[Title] Historiograph

Framing the question:

Webster's dictionary defines a revolution as the "overthrow of a government, form of government, or social system by those governed and usually by forceful means, with another government or system taking its place."[1] Webster's definition does not identify the gender, race, age or ethnicity of the people who form a revolution; therefore, research regarding revolutions should not be limited to the dominant male participation within a guerrilla struggle. A growing field of study for Latin American revolutions has been the study of women's active participation in such violent movements. Authors who study the revolutions of the 1950s to the 1980s have shown interest in the causal relationships that motivate women to participate in guerrilla struggles and the resulting concern for women's issues that evolve under a revolutionary regime. Two principle relationships that prevail in the literature are the effect of women's pre-revolutionary activity on their mass-mobilization and participation in guerrilla struggles and the effect of women's participation in guerrilla struggles on the advancement of women's interests during the post-revolutionary peacetime regime. The authors seek to find patterns or trends that explain why women participate in guerrilla struggles and what advantages/disadvantages there are to the furtherance of women's issues.

example:

Many authors explicitly state their opinion of a revolutionary regime's success or failure to address women and their issues. Margaret Randall entitled her book Gathering Rage: The Failure of 20th Century Revolutions to Develop a Feminist Agenda to explicitly reprove the Latin American revolutionary regimes for their dismissal of specific gendered interests and the lack of incorporation of women into the structures of the new societies.[2] Other authors recognize the complex political, economic and social history and conditions that a revolutionary regime

---

[1] "Revolution". Webster's New World Dictionary, Second College Edition. David B. Guralink, Ed. New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1986. 1218.

[2] Randall, Margaret. 1992. Gathering Rage: The Failure of 20th Century Revolutions to Develop a Feminist Agenda. New York: Monthly Review Press.

confronts in relation to women's issues. In Maxine Molyneux's article "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State, and Revolution in Nicaragua", she analyzes not only the various gendered interests in play before and after the Nicaraguan revolution, but also the internal and external challenges that the revolutionary government had to contend with resulting in the marginalization of women's interests.[3] She demonstrates that the preservation of the state by diminishing the preservation of gendered policy was an attempt to salvage the overall revolutionary goals in the face of crisis and counterrevolution. Regardless of the relationships focused upon in the various works, it is clear that a thorough understanding of the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions must include an analysis of the involvement of women in guerrilla struggles. This paper will examine how various authors who have examined the Cuban and/or Nicaraguan Revolution(s) examine the participation of women in armed guerrilla combat based upon their examination of pre- or post-revolutionary conditions for women, motivating them to mobilize to address gender interests.

Jane Jaquette[4] links the presence of feminist ideology in the revolutionary platforms of the 1950s and 1960s to the presence of women as guerrilla fighters and their relationship to the leaders of the guerrilla movement. Jaquette looks at women's pre-revolutionary activity from a different light from other authors in this study. She focuses on the participation of Latin American women in combat since the time of independence to suggest that women's continued participation in the public sphere has helped to change women's status over history. Therefore, in her specific analysis of the Cuban case, she claims that there is a pre-revolutionary precedent that explains women's participation in the 1959 Revolution. However, her analysis does not

[3] Molyneux, Maxine. 1985. "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua." *Feminist Studies*. 11:2. (Summer): 227-254.

[4] Jaquette, Jane S. 1973. "Women in Revolutionary Movements in Latin America." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 35:2. (May): 344-354.

make sure transitions are referring back to the argument!

offer specific historical evidence to support this claim. Instead, one is better served by looking to Padula and Smith to understand the pre-revolutionary status of women in Cuba.

Alfred Padula and Lois Smith paint a picture of decadence versus destitution in Cuba of the 1950s in their book.[5] Since the early 20th century, Cuba saw an increase in women's education, in economic growth, and in general, in opportunities for women. This led to changes in legislation affecting women's status, such as the legalization of divorce in 1918. Padula and Smith synthesize women's long history of activism and/or civic involvement such as the creation of the 1917 Club Feminino and women's work to overthrow Machado in 1933. The authors establish a precedence of activism for women in the workforce and society from the 1920s to the 1940s, but state that women's movements "run out of steam" in the 1950s and the middle class accepted the military coup of Batista.[6] This idea then leads into their synthesis of the Cuban Revolution. However, the authors do not cite their sources for this claim, leading a reader to question the basis of this analysis, especially as they further state that the revolutionary struggle is driving by men (and women) of the middle classes later on in their discussion.

