Boston University

OpenBU http://open.bu.edu

BU Open Access Articles BU Open Access Articles

2021-05-14

Women’s work and the politics of the daily routine

A. Peri. 2021. "Women’s Work and The Politics of the Daily Routine."
https://hdl.handle.net/2144/43798
"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

Chapter 3
Women's Work and the Politics of the Daily Routine

Alexis Peri

In December 1946, Mrs. Leonard Osborne joined other members of the Fairmont, North Dakota branch of the Women's Society of Christian Service to send Soviet women Christmas greetings and "prayers for a permanent peace." "We know wives and mothers all over the world must feel the same," Osborne anticipated, "and we are sure our prayers are joined by your prayers."[1] A reply only arrived nine months later, but it was an enthusiastic one. "Dear Friend Leonard Osborne!" Klavdiia Andreeva began, "I am very pleased to answer your letter. We Russians are so eternally happy war is over, and like you, our foreign friends, want only for the peace to be lasting." After affirming her commitment to peace and sidestepping her pen-pals' religious and gendered assumptions, Andreeva offered "a few words about myself." The first facts she wanted Osborne to know were that she fought in WWII and now worked in a Moscow research laboratory. Towards the end of the letter, while mentioning her summer plans, Andreeva added that she had a son and her husband perished during the war. Andreeva signed off affectionately, inviting her pen-friend to call her Klava.[2] Four months later, Andreeva read Osborne's reply. Osborne introduced herself by describing her marriage, four-year-old son, two-week-old baby girl, and her housework, which was tough to manage with a newborn. Luckily her sister was helping out. In closing, Mrs. Leonard Obsorne added: "'Leonard' is my husband's name, not mine."[3]

The ways in which new correspondents introduced themselves reveals a great deal about how they understood and structured their daily lives. Nearly all followed the same patterns as Osborne and Andreeva. American participants typically mentioned their marital status first, followed by the ages and genders of their children and detailed descriptions of their homes. By contrast, Soviet participants opened by noting their level of education and their occupation, often not mentioning a spouse or children until a second or third letter. While these introductions may have been crafted unthinkingly, out of habit or convention, they are illuminating. So too were the ways the pen-friends identified themselves. Like Klavdiia Andreeva, Soviet letter-writers were thrown by American women's use of their husbands' first names. Andreeva addressed Osborne as "Leonard," Serafima Antonova called Mrs. Fred Nay "Fred," and others made similar *faux pas*.[4] Americans in turn felt uneasy about patronymics and the Soviet disregard of titles like "Mrs." and

"Miss." "Dear Russian Friend! You did not write to me if you are married or not, so I do not know how to address you, Mrs. or Ms. Mendeleeva," Dorothea M. Bush admitted. "I have been married," Serafima Medeleeva replied, "but it makes no difference here—we call all people 'comrade' be they married or not."[5] Such mundane details were hugely illustrative of the gender norms that shaped everyday life in Soviet and American society.

Around 1947, the pen-pals moved beyond the framework of the wartime Alliance and presented themselves through a broader set of contexts, including marriage, family, and work. Their letters grew longer and more focused on daily life. The pool also widened, as more American women from liberal and progressive backgrounds joined the comparatively conservative women who wrote at the war's end. While peace remained the letter-writers' primary objective, their discussions of family and work also furthered this goal. A key premise of the pen-pal project was that everyday life and international peace were interconnected. The hope was, by corresponding, Soviet and American women would develop an appreciation for each other's way of life, recognize their shared interests, and work together to defuse US-Soviet hostilities. There were also practical benefits. The pen-friends could advise and help each other achieve their domestic and professional goals. Both NCASF's Committee of Women and the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee (AKSZh), which started and facilitated the pen-pal project, were committed to improving women's lives. Proposing a host of strategies from time-saving technologies to social programs, they worked to advance international understanding and personal development simultaneously.

This chapter examines how Soviet and American correspondents presented their everyday lives to each other, how they discussed motherhood and work, and how they suggested practices—namely, their own—to help their interlocutors achieve greater fulfillment. The letter-writers' individual exchanges were mirrored by the Committee of Women and the Soviet Anti-Fascist Committee, which traded publications and exhibits on how women could "do it all" as mothers and workers. These individual and institutional interactions were embedded within and sometimes cut against ideals of womanhood emerging in the postwar US and USSR. Most of the participants presented themselves as typical of women in their nation and, in cases when they did not claim to be representative, they explained what was "normal" for most women in their country. Either way, they reconstructed gender norms on the page. They did so, however, at a moment when gender

practices were in flux, during postwar construction and normalization. The letters capture how their authors navigated the ideals and practical constraints of the postwar moment.

This chapter focuses on the years 1947-1948, when the imperatives of postwar reconstruction pulled women in multiple, somewhat conflicting directions. They were needed as productive workers, devoted mothers, and beacons of societal stability. Despite the US's and USSR's distinct ideologies, their ideals of womanhood overlapped more in the years after WWII than at any point previously. It was a moment when both societies promised women practically everything and demanded they do practically everything. There was a growing expectation—both internally and externally imposed—that women should do and have "it all." The pen-pals wrote in support of this ideal, yet their letters also reveal how impossible it was to achieve, due to personal circumstances, postwar pressures, or a combination of both. In this way, the letters tell a broader story about gender practices and pressures in the postwar US and USSR, their fluctuation as well as their convergence.

Indeed, the Soviet and American letter-writers had many duties, aspirations, and pressures in common. They differed less in terms of principles than priorities. Participants from the US tended to present wage work as secondary to motherhood, their main and most rewarding vocation, whereas most Soviet correspondents argued that happy mothers were those who also did meaningful, paid labor. Although both sets of letter-writers were under significant social, legal, and financial pressure to make these life choices, they usually presented them as coming from a place of freedom rather than obligation. With some exceptions, most US correspondents supported women's employment, but they placed a greater premium on their freedom from the obligation to work outside of the home. The Soviet participants stressed that they were also loving mothers, but they championed the freedom to do work outside of the confines of domesticity. In short, the Soviets and Americans understood "women's work" to be some combination of the maternal and the professional, but they prioritized them differently.

The letter-writers were discussing women's roles and comparing their lives well before these became integral to Cold-War competition and second-wave feminism. NCASF's Committee of Women even attempted to send a model kitchen to AKSZh fifteen years before the US Embassy in Moscow did so. Before the "nylon wars" and "kitchen debates" over whether American liberal-capitalism or Soviet socialism offered women a better life, the letter-writers were already looking to their pen-pals to imagine alternative ways of living. These letters of the late

1940s are evidence of what Dorothy Sue Cobble called "the missing wave," linking WWII to the global women's movement of the 1960s.[6] Like the delegates who debated at meetings of the UN Commission for Women or the WIDF, the letter-writers grappled with different ways of achieving work-life balance, some proposed solutions based on state welfare programs and others on private enterprise and consumerism. In this way, the letters shed light on critical debates that helped define international politics at mid-century.

The letter-writers debated, but by using personal stories, friendly advice, and gentle encouragement. The act of letter-writing highlighted the personal in the political. Of course, there were silences and omissions too. The letters do not convey with certainty how the pen-pals *actually* thought or behaved, but they do reveal how their authors wanted themselves and their countries to be perceived. Whether because of censorship, patriotism, or personal pride, the participants ignored certain questions and avoided particular subjects in order to cast themselves and their countries in the best light. Still, their letters do not just idealize. They also document how individual women struggled against the conflicting imperatives—practical and ideological—of the postwar years. It is not surprising that the letter-writers generally upheld the gender norms of their respective cultures. What is interesting is how they personalized and adapted them, sometimes inadvertently transforming them in the process.

This chapter tackles this theme in four parts. It examines how the pen-friends introduced themselves, structured their daily routines, defined their "work," and endeavored to juggle responsibilities inside and outside the home.

Let me Introduce Myself

First impressions are powerful even though the ways we introduce ourselves are somewhat formulaic and based on cultural conventions. The letter-writers may have penned their introductory remarks unthinkingly, but their words revealed a great deal about the authors' identities, status, and lifestyles. As I mentioned with Mrs. Leonard Osborne, most American participants began by specifying their marital status and the names and ages of their children. They then offered detailed descriptions of their homes. By contrast, their Soviet interlocutors framed their lives in terms of education and occupation first, family second. And, even when prompted, it was absolute rarity for Soviet women to describe their living space. Consider the first letters

exchanged between Mrs. Alfred I. Maile of Miles City, Montana and S. Borototskaia of Moscow. After presenting herself as a wife and mother, Maile added: "we have a small, comfortable home with every modern convenience, such as telephone, electric lights, and many electric appliances including a radio, vacuum cleaner and electric washing machine. We have hot and cold water in our bathroom and kitchen and do our cooking on a gas stove. Our home is heated by a gas furnace. For recreation we take drives out into the country in our new automobile."[7] Six weeks later, S. Borotskaia replied: "Dear Mrs. Maile, I was very pleased to have your letter. I in my turn want to tell you in a few words about myself. I am a scientific worker in one of the institutes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR. Not so very long ago I was just an ordinary 'factory-hand' in one of the Moscow factories. Wanting a university education, I went to a 'school for young workers' in the evening. After graduating, I went on to Moscow University named for Lomonosov" and earned a master's degree in chemistry. "I am passionately keen on my work," Borotskaia exclaimed.[8] She was just as proud as Maile, but about very different achievements.

