UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

FACULDADE DE LETRAS

Flora Tristán and Transnational Feminism

Elizabeth Mirella Solórzano Giraldo

Dissertação orientada pela Professora Doutora Ana Cristina Ferreira Mendes, especialmente elaborada para a obtenção do grau de Mestre em Estudos Ingleses e Americanos.

LISBOA

2022

To my parents Gladis and Fidel for believing in me and giving me wings to fly; to my Portuguese family for the unconditional support; and especially to my grandfather José, who encouraged me to do my masters abroad and sadly left me during the pandemic.

Abstract

The main goal of this dissertation is to analyse the travel books *Pérégrinations d'une Paria 1833-1834* (1838) and *Promenades dans Londres ou L'aristocratie et Les Prolétaires Anglais* (1842) by French-Peruvian writer Flora Tristán (1803-1844) through the translated and edited versions of Jean Hawkes: *Peregrinations of a Pariah* (1986) and *The London Journal of Flora Tristan* (1982). Both travel accounts reveal Tristán's gradual sociopolitical transformation into a feminist first, and a socialist feminist later. Throughout this dissertation, I will bring to light the importance of Tristán's international travel experiences in her awakening and emancipation, and the construction of her own feminism. Tristán is considered one of the most eminent socialist feminists of the first half of the nineteenth century in Europe and South America. Her contribution to women's emancipation and the key ideas she had on gender equality are still significantly influential nowadays. I intend to show how her journey to Peru allowed her to distance herself from her own plight as a separate French woman, giving her personal experience a level of generalisation and abstraction; this was key to becoming a feminist. This work will also bring into view how her last trip to London shaped Tristán's feminism into a socialist one and encouraged her to enter the public space as a political activist in France. Finally, the different moments in the construction of Tristán's feminism and who influenced her to become a socialist feminist will also be analysed. Using the methodological perspectives of feminist literary theory, I will reveal the economic, social, political and psychological operations of patriarchy in France, Peru and England in the first half of the nineteenth century; also demonstrating how race, class and other cultural factors combined with gender so as to produce women's experience, especially when travelling alone, and how Tristán portrayed herself and other women of the period with these gender issues.

Keywords: Flora Tristán, travel writing, feminism, Peru, England

Resumo

Este trabalho tem como objetivo principal a análise dos livros de viagem *Pérégrinations d'une Paria 1833-1834* (1838) e *Promenades dans Londres ou L'aristocratie et Les Prolétaires Anglais* (1842) da escritora franco-peruana Flora Tristán (1803–1844) através das versões traduzidas e editadas de Jean Hawkes: *Peregrinations of a Pariah* (1986) e *The London Journal of Flora Tristan* (1982). Estas obras revelam a gradual transformação sociopolítica de Tristán numa feminista em primeiro lugar, e numa feminista socialista, mais tarde. Deste modo, ao longo desta dissertação darei relevo à importância das experiências e testemunhos das viagens internacionais da autora, eventos importantes e correntes filosóficas da época que influenciaram o seu despertar e emancipação, e na construção do seu próprio feminismo.

Tristán é considerada uma das mais eminentes feministas socialistas da primeira metade do século XIX na Europa e na América do Sul. A sua contribuição para a emancipação das mulheres e as ideias-chave que teve sobre a igualdade de género ainda são significativamente influentes na atualidade. A maioria das pesquisas académicas concentra-se tanto em aspetos da sua biografia, como no seu último livro, *Union Ouvrière* (1843), que aborda o seu envolvimento com o Sindicato dos Trabalhadores em França (1840-1844), altura em que ela já era inquestionavelmente uma feminista socialista e uma famosa ativista política.

Tristán nasceu aristocrata, filha de um membro de alto escalão da Marinha espanhola, Mariano Tristán y Moscoso, pertencente a uma das famílias mais importantes e poderosas do sul do Peru, e a francesa Anne-Pierre Laisnay. O alto padrão de vida de Tristán em Paris durou apenas quatro anos. Infelizmente, após a morte de seu pai, a sua família perdeu tudo drasticamente, sendo forçados a viver no campo até 1818. Na adolescência, após uma tentativa falhada para encontrar um pretendente de melhor posição económica, Tristán foi informada de que era filha ilegítima, pois o casamento de seus pais não havia sido legalmente reconhecido. Forçada a viver uma vida com dificuldades financeiras, foi persuadida a casar-se aos dezassete anos com seu patrão, o artesão André Chazal. Depois de dois filhos e esperando um terceiro, Tristán "sentiu o peso de [suas] correntes" (*Peregrinations* 171)[1],

[1] *Peregrinations of a Pariah* by Flora Tristán and translated by Jean Hawkes is in English. I will translate all the citations from this book into Portuguese for this abstract.

sentindo-se "[e]scravizada a um homem… numa época em que toda a resistência era vã" (173).

Essa união sem amor fez com que experimentasse opressão na esfera doméstica (lar e país). A sociedade francesa esperava que ela cumprisse o papel de boa esposa e mãe, isso implicava aceitar o controle total do marido, mesmo este sendo violento e extremamente ciumento. O contexto histórico em que Tristán cresceu marginalizou as mulheres separadas, pois o divórcio era ilegal. Viu-se forçada a apresentar-se como solteira ou viúva enquanto fugia do marido; passando por estas dificuldades publicamente e depois internacionalmente. A sociedade francesa fez dela uma pária como filha, esposa e mãe. Este foi o momento em que decidiu libertar-se e optou pelo proibido: deixar o marido e viajar sozinha.

A sua viagem ao Peru, é um dos focos desta dissertação, já que permitiu que se distanciasse dos seus próprios obstáculos, dando à sua experiência pessoal um nível de generalização. Ela observou que as mulheres aristocratas eram oprimidas pelas mesmas instituições e leis patriarcais do mesmo modo que em França. Os testemunhos, eventos políticos e personagens importantes que ela conheceu no Peru foram chaves na construção do seu feminismo. Após a viagem, Tristán decidiu ser escritora e denunciar as lutas das mulheres viajantes, ideias descritas no seu primeiro panfleto, escrevendo de seguida o livro sobre as suas experiências no Peru que a levaria à fama, *Peregrinations*.

Após a publicação da sua primeira obra, Chazal, o seu marido, tentou matá-la, sem sucesso, disparando pelas costas. Este ato levou-o à prisão, facto que ajudou Tristán a continuar com a sua agenda feminista. A sua quarta viagem à cidade de Londres, cujo objetivo foi a investigação social da mesma, foi descrita no *The London Journal*. Este livro de viagem revela a evolução e consolidação do pensamento feminista de Tristán. As mulheres desta capital europeia, principalmente as da classe trabalhadora, não eram apenas oprimidas pelas mesmas leis patriarcais dos países acima referidos, mas também pelo capitalismo. As terríveis consequências da Revolução Industrial em relação às mulheres e à classe operária que ela testemunhou, fizeram com que direcionasse o olhar à economia como a primeira causa da opressão das mulheres. Este facto deu início à sua escrita de viagem, obra socialista, a qual lhe permitiu entrar no espaço público em França como ativista política no seu retorno a este país.

A jornada em Londres, serviu-lhe para adotar a educação como principal solução dos diferentes problemas sociais das mulheres da classe trabalhadora, para visionar o proletariado como uma classe social e propor a união deste para a luta dos seus direitos. O livro também evidencia as diferentes influências filosóficas que Tristán teve na sua própria construção do

seu feminismo. Os mais influentes foram Mary Wollstonecraft, concordando que a educação devia ser igualitária moralmente e era chave para uma sociedade mais justa; os Saint-Simonians, que introduziram o sentido de classe em relação ao proletariado; Charles Fourier, que a influenciou na ideia socialista de comunidades semelhantes aos falanstérios; e Robert Owen, reformador industrialista que acreditava que a educação infantil teria um impacto positivo nas sociedades futuras tornando-as mais justas, igualitárias e ordenadas. Embora a obra e os ideais de Tristán tenham logo sido considerados parte do socialismo utópico, o livro evidenciou uma realidade inglesa para onde a França também se encaminhava. Tristán faleceu aos 41 anos devido à febre tifóide, a qual contraiu durante a sua viagem a França, momento em que lutava para unir os líderes dos trabalhadores de França.

Tristán foi severamente crítica na produção dos seus dois livros analisados nesta dissertação: *Peregrinations,* tendo sido dedicado à sociedade peruana, e *The London Journal* dedicado particularmente aos trabalhadores londrinos. Ambos foram friamente recebidos pelos nacionais. *Peregrinations* foi queimado na praça principal de Lima e até proibido por um tempo. *The London Journal* foi escrito em francês e a receção deste em Inglaterra não foi a esperada pela escritora. Nenhum trabalho surge do nada; o contexto sociopolítico e filosófico de Tristán, as lutas pessoais como esposa fugitiva e sobretudo as experiências como mulher viajante nas suas peregrinações internacionais ajudaram-na a tornar-se uma proeminente pensadora feminista socialista ao fim da sua viagem a Londres. Os textos escritos pela autora são um exemplo perfeito para analisar e revelar as operações económicas, sociais, políticas e psicológicas do patriarcado em França, Peru e Inglaterra na primeira metade do século XIX. Do mesmo modo, para examinar como Tristán retratou as mulheres da época e a si mesma como viajante, escritora e mulher separada, e se estas impressões estavam relacionadas com questões de gênero. E, por fim, estes textos são pertinentes para demonstrar também como a raça, a classe e outros fatores identitários cruzam os gêneros para produzir a experiência das mulheres, principalmente quando viajavam sozinhas. Para esta análise na dissertação, usarei as perspetivas metodológicas da teoria literária feminista e terei como referência principal as obras de Susan Grogan *Flora Tristan, Life stories* (1998) que analisa a imagem pública de Tristán e as diferentes funções de escritora, feminista socialista e viajante que adotou durante a sua curta vida; e a obra de Sandra Dijkstra *Flora Tristan Feminism in the Age of George Sand* (2019) que retrata Tristán como uma escritora com consciência de classe e gênero num período histórico de transição.

Palavras-chave: Flora Tristán, Escrita de viagem, Feminismo, Peru, Inglaterra

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

Flora Tristán (1803–1844) was a French-Peruvian socialist feminist born and raised in Paris, and a travel writer who authored four books as well as petitions, articles, letters and a pamphlet. The author died from typhoid fever in Bordeaux during her "tour of France" when attempting to unite the French working class. She is considered a prominent travel writer, feminist and socialist activist. Her works have been studied by numerous scholars and approached using different methodologies and theories from Europe to America. Due to her remarkable biography, most feminist research in English has been mainly focused on her life story, which undoubtedly reflects various forms of women's oppression in the nineteenth century, and on her work with the French working class during the last two years of her life (1843–1844).

In this dissertation, I intend to demonstrate the importance of Tristán's international travel in the awakening, emancipation and construction of her own feminism. This complex feminist author had multiple philosophical and sociopolitical influences throughout her life. She was born in an era of transitions: at the end of the Enlightenment age and the beginning of Romanticism, after the French Revolution and the start of the Napoleonic era, and during the peak of the Industrial Revolution. I will demonstrate how this historical, philosophical and sociopolitical context nourished and shaped Tristán's feminist thoughts through an analysis of the English translated and edited versions of *Pérégrinations d'une Paria 1833-1834*[2] (1838) and *Promenades dans Londres ou L'aristocratie et Les Prolétaires Anglais*[3] (1842) by Jean Hawkes; books which depict Tristán's transformation into a socialist feminist and incorporate key ideas still important for the emancipation of women nowadays.

Tristán's life was rather challenging from childhood. Her Peruvian father, Mariano Tristán y Moscoso, was a high-ranking member of the Spanish Navy. He belonged to one of the most important and powerful families in Arequipa, South of Peru. Her French mother, Anne-Pierre Laisnay, married him in a Spanish church and moved to France for Tristán's birth. During the first four years of her life, Tristán had a privileged aristocratic life in Paris.