In Cuba, there was a strong separation of classes with an upper class tradition of women avoiding manual labor or not working. Society accepted that women of middle class worked in such fields as teaching and office work, as long as the husband was seen as the primary provider for the family. Lower class women would bring home piecework, work in tobacco or sewing industries, or would become prostitutes if desperate. By 1957, women comprised 48 percent of the workers in Cuba's service sector.[7] However, Padula and Smith do not link this information to the participation of women within the guerrilla struggle. Although certain middle class

[5] Padula, Alfred and Lois M. Smith. 1996. Sex and Revolution: Women in Socialist Cuba. New York: Oxford University Press.
[6] Padula & Smith 1996, 19.
[7] Padula & Smith 1996, 20.

women gained fame for their service to the revolutionary movement, the "lesser-known Cuban women" who they claim were part of the guerrilla struggle truly do not come to light in their synthesis. Perhaps this is due to limited sources, yet Padula and Smith should have then considered framing their discussion in a manner that acknowledges the exceptional middle-class women that they use to represent the common Cuban lower-class or rural woman.

Linda Lobao also addresses and analyzes the factors that lead women into participating in guerrilla struggles by framing women's intentions in terms of family structure and survival.[8] She examines the barriers to women's political participation as well as the factors that facilitated their mobilization. She lists the main barrier as male patriarchal attitudes that permeate both politics as well as the home. Lobao agrees with Marxist feminist theorists that these patriarchal attitudes subordinate women to reproductive roles within society. Activities expected of women (such as child rearing and domestic service) take place in the private sphere, limiting her involvement in (public) political action leading to guerrilla struggles. Other barriers prior to the revolution that she indicates are the lower educational level of women, as well as the notion that women are politically more conservative than men.[9] According to Lobao, these barriers not only prevent participation in guerrilla struggles, but also may increase opposition to such movements if their objectives are perceived to conflict with the woman's responsibility of protecting and ensuring the survival of the family.

On the other hand, Lobao uses the model of the family as a factor that facilitates women's entry into guerrilla struggles. With industrialization across the region, greater numbers

[8] Lobao, Linda M. 1998. "Women in Revolutionary Movements: Changing Patterns of Latin American Guerrilla Struggle." In M. J. Diamond, ed. Women and Revolution: Global Expressions. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 255-290.

[9] Present governments often fall prey to this notion and therefore do not see women as a political threat. However, this notion fails to take into account that even conservative women may turn radical in order to protect their family and lifestyle.

of women were forced to enter the paid labor force, often as the head of the household. This income then became necessary to sustain the family. As women took responsibility for the survival of the family, they increased contact with individuals and issues outside of the family, and they reacted to perceived government threats to family survival by participating in revolutionary movements. The role of family protector/provider was also influenced by the diffusion of feminist and class ideas that women encountered outside of the home, allowing women to mobilize as members of a working class as well as across class lines to work for women's liberation.[10] Lobao cites Molyneux's model of strategic and practical gendered interests to explain that women specifically motivated by the objective of ending women's subordination as well as addressing immediate economic necessity. She notes that revolutionary groups that seek the mass support of women (such as in Nicaragua) need to develop platforms in consideration of these practical gender interests as women "must first perceive such movements as dealing with their basic, short-term, practical interests." In the case of the Latin American Left, Lobao identifies the failure to develop a family agenda compatible with social change as the cause for losing women's support over time.[11]

Interestingly though, Lobao does not address the specific situation of women in Cuba before the Cuban Revolution as she does women in the Nicaraguan case. She gives a very brief summary of conditions within Cuba that made the entire country ripe for revolution. Instead, her analysis of Nicaraguan women's motivations for participation should be examined as an example of her general revolutionary theory, as she links the high percentage of women in the labor force as well as the large number of female headed households as the motivation to their participation

[10] Lobao 1998, 260.
[11] Lobao 1998, 262-3.

in the guerrilla struggle. The theory of family survival is thus the predominate framework of Lobao's analysis of women's motivations to enter the revolution.

In the case of Nicaragua, one should look to Molyneux and her analysis of strategic and practical gender interests that motivated women to participate in revolutionary movements. She cites the 1972 earthquake as the instigating factor for most women to become active in public activities. As relief workers, women fulfilled their traditional roles as nurturers and caregivers; many of these women then transitioned from relief workers to participants in the struggle "as a natural extension...of their protective role in the family as providers and crucially as mothers."[12] Molyneux states that this transition, along with propaganda from the Sandinistas, radical clergy, and AMPRONAC[13] linked women's traditional identities (reproductive roles) with the general strategic objectives of the revolution. Unlike many feminist scholars, however, Molyneux does not advocate a complete failure of the revolutionary government to address the interests of women nor does she deny a representation of these interests due to a patriarchal structure as described by Lobao; instead, her analysis focuses on the diversity of women's interests needing to be addressed and the challenges the revolutionary government confronted as factors compounding the complexities of the revolution and state. What is interesting is that the framework of Molyneux's analysis could be applied not only to the case of Nicaragua, but many of the other mass-based Latin American revolutions of the 1970s and the *foco*-based Cuban revolution. Due to factors confronting the governments, such as economic crisis and international pressure, women's interests were subordinated to the interests of state preservation.