These acts of self-presentation illuminate the letter-writers' assumptions regarding their interlocutors, their social status, and whether they privileged the domestic or professional realm. Most began their letters in expectation that the basic contours of their own lives and their pen-pals' were shared. Such assumptions were a holdover from the wartime Alliance but also a guiding premise of the pen-pal project, which held that Americans and Soviets were more alike than dislike. When Vera Ivanovna Karaseva brought up her work as engineer, she told her pen-pal Grace F. Hoight that "this will draw us close together. All working women the world over have the same aims and interests."[9] By contrast, Marjorie Streiff of Plains, Kansas, presumed that domestic life was more universal. "You probably have the same interests that I have," Streiff wrote in her first letter to an unknown friend. "At least we have our homes and our families in common. Let's get acquainted!" These introductions were not just self-portraits but reflections of how the correspondents imagined each other. Streiff continued: "My husband and I and our three sons, as well as my mother who makes her home with us, live quite comfortably in a big, old house—eight rooms, a bathroom, and basement."[10]

Like Streiff, most of the Americans who penned letters between 1947 and 1948 granted amenities and furnishings a privileged place in their notes. Some guided their pen-pals through their homes room by room. "We have a nice eight-room house," began Helen Ross of Boone, Iowa, "completely modern, water, gas range, gas fireplace, furnace, and two bathrooms. We think

our furniture is real nice. Of course, it is not very expensive."[11] Jeanne Woolf of Manhattan, Kansas gave the most thorough description of the home her family rented, starting with its exact dimensions and extending to the wallpaper, upholstery, and furniture. Her pen-pal Ekaterina Andreeva could have reconstructed every corner of the Woolf home right down to the sofa, which was "five feet long, covered in dark blue cotton sheath with drawings of flowers and pink bulges."[12] These house tours may have been attempts to create closeness with one's pen-pal by inviting her into the intimate spaces of life. But given existing Soviet notions of excessive consumption under capitalism as well as the destitution in which most Soviet people found themselves after WWII, correspondents from the USSR must have been jarred by these descriptions of colorful couches and multiple bathrooms. They did not comment on them, however, either in a critical or complimentary fashion.[13]

At the moment when most Soviets were plunged into a new depth of poverty, many Americans were regaining a middle-class lifestyle. The Great Depression had ended, and the US economy was booming. Homeownership in the US grew by seventy-one percent between 1940 and 1950.[14] The US letter-writers' radiate with pride in American prosperity and stake claims to middle-class standing. "We have a terrific house," Texan Mary Rhode exclaimed in her first letter, "consisting of a living room, balcony, three bedrooms, a dining room, and a kitchen with a small balcony, where we have breakfast. We have every comfort, electricity, gas, running water, a new attic, thanks to which the house stays cool.[15] As they introduced themselves, homeowners like Rhode introduced their Soviet readers to the American Dream. Americans who rented did the same, underscoring that property ownership was one of their major goals. In her first letter, Maxine Cryder took care to indicate that she and husband "had big plans for finally having a home and family of our own. But as yet we haven't realized either dream."[16] They did own a car, Cryder added, another benchmark of success.

American correspondents pressed their interlocutors to describe their homes, but Soviet participants avoided describing their lifestyles as well as the poverty and ruin, which plagued the USSR. The Soviet Union lost roughly twenty-five percent of its physical assets and 26 million people.[17] Then famine arrived in 1946, taking millions more. The famine not only devastated Ukrainian, Russian, and Moldovan farmers, it created severe shortages in Moscow and other cities. Rationing finally ended in December 1947, but hunger lingered until 1950.[18] So, when pressed to describe their living space, Soviet letter-writers stressed the beauty of public avenues and parks,

now being rebuilt, or called their rooms "cozy," but they never explained the communal apartment system nor enumerated their possessions. The closest a Soviet letter-writer came to this was when Ekaterina Andreeva—under pressure from her pen-pal Jeanne A. Woolf—described her *kommunalka* as a flat shared with friends. "I have one large room (20.6 m^2) in a well-appointed flat in a big, modern apartment house (*dom*). Besides my room, I have the usage of the kitchen and bath, entrance-hall and large wall-closet I share with some friends of mine who live in the same apartment. We also share a pet, a big iron-gray cat called Moorzik."[19] Translators rendered "*dom,"* which means both house and building, as "house," so when letter-writers described the large apartment buildings in which they lived, their pen-pals assumed these were individual houses.

Instead, Soviet participants emphasized their education and occupation, indicating their status through their abilities not their acquisitions. Again, during the postwar years, Soviet letter-writers tended to be white-collar professionals, so this close identification with work is not surprising. Moreover, it certainly aligned with Marxist-Leninist notions that class comprised the core of identity, and it may also have been an oblique reference to WWII's devastating effect on Soviet families. Because so many of the Soviet correspondents were war widows, there were personal reasons, not just ideological ones, why they mentioned work and coworkers before family members. They had become "breadwinners by default."[20] By contrast, American participants were proud to identify as married, which was widely regarded as an important achievement and indicator of their status.

In addition, by focusing on work, the Soviet letter-writers championed the "Soviet dream" of upward mobility. Some introduced themselves as "the daughter of a factory worker" or "the daughter of a farmer." These were often the first, and sometimes only, references to family in their inaugural letters, and they were meant to demonstrate how the author had achieved significant upward mobility. Soviet participants were quick to credit socialist policies for their success. "Everyone has the right to get a university education, whatever sex or nationality they belong to," as mother and teacher Valentina Ignatiuk explained to Mrs. Morris Samuelson, a self-described homemaker from Boone, Iowa.[21] "Russian women, thanks to Soviet laws, have the opportunity to take an active part on equal terms with men in all branches of the public, industrial, and cultural life of our country," Leningrad engineer Nadezhda Kotomina echoed to Mrs. Tom Foster of Wichita Falls, Texas. The translator inserted a footnote next to the reference to Kotomina's engineering career to explain: "this means Mrs. Kotomina has a college degree."[22] Education was a

central node of identity in Soviet letters the way home ownership was in many American ones. And, just as Americans who rented still identified owning one's home as a core measure of achievement, Soviet women without advanced degrees quickly declared their ambition for further study.[23] By contrast, their interlocutors form the US seldom mentioned their schooling in their introductory letters even though forty percent of them had some post-secondary education.[24] Whether boasting about their education or their possessions, all of the letter-writers were relatively privileged.

These introductions were just the start of detailed conversations about Soviet and American womanhood. As mundane as they may seem, such introductory remarks point to distinct notions of identity, standards of living, measures of status, and configurations of family—all of which informed how the letter-writers structured their days and understood their roles as women.

Typical Day during an Atypical Time

"Now I'll tell you the way I spend my day," Ol'ga Nikolaevna Melnikovskaia proposed in her second letter to Jean Jahr. And Mel'nikovskaia did so with gusto, starting with the coffee, bread, and butter she had for breakfast. Then the twenty-seven-year-old packed "a few sandwiches" and rode twenty-minutes on the Moscow metro to the Soviet Academy of Sciences, where she was an archeologist and junior research fellow. When not away on a dig, she worked there making plaster casts, cataloguing artifacts, and so on. After work, Mel'nikovskaia attended her photography club or a French language class before returning home for dinner. "I am very happy, Jean, to be living in the Soviet Union," Mel'nikovskaia exclaimed. She loved her interesting work and "constant activity." "Active participation in everything—this is the most characteristic trait of our life." At the same time, she admitted this packed schedule kept her mind off two major traumas—her life in besieged Leningrad, from which she evacuated "half-dead from hunger," and the death of her husband, who was killed in action. "I can't imagine how I would have been able to bear all I've had to bear if I had lived in any other country," she noted, touting its communalist ethos. "Here we are never left by our lone self. [...] We have a very united collective at our lab. We all help each other."[25]

While Mel'nikovskaia's routine revolved around her laboratory and coworkers, Jean Jahr's centered on home and family. Jahr introduced herself in a manner that was typical for the US letter-writers: "About me: my name is Jean Jahr, I am married and I have two children. Joanne is five and a half and Mark turns three this week."[26] Jahr lived in New York City with her husband Bert, a singer and a member of NCASF. The Jahrs, therefore, supported progressive and labor politics, and they openly admired the USSR, making them different from "average Americans," Jahr explained. "They want peace," Jahr said of her compatriots, "but they are fed propaganda day and night" and "are oriented to the perspective that war against the USSR" was imminent. The NCASF was trying to counteract that assumption. "Their members are few," Jahr observed, "but their activities are constantly aimed at the benefits of a politics of peace and friendly relations with the USSR. It is a hard fight." Jahr was drawn to political work herself but, beyond corresponding with Mel'nikovskaia, she had no time for it as a full-time housewife. Jahr's letter conveys some dissatisfaction with her thoroughly domestic routine. "There is almost nothing to say about my activities in the capacity of a homemaker. I am busy with such problems that occupy all housewives: tedious (*nudnyi*) housework, constant care to make sure that there is enough of everything with regard to the increase of prices, the constant need for good medical and dental care for the kids, etc. I would be very happy to have some kind of work, but of course, one cannot speak of that."[27]

But Mel'nikovskaia pressed Jahr to speak of it. "I don't understand why you can't go out to work," the archeologist asked. "Because it is hard to get work or because there is no need for you to work or because you must take care of your children?" Soviet citizens often encountered news stories about affluence but also widespread unemployment in the US—signs of capitalism's pervasive inequity. After WWII, many American women were laid off from the "male" positions they occupied during the war but, the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor found, many women left on their own, tired of juggling housework, parenting, and a paying job.[28] Jahr noted she would like "some kind of work," especially for the extra income, but it was impossible while Joan and Mark were so young. "I don't quite understand about Joan," Mel'nikovskaia followed up. "Why can't she go to classes? Because it costs too much or because she attends a kindergarten?" Could Mark be sent to a nursery school?[29] No, Jahr replied, because "classes for young kids are so expensive. The problem that has become an issue for the majority of mothers and me also, is the economic situation—a problem for which there is no solution." Jahr hastened to add that she was

not poor. "In comparison to the rest of the world, we live very well. Our quality of life is rather high."[30] Nevertheless, most kindergartens were private and expensive, and Jahr's first priority was to care for her children. Perhaps Mel'nikovskaia could not relate because she did not have to balance motherhood, housework, and a career. Her husband died before they could start a family, and she moved in with parents; her mother did the housework.[31] "I am very sorry I have no children," Mel'nikovskaia remarked, "but even if I had children, I would go on working, because I can't imagine life without work, without my 'collective' of fellow-workers."[32] In sum, by describing their daily routines, Mel'nikovskaia and Jahr touched on some key challenges Soviet and American women faced, especially during the postwar period when the discourse around women's roles was so conflicted.