Unfortunately, the author's father died in 1807, leaving her and her expectant mother without an inheritance due to irregularities in their Spanish religious wedding. A year later,

[2] Jean Hawkes' translated, edited and introduced work used for this dissertation is *Peregrinations of a Pariah* (1986), to which I will refer as *Peregrinations* from now on.
[3] Jean Hawkes' translated, edited and introduced work used for this dissertation is *The London Journal of Flora Tristan* (1982), to which I will refer as *The London Journal* from now on.

Tristán and her family lost their home, being forced into a much more modest life in the countryside. In 1818, a year after the death of Tristán's younger brother Mariano, both women returned to Paris to live in one of the poorest areas of the city.

Due to the financial status of the family and educational reforms of the time, Tristán was unable to obtain formal complete schooling. Grogan states that, "Tristan may have experienced the intermittent schooling, provided by poorly-educated and itinerant teachers, which was common for rural children" (19).

Despite this, Tristán did have painting and dancing lessons in Paris. This gave her the opportunity to find a bourgeois young man to marry. Unfortunately, the young suitor's parents, along with Tristán herself, discovered the illegitimacy of her birth and objected to the engagement. Learning that her parents' wedding had no legal validity was a crucial moment in Tristán's life, being the starting point of "its monstrous consequences" (*Peregrinations* 68).

At the age of seventeen, Tristán was forced by her mother to marry her employer André Chazal, an engraver with a workshop in Montmartre. Trapped in a loveless marriage, a mother of two and expecting a third, Tristán found herself a victim of domestic oppression without the possibility of divorce as the Napoleonic Civil Code perpetuated women's submission to their husbands or fathers. Divorce was illegal at the time and husbands were responsible for the total custody of children at home. The oppressive French sociopolitical context forced Tristán to leave Chazal and become a social outcast.

Influenced by Enlightenment feminism, Tristán would demand the same rights for women within and outside the domestic sphere given to men at the end of the French Revolution. She urged the modification of certain laws in the French Civil Code such as the reestablishment of divorce and the same rights for women over their children within or outside their marriage. She would insist that the right to education was key for women's emancipation and the foundation of a better society.

A noteworthy analysis of Tristán's biography is Susan Grogan's *Flora Tristan Life Stories* (1998). In this non-chronological biographical approach, Grogan studies Tristán in a multidimensional form, considering different guises and roles Tristán played or appropriated throughout her life. Grogan considers her unfortunate destitute childhood as an illegitimate daughter, her forced marriage to Chazal without any likelihood of divorce and the long battle for custody of her children after their separation, reasons why Tristán assumed the guise of a pariah.

She saw marriage as a form of enslavement and, as Grogan states, "[a]s a separated wife in a society where divorce was illegal, Tristán became a social outcast in the eyes of

many" (26). The awareness of her domestic oppression became broader as she realised the hardship was endured by all women in French society. As a result of the constant hiding from Chazal, who never stopped trying to reclaim his children, and the intense economic difficulties she faced as a separated wife with children, Tristán decided to sail to Peru. She pursued her economic independence by claiming her father's inheritance from her uncle Pío Moscoso, and hoped to become part of the Tristán family and regain her social status.

Her voyage to Peru would constitute her liberation from the private sphere in which she felt imprisoned. Although this was not her first international trip – as in 1825 "she left France for the first time, travelling to England, Switzerland and Italy" (Grogan 30) as a ladies' maid for two English women – this particular journey is of interest to this dissertation as it turned her into a "femme de lettres" and a feminist, allowing her to enter the public sphere.

In my analysis, I will suggest that her trip to Peru was a specific form of emancipation for Tristán; the visits and short travels she took there gave her a different perspective on things. Once in Peru, she shifted from a destitute person to a privileged woman, a member of one of the most powerful aristocratic families in the country: the Tristáns. She also went from being a national to a foreigner, receiving special treatment in the country. Nevertheless, she realised the women of high social-economic status had the same or even worse complications due to their gender as women on the other side of the Atlantic. These experiences gave her personal hardships a level of generalisation and abstraction, and she also became critical of the patriarchal society in Peru. This would not have happened otherwise; her trip to Peru consolidated her feminism and transformed it. The many encounters with distinguished women from Peru, such as the president's wife, influenced her subsequent political ideas and allowed her to be confident enough to become a public figure.

Another valuable analysis of Tristán's life during her journey to becoming a socialist feminist is *Flora Tristan: Feminism in the Age of George Sand* (1992) by Sandra Dijkstra, which aims to depict Tristán as a class and gender-conscious woman writer during the critical historical period in which she lived. Dijkstra affirms that, in nineteenth-century society, the "economic restriction, legal incapacity and ideological injunction" (22) in which Tristán was raised gave women three options: mother, prostitute or courtesan. Tristán chose to become a "femme de lettres" for her short career as a writer and thinker.

Once she returned to France, without her inheritance but with a small allowance, she went against all patriarchal expectations of her gender and status as a separated single mother and bastard, and wrote her first feminist work in 1835. *Nécessité de faire un bon accueil aux*

femmes étrangères (1835) was a pamphlet portraying all the struggles Tristán and women went through when travelling on their own. As Dijkstra affirms, "Tristan also came to see her womanhood as a liability" (220) and used her writing as a way of protesting.

After her unsuccessful attempt to find a place in society, Tristán realised it was society that needed to change. This instigated her many national and international trips in her quest for women's emancipation and later the workers' liberation; she became a real peregrine.

Each trip provided Tristán material for her books. Following *Peregrinations*, the second book I will be analysing is *The London Journal*, written after her fourth visit to London in 1839 and with a socialist feminist agenda. This travel account was not out of necessity but with a purpose. This time, Tristán travelled as an observer to be a reporter and a critic. As Cross affirms, with "Peru the formative moment for her feminism, visits to London are seen as the education into socialism" (51). My hypothesis is that Tristán's travel to London was key to her significant evolution from a feminist into a socialist model.

Although her first three visits to London were on duty, Tristán was able to witness the negative consequences the Industrial Revolution was causing the English capital, especially the emerging proletariat. After her fourth visit, Tristán would demand not only sociopolitical rights for women but also economic ones. Roles assigned to women had remained within the domestic sphere, whether as a wife or a mother, preventing women from any type of economic independence. The author would conclude that lower-class women's lack of economic independence was the cause of one of the principal social issues in London: prostitution. Tristán realised that not only was the patriarchy oppressing women along with the working class, but so was capitalism.

Influenced by the utopian socialists of the time, who gave significant relevance to the role of women in society and their emancipation, Tristán's initial construction of socialist ideas is reflected in *The London Journal*. This was a development of different existing proposals which Tristán found relevant for women's and working-class emancipation after what she witnessed in industrial London.

As the aim of this dissertation is to study Tristán's transformation into a socialist feminist through her travels and her historical context, I will not develop the author's final proposals for the liberation of women and the French working class. Instead, this work will help illustrate Tristán's context, life and thoughts prior to becoming a political activist in France. For a better understanding of my work, I have divided this work into three chapters.

In the first, *Flora Tristán's historical context and life*, I analyse Tristán's historical, sociopolitical and economic context. In the first subchapter, *Flora Tristán, the pariah*, I

reveal the personal events and important legal aspects that made Tristán a pariah as a daughter, wife and mother. In the second subchapter, *Flora Tristán, the peregrine*, I deepen the account of Tristán's voyage to Peru and fourth visit to London, and what she experienced and witnessed as a woman traveller.

In the second chapter, *Flora Tristán and the initial construction of her feminism*, I will examine the main influence on Tristán becoming a socialist feminist. I will exhibit Tristán as an enlightened feminist who believed in the power of education and demanded an egalitarian legislation for women, and as a romantic socialist feminist who believed women were morally superior to men, and their emancipation key for a just society.

In the third chapter, *Flora Tristán, the travel writer*, I will analyse Tristán as a travel writer. I will depict what was expected from women travellers and female travel writers in the nineteenth century and how Tristán reacted to those expectations. According to Susan Bassnett, male travellers were seen as risk-takers, heroes or adventurers; they could "use the journey as a means of discovering more about their own masculinity" (226), considering that they could move freely in the public sphere, and how they also used more of a public discourse and role. Mary Louise Pratt remarks on a difference between the capitalist vanguardists and Tristán, and notices the genderedness in their writing. She suggests that they often "relied on the goal-oriented, linear emplotment of conquest narrative" (157), and that Tristán's accounts do not necessarily do this.

Due to the social norms of that period, women had a contrasting reality. Sara Mills claims that the construction of female writing is therefore different from that of men; she suggests that women "lay on personal involvement and relationships with people of the other culture and in the less authoritarian stance they take vis-à-vis narrative voice" (21). In Tristán's accounts, a great number of details of her encounters and experiences in Peru, Cape Verde and London can be noted. According to Pratt, Tristán showed a strong interest in ethnography: "[s]ocial and political life are centres of personal engagement" (159). Tristán describes what happens around her and writes more "interpretive, analytical lines" (159) in her Peruvian account.

In *The London Journal*, the author was already more of a social critic and presents a more serious, detailed social documentation. Bassnett affirms that "women's writing reflects an interest in philanthropic activities, characteristic of early feminism" (228). Undeniably, Tristán's works manifest a concern for condemning social issues like slavery, marriage constraints for women, corruption, children's and human-rights abuse, and exploitative working conditions for women and men. However, Pratt states that Tristán "reject[s]

sentimentality and romanticism almost as vehemently as the capitalist vanguard did" (159). In this dissertation, I also intend to show that Tristán went through different stages in her thoughts and writing as a result of her travels and experiences. She had not only romantic ideas but also realist ones that reflect an enlightenment influence. Tristán wrote as a feminist from the very beginning.

2. Flora Tristán's historical context and life

To understand Tristán and her work in feminism, it is necessary to analyse the key moments of her life and the historical context in France when she was born; how certain events in her personal life and the sociopolitical circumstances influenced her thoughts and actions.

Tristán was born in Paris on 7 April 1803, a year before the Napoleonic Code was established in France. The revolutionary times when women played a more active political role were gone. The few advances French women had made, such as the women's political clubs, the school for girls, and the movement claiming social and political equality were repressed before the end of the century. The public denouncements, arrests, exiles and especially the public execution of Olympe de Gouges and Madame Roland "served as a demonstration to all women that any public attempts to change gender-based social structures would be suppressed by the new ruling order" (Beckstrand 12). Abray notes that this latter event "effectively destroyed the feminists' political aspirations" (58). The situation for women worsened. They were no longer allowed in public meetings, "all Parisian women [were] under a kind of house arrest" (Ibid.), and were sent back to the private sphere. After the Napoleonic Code was introduced in 1804, it seemed that revolutionary feminism had failed and women were in a worse position than before. The feminist movement had been unable to reach all women, and its unpopularity had prevented it from making any social change. As Abray states: "Neither its words nor its action had made any sense to ordinary women" (59).

The Civil Code of the French marked a period of women's legal and economic incarceration. Tristán was born when the supremacy of the husband over his wife and children was legally supported. The Code demanded a wife's total obedience to her husband, and women were compelled to follow their husband wherever he decided to live, and no longer had legal rights over their personal properties. Divorce by mutual consent had been eradicated and the rights of illegitimate children reduced. The integrity of the family was the

excuse for strengthening patriarchal authority and repressing married women's civil and economic rights. Tristán would find this justification unquestionably immoral since the husband's adultery had no basis for divorce and could only be prosecuted if he brought his mistress home. However, a wife's adultery was grounds enough for imprisonment or the husband to sue the third party for damages. This law resembled the ideology Jean-Jacques Rousseau had promoted decades earlier in *Emile* (1979):

> When woman complains on this score about unjust man-made inequality, she is wrong. . . . Doubtless it is not permitted to anyone to violate his faith, ... But the unfaithful woman does more; she dissolves the family and breaks all the bonds of nature. . . . It is important, then, not only that a woman be faithful, but that she be judged to be faithful by her husband, by those near her, by everyone. (361)

Dijkstra indicates this "double standard for crimes of adultery was instituted, permitting men the right to murder their unfaithful wives" (19), a crime that could be justified by the outrage of finding them in the act of adultery.