[12] Molyneux 1985, 228.

[13] The Association of Nicaraguan Women Confronting the National Problem, founded in 1977 by the FSLN. This organization was a forum for women victimized by the Somoza regime, and was a central factor for the active recruitment of women to the Sandinista movement. (Lobao 1998, 274).

One should be cautious in the case of Cuba, though, as this revolution differed by using a *foco* strategy that precludes active recruitment of women into the guerrilla struggle. [14]

Margaret Randall takes an interesting approach to her analysis of guerrilla struggle and the failure of Latin American revolutionary regimes to address women's issues. As an actual witness to both the Cuban and Nicaraguan Revolutions, Randall critiques the new regimes for their lack of implementation of gendered goals based on her personal observation and conclusions and interviews with women attending solidarity conferences throughout the region. Although she intersperses little historical information regarding women's participation in society before the revolutions, she does claim that the failure of the guerrilla movements to end women's oppression stems from a lack of concern for the *process* by which revolutionary ideas were developed and instilled in society both before, during and after the struggles. She refers to the Russian Revolution of 1917 as a model for her analysis of the leadership of Latin American revolutions, as many socialist (or communistic) ideology as a basis for the struggle itself. This analysis in itself is unique as most scholars refer to Marxist theory and ideology over the example of Russian implementation. Randall claims that under the socialist regime of Stalin, women in Russia lost many if not all of their social gains, due to a male, product-oriented mindset that failed to address the ideological and cultural issues that were in place before the revolution, including the vision of man as dominant and woman as "other".[15] One may conclude that Randall's observations of the failure to form an autonomous feminine discourse *after* the revolutions stems from *women's* lack of concern or focus on incorporating these issues *themselves* into the revolutionary process *before* the end of the struggle.

---

[14] The *foco* strategy depends on a small band of (male) guerrillas; therefore, the guerrillas did not need to mobilize all willing volunteers who were perhaps incompetent but rather preferred a small, dedicated group of people. (Kampwirth 2002, 127).

[15] Randall 1992, 106.

Karen Kampwirth provides an excellent and thorough analysis of the factors leading women to mobilize for a revolutionary struggle.[16] Several of these factors are common themes throughout the literature of Nicaraguan revolution, yet Kampwirth added one that tends to be overlooked as well. Throughout much of the literature, scholars examine the factors of the expansion of export-oriented agriculture, the resulting urban migration, early organizations of women such as popular cooperatives, changes in the Catholic Church in the 1960s, and changes to family structures. The interesting factor that Kampwirth proposes for consideration is that of age. She surmises that many women joined the armed insurgency at a young age for reasons that differed from those of older women and that when observing trends of the Nicaraguan revolution, these young women tended to be older siblings within their families. Kampwirth's analysis highlights the complexity of women's interests that Molyneux referred to in her article, yet further divides the groups of women not only by class, but also age, familial responsibilities and access to resources due to age. She theorizes that many young women began their activism within various student groups at the high school or university level. These students saw revolutionary participation as an opportunity for a new type of life, "taking on new identities through pseudonyms, which some would continue to use long after the wars were over."[17] Kampwirth's age analysis allows for the consideration of non-practical interests of young people in guerrilla movements: that of the excitement and adventure of youth that has yet to be tempered by wisdom that is gained through experience.

She also defines four personal factors that influence the lives of women who would join guerrilla movements. These factors include family traditions of resistance to authority, participation in pre-existing social networks that transition to political organizations, class

[16] Kampwirth, Karen. 2002. Women and Guerrilla Movements: Nicaragua, El Salvador, Chiapas, Cuba. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.
[17] Kampwirth 2002, 9.

background and education levels, and the year of birth. She considers this last factor the single most important personal factor for participation as one's age at the time of various societal turning points would influence one's interpretation of events as explained previously.[18] Kampwirth limits her analysis to these stated factors, but suggests further research is necessary in the area of birth order and family structure. She then applies her general theories to specific revolutions, including Nicaragua's, and ends with a comparison of these revolutions to the Cuban Revolution. By comparing the structural, organizational, political and personal factors for the Nicaraguan case to the Cuban case, Kampwirth is able to support her analysis regarding women's mass mobilization and participation by pointing out the differences from the Cuban revolution that limit the role of women during the guerrilla phase.