In the years around WWII, gender practices in the US and USSR began to converge.[33] This convergence stemmed from ambiguities in how womanhood was conceptualized as well as from new imperatives created by the Great Depression and WWII. The first point of convergence was labor. Soviet and American women increasingly joined the paid work force in the mid-1930s. Soviet women comprised forty-two percent of the labor force by 1935, and in the US the number of women in the labor force increased by six percent each year between WWI and WWII. Though their presence was significant, women in both countries were concentrated into low paying, unskilled or semi-skilled positions.[34] What was new for most American and Soviet women during WWII was not wage work per se, but the kinds of "male" industries open to them.[35] Yet throughout it all, they were constantly reminded of their domestic and maternal duties.[36] The mid-1930s comprised the key turning point in the USSR where, after more than a decade of trying to revolutionize gender norms, Soviet leaders began to foster a cult of motherhood. On the one hand, the USSR's new 1936 constitution enshrined equal rights, pay, and education for the sexes. On the other hand, it banned abortion, restricted divorce, and created financial incentives for mothers.[37] In short, the feminine ideal in the US and USSR expanded on the eve of the war and encompassed both traditional and progressive elements.[38]

Resemblances between Soviet and American models of womanhood grew more pronounced during WWII, when expectations that women "do it all" intensified.[39] Not only did more women enter the labor force, they were encouraged to do so by similar arguments. American labor policies did not champion gender equality, as Soviet ones did, but state-sponsored media campaigns in both countries celebrated women workers as wives and mothers at heart who tackled

their sons' and husbands' jobs out of a sense of family fidelity and patriotism.[40] Soviet posters and slogans like "Men to the Front, Women to the factories" reinforced this ideal.[41] Likewise, the US Office of War Information worked with magazines and advertisers to suggest that good wives took on war-industry jobs without compromising their maternity or femininity. One 1943 ad for an electric company in the *Saturday Evening Post* featured a petite woman handling a huge machine. But, as the caption reassured readers, this 110-pound "beauty boss" still "loves flower-hats, veils, smooth orchestras—and being kissed by a boy who's now in North Africa."[42] In addition, the US press highlighted the femininity of Soviet women who worked and fought. A 1944 spread in the *New York Times Magazine* celebrated the USSR's female partisans, aviators, engineers, and farmers, but added: "Russian women, like women of all countries, like new clothes, leisure time, and to be with their children."[43] Another *New York Times* article profiled Evdokiia Bershanskaia, a decorated lieutenant colonel in the Air Force who loved "to knit and embroider, be a wife to my husband and mother to my twelve-old son."[44] A 1945 *Pravda* article echoed: "women very energetically proved themselves as pilots, snipers, submachine-gunners [etc.], but they don't forget about their primary duty to the nation and state, that of motherhood."[45] These campaigns reinforced traditional femininity, and they elided women's service to nation and to family.

At the war's end, the American press walked back this message that Soviet women could do heavy labor without neglecting their husbands and children. Already in March 1945, a State Farm Insurance ad pictured a hysterical child being taken to a foster home because her mom was too busy with her job,[46] and the *Saturday Evening Post* reported on neglected children locked away in the family car while their mothers worked.[47] Still, despite the shift in discourse, Soviet and American gender practices continued to converge. Both the US's booming postwar economy and the USSR's devastated one meant that female workers were in high demand even if they were relegated to lower-status jobs. In both countries, the number of working women increased through the late 1940s.[48]

As veterans returned, Soviet and American women alike faced demotion and discriminatory hiring practices. In the USSR, new protective labor laws recategorized certain jobs as male and female.[49] In the US, wage gaps and marriage bars—whether imposed by state law or corporations— consigned women to the "pink-collar ghetto of women's work," as Dorothy Sue Cobble put it.[50] They remained in low-paying jobs, Ruth Milkman argued, so that male and female roles remained distinct and that women stayed financially dependent on male breadwinners.[51]

American women also lacked support services to help them manage work inside and outside the home. The 1940 Landham Act and 1943 Emergency Maternity and Infant Care Program ended with the war. A handful of American letter-writers complained to their Soviet pen-pals that they were laid off after WWII and asked about unions and other protections for women. Jean Brand of New York commented to her pen-friend Evdokiia Nikulina that: "the activities of women in this country are very limited. In general, women are either housekeepers or, if they work for wages, they do unskilled factory or routine work in office such as typing or filing. [...] During the war, women were given opportunities to do more skilled and interesting work—not equal opportunities with men but still it was a great advance. Now that the war is over, however, most of the women are fired and are refused jobs wherever they go at their newly acquired skills."[52] Brand was one of those unemployed.

Although needed in the workplace, Soviet and American women also were summoned to the nursery. Political leaders and the press leaned on domesticity to provide stability and normalcy after the chaos of war.[53] Images of domestic bliss filled the pages of *Woman Worker* (*Rabotnitsa)* and *Ladies Home Journal* alike even as American divorce rates (not just marriage rates) rose between 1940 through 1950.[54] Meanwhile, mass death and dislocation in the USSR made the nuclear family an unattainable ideal for many.[55] Millions of women were widowed or single and unable to find husbands. After WWII, Soviet women in their twenties and thirties outnumbered men by a ratio of 100 to 36 in non-occupied territories,100 to 28 in occupied ones.[56] But married or not, they were pressured to have children by the 1944 family law code, the most conservative one in the USSR's history. Designed to help repopulate the Soviet Union, this legislation reaffirmed the ban on abortion, made divorce difficult, and taxed childless adults. It also expanded maternity leave, offered financial incentives to women who had children, and gave state honors to those who had seven or more. The code enshrined child-rearing as a woman's duty, and it shielded men who sired children out of wedlock by prohibiting unmarried mothers from demanding child support from or even using the surname of their children's biological fathers.[57] The *New York Times Magazine* applauded this law code for upholding traditional values—another indication of how American and Soviet gender norms overlapped during the late 1940s. "Doubtless it will serve to bring the family closer together," the article predicted and, with a fuller appreciation for motherhood, "the future for Soviet women will be rosier than in the past."[58]

WWII thus imprinted most letter-writers with the possibility, even the necessity, that women "do it all" as mothers, wives, and workers. Yet, there were formidable obstacles to this. Many lacked time, energy, childcare, spousal support, or a spouse altogether. The circumstances of postwar life cut against national ideals of womanhood. Certainly not all American and Soviet women wanted or endeavored to work inside and outside the home simultaneously, but they were part of a trend during the late 1940s where the number of working mothers grew. By 1950, Soviet women comprised forty-seven percent and American women thirty percent of the labor force.[59]

Defining Women's Work

Paid employment, child rearing, and housework—they all were potential answers to the pen-pals' oft-posed request: "tell me about your work." Almost every letter-writer did a combination of these tasks, but they did not consider all of them meaningful "work." When Soviets answered this question, they overwhelmingly referred to their jobs outside of the home even if they also kept house and raised children. The only exceptions to this were the Soviet letter-writers who were decorated with the Order of Maternal Glory for having seven or more children. Soviet writers associated paid labor with personal fulfillment, reasoning that, as happier women, they raised happier children. By contrast, fewer American letter-writers worked outside the home, but those who did still identified themselves as homemakers. Moreover, they explained their jobs in terms of maternal devotion: they wanted to provide a better life for their families. The pool was even more split on housework. Nearly all of the American pen-pals hoped to trade tips about housekeeping, but the Soviets avoided the topic, barely deeming it "work" at all.

Both ideological principles and financial necessity compelled women in the USSR to work outside of their homes. The Soviet pen-pals, however, presented this not as an obligation, but an opportunity to further personal goals, serve society, and advance gender equality. They undercut the primacy of the domestic with statements like "I am not just a mother" or "I am not just a housewife" before describing their occupations.[60] "I am not just a mother, I am a woman-engineer," mother-of-three Nina Rodzevich told self-described homemaker Mrs. Oscar King.[61] Others reassured their pen-pals that motherhood "did not interfere" with their jobs—a clear expression of how they prioritized and conceptualized work.[62] More than a paycheck, work outside the home gave editor N. Koriakina a sense of freedom: "Like the majority of our women [...] I did

not want to organize my life with the narrow circle of domestic, housewife and family interests," she told Eleanor R. Brucker.[63] Others described work as a pathway to self-actualization. "I must say that although I have been working for 24 years now, I don't find work a burden, on the contrary, it fills my life," publisher Dina Petrova told a Mrs. Banfield.[64] Petrova never mentioned if she had a husband or children, but grieving widows like chemist Ekaterina Slavianskaia openly discussed how paid labor gave them a sense of purpose and connection. "For me, my work isn't just a mean[s] of earning my living, but the first, essential [part] of life. I just can't imagine life without work, without using everyday my knowledge, my experience and my skill for my work. Even if my share is small, it still is a part of the big common labor and this makes it joyful, inspired, and I would like to go on forever living and to work on and on."[65] Work enriched her life and her community simultaneously.

There is no reason to doubt the sincerity of these testimonies, but it is important to note how curated they were. Rodzevich, Koriakina, Petrova, and Slavianskaia were not doing back-breaking labor in heavy industry or agriculture; they were the type of professional women AKSZh recruited to the pen-pal project after WWII, probably with the goal of impressing Americans with how far women had advanced under socialism. In fact, when Rozalia Sorokova explained to Mrs. Foster how she went from being illiterate and doing "hard and unremunerative toil" to becoming an educated engineer, Sorokova and the AKSZh translator underlined how such upward mobility was typical for "<u>many millions of ordinary Soviet women.</u>"[66] This was the promise of Soviet socialism: to uplift society while enabling individuals to reach their full potential. Whether compelled by outside prompting, personal experience, or both, Soviet letter-writers conveyed this inspired vision of "women's work."

Perhaps because of their exalted view of work, Soviet professionals tended to click with Americans who had done heavy labor. Even so, they viewed the meaning of work differently. Dorothy McDade and Pava Grinval'd were matched together because both were once domestic servants who moved up the professional ladder, developed political consciousness, and joined trade unions. It was her interest in organized labor that prompted McDade to request a Soviet pen-pal. Grinval'd replied enthusiastically, delighted by the parallels in their lives. "I, just like you, began my working life as a maid, and thanks to my character, not being a fan of submission, slavery and constant dependence, I went to work at a sewing factory. [...] In the factory I, also like you, became acquainted with the labor movement and trade union work. [...] It was only after joining

this work that I understood clearly how noble, interesting, and good it is to be a free and organized citizen." The union helped Grinval'd attend a tuition-free night school, where she earned a high school diploma.[67] She went on to medical school and eventually became a doctor. Grinval'd credited Soviet welfare policies for her success: "only in our country, where infinite attention and care is given to improving a person's life, lifestyle, and cultural development, can one easily turn from a dark, domestic worker into a cultured person in any specialty."[68]

McDade also discussed work's transformative effect on her life but did not frame her story in terms of enlightenment or empowerment. During the Depression, McDade bounced between low-paying jobs "as work was not easy to find and often a job did not last long. I worked in a laundry, a clothing factory, and once as a chambermaid on a large steamship."[69] When WWII began, she moved from "female" jobs to pouring hot aluminum into molds at an aviation plant. "It made me feel that I was doing my part in the long and terrible war." "Wherever I worked, if there was a labor union to join, I became a member, believing that by doing so I could improve my own living standards and that of my fellow workers." She joined the CIO— "the most progressive trade union group in America today"—which established a women's bureau in 1944.[70] Eventually, she became a CIO instructor and taught workers about organized labor. But McDade did not end her story here, as Grinval'd did. She concluded with a different benchmark of success: marriage. Now supported by her husband and free not to work, she left her job. "We are very happy" that "we can begin building our family," she exclaimed.[71] By contrast, Grinval'd did not mention motherhood or marriage as a part of her life or as an aspiration.