With the restoration of the monarchy under Louis XVIII, Roman Catholicism became the state religion once again. In 1816, in accordance with its doctrine, divorce was abolished completely and only a judicial separation was legal. On these terms, the wife still needed the husband's permission for any economic venture. In Tristán's Dedication in the Spanish translation of *Peregrinaciones de una Paria* (2003), [4] the author condemns the Catholic Church as an oppressive institution for women, putting emphasis on the plights the indissolubility of marriage brought to women in Catholic countries around the world.

> In the course of my narration I often talk about myself. I depict my pains, my thoughts and my affections. . . . Nothing is completely the same and, without a doubt, there are many differences between all creatures of the same species and of the same sex. However, there are also physical and moral similarities on which the usages and customs proceed in a similar way and produce analogous effects. Many women actually live separated from their husbands, in countries where Roman Catholicism has made divorce rejected. It is not, then, my intention to attract attention to myself,

[4] Jean Hawkes, the translator of *Peregrinations of a Pariah* (1986), reduced the original work in French "by more than one third" (xxix) by omitting the Dedication, Preface and Foreword all together. She also eliminated "a number of minor characters" (Ibid.), to whom I will refer later. From this point onwards, I will translate all the references from the Spanish translation by Emilia Romero: *Peregrinaciones de una Paria* (2003), to which I will refer as *Peregrinaciones* from now on.

> but on all the women who are in the same position and whose number is increasing daily. They go through tribulations and sufferings of the same nature as mine, they are preoccupied with the same kinds of ideas and feel the same affections. (79)

Grogan affirms that, in Tristán's view, "indissoluble marriage was responsible for a host of social problems: illegitimate children, illicit liaisons, and crime" (32). In *Peregrinations*, Tristán's autobiographical book, she extensively describes her personal marital struggles and the difficulties she had after her separation, and how this forced her to travel to Peru to claim her inheritance and achieve her independence. Personal experience "underlay her claim that the inescapability of marriage gave rise to domestic violence and worse, as desperate spouses murdered their spouses and unmarried mothers murdered their infants" (Ibid.). It was this unbreakable union by law that forced Tristán to go from a legal situation as André Chazal's wife to a fugitive separated woman hiding and disguising herself as a single woman. French society gave Tristán no other option but to live a lie in total social exclusion, not only in France but also in her transatlantic journey. According to Grogan, "the tribulations of marriage helped [Tristán] shape her as a feminist, then, but they may also have led her to question social institutions and power structures more generally" (98).

Charles X, the leader of the ultra-royalist faction, ascended to the throne in 1824, a year before Tristán left her husband, André Chazal. The following political events after his coronation might have been unimportant to Tristán at the time, who was more focused on hiding from her enraged husband. King Charles X was never keen on the idea of a Constitutional Monarchy, like the one in England from 1688, nor the changes of the previous four decades. Hence, after a series of unpopular and imprudent political decisions – such as the compensation for aristocratic losses during the revolution of 1789, the reestablishment of the death penalty for any sacrilege, the increase of power of Roman Catholicism, and strict censorship – his reign was interpreted as an attempt to restore the Ancien Régime, gaining disapproval from the liberal opposition. Charles X's unpopular ascendance, then, marked the end of the restoration and the advent of the July Revolution of 1830, an important happening in which Tristán took part and would help forge her later socialist ideas.

Tristán had separated from her husband while expecting her third child, Aline. Chazal, who had never seen his new-born child, chased her. Tristán moved around France with her children. However, she was struggling to maintain herself and her offspring; for that reason, she decided to leave her children in her mother's care and travel to London where she worked for an English family. Unfortunately, there is not much information about this particular part

of her life, though it is known that from 1825 to 1829 Tristán worked as a companion to a number of English ladies with whom she travelled to Switzerland, Germany and Italy.

When Tristán returned to Paris she was an inspired spectator of the July Revolution in 1830, where women, like in 1789, actively participated in the manifestations, strikes and on the barricades in the fight for liberty. In 1834, while witnessing one of the many battles during a civil war in Peru and fearing for her life; Tristán confessed: "I had witnessed the July Revolution of 1830, but then I was exalted by the heroism of the people and I had no thought of the danger . . ." (*Peregrinations* 220). Although there is no clear evidence of her participation during the "Three Glorious Days", the "heroism" of those people, particularly women's, inspired her and had a great impression on her as a woman. Grogan affirms Tristán belonged to the generation of young adults who were politicised by these three important days in French history, and they "marked her political initiation" (98). However, the same author claims that "her political philosophy in 1830 [was] unclear . . . Tristán's interest in socialism only [became] visible historically on her return to Paris from Peru in 1835" (98–99). The July Revolution was a key event for Tristán and her generation's own perception of women. According to Hart, weeks after the revolt: "there was a proliferation of female revolutionary imagery by painters, printmakers and engravers, including even a set of playing cards featuring individual women who had performed heroic acts during the July days" (55). Women were allegorically represented, again, as the symbol of freedom. However, their situation did not change at all: they became muses of change but continued being subordinated.

Following the July Revolution of 1830, Louis Philippe, from the House of Orléans, was crowned as a constitutional monarch. This new government was based on a form of popular sovereignty instead of divine right, hence the king adopted the title of King of the French and not of France. His reign was known as the July Monarchy and lasted until the Revolution of 1848, a political transformation Tristán would not witness as she died of typhoid in 1844. Louis Philippe's regime was supported by the wealthy bourgeoisie and his initial rule seemed guided by liberal principles. During the first months of the monarchy, censorship was abolished, Roman Catholicism's influence was reduced and the number of people allowed to vote almost doubled. Yet the regime insisted on a more conservative position regarding divorce. In 1830, Tristán had been invited to Peru by her royalist uncle Pío

de Tristán[5]; however, at that time she was being chased by Chazal, who wanted his children back, and was unable to arrange her travel. Tristán's first son, Alexandre, died not long after. This forced the couple to amicably meet, though it ended in a terrible physical fight. Tristán ran away with Aline, her third child, but was soon caught by the police, losing custody of her second son, Ernest-Camille. She spent a year fleeing from place to place, disguising herself as a widow, looking for a safe place to leave Aline before embarking on the transatlantic voyage to Peru in April 1833. Tristán would not return to Paris until 1835.

During these first five years of Louis Philippe's reign, while Tristán was fighting to keep her children, fleeing Chazal and finding in Peru paternal support to reintegrate into society as a Tristán, the new political, economic and social scenario was being built in France. Civil unrest, political opposition and the first confrontations between the bourgeoisie and the initial proletariat would happen before Tristán returned in 1835.

The July monarchy was mainly formed by two political parties: the Resistance Party and the Movement Party. The Movement Party members, headed by Jacques Laffite, believed in a more democratic regime, laws that reflected the will of free and equal individuals, and universal suffrage. Initially, this political party was the leading one; however, the king became more conservative over time and, after a year, the Resistance Party, led by François Guizot, became the dominant one. The Resistance Party was formed mainly by the doctrinaires, who believed in a constitutional monarchy but with a restricted census system and political rights among the people. According to Sperber: "Liberals saw government as emerging from the process of rational debate and deliberation, exercised by self-reliant individuals. Basic legal rights enabling such a process to be carried out, such as freedom of speech, the press, association and assembly, were fundamental to liberal conceptions of government" (297). This implied that conceivably all adult men could exercise these rights and have a role in government as long as they had self-reliance and independence. Therefore, women were ostracised, as Sperber indicates:

> Women, by their biological nature and their role in the process of reproduction, dependent on men, had to be excluded from this process, as were men who did not own enough property to support themselves or their families . . . . Adult men would thus be free to exercise their self-reliance, although women and children would not. Liberals' conception of family life was strongly patriarchal. (297–298)

[5] Juan Pío Camilo de Tristán y Moscoso was a Peruvian general of the royalist army in Peru. He was the last interim viceroy after the Peruvian independence (1824) who assumed the office to transfer power to the Peruvians. He later became a politician, exercising the role of governor, minister and president of Southern Peru.

This, however, did not mean that conservatives did not have a patriarchal understanding of family life; their principles were just different. Even though liberals were formally offering equal opportunities to anyone who was competent and qualified, with this rigid requirement, it was pretty evident that liberals, as well as conservatives, wanted the regime in the hands of a few privileged wealthy individuals: the bourgeoisie. The July Monarchy would then be characterised by the ascendance of the bourgeoisie as a dominant social class; however, Sperber suggests that the transition from "the old regime burgher to the nineteenth-century bourgeois was a long, slow process, one . . . which was by no means concluded in 1850" (15). Tristán would criticise this historical event, claiming the bourgeoisie as avaricious, a class which only defended their own interests at the expense of the lower classes: the workers.

Women had been seeking personal autonomy and recognition as citizens and the rights that came with this. However, as Grogan points out: "Few people saw the political rights associated with 'liberty' as relevant to women" (154), as they belonged to a completely different sphere from that of men. François Guizot, the prominent liberalist figure during the 1830s and 1840s, "specifically rejected women's capacity for public roles of any kind" (Ibid.), assuring they were destined for domestic life. Hence, the attempt to "redefine women's social roles . . . was a battle against great odds in the 1830's" (Ibid.).

In 1834, Tristán got to know the story of the Peruvian ex-president's wife, Doña Francisca Zubiaga de Gamarra, also known as "Doña Pancha" or "La Mariscala" ("The Field Marshal"), who had had a key political role in Peru. Despite her epilepsy, Doña Pancha had commanded her husband's army for several years, participated on horseback in every battle, restored order, tamed rival factions and brought peace to the country. Tristán admired her character, her rejection of women's role being confined to the domestic sphere, and how she had broken free thanks to her husband's political position. Doña Pancha became Tristán's role model, and hence she discovered the ambition to enter public life and have a similar role in Peru through a convenient marriage to Colonel Bernardo Escudero, ex-president Agustín Gamarra's army leader and Doña Pancha's personal assistant. Encouraged by her "passionate desire to contribute to the good of the world" (*Peregrinations* 231) and her inclination for "an active and adventurous life" (Ibid.), Tristán planned to gain influence over Escudero, to whom she was attracted, persuade him to become president and rule Peru through him, just like Doña Pancha had done. Tristán had previously visited various cities and places in Peru and had "an ardent desire to see [that] nation prosper, [e]ducate people, improve communications, [and] encourage free trade" (237), among other things. However, not long

after, Tristán "sacrificed" the position she confessed she could have easily gotten "to the fear of having to treat [her] uncle as an enemy" (232), knowing how dishonest he was; she also feared becoming "hard, despotic – a criminal, even – like those who were [then] in power" (Ibid.), as she had witnessed corruption and avarice from their leaders and her uncle. Greater disenchantment would come after meeting Doña Pancha in person in Lima days before going back to France in 1834.

After becoming the wife of the president, Doña Pancha had lost her privacy and "her life came under investigation, . . . [h]er enemies spread the vilest slanders about her and, finding it easier to attack her morals than her political actions, attributed various vices to her to console themselves for her superiority" (303). Tristán first believed that Doña Pancha's "all too feminine exterior stood in her way" (Ibid.) of being a soldier and a successful leader, yet it was the lack of these feminine traits that brought her down to exile. According to Dijkstra: "The effect of her total rejection of the 'feminine' was that it infuriated the men whom she commanded" (71). Doña Pancha had lost the advantages of being a woman, "her despotism had been so harsh, her yoke so heavy, she had wounded so many people's self-esteem, that a strong opposition rose against her" (*Peregrinations* 305). Even though Doña Pancha had tried "to compensate for the weakness of [her] sex" (295) by using feminine cunning "to retain its attractions and exploit them as need arose in order to enlist the support of men" (Ibid.), female leadership was a certain failure in Peru. It was exactly as in Jacques Rousseau's dictum: "The more women want to resemble [men], the less women will govern them, and then men will truly be the masters . . . [a] woman is worth more as woman and less as man. Wherever she makes use of her rights, she has the advantage. Wherever she wants to usurp ours, she remains beneath us" (363–364). Tristán would come to the conclusion that it was not enough for Peruvians to have a good strong ruler as Doña Pancha had been: the problem was gendered, and she was a woman. Doña Pancha was not as feminine as a woman was expected to be, nor was she strong enough to hold her position for long. As Grogan affirms:

> It was not simply that men did not recognise authority in a woman, but that her female body proved unsuited to the demands of the role. She lacked physical strength in a context in which "brute strength" reigned supreme. Since political power in Peru rested on military supremacy, a "strong woman" needed to be a military leader, but Gamarra's epilepsy, understood at the time as an emotional illness, seemed to confirm that women were physiologically incapable of such a role. (159)

Tristán wrote this story at the end of her book as if she was telling us she had understood the dangers of her political resolutions. Disappointed in the Peruvian system, its people and especially their rulers, Tristán knew she would not succeed in ruling Peru as a woman. Hence, she renounced her political ambitions and "never wanted to hear another word about politics" (*Peregrinations* 256). After her first encounter with Doña Pancha, Tristán confessed:

> I shuddered when I thought that once I had planned to usurp her position; what torments would have been in store for me had I succeeded! Now my poverty and obscurity seemed infinitely preferable, nobler, even, for I still had my freedom. I felt ashamed to have believed even for a moment that ambition could bring happiness, and that anything could compensate for the loss of independence. (298)

According to Dijkstra, the encounter with Doña Pancha before her exile to Chile produced in Tristán "an ambivalent response . . . it reinforced her fear of public life. Yet she could not return to the other option; to choose marriage and family was impossible for her" (72). Tristán's desire for power was evident, as were her good intentions; yet she was also knowledgeable of the plights that came along with them.