Kampwirth begins her analysis of the Nicaraguan revolution with a brief outline of the aspects of the Somoza dictatorship that lead to the development of cross-class and gendered coalitions against him. She states that the conflicting discourses of "governmental benevolence and empowerment of female citizens...and the reality of violent exclusion of both women and men" may have been one reason for women's mobilization against the dictatorship.[19] Structurally, she notes that land was concentrated in the hands of a few, leading to mass urban migration. Families were broken up as men (and women) searched for employment in cities, rarely returning to rural areas.[20] Large numbers of women entered the urban work force, setting them onto the path of community involvement and organization, echoing Lobao's observations of women's roles as family providers. This community activity allowed for a dissemination of political and feminist ideas that was not necessarily possible before on such a large scale. Many

[18] Kampwirth 2002, 12
[19] Kampwirth 2002, 23.
[20] As women migrated to urban areas, they felt a sense of independence that previously did not exist. Also, they were able to observe and compare first hand the class and regional divisions within the country, a truly "radicalizing experience". (Kampwirth 2002, 27).

of these women who organized were single women, economically desperate and personally free from responsibilities that married women contended with (husband and children).[21] This, as well as age, would be an important factor for Kampwirth's analysis of guerrilla participation.

Another factor that one sees detailed in Kampwirth's analysis but absent from most other literature referring to Nicaragua is a focus on and in-depth analysis of the importance of liberation theology and the structural changes of the Catholic church on the revolution itself. She links the mobilization of poor people, missionary programs and religious education as critical factors for the political indoctrination of many (rural and lower-class) women. The church plays a larger role in the Nicaraguan Revolution than the Cuban Revolution, yet this area of analysis is not a focus of most of the research of the authors presented here. One may conclude that the occurrence of Vatican II and the resulting change in clergy practices *after* the Cuban Revolution is one reason that the guerrilla struggle in Nicaragua took on a mass-based mobilization strategy instead of the *foco* strategy. Yet, even though support for this conclusion is alluded to within Kampwirth's analysis, explicit Kampwirth or other authors do not address information regarding this link studied in this paper due to the lack of consideration of the Church's role in specifically mobilizing and educating women.

Although Kampwirth acknowledges the limitation of her Cuba analysis due to a reliance on secondary sources, she uses what information she possesses to highlight the distinguishing factors that were absent from Cuba's situation but present in Nicaragua. She notes the presence of land consolidation by rural elites, the increase of rural wageworkers and the resulting migration to cities, the increase of educational opportunities and the ease and ability for community involvement. She notes that in Cuba the only noticeable structural difference was

[21] Kampwirth claims that most women who did not organize faced the sexism of husbands or male family members who felt threatened by the challenge presented to gender and power relations. (Kampwirth 2002, 27).

that fewer women were heads of households, and that "more cohesive and controlling families could help explain the limited role that young women played in the Cuban guerrilla war."[22] Therefore, she discounts structural conditions as a decisive factor for the difference in composition between the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions. She does indicates the weakness of the church as an institution in Cuba and the absence of a liberation theology movement as perhaps the single structural factor that clearly distinguishes Nicaragua from Cuba.

Finally, Kampwirth highlights the primary difference of these revolutions as the difference in guerilla strategy, noting that Cuba used a *foco* military strategy that did not require mass mobilization; women were apparently among the category of people that the dedicated and competent guerrilla band did not deem necessary to mobilize. [23] Meanwhile, the Nicaraguan revolution shifted to a political-military strategy in an effort to "incorporate a wide variety of social organizations into the Sandinista coalition, either by actively founding new groups or by incorporating preexisting opposition groups into the fold.[24] Her conclusions clearly link her general hypothesis outlining the factors that lead women to mobilize as guerrillas to the individual cases of Nicaragua and Cuba, delineating the economic, political and social factors in such a depth that the articles previously mentioned cannot encompass in such a limited framework. Kampwirth also outlines a thorough comparison of Nicaragua and Cuba and the outcomes of the struggle based on these similarities or differences; authors such Randall or Lobao (who also present arguments for both Nicaragua and Cuba) focus primarily on the similarities of the cases and their success and failures, or fail to make clear linkages between the conditions contributing to women's participation in each specific case.

[22] Kampwirth 2002, 122.
[23] Kampwirth 2002, 127.
[24] Kampwirth 2002, 34.