Myrtle Park also bonded with Irina Aleksandrovna Kuznetsova over work. Park was from Englewood, Kansas, and she taught fifth grade until a marriage bar forcibly retired her. Like McDade, Park wrote how glad she was "not to have to work so hard" now that she was married,[72] but she complimented Kuznetsova on her career as a museum curator: "your work evidentially is very interesting and requires great education. You studied much more at university than I did."[73] Kuznetsova in turn was intrigued by Park's stories of farming wheat and herding cattle on "the Kansas steppe."[74] "We were quite wonderstruck when we read that you and your mother (she must be at least 60) you inspect the herds on horseback. Please tell her from me that is a wonder!" "Each time I get a letter from you it makes me want more and more eagerly to get the next," Kuznetsova continued. "For it is quite a different thing to read about the life of American farmers in newspapers or novels, or to be personally acquainted with an American farmwoman. The image

I had of you after your first letter, as yet very nebulous and abstract, is now getting more and more real. I can now almost visualize your home, your husband, your mother, and yourself occupied with housekeeping duties or pounding a typewriter. I can't run a typewriter, and neither can I ride horseback," Kuznetsova confessed. The Muscovite tried riding once, "but this endeavor had a very sorry and comical end, so that I never risked a try (sic) again."[75] Over the course of the ten letters they exchanged, Park delighted Kuznetsova with stories of racing after coyotes, and she sent pictures of her mother on horseback.[76] Work stories charmed the pen-friends, pulled them into each other's worlds, and helped them imagine alternative lifestyles.

Like Kuznetsova, other Soviet pen-pals, mostly urban Soviet professionals, were fascinated by American ranchers and farmers. Their letters capture a sense of encounter between urban and rural as well as between east and west. Vera Karaseva—who introduced herself as "a university graduate and a certified engineer"—implored Grace Hoight of Iowa: "Do tell me please about life on a farm, both for farmers and farm hands,"[77] while Moscow musician Lidiia Ivanova entreated Mrs. Fred Townsend of Iowa to tell her about "the good points of Hertfordshire cattle."[78] The allure stemmed both from a kind of exoticism and a respect for hard work, which US farmwomen also stressed. Marjorie Streiff of Plains, Kansas relayed how she "learned the hard way" to drive a tractor and a plow "during the war when it was difficult to get help and [our] oldest boy was in the navy. I ran the tractor and plow while the boys were in school."[79] "I am a farmer's wife, who knows all kinds of hard work," Mrs. L. R. Miller echoed. "What I have to do on the farm is on a par with that of my husband: threshing, plowing with cultivator, harrowing, I have to walk more than twenty miles a day, sewing by hand, milking cows, looking after pigs, chickens, raising children, and I even [work] additional time to pay off the farm."[80] Not only could these farmers go toe-to-toe with Soviet labor feats, their emphasis on overcoming obstacles and tackling "male" tasks resonated with their interlocutors in the USSR.

Farmwomen did not choose between work inside and outside the home since their labors were really both at once. American participants who did face this choice explained that they put their husbands and children first, but sometimes this meant taking on paying jobs. Young letter-writers often worked to support their husbands before they started families, and women whose children reached high-school age took on paid work to increase the family finances.[81] This was a common rationale amid the conservatism of the postwar decade. By working, they were serving their families by other means.[82] Similarly, unmarried women were encouraged to take jobs, which

prepared them to be mothers and wives, like nursing, teaching, or being a flight attendant.[83] Twenty-one-year-old Joy Larson had been married only four months when she posted her first letter, addressed "dear future friend." Larson had studied journalism in college, along with a little Russian language and history, and these interests drew her to the pen-pal project. She worked fulltime as a reporter for a local newspaper, so that she and her new husband Jack could rent a room in the top floor of a house. This job was in her field of study, but Larson presented it as a necessity rather than a source of fulfillment. "I dreamed of being a really good journalist, but for now that is just a hope."[84] With this twinge of disappointment, Larson cast herself not as a careerwoman but as supportive wife. Similarly, Iowan Maxine Cryder worked full-time as a bookkeeper to support her husband who had just been decommissioned from the navy. "One reason I am working is to get money to help furnish our new home. [...] So far, we have purchased an electric refrigerator, bottled gas stove (for cooking), electric vacuum sweeper, and electric food mixer."[85] Cryder may have had did other reasons for working but did not list any. The American middle-class ideal was the stay-at-home wife free from the obligation to work. US letters both upheld and cut against that ideal, underscoring how two incomes were often needed to afford that status.[86]

American letter-writers with young children overwhelmingly wrote that they chose not to work outside the home because it was motherhood that was most gratifying and socially meaningful. In other words, they gave the same rationales for staying at home that their Soviet pen-friends cited for working outside of it. Also like their Soviet interlocutors, they tended to present this as a choice they made freely without acknowledging the policies and pressures that shaped it. "Most of my early life was spent teaching young children in rural and city public schools," explained Mrs. Alfred I. Maile of Miles City, Montana. "That was very interesting work, but I find more happiness and have a greater feeling of security as a housewife in our little home."[87] "My life is full and brimming over," Marjorie Crouse wrote to Assia Sidorova, by the joys of motherhood and homemaking. "I enjoy keeping house and I could spend all of my time in the kitchen trying out recipes."[88] Even Grace F. Burt, a bookkeeper and self-described "old maid" from Greenfield, Massachusetts, reiterated that motherhood was women's highest calling and a national service. Burt explained that homemakers, workers, farmers, businessmen, and servicemen all contributed to a nation's success, but she identified the "housewives as most important. I believe it is on them and

the influence they have on children that is going to rule the world by bringing us 'higher to a new standard of living.'" They secured the future of the nation through their moral guidance.[89]

A few likeminded pen-pals were concerned, therefore, that working mothers in the USSR were shirking their moral duty to their children and to society. One was Adele H. Marquardt of Milwaukee. "Are there no women who still believe in God and try to raise their families according to the bible? Who pray to God for guidance in their lives? Who teach a Sunday school class? Besides taking care of their home and family as best as they can?"[90] Eager for answers, Marquardt asked AKSZh: "Please turn this letter over to some housewife like myself." However, the reply she received was from Lidiia Petrova, AKSZh's Executive Secretary.[91] Marquardt pressed again for a housewife. "While I appreciate the letter from you," she told Petrova, "I can tell from your title that you most likely are too busy to be keeping house for a family and that is the only kind of life I am really capable of understanding."[92] So, Petrova enlisted Evdokiia Borovkova, a mother of nine and self-described Christian, to correspond with Marquardt. Borovkova wrote that mothers must let children make their own spiritual and moral decisions.[93] Needless to say, Marquardt never wrote back.

To refute such concerns, Soviet pen-pals stressed that women in the USSR were dedicated mothers. "The same as you, we Soviet women love our families and our children," mother and doctor Anna Shul'man proclaimed.[94] "Yes, children are the main thing in life," Irina Pisareva agreed in her reply to Joan Snyder of North Dakota. "They [children] are the center and aim of our today and their future depends from (sic) our care. I have come to feel it most intimately now. I also have a child. I work in a factory. Though I have become a mother, I still go on working. I find time both for my baby and for my social duty to work."[95] Likewise, unmarried women underscored that their aspirations were both maternal and professional. "Our dreams are of a special nature," four Moscow State University students wrote in a collectively-authored letter, "Before each of us lies not only in work we are interested in and fond of, but marriage, babies, the bringing up of children."[96]

While they agreed about the importance of motherhood, the Soviet and American participants did not see eye-to-eye about housework. Correspondents from the US were eager to chat and commiserate about chores, whereas their pen-friends barely acknowledged them as "work" at all, even though such tasks invariably fell to them. No one from either country mentioned a husband lending a helping hand. After 1945, Ruth Cowan and Susan Strasser found,

American women increased the time they spent on housekeeping to about fifty-two hours a week.[97] Those who worked outside of the home spent roughly twenty-six hours, but they still did the vast majority of domestic tasks. Their husbands, on average, spent only 1.6 hours a week.[98] Many US correspondents confessed they felt guilty when they put off domestic chores for other pursuits, including their pen-friendships. "Here I sit," Maxine Cryder declared to Natalia Popova, "writing letters with my house in real need of cleaning. Also, I have a large basket of clothes to be mended." She suggested they share recipes as a timesaver.[99] But Popova did not share her recipes or Cryder's sentiments.

The American pen-pals were so keen to talk about housework because managing it could be a struggle. The letter-writers who juggled motherhood and paid work described their days as a frenetic back-and-forth between home and the workplace. "I make breakfast first thing, even before I am dressed," Jeanne A. Woolf began, recounting her routine to Ekaterina Andreeva. After Woolf's sons, Don and Cameron, left for school, she hurried to "tidy the rooms, make the beds, and wash dishes after breakfast." On his way to work, her husband Maurice dropped her off at her office at the headquarters of the local newspaper. Although Andreeva knew all about Woolf's family, she did not learn about Woolf's job as a journalist until her fourth letter. Even then, Woolf's comments on her writing were sparse compared to the detailed descriptions of her chores. "It seems to me that you would consider most of my [writing] topics unimportant," she balked. "At noon I hurry home to prepare lunch for the boys and Maurice. Sometimes we have soup from concentrate and sandwiches or something that I generally can make quickly." Woolf spent two hours at home midday to cook, eat, and clean up before "I return to work. I work for four hours in editing and then I return home to make dinner, our more respectable meal." Clearly she felt a little sheepish about serving canned soup. Woolf's sons did the evening dishes, while their mother continued to work. "I write something for the newspaper or for my husband," she wrote, adding: "this schedule changes if I have to do laundry or iron."[100] Chores structured her day.