Tristán returned to France on 15 July 1834, well aware of the plights of women in society and the urgent need for social change. However, the French sociopolitical and economic context was still very restrictive for women. As Dijkstra concludes:

> The nineteenth-century society offered [Tristán] (and all women) essentially three options: to be a mother – a victim of her body, its periodic flow, its procreative capacities, and thus to be eternally incapacitated, . . . to be that "other woman" – the prostitute or courtesan, the woman who broke the taboos, giving free rein to her sexuality, and thus incarnating all that men feared and worshipped in woman, . . . or to be a "femme de lettres", thus refusing either of the other two options . . . refusing to be a "woman" according to the current definition of that term, choosing therefore to be regarded as a monster by some and as a saint by others, to be marginal and therefore recuperate the freedom inherent in negation. (22–23)

After her trip to Peru, Tristán would choose to be a "femme de lettres" and reject the traditional role that women had in the French patriarchy. She would initially expose the limitations of women to then reveal the socio-economic problems of London, and finally become a political activist fighting for the rights of workers and women in France – a part of

Tristán's life I do not study in this dissertation as it falls outside the scope of her transformation into a socialist feminist.

2.1. Flora Tristán, the pariah

2.1.1. Pariah as a daughter

Flore Célestine Thérèse Henriette Tristán Moscoso was born in Paris on 7 April 1803, the daughter of Anne-Pierre Laisnay, who was French, and Mariano Tristán y Moscoso, a Peruvian who belonged to the Spanish military and aristocracy. Tristán's parents met in Spain and privately married there during the French Revolution; however, their marriage was never legally registered by her father. This particular incident made Tristán an illegitimate child, or a "pariah", as she chose to call herself, not only in French society but also in Peru. Tristán had been completely ignorant of her social misfortune until the age of fifteen when she wished to marry a young man and was rejected by his family due to her birth circumstances. In 1802, Tristán's parents settled in Vaugirard, "a town next to Paris. The property . . . included a one-story house, a large garden adorned with statues, and numerous outbuildings: a stable, a shed, a warehouse and a barn. All for a sum of 12,000 francs; most of which had to be paid in ten years" (Leprohon 16)[6]. It was there their children Flora and Mariano were born.

The first four years of Tristán's life were very privileged: colonel Don Mariano Tristán belonged to one of the wealthiest and most influential aristocratic families in Peru, closely connected with the Spanish Crown (Peru was still a colony of Spain when Tristán was born). The family would receive visits from important well-known people such as the "Liberator" of South America, Simón Bolívar, who was Mariano Tristán's close friend. Grogan suggests that even though Tristán was still young, "it is fanciful to insist on her exposure to advanced political ideas, to the defence of equality and the denunciation of tyranny" (24). It is known that Anne Laisnay would reconstruct events and tell Tristán stories of what happened in their noble house in Vaugirard. Tristán's mother had kept letters and would read them to her when she was growing up. As Dijkstra affirms: "Parisian Marie Thérèse Laisney Tristan maintained a precarious foothold in the prosperous past by reminiscing with Flora about a world the child had never known . . . her mother read his

[6] *Flora Tristan* (1979) by Pierre Leprohon was originally written in French. I will translate all the citations from this book into English.

letters aloud and embroidered her recollections" (26). These would later be published by Tristán in adulthood.

A week after Don Mariano Tristán's sudden death, things changed dramatically in Tristán's family. Due to the lack of a will and a formal proof of their marriage, all their belongings, except their house in Vaugirard, were confiscated by the Spanish government. In addition to this misfortune, and again as a result of their irregular marriage, "Peru ceased all recognition of her, and sent no funds" (Dijkstra 26). Not long after, owing to the Napoleonic invasion of Spain, the family was forced to move from one of the most elegant neighbourhoods in Paris (Vaugirard) to the countryside where it was more affordable, which was "where they lived until . . . 1818" (Grogan 6).

There is very little or no information regarding certain aspects of their lives during all those years in the countryside. According to McPhee, in the first half of the nineteenth century "[a]bout one-tenth of the national population lived in these country towns. . . . Despite the Revolution, rural France remained sharply hierarchical in economic terms" (147); the political changes the country went through after the Revolution did not particularly affect this economic structure. Agriculture was still France's main economic activity. According to Grogan, Anne-Pierre Laisnay had bought lands to rent out in order to bring up her children, as "[s]he managed her finances well enough" (18). The family did not have the same comfort as in Vaugirard, but although their living was rather "frugal and modest" (Ibid.) it was not at all destitute. Regarding Tristán's education, Dijkstra suggests it was "entirely in her mother's hands" (27), who strengthened "her fixation on their 'noble' past" (Ibid.) by telling her how wealthy and important the Tristán family was. Tristán did not mention anything about her childhood education in her books, only confessing that: "My mother had few resources to live and educate my younger brother and me" (*Peregrinaciones* 83). Grogan, on the other hand, suggests that Tristán might have had "the intermittent schooling, provided by poorly-educated and itinerant teachers, which was common for rural children . . . her early letters, while weak in grammar and spelling, reveal an adolescent imitating a style and turn of phrase which is far from ignorant" (19); she presumes Tristán must have had "at least a limited exposure to literature" (Ibid.) given that her parents had a privileged social background.

In May 1817, Tristán's younger brother Mariano died. What caused his death is unknown. However, McPhee points out that "[a]wareness that disease and death more often spared the rich than the poor was often explained in rural society by the evil influence and sorcery of the increasing numbers of doctors appearing in the countryside . . . if Paris had a

doctor for every 662 people by 1844" (160–161), there were much fewer for bigger populations in the countryside. Évelyne Bloch-Dano also explains that "[i]n the countryside, some people [ate] grass, the most miserable or the most fragile simply die of hunger . . . There is no doubt that Anne and her children, like all the inhabitants of the countryside, had to endure terrible living conditions" (29)[7]. Little Mariano's death marked the end of their rural life.

In 1818, Tristán and her mother moved back to Paris. Leprohon affirms that after their arrival:

> Thérèse could only rent a mediocre accommodation in the Maubert district: an attic in a house in the rue du Fouarre. This street had had its fame . . . at the beginning of the 19th century, [as] one of the most ill-famed in Paris. There were . . . pickpockets, low-level prostitutes, artisans of small trades: chairpickers, gingerbread merchants . . . among the infirm and beggars. (20–21)

Grogan suggests that the death of young Mariano, aged ten, "may have prompted this change of location for Flora and her mother. It may also have seemed an opportune time to consider Flora's education and future prospects" (18) in Paris. Tristán was about to turn fifteen when they returned to the capital city; her mother might have been "hoping to marry Flora off, or at least put her to work . . ." (Dijkstra 27). Grogan states that Tristán had been "taking dancing lessons and was sufficiently skilled as a porcelain painter" (19); this showed Tristán's or her mother's aspirations to make her a lady and go "beyond the realm of proletarian women her own age . . ." (Ibid.). This could have been enough to make her a good marriage candidate. However, it all turned out differently for Tristán. The father of the first young man "with whom she had fallen in love refused to allow the marriage" (Dijkstra 27) as he found out Tristán was an illegitimate daughter. In *Peregrinations*, Tristán confessed:

> I was completely unaware of this absurd social distinction and its monstrous consequences. . . . I was fifteen when, because of a marriage I wished to contract, my mother revealed to me how the circumstances of my birth affected my position. My pride was so deeply wounded that in the first flush of indignation I renounced my uncle Pío and all my family. (68)

[7] Évelyne Blach-Dano's work *Flora Tristan: Une femme libre* (2018) was originally written in French. I will translate all the citations from this book into English.

The misfortunes of Tristán's social status as an illegitimate daughter created contradictory feelings towards her parents. Tristán grew up observing her mother's "cult of Mariano during her childhood. . . . Devotion to his memory was supplemented by celebration of the legendary fraternal devotion between Mariano and Pío" (Grogan 21); her father represented the Spanish-Peruvian aristocratic connections for both Tristán and her mother. Tristán would confess in her autobiographical book: "I worshipped my father's memory and still hoped for my uncle's protection, as my mother often spoke of him and encouraged me to love him, although she knew him only through his correspondence with my father . . . it was an extraordinary monument of fraternal love" (*Peregrinations* 68). Tristán had read their letters and was aware of the role his father had played in her uncle Pío's life as the oldest brother. Hence, Tristán expected gratitude and affection from Pío Tristán, not knowing how dishonourable he would later be.

Before her trip to Peru, Tristán identified more with her father than her mother: "I was born in France, but I belong to my father's country" (48). Despite Tristán's aristocratic background, having been born under the Napoleonic Code, French society rejected her for being illegitimate. Dijkstra suggests Tristán saw French society as "an enemy" (28) based on this initial rejection and sought protection in her Spanish-Peruvian origins. However, her visit to Peru would also destroy "any illusions she might have held regarding her father's family and their generosity or sense of responsibility towards her, [and] the experience came to represent still another betrayal she had experienced in French society" (29). Tristán wrote a letter to her uncle Pío showing her deep disappointment on realising she was not to be recognised as a real Tristán: "I came to you for fatherly affection . . . [a]rmed with the letter of the law, you have calmly robbed me one by one of any claims to kinship with the family in whose bosom I came to take refuge . . . you have been unmoved by pity for the innocent victim of her progenitor's culpable neglect" (*Peregrinations* 149). Tristán's hopes of belonging were shattered, and "was as much a pariah in the New World as [she] had been in the Old" (54).

For these reasons, Tristán would later criticise her father for not having formalised his union with her mother, and leaving them in such a difficult socio-economic situation that complicated her life. She had been born a Tristán, though paradoxically this eventually became her social curse. Tristán ended up rejecting it, declaring in her *Peregrinaciones*: "Born with all advantages which excite the desire of men, these were only shown to me to make me feel the injustice that deprived me of enjoying them. Everywhere I saw chasms; society was organised against me; nowhere could I find safety nor sympathy" (315). Tristán

had been offended by her uncle's indifference and dishonest behaviour towards her legitimate inheritance, and this refusal would detonate in grievances against her father's irresponsibility. Although Tristán's love for her father was more evident, she was well aware of his neglect, and this was shown in her second letter to her uncle. Tristán had been planning on taking Don Pío to court since she had been told she had a case. However, when Tristán knew her uncle was likely to return to power, she "bowed [her] head . . . abandoned all thought of a lawsuit and a hope of a fortune" (*Peregrinations* 148), knowing her uncle was unprincipled and Peru was "a country where justice could be bought" (144). In the letter, Tristán confessed her plans to "cast a veil over the offence of [her] father, whose memory remain[ed] sullied by reason of his failure to provide for his child" (149). Even though Tristán renounced her judicial plans against her uncle, she detailed the hardships her uncle would have gone through to:

> [D]emostrate, in effect, that [his] brother was a dishonourable man and a criminal, that he had wickedness to deceive a defenceless young woman (Anne-Pierre Laisnay) . . . and that taking advantage of her love and lack of experience, he cloaked his perfidy in the farce of a clandestine marriage; [he] would also have to prove that [his] brother abandoned the child God gave him to poverty, insult and the scorn of a barbarous society; and while in fact he commended his daughter to [him] in his dying words, [he] would have to dishonour his memory and accuse him of deliberate and culpable negligence. (149–150)

Clearly, Tristán's mother was not entirely as "deceived" as suggested since she was in her early thirties at the time of their marriage. However, it was Mariano Tristán's legal responsibility to ask for permission from the king to marry Anne-Pierre Laisnay or write a will, and he did not.