With reference to the actual participation of women in guerrilla combat and movements, Lobao includes an intriguing analysis of the division of labor within the camp for all revolutionary movements. She relates the fundamental sexism associated with Latin American societies to the placement of women in "positions that are most compatible with the existing gender order....Thus, women may be more likely to occupy support, rather than combat, positions in guerrilla struggle."[25] This statement is consistent with conclusions found in other feminist literature regarding women's participation as supporters instead of combatants. However, Lobao's analysis of these supporting roles looks deeper than the apparent surface "sexism" that many attribute to the guerrilla leaders. She applies a study conducted by Charles Russell and Bowman Miller of world terrorists stating that women attract less attention than men due to universal sex stereotyping. Therefore, they are the perfect choice by guerrilla movements to oversee safe dwellings, store weapons or gain access to restricted areas by posing as wives and mothers.[26] Padula and Smith cite the Cuban examples of Haydee Santamaria carrying weapons in a suitcase and flower box and Teresa Casuso offering her Mexico City apartment to store arms for Castro's forces.[27] Women were also used as messengers and arms runners, with the ability to aid guerrilla movements by "exploit[ing] these patriarchal 'images' through covert operations" for strategic utility.[28] Lobao also concludes that in the Cuban revolution, women were not actively recruited during the insurgency and no attempt was made to mobilize them. [29]

Unfortunately, in her analysis, Lobao does not apply her analysis of supporting roles specifically to the Nicaraguan situation, only to the Cuban situation. This perhaps might be due

---

[25] Lobao 1998, 266.
[26] Quoted from Charles A. Russell and Bowman H. Miller, "Profile of a Terrorist," *Terrorism* 1. 17-33. (in Lobao 1998, 267).
[27] Padula & Smith 1996, 23.
[28] Lobao 1998, 267.
[29] Lobao bases this conclusion on broadcast excerpts from Radio Rebelde. (Lobao 1998, 270).

to the fact that unlike the Cuban revolution, women in the Nicaraguan revolution did engage in combat and were able to achieve positions of leadership both during the struggle and after in the new regime. One observes too that when reading about women's participation in the Cuban guerrilla struggle that the same names of "exceptional" women are repeated and used as representative of all women within the guerrilla struggle, and that the majority of these women have a link to the guerrilla leadership.[30] These women were middle class women, and were prevented for the most part from participating in battle unless rare circumstances allowed them to substitute for the lack of men. In her article, Jaquette praises Celia Sanchez, Haydee Santamaria and Vilma Espin for their important roles in the revolution, but she overstates the amount of literature written regarding the role of other women in the revolution itself. Padula and Smith give numerous examples of women participating in demonstrations, acting as lawyers for revolutionary prisoners, working as nurses and supply masters, and spreading propaganda throughout the country, although the majority of these women remain unidentified in their work. This information, though, must be scrutinized carefully due to the admitted lack of sources and the censorship of written information regarding women in the revolution. In fact, a majority of Padula and Smith's sources for women in guerrilla struggle are newspaper articles, magazine articles, personal letters and correspondence, and radio broadcasts published after the revolution, all controlled by Fidel Castro and his revolutionary leadership. This leads one to question the potential bias of this information due to the sources. Kampwirth addresses the issue of credibility in a footnote in her appendix with regard to using journalistic accounts for guerrilla information:

> "Journalistic accounts may be poorly suited for analyzing the social background of rank and file guerrillas....[U]rban guerrillas were much harder to find, because they

[30] For example, Celia Sanchez was Castro's secretary, Vilma Espin the wife of Raul Castro, and Haydee Santamaria the wife of the Party Leader Amando Hart Davaalos. (Jaquette 1973, 346).

> almost never grouped in camps,...and sought to blend into their surroundings: continuing to go to work or school and to live at home if possible. For obvious reasons, urban guerrillas who sought to go unnoticed would be harder for journalists to identify than rural guerrillas in camps."[31]

Women's participation in the Nicaraguan guerrilla movement is briefly touched on in Molyneux, Kampwirth's and Randall's works. Kampwirth identifies that "female rank-and-file Sandinistas were more likely to be of urban origin, and to have traced their political roots to the student movement." She also concludes that they were nearly always young, free of familial duties, and oblivious to the serious risks of guerrilla combat.[32] Molyneux states that the FSLN[33] was successful in mobilizing women in support of its struggle partly due to the women's organization AMPRONAC as well as the Sandinista leadership's demonstrated enthusiasm for women's liberation. She notes the high level of women in combat forces (approximately 30 percent of the FSLN's combat forces) late in the struggle, but does not comment on the reasons for the late entry into combat (1978).[34] Randall notes that "[w]ith few exceptions, early women in the FSLN were girlfriends and sisters of the male members, and then young women from the Christian movement who also envisioned a different Nicaragua and had tired of the more traditionalist routes."[35] Lobao observes that as more women entered the movement, sexism began to break down and an atmosphere of respect based on merit and skill not only cultivated respect for the women but also motivated other women to join the movement.[36]