Woolf had a college degree, and she longed to study Russian at nearby Kansas State University. "To my shame I have not yet found time to take these courses. Life is so filled with housework and it demands to be done every day, so that I do not have enough time for studies."[101] When the juggling act that was her daily routine became unsustainable, Woolf resigned from the newspaper.[102] But her pen-pal summoned her back. "Dear Jeanne," Andreeva implored, "please don't give up your work in the newspaper. I am sure your articles must be good, judging by your

letters. Couldn't you let me have some of them? Couldn't you manage to do both: help your husband and go on with your own work?"[103] Andreeva managed to convinced Woolf not to quit. But the Muscovite never said a word about housework.[104] Woolf grew quite self-conscious at Andreeva's silence on the topic, as though only she struggled with it. "I often think how you manage to cope with housework and laundry when you also work," Woolf told Andreeva, admitting: "I got so tired that I fell ill."[105] Andreeva finally wrote just one line to allay Woolf's concerns: she hired a neighbor to help with the washing and mopping.[106]

There lurks in Woolf's letters a sense of shame as though she ought to be better at balancing housekeeping, parenting, and working outside the home. She commended friends and neighbors who managed to raise children, held down jobs, and kept tidy homes. "One is a young mother, twenty-four years old, who looks after her three boys herself and who is a wonderful poet at public gatherings and still finds time for serious study of the classics, methods of government, and politics. The only help she has is when a schoolkid comes to spend a few hours with the children. Another mother of three preserves food for the winter, sews terrifically for herself and her children, and performs in public playing the violin, and participates in discussion groups on issues of children's psychology and national and international problems." Similarly, Woolf's closest neighbor, a war widow, worked as a teacher, raised a three-year-old, and did all of her own housework.[107] The pressure to "do it all" shines through these descriptions.

Undoubtedly, Soviet women's lives were just as filled with mundane chores. They spent fewer hours on them than their American counterparts, but they did them in more onerous conditions. Often Soviet women lacked access electricity or hot running water, and they had to queue and navigate the ration system to prepare meals in crowded communal kitchens.[108] Yet, they seldom identified this as work and avoided discussing it. "I hate cooking," Ekaterina Nikiforovna Ol'shanskaia of Sevastopol' declared in a rare reference to housework, "I feel that cooking must bore you too."[109] They did not conflate good housekeeping with good mothering. Similarly, during the late 1940s, *Woman Worker* profiled some exemplary working mothers and noted their apartments "we not always tidy."[110] From the early days of the revolution, housework was deemed "unproductive labor." "Petty housework crushes, strangles, stultifies and degrades her, chains her to the kitchen and the nursery, and she wastes her labor," Lenin famously remarked.[111] Bolshevik policymakers endeavored to eliminate what they called "kitchen drudgery" by building canteens and communal laundries, but they were always in short supply. By the mid-1930s, Alissa Klots has

shown, the regime took a more ambivalent stance on domestic labor. It continued to promote educational and professional opportunities for women, but it also outlined domestic chores as women's work.[112] Thus, Soviet women faced the same impossible expectations as their American counterparts.

In sum, most letter-writers upheld the ideal that women should "do it all" even as their struggles and life choices underscored its impossibility. The model Soviet woman who effortlessly balanced her career with motherhood was unrealistic given the devastation and demographic crisis of the war-torn Soviet Union. Soo too was the full-time homemaker when so many in the US had to work to support their families. For most pen-pals, the question was less whether women should juggle paid employment, motherhood, and housework, but rather how they could manage this. The pen-pals, as well as the organizations overseeing them, proposed different solutions, some of which reflected, others which pushed against the policies and ideals of the postwar US and USSR.

Work-Life Balance

Like the pen-pals, the Soviet Women's Anti-fascist Committee and NCASF's Committee of Women supported the idea that women "do it all" and tried to advise them on how to achieve this. The solutions they proposed drew on cultural norms as well as on ideas sparked by the pen-pals and polling data. Starting in 1944, the New York-based Committee of Women regularly surveyed women's organizations, clubs, and church groups, asking: "what do American women want to know about the Soviet Union?" Between 1945 and 1947, the most common query was: how do Soviet women managed their domestic responsibilities with full-time jobs?[113] Respondents asked how much time Soviet women spent cooking and cleaning, if they relied on services like daycares, nurseries, and laundries, and whether their domestic and professional duties interfered with each other. Americans polled in October 1945 inquired: "to what extent will [Soviet] women who entered industry for the first time during the war remain at these jobs?" "Do Soviet women feel any conflict between their family life and their work?" "Is there any tendency on the part of men to want their wives to stay at home rather than work?[114] The Committee dispatched seventy-five folders of survey results, along with information about American women's organizations, to AKSZh in 1945[115] and another forty folders by mid-1946.[116] The packets were delivered by Soviet consular staff and by couriers like journalist, fellow-traveler, and NCASF member Jessica Smith.

Smith told her American readers that this curiosity was mutual. She visited Moscow in 1946 with "a long list of questions [...] about women, children, and family life in the Soviet Union, and they said: 'why these things are just the things we want to know about you—can you get together similar material for us?'"[117]

A core part of the Committee of Women's postwar mission of peace and friendship was to help restore Soviet home life.[118] It sought to do this by introducing Soviet women to American methods of housework and "American household equipment and technology"—two areas where it assumed the US was superior.[119] "In the immense problems of reconstruction that face them, Soviet women look to us to share with them all that we have learned in home-making, in labor saving devices, in improved living standards."[120] The notion that Soviet rebuilding could be improved through American know-how was also promoted by a several high-profile officials including Andrei Gromyko and Major-General Mikhail Galaktionov, an editor of the newspaper *Red Star*. Speaking at a 1946 NCASF event, Galaktionov noted: "We Russians will fully master the problems of our reconstruction and the economic development of our country, provided we use American techniques."[121]

Women could "do it all," the Committee of Women suggested, if they used technology to buy themselves extra time. Between 1944 and 1946, the Committee sent several exhibits of equipment and furniture to the USSR through its New York Consulate. The first exhibit was a model American nursery, which contained "everything from a crib to a perambulator."[122] The exhibit included "typical" clothing for American preschool-aged children—hats, socks, and everything in between. The Committee's officers, all of whom resided in New York City and some in posh neighborhoods, presented the clothes as "moderately priced" and "representative of what is within the read of average American families." In fact, the items ranged in cost from 59 cents to 35 dollars (today a sum of 516 dollars) and were out of reach for many people, especially Soviet citizens. The exhibit was a showcase of American affluence.[123] It was also a business enterprise. US companies donated the items in exchange for valuable publicity. The nursery was displayed in the James McCreery and Company's department store on Fifth Avenue, visible to throngs of tourists and shoppers during the peak of summer. The Soviet consular staff pledged to display it at the Mother and Child Institute in Moscow.[124] Encouraged by this, the Committee sent two other exhibits—one of books about childrearing and another of "practical" work clothes for women.[125]

These displays not only touted American homemaking, they linked good mothering to conscientious housekeeping and shrewd consumerism.

The Committee's most ambitious plan was to send a model American kitchen to Moscow.[126] It began preparing it in 1944 after AKSZh apparently asked about "models of kitchen equipment and other materials," though I did not find any direct statements from the Anti-Fascist Committee requesting these items. The Committee of Women set about assembling "a complete model kitchen for a city family of moderate income." It included "small household objects that are to be found in the kitchen of the average American woman. These items will be particularly needed when the Soviet Union begins to rebuild and make consumer goods," the Committee reiterated.[127] Preparations continued through 1946, and the list of necessary items expanded to include "recipes, gardening tools, canning equipment, literature on methods of food conservation."[128] But in the end, the kitchen was never sent. The Committee of Women was concerned it might not make it to the Soviet Union because AKSZh claimed that some of the earlier shipments of clothes and books never arrived.[129] In a June 1946 letter, sent through diplomatic courier General Victor A. Iakhontov,[130] Muriel Draper told Nina Popova how "disturbed" and 'discouraged" the Committee of Women was to "have no news of their arrival."[131] Did the Central Committee forbid the display of these items to Soviet viewers? Or was the cargo lost amid the wartime chaos? Either way, the books and clothes were never found.

Although many US letter-writers would have considered the supplies NCASF sent to Moscow prohibitively expensive, they tended to support the group's overall message that technology and smart consumption was the key to gaining more time. When they acquired new appliances, which promised to shave time off of their chores, they wrote excitedly to their pen-friends. "Technology had come to the relief of many working mothers," Gladys Brown told A. Fedosova, "in America many married women have work outside the home. Some of them have housekeepers, others get by without it because they have many electronic appliances: vacuums, washing machines, refrigerators, electric irons etc."[132]

Unsurprisingly, the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee rejected this consumer-based solution. Instead, it argued that state-subsidized daycares and nurseries were the best way to lighten the load on working mothers, and it curated its own exhibition to convey that point.[133]
Entitled "Mother and Child Care in the Soviet Union," the exhibit's central message was that Soviet mothers balanced motherhood and paid work with the help of state support. It featured

detailed panels, which traced a child's development from the prenatal stage through kindergarten to show that all along the way he was cared for by state institutions—from the Central Research Institute of Obstetrics and Gynecology to polyclinics, daycares and kindergartens. One photograph showed an expectant mother gushing over the adorable tiny baby clothes she purchased with state assistance. Nearby, Siranush Markosyan, a decorated "heroine mother" living in Yerevan, was pictured helping her child take his first steps while a nurse looked on.[134] Nearly all of the exhibit's thirty-four photographic panels showcased Soviet mothers' love and care for their children; it contained only two images of fathers. The text that accompanied the photographs, however, made it clear that state authorities played essential roles in every child's upbringing.[135] The answer to the question of how women could "do it all" was for teachers, doctors, and other caregivers to help raise their children. ASKZh's exhibit arrived in New York harbor in June 1945,[136] and the Committee of Women sent it to more than a dozen museums, libraries, and universities,[137] including women's colleges like Vassar and Bryn Mawr and African American universities in the South.[138]

In reality, the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee knew state programs had not solved the problem. The committee often received letters from Soviet women asking for help in managing their responsibilities and complaining about the lack of nurseries and daycares.[139] During one 1948 meeting, several AKSZh officers argued that the committee should acknowledge these challenges in its magazine *Soviet Woman (Sovetskaia Zhenshchina)*. Although the state offered resources, they were too few and of uneven quality, so everyday life (*byt)* remains women's personal task," O.P. Mishanova admitted. She called this "the biggest contradiction" and acknowledged that "women suffer terribly from it." Mishanova blamed the male-dominated party leadership for not providing adequately for working mothers. "Among our leadership there are men everywhere who take much too little care of women. That is the position wives are taking. Men in leadership positions sit and judge how women live and thus how his wife lives. [...] Why do we hide the fact that we have this difficulty from [readers] abroad?"[140] T.V. Fedorova agreed that articles in *Soviet Woman* should champion state welfare programs but recognize shortages without "embellishing." "Woman will work and she will look after her home. We need to say how we plan to resolve issues of everyday life," with "scientific solutions."[141] The idea that women had to "do it all" was thus accepted as a fact. Concluding the meeting, AKSZh's chairman Nina Popova agreed the magazine should "provide rich material showing the state and party's care" for working

mothers but "raise criticisms of individual negligent leaders and organizations."[142] In this way, AKSZh ultimately upheld the ideal of the working mother as well as the notion that she should rely on professional caregivers. It was not until the post-Stalin era that AKSZh suggested consumer goods and strategies to help working mothers. *Soviet Woman* published its first articles about appliances that "make housework easy" in 1954.[143]

In this way, both the Committee of Women and the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee were eager to help women balance multiple roles, and the solutions they offered were embedded in their own national norms and values. The organizations' arguments resembled the letter-writers' own introductions: the Committee of Women emphasized consumerism and American affluence, while AKSZh stressed state expertise and resources.