2.1.2. Pariah as a wife

Tristán's relationship with her mother was worse than how she felt about her father; she was more severe with her mother for her plights than with her father. After leaving the countryside in 1818, Tristán and her mother settled in one of the poorest areas of Paris. Here is where her mother's wrongdoing would take place. Tristán explains in her Preface:

> We came back to Paris where my mother forced me to marry a man who I could not love nor esteem. I owe all my misfortunes to this union, but since my mother, from

> then on, has not ceased to show her deepest regret, I have forgiven her and in the course of this narrative I will refrain from speaking about her. (*Peregrinaciones* 83–84)

André-François Chazal "owned a small engraving workshop in Montmartre" (Grogan 19), and Tristán had been employed by him to colour his designs. Eventually, Chazal started courting Tristán, winning her mother's approval. According to Tilly and Scott, during the first years of the nineteenth century, while France was still a pre-industrial society:

> Marriage was, among other things, an economic arrangement, the establishment of a family economy. It required that couples have some means of supporting themselves and, eventually, their children. . . . for artisans, the mastery of a skill and the acquisition of tools and perhaps a workshop. Wives must have a dowry or a means of contributing to the household. (24)

During that period, middle and lower-class women were expected to actively participate in the family business. In Tristán's case, this meant helping her artisan husband in his engraving workshop alongside the domestic work. This scenario was completely different from the one Tristán had pursued, and could have been a reason why their marriage ended up being unsuccessful.

In accordance with Hawkes: "It was to escape from life with her mother in the poverty of the slums that Flora married her employer, the minor artist and engraver Andre Chazal, in 1821" (xiv). However, based on the letters Tristán and Chazal exchanged before their marriage, Grogan suggests "little evidence" to support the belief that "Tristan and her mother lacked basic necessities" (20). However, it is plausible that Anne-Pierre had imposed this union on Tristán, well aware of the fact that her illegitimate status would not bring her any better options; as had happened with the previous fruitless attempt to marry a well-off young man. Tristán, however, would not remain silent about the sufferings her mother's decision brought her. After rejection by her uncle and aware that she would not inherit her fair share as Mariano Tristán's daughter, only a small monthly allowance from her uncle, Tristán became angry at her mother in her *Peregrinaciones*: "How much harm you have done to me! . . . Ah! Mother, I forgive you, but the number of misfortunes you have put on me is too heavy for any human being to carry alone" (315). Their relationship would not improve when Tristán left André Chazal in 1825. Anne-Pierre and her brother (Tristán's uncle) initially opposed this, considering it an unfortunate decision, knowing it would totally exclude Tristán socially.

According to Dijkstra, the lack of support from her mother after her separation "might have influenced her views of women. Once it becomes clear that French society had rejected her, and that despite her father's noble background she was considered 'untouchable', doubly damned given the restriction of the Code Napoléon" (28). Following this, Tristán identified with neither her father nor her mother, and is one of the reasons she gave for representing herself as a "pariah" in her writings. According to Grogan, "Tristán adopted the 'pariah' role self-consciously, and used it to articulate both her sense of personal alienation and her broader view of the oppression endured by women in her society" (26).

Tristán wedded André-François Chazal on 3 February 1821 in "the eleventh *arrondissement* in Paris, [without a] religious service" (Ibid.). She was seventeen and Chazal was twenty-four. Tristán became the wife of an artisan and had to face all the responsibilities that came with it; she had to play the role society imposed on women: "[t]he 'good wife and mother'" (Ibid.). Tilly and Scott assert that "[o]nce a couple married, at whatever age, they began to have children" (26), and Tristán was no exception. In less than four years, Tristán had had two children and was expecting her third, Aline. This new phase in Tristán's life might have been a lot to handle and a big disillusionment, since Chazal would later criticise Tristán for never properly fulfilling her role. This might have been due to Tristán's aristocratic inclination and claims; she had not accomplished this desire of becoming noble by marrying Chazal or, as Grogan suggests, "she was not prepared for the unromantic reality" (28). Even though both families agreed to this union, "the marriage was a disaster" (26). Four years later, expecting her third child, Tristán would take her two children and leave Chazal permanently. The separation was mutually agreed at first; their eldest son "needed fresh country air to improve his health" (29), and this gave Tristán "the excuse she needed" (Ibid.) to leave her marital home in March 1825 and never return. According to Leprohon, six weeks after Tristán had left, "Chazal abandoned his home and the few belongings he had there. He especially accepted the separation to escape his creditors, but he told those around him that his wife, after having ruined him by her 'crazy expenses', had left taking the furniture" (29).

Tristán separated from Chazal at a time when divorce was illegal, and "legal separation [was] only permissible with considerable expense and difficulty" (Grogan 27); Grogan suggests this made Tristán "a social outcast in the eyes of many" (26), a pariah as a wife. Tristán left Chazal under the terms of the Napoleonic Code and while Charles X was king; during this period, married women were considered incapable and dependent on their husbands, to whom they owed total obedience. According to the Napoleonic Code: "A married woman [had] no domicile but that of her husband" (art. 108). This meant Tristán,

after leaving her husband, was forced to either remain unseen, disguise herself as a widow or hide her children and pretend to be single, as she did on her voyage to Peru. Tristán would confess:

> After separating from my husband, I had abandoned his name and taken my father's. I was welcomed everywhere as a widow or single, however, always rejected once the truth was uncovered. Young, pretty, and apparently enjoying a shadow of independence were sufficient reasons . . . to be repudiated by a society . . . that does not forgive any of its citizens trying to get rid of [its chains] . . . Living in the same town as my husband and my old acquaintances, it was really difficult for me to sustain a role when several circumstances could expose me. (*Peregrinaciones* 84–85)

Dijkstra notes that "society was pointing the guilty finger at her. What kind of woman was she? . . . she was a monster" (30) for leaving her husband and children. Leprohon indicates that Tristán would later "protest against 'old prejudices' of a society which [made] a woman separated from her husband an 'unhappy pariah'. All the injustices which she witnessed through the memories of her mother [were] repeated [then] for her, differently, but equally cruel" (30). Regarding Tristán's children, the Napoleonic Code dictated that "[a] child [could] not quit the paternal mansion without permission of his father" (art. 374). Therefore, Chazal was legally able to have them arrested. The legal help Chazal used to chase them and bring them back home allowed him to send multiple letters to different town councils and mayors to get information about his wife's and children's whereabouts in France.

In 1831, Tristán's first son died. Chazal had already discovered their location in Paris. However, due to his great debts, he only went to search for them in 1832. He had not yet met his daughter Aline, who was then aged five. The first of many violent scenes between the spouses happened in "Tristan's uncle's home at Bel-Air, north of Paris" (Grogan 30) at the beginning of 1832. Chazal wanted his children back. This confrontation resulted in a mutual compromise: "[Tristán] handed Ernest to his father in exchange for a signed statement that Chazal would agree to a legal separation, and to a divorce when that became possible" (Ibid.). Nonetheless, Chazal would only pretend to agree, subsequently following Tristán back to Paris to locate Aline and summon the police to take her. "[H]e assaulted her in the streets. Since she was his wife, this was his right" (Dijkstra 43); however, Tristán managed to escape.

Tristán would then initiate her "peregrination" around France, escaping from her husband who never ceased to write letters to town councils to find her. In April 1833, Tristán embarked on her voyage to Peru as a single woman in search of her Peruvian family and

inheritance, leaving Aline enrolled in a boarding school. Chazal "did not give up the search" (Grogan 30), and in October 1835, when Tristán had returned from her transatlantic trip and was again hiding from her husband, he abducted Aline on her way to school. Regardless of Aline's distress, as this was their first father-daughter encounter, Chazal was legally endorsed to do this. This would be the first of the many times Chazal captured Aline with the law on his side. The following years were a constant fight to keep her, with Tristán "powerless to prevent his successive abductions of Aline" (Dijkstra 44). The child would always manage to escape and go to her mother's house. However, she would then be sent back to the boarding schools chosen by Chazal.

In April 1837, Tristán received a letter from Aline in which "the child complained that her father had made sexual advances and, it seems, raped her" (Ibid.). Tristán, with the help of a lawyer and her son's witness testimony, "was finally able to move justice to her side" (Ibid.). Chazal was arrested, but did not remain incarcerated for long. During his short stay in prison, he wrote his *Mémoire* (1838) in which he "attacked his wife's morals" (Ibid.). Chazal used this pamphlet along with other testimonies to ask for his release; "the court found . . . there was insufficient evidence for the case to proceed" (Grogan 31) and released him in less than three months. Chazal had made thirty-five copies of his pamphlet and distributed them. In December of the same year, Tristán made a petition for the reestablishment of divorce, and used Chazal's defamatory pamphlet to ask for a legal separation. "In March 1838 Tristan finally gained the right to live apart from her husband on the grounds of this long history of conflict" (Ibid.). Tristán's children had to remain under their father's custody; however, Ernest carried on living with Tristán's mother, and Aline with Tristán.

A series of events such as the publication of *Pérégrinations d'une Paria* in January 1838, where Tristán revealed her domestic plights, the successful legal separation and the fact that none of the court's decisions had actually been fully executed, might have left Chazal without a choice but to "contemplate murder" (Dijkstra 44). Chazal, who was "the father of the family, who possessed in theory full legal rights over his children" (Grogan 31), was not fulfilling his as either a husband or a father. In September 1838, while Tristán was leaving home, "Chazal tried to kill her, but the bullets were not fatal, although one lodged permanently in her chest" (Dijkstra 44). At Chazal's trial, he admitted his motive was "not hatred or anger . . . but the desire for justice. Chazal's self-justification focused around his rights as husband and father" (Grogan 32); with his *Mémoire* publication, he was clearly defending the patriarchal family order, while Tristán's writings confronted the oppression of

married women. Tristán had become notorious after the publication of her travel journal, and this event made the French even more interested in her.

Tristán, in her *Peregrinations*, uses "the ignoble marriage [she] had been forced to contract" (40) to illustrate the specific adversities a woman was bound to go through if she ever wished to emancipate from the traditional female role at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Tristán blamed the Catholic Church for all the social problems their opposition to divorce brought. The inescapability of marriage was clearly mirrored in her *Peregrinations* and showed how women became social pariahs once being "liberated".

2.1.3. Pariah as a mother

Tristán's motherhood had been questioned from the moment she separated from her husband in 1825. Justice always gave Chazal total guardianship over their children and deny Tristán her right, as a mother, to be near her children Ernest and Aline even after Aline's alleged rape. This can be considered evidence that French society, in the nineteenth century, considered women who left their husbands as pariahs, not worthy of motherhood. Even Pierre Leprohon, a twentieth-century writer and author of the biographical book *Flora Tristan* (1979), considered Tristán as not efficiently fulfilling her role as a mother: "As for her children, left in the care of Madam Tristan's mother, they grew up like orphans" (31).

To understand why nineteenth-century society judged Tristán's motherhood and ostracised her socially after she separated from her husband, it is necessary to understand how the family was hierarchically organised. According to Scott and Tilly, in the middle classes, "the family . . . assigned the husband the role of the breadwinner and the wife the role of domestic manager and moral guardian" (41); in lower classes, the wife or daughters were expected to contribute economically to the household. The traditional nuclear family model in the nineteenth century, bolstered by the Napoleonic Civil Code, had the father as the authority. In Tristán's travel journal *Peregrinations*, she not only confesses to never having loved her husband but publicly questions marriage and the patriarchal system. By challenging this system she put the model at risk. This could be Chazal's justification for always having witnesses and support to show his wife was not the right role model for Aline, and why the French justice system always gave Chazal custody of their children.