---

[31] Kampwirth 2002, 140.
[32] Kampwirth acknowledges that these observations cannot be confirmed due to the fact that a study does not exist that breaks down data for all members by sex and social background. However, she does state that a comparison to other guerrilla movements (Cuban guerrillas, Peru's Sendero Luminoso, etc.) shows similar findings.
[33] The Sandinista National Liberation Front. Founded in 1961 by Carlos Fonseca, Tomas Borge and other young Nicaraguan revolutionaries. (Randall 1992, 177)
[34] Molyneux 1985, 237.
[35] This is stated in her endnotes, as the body of her work focuses on the analysis of feminist theories in post-revolutionary Nicaragua and Cuba.
[36] Lobao 1998, 275.

Yet for each of these studies, neither the reasons for the late combat entry nor the prevailing conditions for women in combat are explicitly analyzed.[37] AMPRONAC was formed in 1977 to mobilize women, yet the Sandinista struggle had been in progress for many years before this. Is women's overall late entrance into combat due to neglect from the guerrilla leaders until the point they entered or perhaps to a lingering patriarchal attitude prevailing within the guerilla leadership that prevented large numbers of women from taking up arms until such a point where any able-bodied combatant was welcome? Or, is it possible that women, since the beginning of the struggle, held support positions until such a time that the leadership was ready for them to fight? Though this information would not change the fact that women did participate in combat, further in-depth analysis of the time period in which women were mobilized would expand our understanding of the revolutionary period.

Information regarding women's continued participation in the Cuban revolutionary regime is more accessible than women's participation in the guerrilla struggle. Authors that study Cuba acknowledge that a concerted effort to mobilize women did not occur until 1960, after the revolution was won and Castro had assumed control of the country's government. Jaquette notes that the key to the mobilization of women was the Federation of Cuban Women (FMC), created by Fidel Castro in 1960 and run by Vilma Espin, to be "...a central force in creating-and directing-female consciousness."[38] Drastic structural changes resulted after the formation of the FMC that affected women's lives in the years immediately following the revolution: an increased participation of women in the labor force, the creation of a large network of day care centers, improvement in health and welfare programs, increased educational

[37] An example of a prevailing condition for the Cuban Revolution is the need for women to substitute for the lack of male combatants in various locations.
[38] Jaquette 1973, 347.

opportunities, the availability of contraception and the legalization of divorce.[39] Ideologically, the regime and the FMC worked to create an egalitarian society in which women held the same status of citizen as men. "One of the major targets of regime criticism has been the traditional husband who tries to control his wife's behavior to conform to traditional views....In his 'Santa Clara' speech, Fidel argued that women, like the black population of Cuba, had been doubly liberated 'as part of the exploited sector of the society' and 'not only as workers but also a women, in that society of exploitation.'"[40]

However, it should be noted that an analysis of this egalitarian society concludes that the "egalitarian quality" extolled by the leadership did not extend to incorporating large numbers of women into positions of power and leadership, or even consulting with women in regard to their needs and desires for a new society. Notice that Fidel Castro created the FMC, and directed its leadership: a male, middle- to upper-class leadership chose to decide what was in the best interests of *all* women; the resulting focus tended to be on the reproductive responsibilities and family protection roles that women had before the revolution. Therefore, the revolution, against its stated objectives, was not necessarily meant to "free" women from their oppressive burden. Jaquette notes that:

> "...this view of female emancipation does not rest on the premise that sex role distinctions should be eliminated, but rather on the professionalization of household work....Che [Guevara] has argued that female participation in the Revolution is inevitably linked to psychological factors as well; that the liberation of women should consist in the achievement of their total freedom-their *inner* freedom. It is not a matter of a physical restriction which is placed on them to hold them back from certain activities."[41]

[39] Although it has been stated earlier that divorce was legal in Cuba since 1918, divorce was not seen as acceptable. After the revolution, women took advantage of the new divorce laws to improve their life situations. (Padula & Smith 1996, 15).
[40] Jaquette 1973, 347.
[41] Che Guevara as quoted by Gerassi, 1968, 241-242. (Jaquette 1973, 348)