The letter-writers expressed agreement with these respective strategies in principle, but in practice, their choices were not so different from each other's. For instance, both the Soviet and American participants relied on relatives and neighbors for childcare. With so many displaced persons and an acute housing shortage in the postwar USSR, Soviet letter-writers often lived with extended family members who looked after their little ones. Even AKSZh's wartime chairman, the aviator Valentina Grizodubova, preferred to leave her son in her mother's care than in a state-run children's home.[144] Moreover, many Soviet and American letter-writers supported the idea of childcare outside of the home, albeit under slightly different conditions. Correspondents from the US wrote positively of private kindergartens and nurseries as a help but never as a substitute for parenting or a state-provided resource. By contrast, their Soviet pen-friends championed government-subsidized childcare not just as a necessity but as an effective way to give children a moral upbringing.

Daycares and kindergartens generated significant conversation between the pen-pals, drawing out differences in how they prioritized their responsibilities. Soviet mothers relied on state-provided childcare, especially those who were widowed or single. Although films, policies, and the press upheld the nuclear family ideal, an estimated 8.7 million Soviet children were born out of wedlock in the postwar decade.[145] The single mother became so ubiquitous, she was recognized under the 1944 family law code. In light of these circumstances, Raisa Kopylova told Mrs. Paul A. Walter of Fairmont, North Dakota, workplace daycares were essential. "Very many children have been orphaned during the war, losing both parents or only their fathers." Kopylova worked at the Mikoyan Shoe Factory in Rostov. "Our factory," she explained has opened a children's home,

where all orphaned children are brought up at state expense." Kopylova boasted about state-funded resources, saying: "Everything is done to help women workers, especially those with children."[146] Still, hers was a practical rather than an ideological argument.

The Soviet state was stepping in to compensate for absent fathers.[147] Fima Petrovna Dashevskaia told a Mrs. Fridley—mistakenly addressed as "Mistress Friday"—how her husband was killed in action in 1944. Her salary was not enough to support her two children, but Dashevskaia made ends meet with the help of a widow's pension, free summer camp, and student stipends provided by the state. "I have been left alone in the world by the death of my husband, but notwithstanding I feel strong and hopeful to bring up my children, with the help of our Government, to be Soviet citizens worthy of the name."[148] Her letter certainly lauds Soviet socialism, but it also captures the gratitude of a single mom in need of financial help. After WWII, the Soviet regime increasingly played the role of benefactor in a fatherless society.

Not only were daycares necessary, letter-writers like Irina Kuznetsova and Adassa Nimerovskaia argued that trained caregivers could instill moral and behavioral norms better than many parents could.[149] Factory brigade leader Mariia Pasynkova used to leave her young son home with her mother when she went to work. "Everything was fine," at first until he "became naughty (*shalunyi*), started to act rudely to me and grandma, did not want to do anything to help out around the house. My girlfriend, who has two kids, convinced me to send him to a kindergarten in our factory. I sent him there and the boy became completely different. It is interesting and fun for him there. He is occupied with his children's matters." So much so, he forgot to make mischief and instead learned good habits like washing his hands before eating, cleaning up after himself, and making his bed. "The main thing is that he has become polite and obedient and started to take a completely different attitude towards adults. I began to work calmly knowing that my child is not only receiving food and care but also [a good] upbringing." When Pasynkova had a second child, she did not hesitate to enroll him in the factory nursery. "He is growing up into a healthy and cheerful child, to everyone's delight."[150]

Although the notion that a trained professional might raise a child better than his biological mother was an anathema to the American cult of motherhood, there was growing interest in childcare for working mothers at mid-century. During WWII, the Women's Bureau in the Department of Labor lobbied for daycare facilities and other resources to ease mothers' transition into the workforce. However, the War Production Board and War Manpower Commission made

few accommodations, assuming that that this influx of working mothers was temporary.[151] Moreover, US officials were concerns that, by providing such services, women would not want to return to domestic life—a fear that belied their insistence that women's instinctual vocation was motherhood and homemaking.[152]

The American letter-writers tended not to reject professional childcare in principle, but to complain about its high cost. A handful of enterprising correspondents created their own cooperatives or started childcare businesses.[153] "There are only a few nursery schools run by public agencies for working mothers," Rose Freedman of Bogota, New Jersey explained. "And, with the end of the war, even some of these have been disbanded." As a result, "most married women in this country are forced to give up their work when they start raising a family." Freedman responded by starting her own private nursery school to help working mothers and children. "My little girl was two years old when I began to realize that she needed more than just an occasional playmate. And so, we rented a large house with a half-acre of ground. We moved into the house (occupying the second story) and turned the downstairs into a school." This work not only benefitted mothers and children in Bogota, it gave Freedman a sense of fulfillment. "As for myself, I find the work more and more interesting and, while it keeps me very, very busy, I do feel a great deal of personal satisfaction in being able to do something useful."[154] Of course, Freedman's private business was not the state-subsidized facility her pen-pal advocated, but when it came to practical time-management solutions, Soviet and American letter-writers' choices were not so different as their cultural norms might suggest.

Betty Oberstein, who volunteered at a charity-run nursery school for working mothers, was eager to discuss the value of daycare with Natalia Aleksandrovna Chudovskaia, a factory worker, widow, and mother of three.[155] Chudovskaia, however, preferred her mother to babysit her youngest child rather than send him to a state-funded childcare facility.[156] So, it was the American rather than the Soviet mother who lauded the value of affordable daycare during their exchange. It is notable, however, that Oberstein had been a stay-at-home mom with her own sons, now fully grown and demobilized from the army. Oberstein was a full-time volunteer for a non-profit nursery school in New York City, which fed and cared for 150 kids a day. "We have nannies and teachers who look after the children who range from 2-3 months to 12 years old. The older children go to a city school but at noon they come [back] to eat lunch, and at 3 [o'clock] they return to drink milk and to rest. I think that the children are the most important because they are the future citizens of

the world and the other important factor is that little children are helpless—they cannot ask for help, meaning that it is our task to offer them help," Oberstein observed. She was a member of NCASF and supported the Progressive Party, which may explain her support for out-of-home care—at least for the working classes. Like other US letter-writers, Oberstein underscored that she was middle-class, noting that her husband "made good money."[157] In short, Oberstein and Chudovskaia did not contradict national norms, but they did not strictly conform to them either.

* * *

These letters document the politics of everyday life and how they evolved in the aftermath of war. Expectations for women to undertake multiple roles inside and outside the home intensified during WWII. These pressures were both externally and internally imposed, emerging from new state imperatives as well as new professional opportunities created by the war. For all of the ideological and policy differences between the US and USSR, American and Soviet gender norms converged more than ever before in the years around WWII. They were stretched to suit larger objectives—first military victory and then postwar normalization. The model Soviet woman became more maternal and domestic, while the ideal American woman tackled more traditionally "male" jobs without sacrificing her family and femininity. The letters Soviet and American women exchanged in the war's aftermath—especially the ways they introduced themselves, structured their routines, and prioritized their responsibilities— reflect these complex social codes. The pen-pals upheld these codes but also exposed their limitations. Their life choices often pushed against national gender norms.

Before it became a cornerstone of second-wave feminism, the question of whether women could "do it all" was a major talking point in these letters. It was also a standard by which the letter-writers increasingly evaluated themselves and each other. Although they did not speak with one voice, Soviet correspondents tended to argue that meaningful work outside of the home was necessary for women's personal fulfillment and overall happiness. Most Soviet women had to work out of necessity, but those who participated in the pen-pal project presented their jobs as symbols of freedom and opportunity. By contrast, American letter-writers argued that women should put family first because of their natural inclinations and moral obligations. They celebrated (or longed for) the freedom not to work. In this way, the pen-pals evoked the American and Soviet dreams;

the former was rooted in material affluence and domestic bliss and the latter in educational and professional achievement.

The challenging of juggling work inside and outside the home became a major preoccupation of the Committee of Women and the Soviet Women's Anti-Fascist Committee as well. Like the pen-pals, these organizations offered moral support and practical advice, staking out areas of national expertise in the process. In essence, the pen-pal project was an influence campaign pitched in the register of everyday life. Although few pen-friends ultimately convinced their interlocutors to change, they did help each other imagine and understand alternative ways of living.

The pen-friends' conversations capture Cold War-era debates in miniature. The American-Soviet rivalry was often mapped onto ideals of womanhood.[158] The most famous instance of this was the 1959 Kitchen Debate between Vice President Richard Nixon and Premier Nikita Khrushchev. Women figured into that debate as symbols of national achievement, but they were conspicuously absent from the conversation.[159] In an interview for *National Business Woman*, Patricia Nixon described how she and the wives of top Soviet officials "sat in silence for six hours" at the Khrushchevs' dacha while their husbands continued to debate a few days later. "'We women did not say a word the whole time. Neither did anyone else. It was just the two men talking.'" Finally, Mrs. Nixon "'said jokingly to the women, 'They ought to let women settle this.' Quite earnestly, Mrs. Kozlov [wife of the Deputy Premier] responded: "'Yes. They should let women do it.'" Nixon's interviewer mused whether "the seeds of friendship planted with 'small talk' between women" would "bear fruit in the homes of the men who will meet around conference tables.'"[160]

But rather than speak through their husbands, these little-known Soviet and American letter-writers debated the same issues as Nixon and Khrushchev but more than a decade earlier. And, unlike the combative Kitchen Debate, their exchanges were couched in friendly tones, well wishes, and anecdotes, which made the ideological faut lines of the Cold War personal and meaningful. Thanks to this amiable approach, theirs was an on-going conversation about women's roles, not a one-time stunt. More than artifacts of citizen diplomacy, therefore, the letters capture key fluctuations in postwar gender politics and how they impacted the pen-pals' understandings and choices regarding "women's work."

[1] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 244, ll. 13-14 dated 12/XII/46.