In twentieth-century Europe, women's legal situation as wives had not totally changed. According to Crompton:

> [I]n England, rape within marriage was only criminalised in 1991, French men could formally forbid their wives to take up paid employment until 1965, and Portuguese women were by law subject to their husband's authority until the 1970's . . . the unravelling of the "male breadwinner model" towards more egalitarian models of work-family articulation across Europe is a complex and very slow process . . . [G]ender continues to shape experiences of work and family everywhere. (230)

What society required from women as mothers had not changed either, and may be the reason why Leprohon considered Tristán as a careless parent. According to Drew, "'Familistic' gender regimes presuppose[d] the existence of a home-based dependent wife who [was] responsible for home-making, childrearing and care of other family members" (28). Motherhood was part of marriage, and consequently women had an important role as mothers within the family. They were inculcated "a deep sense of responsibility for the primary upbringing and care of children" (110). Tristán's duties were not only domestic but also maternal. What was wanted from "[t]he mother – the symbolic heart of the family, peacemaker, and counsellor" (Grogan 115) was dedication, love, care and sacrifice. However, in Tristán's *Peregrinations*, certain attitudes could have been interpreted as opposed to what was expected from a mother in the nineteenth or twentieth century.

The exact date on which Tristán became a mother is uncertain; biographers suggest it could have been in 1822 or 1823. Her first-born's name as well as the reason for his early passing are also unknown. In 1824, Tristán gave birth to her second child, Ernest-Camille; and soon after to a daughter, Aline-Marie, in 1825: "Each of her children was placed with a wet nurse soon after birth" (116). Although this fact may seem careless from her side now, this was habitual among artisans as it "enabled artisanal wives like Tristan to continue to play their role in the family business, and this was probably the expectation when her sons were born" (Ibid.).

The death of Tristán's first child happened at Anne-Pierre Laisnay's house in 1831 while Tristán was away working for some English ladies. After Tristán separated from Chazal, she became the "breadwinner" for her three children. Her job had to be overseas as she had "failed to find satisfactory employment in Paris" (Ibid.). This part of Tristán's life was never fully shared, probably because her job position showed subordination, unlike what she was used to. However, being the companion to various English ladies initiated Tristán's life as a traveller. During the years Tristán was away, Chazal had significant debts and was avoiding his creditors, and this made Tristán leave her children in her mother's care. They

were never abandoned negligently like "orphans", as Leprohon suggested. In Book I of *Emile*, Jean-Jacques Rousseau states in a footnote that "[t]he first education [was] the most important, and this . . . belong[ed] incontestably to women; if the Author of nature had wanted it to belong to men, He would have given them milk with which to nurse the children" (37). According to Grogan, "Rousseau's admonitions on maternal breastfeeding in the 1780s had already begun to influence the behaviour of the well-to-do" (116), and by the time Tristán's third child was born, the mother's role was that of the "nurturer". Unfortunately, given the circumstances, this was a luxury Tristán could never afford. She had to leave Aline at only a few months old, only reuniting with her when she was four, after which she left Aline in France during her visit to Peru.

Grogan suggests that it is quite impossible to determine whether Tristán ever wished to be a mother or if she loved her children as "the sources which might uncover such personal sentiments do not exist" (Ibid.). It is indeed a fact that Tristán openly shared her personal plights as a married woman through her writings, and that there seems to be an absence of references about her motherhood or children in them. However, in Tristán's *Peregrinations*, she describes how distressing it was to deny her children by posing as a single woman in Peru: "my situation imposed restraint, and I was always conscious of the painful task I had undertaken in posing as an unmarried woman. I had to forget the whole of my past life . . . the existence of my children . . . I could not trust myself and did not dare to say a word for fear of mentioning my daughter . . . so I held my tongue . . ." (49–50). Tristán also felt guilt for having left her daughter in a boarding school back in Paris at the age of seven. She confessed:

> If my thoughts turned towards my daughter, I perceived the danger here too, and laboured unceasingly to banish her from my mind. I was so afraid of betraying myself by mentioning her. Ah! How difficult it is to forget eight years of your life, especially when you are a mother! . . . Joaquina's youngest child was the same age as my daughter . . . [she] reminded me of my poor Aline; at the thought, my eyes would fill with tears . . . Ah! wretched woman, I said to myself, what have you done? Grief has made you cowardly, unnatural; you have left your daughter in the care of strangers, perhaps she is ill, perhaps dead! Then my imagination exaggerated her danger as well as my guilt, and I fell into a fever of despair. (172)

Tristán's relationship with her daughter was stronger than the one with her son Ernest-Camille; perhaps because Tristán had given Ernest to his father's care in 1832 and had kept Aline from birth. According to Grogan, "Chazal did not meet his daughter until she was

10, when he finally abducted her on her way to school" (117). In her *Peregrinaciones*, Tristán mentioned the special bond she had with Aline: "If it had not been for the love I had for my children, especially for my daughter, whose fate concerned me greatly and led me to stay by her side to protect her and help her, without that sacred duty deeply pierced in my heart, . . . I would have killed myself . . .!" (85). Perhaps her affinity with Aline was due to her gender or that she was her second child, but this can only be speculated on. Nonetheless, the son-and-mother relationship endured regardless of their separation. According to Grogan, Ernest-Camille and Tristán maintained communication "without Chazal's knowledge, and it was Ernest who alerted Tristan to Chazal's intention to murder her" (117). This clearly demonstrated Tristán's son's consideration and affection for her.

It was not until Chazal's trial after his murder attempt that Tristán obtained custody of her children and was able to change their and her own last name to Tristán. She would then leave Paris to go to England for the fourth and last time, leaving her children behind once again. The fact that divorce was not allowed in Tristán's times forced her to be away from her children in order to provide for them. In her travel journal, Tristán blamed the indissolubility of marriage for making her feel like a "pariah" not only as a wife but also as a mother. Tristán might have used her *Peregrinations* intelligently to clean her reputation as a mother and show her maternal love for her children in order to obtain Aline's custody, but this is unknown. Yet, these injustices were not only Tristán's but any other woman's at the time, especially from the lower classes, as Grogan clarifies: "Tristán outlined the impossible situation in which women found themselves, forced to support a family or contribute to family income, but at the expense of caring for their children" (120). With her writings, Tristán clearly showed how distorted society's values and expectations from married women were. Grogan suggests that Tristán would have preferred to show her "'maternal' talents exercised on a broader social stage" (118) as the mother of the French workers. Already a socialist, after her visit to England, Tristán worked to liberate French working women from social order and economic inequity.

2.2. Flora Tristán, the peregrine

Tristán's international travels commenced when she was working as a companion to some English women during 1825–1829. She had "a visit to England in 1826, several trips into the provinces around 1830, another journey to England in 1831, and a voyage to Peru in 1833–4.

Tristan made two further trips to England in 1835 and 1839, and travelled extensively within France in 1843–4" (Grogan 44). However, her trip to Peru would become the most significant of all as it turned her into a feminist writer and introduced her to the world of politics. Tristán's *Peregrinations* was her travel journal in which she would present her "motivation and justification for her journey to Peru and her subsequent account of it" (Dijkstra 58), along with her "concern with women's fate" (Ibid.).

Tristán's voyage to Peru would give her a social purpose. A year after the publication of her *Peregrinations*, Tristán decided to travel to London for the fourth time with the specific objective of investigating and recording social conditions in "the monster city", as she called it. The product of her first-hand accounts of London's different public places in 1839 was her *Promenades dans Londres*[8] (1840). Unlike *Peregrinations*, this book has more formal documentation and information about London society. Already a socialist, after her trip, Tristán continued travelling within France in her pursuit to liberate the working class (proletariat), men and women, and died as a peregrine on her attempt to create the Workers' Union in France in 1844.

In this dissertation, only two of Tristán's journeys will be covered: her trip to Peru through her *Peregrinations*, and her trip to England through *The London Journal*. Her last travels within France will not be examined as they happened when Tristán was already a political activist attempting to unite the French proletariat. The trips that reveal the transformation of Tristán's feminist thought (Peru and London) will be examined chronologically as the second is a result of the experiences of the first. It is essential to analyse the conditions in which the second trip took place.

2.2.1. Peru

Tristán departed from Bordeaux aboard the *Mexicain* on April 7, 1833. In her *Peregrinations*, the author narrates her courage in leaving France as arising from the laws and prejudices that had "banished [her] from its midst" (1) and made her a pariah. Portal[9] states that four years

[8] Flora Tristán's original French work was *Promenades dans Londres* (1840), however, I will be using Jean Hawkes's English translation of the fourth edition published in 1842 entitled: *The London Journal of Flora Tristan*, to which I will be referring as *The London Journal* in this dissertation.

[9] Magda Portal was a twentieth-century Peruvian poet, feminist and transnational activist who gave Tristán the title of "Latin American feminist forerunner". While in exile she wrote the book: *Flora Tristan, Precursora* (1944). During the 1970s, Portal had an activist role advocating strongly for women's rights.

before leaving for Peru, Tristán had met "an official of the merchant navy called Zacharias Chabrié" (40) in a Parisian boarding house. Captain Chabrié "traded regularly with Peru" (Grogan 46) and had heard of the Tristáns in Arequipa. With Chabrié's help, Tristán sent "a first letter to her uncle Pío . . . in Peru" (Portal 40), informing him of her unfortunate situation regarding her parents and illegitimate status. Although Don Pío acknowledged Tristán as his niece and invited her to Peru, he did not recognise her as a legitimate heiress in his written reply of 1830.

It can be assumed that Tristán must have been disappointed at not receiving what to her was her right; however, besides receiving some monetary help from her uncle, she reconnected with her paternal family back in Peru. During the three following years, Tristán's life would become that of a fugitive, disguising herself as a widow or a single woman. By 1833, Tristán had been separated from Chazal for eight years, and "struggling to support herself and her children, Tristan made a desperate decision to go to Peru in hopes of claiming an inheritance from her father's family and thereby gaining financial independence" (Pratt 156). Tristán wished to re-enter society as a real Tristán, an aristocrat, and belong. Yet this endeavour would have been impossible if she had told the truth about her marital status. Tristán had experienced social exclusion for leaving her husband in France; therefore, she made the decision to pose as a single woman from the moment she boarded the ship.

Grogan affirms that "Tristan's voyage from Bordeaux, down the coast of Africa, across the Atlantic Ocean, around the Cape Horn into the Pacific, and up the coast of Chile to the port of Valparaiso, was still extremely hazardous in the 1830's" (47). Tristán was definitely not the first woman to make a transnational trip. However, as Pratt remarks, women travelling in this period were usually accompanying "the capitalist vanguardists" into "a wholly male, heroic world" (155). This was not the case for Tristán, and during her stopovers in Cape Verde and Chile, and especially after arriving in Peru, she became what Pratt calls an "exploratrice sociale". Tristán would return from her trip to Peru convinced that it was society that was rotten and had to change. Therefore, it is essential to analyse what situations or encounters during her transnational trips made Tristán a feminist in the first place, as well as a socialist .

Aboard the *Mexicain*, with Zacharie Chabrié as captain, "[t]here was a crew of fifteen (men) . . . (and) only four other passengers" (*Peregrinations* 2–3). Tristán was to be the only woman on board for the next "one hundred and thirty-three days" (6) of the voyage before arriving in South America. Chabrié, whom Tristán had met in 1829, was the only one who knew she had a daughter. In her *Peregrinations*, the author confesses: "In following the plan I

had made for myself, I had been obliged to lie to M Chabrié . . . I had kept my marriage from him. However, I still had to account for the birth of my daughter" (38). During the voyage, Chabrié fell in love with Tristán, and she recounts: "he conceived the idea of restoring me to the society which had banished me by offering the protection of his name" (39). Tristán's past eight years had been that of a social outcast back in Paris, so the thought of having Chabrié as a husband filled her with hope; however, she was well aware of the consequences her lies would bring. Her *Peregrinations* displayed her mixed feelings about not being able to plan a life as a divorced woman: "When he offered to marry me . . . I saw that he truly loved me . . . But this burst of gratitude was followed by despair at the thought of my position. An infernal mocking voice kept repeating: '*You are married!* Married to a contemptible creature . . . you are chained to him for the rest of your days, and you cannot break that chain here anymore than you could in Paris'" (Ibid.). Tristán's attitude towards Chabrié during the voyage would also be conflicted; she would give him hope whenever she felt she needed protection, being perfectly conscious of her marital status preventing her from any formal plan to remarry.