Margaret Randall, though, is outspoken in her praise of the principle ideals of Cuban leadership. "The Cuban Revolution, with its serious formulation of women's rights, provided the context for considering every *human* need." [42] She also noted the increase in quality in women's education, equal pay as men, maternity leave, and some women in high-level political and administrative positions. "Everywhere, women glowed with the joys of their newly won social place."[43] Yet even Randall criticizes the revolution for its failure to encourage the development of a feminist discourse that would allow for real female autonomy and development and implementation of policies coming from women and their unique experiences, not told to them by a male patriarchal leadership. She notes that even though the overall quality of life improved for all, "women-only" space needed to be created so that women could draw upon their strength and history against the vision of men who "would continue to make us *other*."[44] This observation coincides with feminist critiques of the Marxist revolutionary method that focuses on the assurance of economic equality for all and assumes that once this is established, social equality will quickly follow. Randall concludes:

> "The Cuban Revolution is extraordinary in its ability to admit mistakes and rectify them; it is slower to permit a critical discourse that encourages real debate and may prevent such errors from being made. I now see that a missing piece was men's ability to see beyond male privilege. Those in power, in all places and at all times, will go through veritable contortions to avoid sharing that power."[45]

In effect, the Cuban revolution did much to improve the practical concerns of women, yet has had limited success in achieving long term strategic goals due to the pervasiveness of the male patriarchal attitude of leadership and need to maintain control throughout society.

---

[42] Randall 1992, 131.
[43] Randall 1992, 127.
[44] Randall 1992, 135.
[45] Randall 1992, 138.

Molyneux and Randall both examine the post-revolutionary goals and outcomes of the FSLN's commitment to women's emancipation. The FSLN "recognized women's oppression as something that needed to be eliminated in the creation of a new society."[46] Through the organization AMNLAE[47], the FSLN was able to promote equality and support for measures to achieve it. AMNLAE's official goals were in support of the overall revolutionary goals (mixed economy, nonalignment, political pluralism) toward the achievement of a socialist democracy:

1) *defending the revolution* [emphasis added];
2) promoting women's political and ideological awareness and advancing their social, political and economic participation in the revolution;
3) combating legal and other institutional inequalities;
4) encouraging women's cultural and technical advancement and entry into areas of employment traditionally reserved from men combined with opposing discrimination in employment;
5) fostering respect for domestic labor and organizing childcare services for working women; and
6) creating and sustaining links of international solidarity.[48]

The ultimate goal of this organization (a woman's organization with female leadership) has been to defend the goals of the revolution that the FSLN promotes. Therefore, in this context it is understandable that when confronted with the limitations of limited resources, economic crisis, and military international pressures, the priorities of the revolutionary regime move away from women's emancipation toward the preservation of the state itself. Although the official concern for women's issues remains, the evidence demonstrates that the realization of projects and policies regarding the improvement of women's positions and conditions have alleviated some practical concerns, but have yet to achieve the long-term strategic goals set forth by AMNLAE. Coupled with the governmental limitations mentioned previously is the negative impact of FSLN

[46] Molyneux 1985, 238.
[47] The Luisa Amanda Espinosa Nicaraguan Women's Association. This organization is the continuation of AMPRONAC, founded during the last years of the war against Somoza. Luisa Amanda Espinosa was the first woman to die in the guerrilla struggle that began in the 1960s. (Randall 1992, 179).
[48] Molyneux 1985, 239-240.

ideology itself on women's emancipation. The ultimate goal of the regime was to achieve a socialist democracy, and to achieve this, opposition to the regime had not been eliminated (this is the promotion of political pluralism). However, this allowed opposition to the implementation of policy that might indeed affect the lives of women and promote ideological changes within the society. Opposition came from dissenting political organizations or individuals, the private sector, and the conservative wing of the Catholic Church, slowing reform in areas directly concerned with women such as educational, family, and labor reforms. "What was therefore a positive feature of the Sandinista revolution-its democratic commitment-did have the effect of diluting policy measures and weakening the government's capacity for implementation."[49] The FSLN was thus only able to implement policies that coincided with the general goals of the revolution itself. Women gained because everyone in society gained; the revolution was not a failure for women's issues overall as it provided policies that met the basic needs of the people in the health, housing, education and food sectors. The failure lay with the lack of focus on the advancement of issues specifically related to women and the lack of promotion by AMNLAE of these issues.

Upon her return to Nicaragua in 1991 to attend a solidarity conference, Randall observed that women continued to question why "feminism in its broadest definition-addressing power relations in gender, class, race and cultural configuration-was not allowed to consolidate and grow during the years of revolutionary government."[50] She also noted that most women agreed that the Sandinista government "opened a vast economic, social, political, and cultural space for women, empowering them with a strong sense of their personal and collective identities."[51] The disappointment of these scholars of feminist agendas of Latin American revolutions seems to lie

[49] Molyneux 1985, 244.
[50] Randall 1992, 61.
[51] Randall 1992, 57.

