tended to emphasize their domestic and maternal roles above all else. And yet, such positivist, “scientific” discourse has been too frequently taken at face value, with scholars tacitly accepting it as explaining sex-based differences rather than studying their construction. Fortunately, recent historians have challenged the validity of such a simplistic understanding. By carefully assessing new types of sources and re-reading traditional sources with the tools of gender-based analysis, they have contributed richer, more nuanced, and more accurate depictions of Argentine history.
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