"[T]he first disappointment of the voyage" (9) happened once she arrived in Praia, the colonial capital of Cape Verde. Tristán's natural ethnographic curiosity made her leave the ship to spend the days on the island and "study the manners and customs of the people and take note of everything [she] found worth recording" (13). On this island, Tristán would witness colonialism of the worst kind. Dijkstra states that "[Praia's] economy was based on a human commodity, the slave trade" (59). One of the few people Tristán came to meet in Praia was M. Tappe, a Frenchman who had dedicated his life to being a slave trader. The Slavery Abolition Act of 1833 in the British Empire, which had made the purchase or ownership of enslaved people illegal within the territory and some of its colonies, had negatively affected the business, leaving M. Tappe in ruins. He recounted to Tristán:

> When I first settled on this island, ah, those were the days! There was money to be had then for very little trouble. For two years it was a good business; even after the abolition of the slave trade you could still sell as many negroes as you liked. But now those accursed English insist on such strict enforcement of the treaties that it has become too dangerous and expensive to transport the negroes, and the most profitable trade of all time has been completely ruined. Besides, nowadays everybody wants his cut from the business, so you make no more out of it than if you were selling bales of wool or cotton. (*Peregrinations* 25)

According to Gross, people in Britain no longer wanted "a system which they thought not only cruel, inefficient and objectionable from a religious or moral point of view, but also unnecessary for the national interest" (65).

M. Tappe's enslaved women had tried to poison him three times, therefore he had unwillingly married one of them and given her three children merely to avoid being murdered. M. Tappe confessed to Tristán that he was planning on leaving his family after he made his fortune, knowing his wife was fearful of rough waters and would never agree to go on a voyage to France with him. The fact that he would abandon his wife and children, having the certainty his wife would sell their children to survive, infuriated Flora to a point where her abolitionist thought manifested. Tristán would refer to M Tappe as "a cannibal in sheep's clothing" (*Peregrinations* 26) for profiting from the enslaved people with cruelty and abandoning his children and wife without remorse. As Grogan would explain, Tristán found telling this story relevant by making an extreme comparison between M. Tappe and European husbands "whose wife and children were also at his mercy" (34). Dijkstra concludes that this encounter showed Tristán that "the condition of servitude in its various forms extended beyond the boundaries of France" (59).

Tristán's perception of the places she visited during her trip was mostly negative. Kramer suggests that her "cross-cultural experiences" created a "strong cultural identit[y]" (792) as French. Her pride in European culture was shown in her cross-cultural comparisons, where "Europe was perceived as different *and* as more advanced, more civilised, more enlightened" (794). When describing the Cape Verdean inhabitants, Tristán would use the word "grotesque" to compare their costume to the French's. While in Praia, Tristán admitted: "I must confess how proud I felt as I compared our boat with the three others manned by negroes or poor Americans sailors. How trim our boat was, and how fit our sailors looked!" (*Peregrinations* 12). According to Grogan, due to her cultured European standards, her descriptions of housing, furniture, cuisine and table manners "emphasised the 'backwardness' of this society in comparison with Europe" (50).

However, this European superiority Tristán believed in did not meet her expectations when she witnessed the brutality of slave owners like M. Tappe. Tristán had been gladly received in Praia, unlike her treatment in France. She had been introduced to the wealthiest woman on the island, Madame Watrin, and the American consul, both belonging to the upper class of the Cape Verdean society. Tristán would learn differently when she noticed that both *civilised* aristocrats had *uncivilised* behaviour and beliefs towards the enslaved people. As Kramer affirms: "Tristan was highly critical of slavery's effect on slaves and slave owners

alike. The brutality of slave-owners shocked her" (797). On a visit to the American consul's residence, Tristán witnessed "one of those scenes of cruelty so common wherever slavery . . . persists" (*Peregrinations* 29). She recounted:

> This young consul, the representative of a republic; this elegant American, so courtly towards me, so agreeable towards M David, was from that moment no more than a barbarous master in my eyes. We found him below-stairs, savagely beating a big negro lying at his feet. The man's face was covered with blood. . . . I cannot describe what a painful impression this dreadful scene had upon me. I pictured the wretched Tappe among his slaves . . . Could all men be wicked? These reflections completely overturned my notions of morality. (29–30)

Tristán denounced this occurrence with Madame Watrin, hoping to find sound judgement. However, Mrs. Watrin encouraged the idea, replying: "if you were to live here for a week, you would no longer even think of them" (Ibid., 30). As Grogan concludes: "[Tristan] condemned the criminality of depriving other human beings of their freedom" (82). She could not help finding this revolting, and questioning the morality of those in power.

After more than four months, the *Mexicain* anchored in Valparaíso, Chile. Tristán bade Chabrié farewell and boarded the Leonidas to reach Islay, southern Peru, in September 1833. However, Tristán, the "exploratrice sociale", term used by Pratt to describe Tristán's role during her travels, used the fourteen days she had in Valparaíso to "devote [herself] to the role of observer, and . . . [explore] the town in every direction" (*Peregrinations* 60). This shows that Tristán had made the decision to study the places she would visit, their people, its customs, its beliefs, and society in not only Peru but England and France as well. Grogan calls her the "social scientist" as Tristán used her writings to promote social change. Grogan stipulates:

> Tristan's studies of French, English, and Peruvian society can be seen not merely as works of literature, then, but as ventures into "social science", as she sought to expose the "facts" she observed about those societies, and the reforms which were essential. This, in turn, justified the political stance she adopted as a socialist, engaged on a mission of social change. (79)

Tristán took detailed notes when interacting with people. She wanted to listen to what they had to say and analyse their socio-economic context in order to disclose their moral condition and suggest plausible solutions. However, due to Tristán's guise as a single woman, and how

difficult it was for her, she avoided certain social gatherings. Kramer points out: "Tristan's entry into Peruvian society provoked comparable disorientation and isolation . . . a period of solitude and alienation" (793). Although it is true that Tristán stayed with her paternal family members or with other Europeans in Peru, she always felt like a "detached spectator and lonely outsider" (Ibid.) – a pariah.

Once Tristán arrived in Peru, she was no longer the poor, separated woman escaping her husband and trying to make a living; she was Flora Tristán, niece of Don Pío de Tristán, the former and last interim viceroy of Peru. The treatment she received became that of an aristocrat. Tristán recounted, "they began to treat me with the deference reserved for persons of eminence in the republic" (*Peregrinations* 67). When arriving in Arequipa, her uncle Pío was absent, yet her welcoming was "just like one of those scenes of pomp and ceremony that you see in the theatre" (95). This was what Tristán was longing for: to belong. She was not simply visiting a foreign country, she was visiting family. As Grogan suggests, "Tristan hoped initially not merely to win her inheritance, but to establish herself as a 'real' Tristan, her father's daughter" (51). Being a foreigner, especially European, also made her someone interesting in Peru, unlike in France. Grogan affirms that, "Tristan's experiences as a visitor in Peru assigned her a privileged role and a way of interacting with others. She was a curiosity whom many wished to see and meet" (54). This was indeed a treatment Tristán was not used to receiving, and which somehow made her feel important and with certain power.

Her stay in Peru is key in this study as it was the turning point in her feminism and her political awakening. Tristán would witness and be part of countless social and political events that would notoriously change her perspective regarding her career and calling in life. When Tristán arrived in Peru, the country was no longer a Spanish colony, as it had become a republic in 1821. President Agustín Gamarra's government would soon come to an end, and the election of a new president was approaching. Basadre[10] recounts that "[t]he Political Charter of 1828 had decreed that in 1833 a National Convention had to be held to make new amendments. Thus, without the legislators having foreseen it, the meeting of such assembly came to be simultaneous with the presidential elections" (64). This particular political situation would create political instability and even the first civil war, the one Tristán would closely witness and the experience of which would make her want to be the first lady of Peru.

[10] Jorge Basadre was a Peruvian historian from the twentieth century who wrote numerous works in Spanish on the history of Peru from the nineteenth to the twentieth century. From this point onwards, I will translate all the citations from *Historia de la República del Perú 1822–1933* (2014).

Tristán first arrived in Islay, south of Peru, and travelled by mule and mare through the desert to the second most important city in the country, Arequipa. This was where Tristán's family resided and her accommodation for most of her stay. It was her cousin, Dona Carmen Pierola de Florez, who received her while her uncle, Pío de Tristán, was away in his Camana summer house. Grogan suggests that Don Pío seemed to "have delayed his return to Arequipa quite deliberately" (52), planning on how he would deny her inheritance, which he did.

In *Peregrinations*, Tristán would severely criticise the patriarchal society. From all the experiences she had in Peru, it was her encounters with aristocratic women that influenced her soon-to-be feminism, as they gave her personal problems, as a French artisan's wife, a level of generalisation and abstraction. Her cousin Carmen was the first of many examples Tristán would give in her journal resembling different types of women's oppression and the complications the impossibility of divorce brought.

Carmen, who came from a patriarchal family, had lost her mother early in life. Like Tristán, she had had no formal education and was self-taught instead. Carmen saw in marriage her only way of escape from her arrogant family. Her husband, Tristán's cousin, had squandered her dowry and humiliated her with several mistresses throughout their marriage. Carmen confessed that, after denouncing her husband's behaviour, she was told to "stop complaining and think herself lucky to have such a good-looking man for a husband" (*Peregrinations* 101). Tristán would question the principles of marriage and the unacceptable justifications society gave not to free women from immoral matrimonies like Carmen's. Her husband could publicly dishonour Carmen on the grounds that divorce was unattainable for her. Her cousin had been a clear example of a homely upper-class woman who had to choose between a cloister or marriage. After ten years, her husband returned home really sick and impoverished; she had no other option but to take care of him until his death and be left a destitute widow with her daughter.

Tristán suggested leaving the country after Carmen admitted how troubled and miserable she was, to which she responded: "Because of the harshest of all laws, necessity! If you have no money you are a dependant, a slave, you have to live where your master puts you" (105). Carmen associated her lack of freedom with her lack of economic independence. In this scene, however, Tristán would suggest otherwise: "Cousin, I am poorer than you, but I wanted to come to Arequipa and here I am . . . That freedom is a matter of *will*" (Ibid.). Perhaps Tristán's own self-perception as a strong, determined woman, travelling from Europe, attempting to break free from her oppression as a married woman with children in

France, made her innocently believe it was merely a matter of character and determination. Yet, Tristán had travelled to Peru for the same reason: necessity. As Dijkstra states: "Liberty, as Tristán already knew, is not the result of free will but is based on economic independence, the pursuit of which had lured Tristán to Peru in the first place" (60).

Carmen, assuming her foreign cousin was single, replied: "you cannot really appreciate the depths of misery in which [women] are condemned to live unless you are, or have been, married . . . marriage is the only hell I acknowledge" (*Peregrinations* 106). This situation made Tristán realise that women in Peru were "just as unhappy and oppressed as they [were] in France" (Ibid.). The lack of freedom was a collective struggle for women, regardless of their nationality or social status. The indissolubility of marriage and lack of economic independence was no longer Tristán's plight alone. Carmen described Peruvian women's plights and somehow showed her cousin that she was not the only pariah incarcerated by marriage and family:

> Ah! Florita, it is plain to see that you have not been oppressed by a tyrannical husband, . . . or exposed to the wickedness of men. You are not married, you have no family, you have been free in all your actions, absolute mistress of yourself; you have had no obligations towards society, so you have never been affected by its calumnies . . . most marry very young and their faculties can never develop because they are all oppressed to some extent to their masters. You do not know how much this secret suffering paralyses the morale of even the most fortunate and gifted women . . . (105–106)

Carmen had detailed the same condition and difficulties Tristán was having. Nonetheless, the author's European superiority was shown when she clarified: "But in Europe God has given more women the moral strength to free themselves from the yoke" (106). Tristán believed that the intelligence God had given Peruvian women was "doomed to sterility and inertia" (Ibid.).