[2] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 358, l. 13 dated 7/IX/47.
[3] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245, l. 2 dated, 2/XII/47.
[4] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 24; sent 23/IV/47.
[5] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 360, l. 2; dated 6/IV/48; GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, l. 211; dated 10/XI/48.
[6] Dorothy Sue Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement: Workplace Justice and Social Rights in Modern America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 1.
[7] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 480, ll. 41-42; dated 6/XI/48.
[8] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, ll. 176-177; dated 21/XII/48.
[9] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2, d. d. 482: l. 79; dated 23/VI/48.
[10] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245,; dated 1/IX/47.
[11] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 50, l. 29; dated 25/IX/46.
[12] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 360, l. 29; dated 27/I/48.
[13] Only two Soviet writers asked their correspondents to describe their living space: GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 482, l. 64; sent 30/VII/48; GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483 ll. 212-214, dated 15/XI/48.
[14] Sylvie Murray, *The Progressive Housewife: Community Activism in Suburban Queens, 1945-65* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2003), 40.
[15] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2, d. 360, l. 1; dated 8/VII/47. A similar example in: GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 360, l. 34; dated 25/VII/47.
[16] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 50, l. 16, dated 23/IX/46. On the importance of domestic interior space in shaping identity, see: Erving Goffman, *The presentation of self in Everyday Life* (Edinburgh: U of Edinburgh Press, 1956), 17-25); Rachel Hurdely, "Dismantling Mantelpieces: Narrating Identities and Materializing Culture in the Home," *Sociology,* 40, No. 4 (Aug. 2006): 717-733.
[17] Mark Harrison, *Accounting for War: Soviet Production, Employment, and the Defence Burden, 1940-1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 162.
[18] Nicholas Ganson, *The Soviet Famine of 1946-47 in Global and Historical Perspective* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), 51-62, xv.
[19] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358, l. 2; dated 3/XII/47.
[20] Marina Kiblitskaya, "Russia's Female Breadwinners: The Changing Subjective Experience," *Gender, State, and Society in Soviet and Post-Soviet Russia,* ed. Sarah Ashwin (New York: Routledge, 2000), 55.
[21] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 358, l. 97; undated in 1947.
[22] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 71; dated 13/II/47.
[23] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 146, l. 98; dated Jan. 1947.
[24] An exception is Margaret E. Faires, whose first and only letter describes her career as a lawyer. It does not discuss her marriage but lists her married and maiden names. See: GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 480, ll. 2-3; dated 22/XI/48.
[25] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, ll. 63-67; dated 27/VI/49.
[26] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 481, ll. 31-34; dated 4/I/49.
[27] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 481, 4/I/49; ll. 32-33. Phrase underlined by AKSZh editors.
[28] Honey, *Creating Rosie,* 123.
[29] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, ll. 55-62; dated 27/VI/49.
[30] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 481, ll. 32-33; dated 4/I/49.
[31] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, ll. 63-67; dated 27/VI/49.
[32] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, ll. 55-62; dated 27/VI/49.
[33] A pioneering study of this convergence is: Lynne Attwood, "From the 'New Soviet Woman' to the 'New Soviet Housewife:' Women in Postwar Russia," *War-torn Tales: Literature, Film, and Gender in the Aftermath of World War II,* eds. Danielle Hopkins and Gill Plain (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007), 143-162.
[34] Wendy Z. Goldman, *Women at the Gates: Gender and Industry in Stalin's* Russia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 1, 160; Alice Kessler-Harris. *Out to Work: A History of Wage-Earning Women in the United States* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 276-277.
[35] Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement,* 13; Maureen Honey, *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender, and Propaganda During World War II* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 1984), 19. Historians debate whether WWII improved women's status long term. William Chafe argued in favor, Lelia Rupp against, while Karen Anderson and Susan Hartmann claimed expectations and practices changed but without a radical transformation. See: William Chafe, *The American Woman: Her Changing Social, Economic, and Political Roles, 1920-1970* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972); Lelia Rupp, *Mobilizing Women for War: German and American Propaganda, 1939-1945* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978); Susan Hartmann, *The Home Front and Beyond: American Women in the 1940s* (Boston: Twayne, 1982); Karen Anderson, *Wartime Women: Sex Roles, Family Relations, and the Status of Women during WWII* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1981).
[36] On maternity as a Soviet women's instinctive duty, see: Yulia Gradskova, "Soviet People with Female Bodies: Performing Beauty and Maternity in Soviet Russia in the mid 1930s-1960s." PhD Diss. Stockholm University, 2007, 67, 80.
[37] L. Zavadskaia (ed.), *Gendernaia ekspertiza rossiiskogo zakonodatel'stva,* (Moscow: BEK, 2001), 105. Also see: David L. Hoffman: *Stalinist Values: The Cultural Norms of Soviet Modernity, 1917-1941* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003), 105.
[38] Looking at the 1930s and 1940s, Anna Krylova argued the USSR had a "*nonoppositional though still binary* concept of gender," which allowed women to be maternal and martial (Krylova, *Soviet Women in Combat, 12).*
[39] On the "warring impulses" between gender equity and productivity concerns in guiding women's influx into the labor force, see: Wendy Z. Goldman, *Women at the Gates: Gender and Industry in Stalin's* Russia (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002),

145, 174; Ruth Milkman, "Redefining "Women's Work": The Sexual Division of Labor in the Auto Industry during World War II," *Feminist Studies,* Vol. 8, No. 2, (Summer, 1982), 336-338.
[40] Rupp, *Mobilizing Women*, 146-152; Maureen Honey, *Creating Rosie*, 6.
[41] Elena Bondareva, "Moe slovo sovetskim rabotnitsam," *Rabotnitsa*, No. 1, 1945, 1-8. This series of articles covers women taking their husbands' places in factories. Also see: Natalia Igorevna Tolstikova, "Reading R*abotnitsa*: Ideals, Aspirations, and Consumption Choices for Soviet Women, 1914-1964," Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, 2001, 158-187; Elena Baraban, "The Return of Mother Russia: Representations of Women in Soviet wartime Cinema," *Aspasia,* Vol. 4 (2010): 121-138.
[42] *Saturday Evening Post*, 12 June 1943, 55. Drawn from: Honey, *Creating Rosie*, 113.
[43] W.H. Lawrence, "Russia's New Women," *New York Times Magazine* (November 5 1944), 22, 41-42. Also see: "Russian Women had Place More Important than Most," *The Globe and Mail* (16 Jan. 1942), 13; Edgar Snow, "Meet Mr. and Mrs. Russia at Home," *Saturday Evening Post* (22 December 1945), 14-15. 65; Joseph B. Phillips, "A Typical Woman of Postwar Moscow," *Newsweek*, 4 November 1946, 23; "Free Women of Russia," *Woman's Home Companion* (1943).
[44] Oriana Atkinson, "Weaker (?) Sex of Soviet Russia," *New York Times* (3 March 1946), , 15, 51-52.
[45] Ol'ga Mishakova, "Sovetskaia zheshchina velikaia sila," *Pravda* 8/III/45; quoted in: Regina Pennington, "Women," *The Soviet Union at War 1941-45,* David R. Stone, ed. (Barnsley: Pen and Sword: 2010).
[46] Ad in: Honey, *Creating Rosie*, 124.
[47] Cited in: Steven Mintz, *Huck's Raft: A History of American Childhood* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University, 2004), 259.
[48] Susan Hartmann, 'Women's Employment and the Domestic Ideal in the Early Cold War Years," *Not June Cleaver: Women and Gender in Postwar America, 1945-1960*, ed. Joanne Meyerowitz (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1994), 86; Donald Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and Late Stalinism*: *Labour and the Restoration of the Stalinist System after World War II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 19.
[49] Filtzer, *Soviet Workers and Late Stalinism,* 210.
[50] Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement*, 13-14; Greta Bucher, *Women, the Bureaucracy and Daily Life in Postwar Moscow, 1945-1953* (New York: Columbia University Press: 2006), 15-17, 68-69; Kessler-Harris, *Out to Work,* 277.
[51] Milkman, "Redefining "Women's Work," 340.
[52] GARF, F. R7928, op. 2, d. 50, ll. 92-93; dated 17/IV/46. AKSZh quoted Brand's letter in its 1946 report to the Central Committee (RGASPI, f. 17, op. 128, d. 69, l. 78). At the time of Brand's letter, the Committee was planning a large demonstration to push the New York City mayor's office to build more affordable housing. Similar examples in: Ibid, d. 50, l. 79; dated 11/IV/46.
[53] Elaine Tyler May, *Homeward Bound: American Families in the Cold War Era* (New York: Basic Books, 2008); Anna Krylova, "'Healers of Wounded Souls:' The Crisis of Private Life in Soviet Literature, 1944-1946," *Journal of Modern History,* Vol. 73, No. 2 (June 2001), 326. Krylova: "In post-1944 literature, women's wartime work outside the home was mentioned in passing, as a mere adjunct to their domestic responsibilities."
[54] Mintz, *Huck's Raft*, 273; "The Divorce Orgy in the US," *SW*, No. 1, 1948: 48, [up To 620,000 in 1946].
[55] Examples in: Anna Loviagina, "Radost' sem'i" and E. Vishniakova, "S materinskoi liubov'iu," *Rabotnitsa*, No. 10 (1945), 10-11; Nancy A. Walker, *Shaping Our Mothers' World: American Women's Magazines* (Jackson: University of Mississippi Press, 2000).
[56] Mie Nakachi, "Replacing the Dead: The Politics of Reproduction in the Postwar Soviet Union, 1944-55." PhD diss. University of Chicago, 2008, 149, 162.
[57] Mie Nakachi, "N. S. Khrushchev and the 1944 Soviet Family Law: Politics, Reproduction, and Language," *East European Politics and Societies*, Vol. 20, No. 1: 40–68; G.M. Sverdlov, *Legal Rights of the Soviet Family: Marriage, Motherhood, and the family in Soviet Law* (London: Soviet News, 1945), 8-11, 22.
[58] "Russia's New Women," *NYT Magazine* (5 Nov. 1944), 42.
[59] Feiga Blekher, *The Soviet Woman in the Family and in Society* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1980), 83. Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement*, 12, 17.
[60] Example in: GARF F. R7928 op. 2, d. 146, l. 83.
[61] GARF F. P7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 77; sent Feb 1947.
[62] Examples in: GARF F. R7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 107; sent 29/XI/46; GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358, ll. 120ob-121; dated 10/V/47.
[63] GARF F. P7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 82; undated.
[64] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 14.
[65] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, l. 238; dated 9/X/48.
[66] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358, l. 92; dated 18/X/46.
[67] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 146, l. 124; sent 14/VIII/46.
[68] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 146, l. 124; sent 14/VIII/46.
[69] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 50, l. 65; dated 14/V/46.
[70] Milkman, "Redefining "Women's Work," 343.
[71] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 50, l. 66; dated 14/V/46.
[72] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 245, l. 65; dated 24/IX/47; GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 480, l. 4; dated 1/XII/48.
[73] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 361, l. 33; dated 23/II/48.
[74] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 480, l. 4; dated 1/XII/48.
[75] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 483, l. 153; dated 26/I/49.
[76] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 639, ll. 58-59; dated 9/IV/49.
[77] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 482, l. 79; dated 23/VI/48; GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 361, l. 54; dated 18/VI/~~48~~ 7.
[78] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 483; ll. 212-214; dated 15/XI/48.