in the relegation of women's interests to a secondary or marginalized status after the revolution used these ideals and promises to free women from oppression and repression to mobilize women to participate and support the revolutionary movements. Molyneux acknowledges that the Sandinistas have done more than most Latin American governments (except for Cuba) to improve the lives of women both practically and ideologically. She calls for greater discussion and debate regarding the official theory and program of women's emancipation both among the people and within the realms of political power so that women's issues are articulated within the wider strategy of development for the country. "[I]t is essential that [women's organizations] charged with representing these [gender] interests have the means to prevent their being submerged altogether, and action on them being indefinitely postponed....Rather, they must enjoy a certain independence and exercise power and influence over a political party."[52] This statement is advice applicable to both Cuba and Nicaragua, whose history has shown that consideration of women's interests are delayed in favor of economic or political crisis, without realizing that women, as citizens and political constituents, have needs that must be incorporated into the policies that arise as the government struggles to avert these crises.

point didn't FIT anywhere else, but was important & needed to be said (fill many notes in the field here!)

tied point

A final observation of guerrilla movements: Jaquette's article does not analyze the Nicaraguan revolution specifically due to the fact that it was written before the outcome of the revolution was known. However, as she notes that "there appears to be a link between female participation in guerrilla movements and the development of political statements and platforms directly aimed at feminist issues"[53], it would be interesting to further study the connection between the high percentage of women fighting in Nicaragua with the diminishing power of or focus on women's issues after the revolution. It would be further fascinating to complete such a

[52] Molyneux 1985, 251.
[53] Jaquette 1973, 344.

study looking at the high numbers of women who maintained positions of leadership both during the guerrilla struggle as well as afterward in the AMNLAE organization as well as other political organizations run by the FSLN. The sources covered in this paper do not address this link, possibly indicating a lack of theory regarding this issue.

Overall, Molyneux, Kampwirth, and Lobao each seem to follow through on their original research questions with convincing conclusions, ample documentation and clear support of their arguments. Kampwirth incorporated not only statistical information but also information gained from interviews with a variety of women in multiple cities, allowing for a more personal analysis rather than a sterile, data-based analysis. She clearly notes for the reader the limitations of her research and the potential for further research in the field, especially when these limitations affected her conclusions. Molyneux also uses this technique to express the boundaries of the research questions she addresses in the limited space of her article. It seems more credible to rely on the information of authors who are able to acknowledge their boundaries than authors who perhaps might overreach the limitations of their sources. Jaquette, Padula and Smith, and Randall speak in authoritative and definitive terms regarding their conclusions, causing the reader to question the broad generalities that they expound. Broad generalities without clear and strong support, such as in the case of Padula and Smith and their use of newspaper articles, may not address all the variables that affect the analysis of women's participation in guerrilla movements. This problem does not seem to plague the writers of carefully defined research questions, as they are able to address specific factors explicitly stated instead of trying to answer broad, sweeping research questions incorporating information extrapolated from limited sources.

Finally, the use of interviews, personal correspondence and literature (i.e. Che Guevara's diaries and guide for guerrillas) and personal experience add a unique perspective to the analysis

of the Cuban and Nicaraguan revolutions. The limitations, though, of relying solely on these sources comes from the political or social bias of the author, the potential questionability of the author as a reliable source of information, and the lack of overall perspective presented. The incorporation of these sources, demonstrated masterfully by Kampwirth, should be tempered by the study of other literature written during the period in question and the study of other scholars' studies of similar themes. By presenting multifaceted theories for the mobilization of women in guerrilla movements, the authors have presented studies that have worked to re-insert the memory of women into the history of revolution and change.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Jaquette, Jane S. 1973. "Women in Revolutionary Movements in Latin America." *Journal of Marriage and Family*. 35:2. (May): 344-354.

Lobao, Linda M. 1998. "Women in Revolutionary Movements: Changing Patterns of Latin American Guerrilla Struggle." In M. J. Diamond, ed. Women and Revolution: Global Expressions. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers. 255-290.

Kampwirth, Karen. 2002. Women and Guerrilla Movements: Nicaragua, El Salvador, Chiapas, Cuba. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP.

Molyneux, Maxine. 1985. "Mobilization Without Emancipation? Women's Interests, the State and Revolution in Nicaragua." *Feminist Studies*. 11:2. (Summer): 227-254.

Padula, Alfred and Lois M. Smith. 1996. Sex and Revolution: Women in Socialist Cuba. New York: Oxford University Press.

Randall, Margaret. 1992. Gathering Rage: The Failure of 20th Century Revolutions to Develop a Feminist Agenda. New York: Monthly Review Press.

"Revolution". Webster's New World Dictionary, Second College Edition. David B. Guralink, Ed. New York: Prentice Hall Press, 1986. 1218.