[79] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245, l. 94ob; dated 1/IX/47.
[80] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245, l. 75; dated 9/IV/47.
[81] Ex in: D. 244, l. 75; dated 22/III/47.
[82] Cobble, *The Other Women's Movement,* 13; Honey, *Creating Rosie,* 81.
[83] On how flight attendants symbolized ideal potential wife and the airplane cabin configured to look like a suburban home in the 1950s, see: Victoria Vantoch, *The Jet Sex: Airline Stewardesses and the Making of an American Ico*n (Philadelphia: University of Penn Press, 2013), 23, 37.
[84] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245, l. 78; dated 20/XI/46.
[85] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 244, l. 36; dated 21/VI/47.
[86] Murray, *The Progressive Housewife,* 41.
[87] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 480, ll. 41-42; dated 6/XI/48.
[88] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 50, ll. 30-31.
[89] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 245, ll. 88-89; dated 5/VIII/1947.
[90] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 246, l. 67; dated 24/I/47.
[91] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 246, l. 102; undated in 1947.
[92] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 244, l. 56; dated 17/VI/1947.
[93] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358, l. 94; dated 14/V/47. Also see: GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 50, ll. 223-223ob; dated 12/I/45.
[94] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 358, ll. 50-51; dated 24/VII/47. From Anna Shul'man
[95] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 358, L. 22; dated 28/VIII/47; GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 244, ll. 16-17; dated 12/XII/46.
[96] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2, d. 358, l. 62; undated from 1947.
[97] Ruth Schwartz Cowan, *More Work for Mother* (New York: Basic Books, 1983): 193-207; Susan Strasser, *Never Done: A History of American Housework* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1982), 275-309.
[98] Dion, "Challenges to Cold War Orthodoxy," 24-25.
[99] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 244, l. 37; dated 21/VI/47.
[100] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 360 27/I/48 l. 29; Ibid, d. 480, ll. 33-34; dated 23/X/48.
[101] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 245, l. 15; dated 16/X/47.
[102] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 245, ll. 16-16ob; dated 16/X/47.
[103] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358, l. 4; 3/XII/47,
[104] Maurice D. Woolf, Jeanne A. Woolf, *The Student Personnel Program: Its Development and Integration in the High School and College* (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1953).
[105] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 360; dated 27/I/48 l. 29; Ibid, d. 480, l . 33-34.; dated 23/X/48.
[106] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 358; dated 3/XII/47, l. 2
[107] GARF, f. R7928 op. 2 d. 480, ll. 28-29 ; dated 23/X/48.
[108] See Great Bucher's interviews with Muscovites about the immediate postwar years in: Bucher, *Women*, 28-33.
[109] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 642, l. 60; dated 5/X/49.
[110] Examples in: Anatolii Sergeev, "Svetlyi Put'," *Rabotnitsa*, No. 2, 1947, 5-6 ; Elena Kononenko, "Na fabrike i v sem'e," *Rabotnitsa*, No. 4 (1947), 8-9 . One of the women profiled had an immaculate house.
[111] V.I. Lenin, "A Great Beginning," June 28 1919, *Marxist Internet Archive*, https://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/1919/jun/19.htm (accessed December 12, 2019); also see: G.M. Sverdlov, *Legal Rights of the Soviet Family*, 3.
[112] Alissa Klots, "The Kitchen Maid that will Rule the State: Domestic Service and the Soviet Revolutionary Project, 1917-1941," PhD diss. (Rutgers University- New Brunswick, 2017), iii.
[113] Ruth W. Russ, "Report on Committee of Women" (Nov. 5, 1945), 1: Tam.134, Box 5, Folder 18.
[114] GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, l. 43.
[115] Minutes of the meeting of the Committee of Women of NCASF," January 20, 1945 (TAM.134, Box 15, Folder 18).
[116] "Purpose and Program, Fall 1946," 2 and "Minutes of the meeting of the Committee of Women of NCASF," January 20, 1945 in: TAM.134, Box 15, Folder 18. Also see the minutes from May 15 1944, June 6, 1945, November 5, 1945 (TAM.134, Box 15, Folder 18).
[117] Jessica Smith, "What do the Russians know of Us?" (June 1946), *SRT*, 23.
[118] "Purpose and Program of the Committee of Women, NCASF, Inc. Fall 1944," 1: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18; "Purpose and Program, fall 1946," 1: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[119] GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 49, l. 43.
[120] "Call to a Conference on Women of the USA and the USSR in the Postwar World. Saturday November 18," GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 49, ll. 53-54.
[121] "American-Soviet Friendship Rally" May 29 1946, TAM 134, Box 6, Folder 19). Also see: Committee of Women, "Purpose and Program, fall 1946," 1: TAM134 Box 5, Folder 18.
[122] "Purpose and Program, fall 1946," 2: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[123] Helen Ross, "American Kids' Clothing of Medium Prices En Route to Moscow in Exchange Exhibition," *PM*, 24 July 1944, Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[124] "Purpose and Program of the Committee of Women, NCASF, Inc. Fall 1944," 2: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[125] NCASF Committee of Women, "Purpose and Program, fall 1946" 1: TAM134 Box 5, Folder 18.
[126] "Purpose and Program of the Committee of Women, NCASF, Inc. Fall 1944," 2
[127] Meeting Minutes of the Committee of Women of NCASF (1 April 1944), GARF f. 7928, op. 2, d. 75, l. 28.

[128] "Purpose and Program, fall 1946," 2-3: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[129] GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, ll. 90-92; dated 10/IV/45; letter from Serafima Ezhova to Mrs. Joseph E. Davies.
[130] Iakhontov is mentioned in Leon Sharpe's *America in Decline* (New York: Routledge, 2012), 118. He was youngest general in tsarist army at the time of the revolution. He emigrated to the US?
[131] GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, l. 17; dated 4/VI/46.
[132] GARF F. R7928, op. 2 d. 245, l. 1. Letter dated 4/II/48 to A. Fedosova from Gladys Brown.
[133] NCASF's Committee of Women asked AKSZh to create such an exhibit in a letter dated 25/IX/44 to Valentina Grizodubova from Muriel Draper and Edwin Smith in: GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, l. 166.
[134] "Mother and Child Care in the Soviet Union" (Text and Panel Descriptions), p. 2 TAM 134, NCASF, box 6, Folder 5.
[135] "Mother and Child Care in the Soviet Union," 7. TAM 134, NCASF, box 6, Folder 5; Yulia Gradskova, "Soviet People with Female Bodies: Performing Beauty and Maternity in Soviet Russia in the mid 1930s-1960s." PhD Diss. Stockholm University, 2007, 112.
[136] Telegram to Grizodubova, GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, l. 82
[137] These included New York, Washington DC, New Orleans, Cleveland, St Paul, New London, Durham, and Baton Rouge (Ruth W. Russ, "Report on Committee of Women" (Nov. 5, 1945), 3-4 in: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18. Slightly different figures in: GARF, f. R7928, op.2, d. 49, ll. 17-18; dated 4/VI/46 from Draper to Popova.
[138] Ruth W. Russ, "Brief Report on Activities of the Committee of Women," (29 March, 1946), 1-2: Tam.134, NCASF, Box 5, Folder 18.
[139] GARF, f. R7928, op. d. 908, ll. 34-35 : "Stenogrammy i protokoly zasedannii prezidiuma AKSZh, 15 Ian.-24 Iiun. 1948.
[140] GARF, f. R7928, op. d. 908, ll. 28-29.
[141] GARF, f. R7928, op. d. 908, l. 29.
[142] GARF, f. R7928, op. d. 908, l. 36.
[143] See: A. Urovsky, "New Homes," *Soviet Woman,* No. 1, 1954, 24-27; R. Chokovskaia, "For the Home," *Soviet Woman,* No. 11, 1954, 45-46. The leading research on this new Soviet consumerism for women has been doen by Susan Reid (S.E. Reid, 'Destalinization and Taste, 1953–1963', *Journal of Design History* Vol. 10, no. 2 (1997): 177-201; Susan Reid, Cold War in the Kitchen: Gender and the De-Stalinization of Consumer Taste in the Soviet Union under Khrushchev. *Slavic Review,* Vol. 61, No. 2 (Summer, 2002): 211-252).
[144] Ella Winter, "Soviet's Heroine Seeks Closer Russia-US Bond," *New York Post* (8 August 1944).
[145] Mie Nakachi, "Replacing the Dead: The Politics of Reproduction in the Postwar Soviet Union, 1944-1955," Vol. 1, Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 2008, 317.
[146] GARF F. R7928, op. 2 d. 358, ll. 31-32 to "Mrs. Paul A. Walter" From Raisa Kopylova; no date; likely VIII or IX/47.
[147] Nakachi, "Replacing the Dead."
[148] GARF F. R7928, op. 2 d. 146, ll. 30-31; dated 14/IV/47;.
[149] ll. 149-152; to Myrtle Park from Irina Kuznetsova; dated 26/I/49.
[150] GARF f. R7928 op. 2 d. 146, l. 164; dated 12/IV/45.
[151] Honey, *Creating Rosie,* 25-27.
[152] Kaspar Burger, "A Social History of Ideas Pertaining to Childcare in France and in the United States," *Journal of Social History,* 45, No. 4 (Summer 2012): 1010, 1016.
[153] On cooperatives: GARF, f. R7928, op. 2, d. 360; dated 27/I/48.
[154] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 50, l. 85; dated 16/IV/46.
[155] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 50, l. 105; dated 15/IV/46.
[156] GARF f. R7928, op. 2, d. 146, l. 114; sent 29/XI/46.
[157] GARF f. R7928 op. 2, d. 245, l. 33; dated 7/XI/47.
[158] Paraphrase of: Vantoch, *The Jet Sex,* 5.
[159] Episode described in: Laville, *Cold War Women,* 198.
[160] *NBW,* Vol. 38, No. 9 (Sept. 1959), 4.