Tristán chose to describe the story of her cousin Dominga Gutierrez de Cossio, a nun who escaped from one of the strictest convents in Peru, to depict a different type of women's oppression, the Church. As Grogan illustrates, "[w]ithin the limits of Peruvian and French society at that time, marriage with God or marriage with man were the only two options available to women" (63). Arequipa at that time was highly traditional, conservative and catholic. It was auspicious, a privilege and a good reason to commemorate for aristocratic

families whenever a member of their family consecrated his or her life to the service of God. This act would represent the family well and set an example.

Dominga was only fourteen years old when a Spanish doctor became interested in her; she was from one of the most opulent families in Arequipa, and this was enough for him to propose marriage. However, as Dominga was too young, her mother asked him to wait a year. To Dominga's misfortune, he found a new prosperous match not long after publicly announcing their engagement. Such humiliation was a lot for Dominga to process at such a young age, and "[i]n her despair she saw no other refuge save the cloister" (*Peregrinations* 200). Dominga was admitted at the Santa Rosa convent and remained cloistered there for eleven years. Due to her unhappiness and inability to adapt to the rigorous sacred life at the Carmelite monastery, she escaped in 1831.

Tristán, using her influence and making the most of the political crisis going on in Peru, managed to visit the interior of two of the most important monasteries in Arequipa: Santa Catalina and Santa Rosa, the latter with "the strictest and most austere régime" (Ibid. 191). Tristán found the convents depressing and extremist. The nuns in Santa Rosa had a vow of silence, and whenever they happened upon each other they could only utter: "'Sister, we must die', to which the other [gave] reply, 'Sister, death is our deliverance'" (Ibid. 190). All the nuns at the convent were afraid of speaking of Tristán's cousin; their Mother Superior thought of Dominga as possessed by the devil and wanted to go to Madrid to reinstate the Holy Inquisition.

In Dominga's third year, during one of her St. Teresa sacred readings, she came across the escape story of a nun from Salamanca and got inspired by it. The nun in the story had been tempted by the devil to place a dead woman's body in her cell to convince the religious community of her own death. It took Dominga eight years of careful planning before she could carry out her escape. With the aid of her enslaved black woman and the convent's porter, Dominga managed to bring a corpse into the convent, place her on the bed and burn it. It required great courage and strength but "is there anything the love of freedom cannot do?" (Ibid. 203). Everybody believed Dominga had burned herself; however, not long after the incident, Dominga made an appearance requesting the return of her dowry. She knew she was unable to have complete freedom without economic independence, but not long after she learnt differently.

Before leaving Peru, Tristán managed to visit her cousin. Ironically Dominga, whose bravery and determination were admired for achieving freedom, "live[d] in isolation, and although she [was] related to the wealthiest and most influential families in the country,

nobody dare[d] to see her, so great a hold do prejudice and superstition continue to exert on this ignorant and credulous people" (Ibid. 239). To Tristán's surprise, Dominga was beyond doubt unhappy, "much more than [she] ever was in Santa Rosa . . . ." (Ibid. 240). Dominga still felt chained to her indissoluble vows to the Church as Tristán was to marriage; society would still judge and criticise her for what she had done. Dominga was not welcome anywhere in Peru as people believed she belonged to her cloister; she could not even get a passport and flee. For society, Dominga "[was] still the nun of Santa-Rosa!" (Ibid.). Regardless of her high social status as a wealthy aristocrat, she could never thoroughly reincorporate into her secular life. She became ruthlessly rejected, and criticised even by her own mother. Social ostracism never made her feel free. Dominga questioned Tristán: "You call me *free*? In what country can a frail creature oppressed by a wicked prejudice be called *free*?" (Ibid.). Dijkstra concludes that with these two examples, "Tristán could examine both institutions, the family and the Church, in terms of their material and ideological effects. She discovered that their oppressive structures are as dangerous as the ideas they propagate. Dominga's story makes this as clear in terms of the Church as Carmen's had in terms of the family" (63–64).

In Jean Hawkes's introduction of *Peregrinations*, she states she had eliminated "a number of minor characters, among them . . . the ladies Tristan met in Lima" (xxix). One of these minor characters Hawkes omitted from the original French version was Madame Aubrit, a French woman who owned the guesthouse where Tristán stayed in Valparaíso. I consider this omission highly relevant to my dissertation as this encounter mirrored Flora's marriage situation and gave it a degree of abstraction. Gomashie claims that "Madame Aubrit was more than a hotel owner for Tristan, she was an example that marriage in France [made] women second-class citizens as they suffer[ed] many injustices. Tristan informed readers of her resilience, and the trials and hardship she endured after running away from her husband" (Gomashie 137). Madame Aubrit had got married to an aged military man, who was not of the kindest personality. She decided to leave him and run away with no means to subsist. "She wanted to make an honest living, but what to do? Aren't all doors closed to women?" (*Peregrinaciones* 181). In her attempt to survive, Madame Aubrit tried many jobs, though without further education she could not make a decent living. Later she met a young man who proposed going to South America and starting a new life. Unfortunately, six months after their arrival in Valparaíso, the young man died, leaving Mme. Aubrit carrying their child without any means of survival. M. Chabrié offered to take both to France. "However, she knew that in France she would be a miserable pariah and preferred to stay. . . . Mme. Aubrit's

story is that of thousands of women, who, like her, are on the margins of society and who have to suffer the horrors of misery and neglect. Our society seems insensitive to these misfortunes and the wickedness that gives rise to them" (Ibid. 181–182). Tristán mentioned Madame Aubrit in her journal as "one of the victims of marriage" (Ibid. 181) to back up her claim that French society did not aid abandoned or abused women, and even worse was complicit in their plight and poverty for not giving them opportunities to move forward. Yet, with this story she also showed Mme. Aubrit as "a symbol of female power, strength, and stamina" (Gomashie 137). Regardless of society's lack of support for women, Mme. Aubrit could endure the adversities and carry on abroad.

An example Tristán would use to support her belief that patriarchal families are also to blame for the misfortunes of their daughters, who then become enslaved in marriage, was the case of Caroline Riva-Agüero. The wife of the first president of Peru, young Caroline Delooz was from a privileged Dutch family, well-educated and elegant. José de la Riva-Agüero[11], after being expatriated from Peru, travelled to Brussels. He introduced himself to the Delooz family as the current president of Peru and fabricated a different reality of the country in his favour, solely to impress Caroline's ambitious father. Mr. Delooz saw in Riva-Agüero an opportunity for one of his four single daughters and agreed to his marriage proposal. Riva-Agüero was an unattractive aged man when Caroline, who was seventeen, discovered the agreement. Tristán recounted how:

> The young woman with despair in her soul lay at her mother's feet and asked for her protection. But alas!, the poor mother, a slave like her daughter, could not help confusing her tears with those of her child. The noble husband, absolute master of her family, saw all resistance silenced before his will. . . . not a single person was found who dared to reveal how the father was proceeding cruelly by throwing his daughter into the arms of an old hypochondriac and, recklessly, marrying her to a stranger. . . . (*Peregrinaciones* 503)

José de la Riva-Agüero was no longer a man in power. Caroline left Brussels pregnant and with an infant in arms, and followed her husband to Valparaíso, where they lived under unfortunate circumstances for two years. The situation was similar once they arrived in Lima, where Tristán met her. The story of this young European girl would exemplify and echo

[11] José de la Riva-Agüero was the first president of Peru after it became a republic (1823). His disagreements with Congress regarding the way he was managing Peruvian independence resulted in his deportation, first to Guayaquil and then to Europe.

Tristán's own hardship of a forced marriage young in life. She projected her struggles with André Chazal, her husband, onto other women by saying: "Killing the victim is less criminal than preparing for her a future of calamities. Forcing to love is the height of insanity that tyranny can reach" (Ibid. 502). Tristán proved she was not the only one trapped in a loveless marriage, and understood the universality of her problems. Caroline was another victim who would also support "her assertion that women were universally enslaved" (Gomashie 140). Marriage was not only oppressive to women in France, but went beyond national boundaries.

It is evident then that, with these four examples of oppressed women, Tristán aimed to make married women's private plights public. She stated in her Preface:

> If one considers the large number of crimes committed every day which are beyond the reach of laws, one will be convinced of the tremendous improvement in morals that would result from exposing private actions. Hypocrisy would no longer be possible, and perfidy, betrayal, and treachery would not, under their deceitful guise, constantly usurp the rewards of virtue. (*Peregrinaciones* 80)

Dijkstra affirms that "[a]s a married woman, Tristan knew that statistics were insufficient to describe the actual suffering of women. Therefore, she was determined to lift the veil of privacy covering the reality of married life" (58). This resonates with the second-wave radical feminism's popular phrase of the twentieth century: the personal or private is political. Tristán's first publication was a little brochure called *Nécessité de faire bon accueil aux femmes étrangères*. Aiming for social action at an international level, the author portrayed her personal solo travel experiences as a separated woman. Pratt claims this "manifesto" portrayed "the needs of women travelling abroad and exhorted women to educate themselves through travel" (171). Tristán claimed that the reasons for most women's struggles were based on their economic and social status. Dijkstra points out that "Tristan renounced the privacy she had so meticulously cultivated during the 1820s" (32), and went on to become a public person after her return from Peru; she intended to "fuse the private and the public, the personal and the universal, theory and practice" (Ibid.). Regrettably, Tristán's decision to expose her plights as a married woman in her semi-biographical book *Peregrinations* had the opposite effect. According to Puleo[12], it brought her defamation and denigration, similar to what happened to Doña Pancha in Peru where her enemies "[found] it easier to attack her

[12] *El reto de la igualdad de género* (2008) by Alicia Helda Puleo was originally written in Spanish. I have translated the citations used in this dissertation.

morals than her political actions" (*Peregrinations* 303). Puleo uses Flora Tristán as an example to support her claim that:

> In the history of patriarchy the public brilliance of distinguished philosophers has been undermined or hindered by defamation through matters related to their intimate lives . . . Flora Tristán also suffered an attempt at denigration. This woman . . . was subjected to violence by the republican lawyer who defended the canuts of the Lyon riots of 1834; the defense lawyer of the labor movement, in complicity with Tristán's murderer and ex-husband, used, in his defense, passages from the novels of this socialist and feminist thinker to condemn her for her "immorality". (272–273)

Tristán's plan failed for the same reason Doña Pancha's did: her gender. The author had probably anticipated it, and this could be the reason why she sought to register all these women's stories in her travel journal to make it seem like a collective protest against the patriarchal system.

Since Tristán was staying at her royalist uncle's house, "[i]t was impossible for [her] to escape the discussion of politics; . . . it was the sole topic of conversation" (*Peregrinations* 175). Pratt states that this house was a "strategic meeting place" (166) for the royalists, colonels, priests and governors in Arequipa. Tristán closely witnessed how politicians ran the country, especially during the presidential elections of 1833 and the first civil war of 1834. "Tristan [engaged] deeply with the crisis in her account, portraying herself offering sound advice to all sides, remaining calm in the crisis, visiting military encampments, and heroically climbing to the rooftop to survey the battlefield" (Ibid.). To Tristán, "Peruvians [were] all political opportunists" (*Peregrinations* 80) and untrustworthy, like her uncle Don Pío. "[She] could not help pitying the plight of Spanish America" (156) since no government had been able to "protect the persons and property of its citizens" (Ibid.). Pratt suggests that, after the failure to become a Tristán, and noticing how corrupt the system was, "Tristan formed the ambition of becoming a political activist. Crucial to her transformation was one of the most dramatic figures in Peruvian public life, Doña Pancha, wife of Agustín Gamarra, Peru's president from 1829 to 1833" (166). Tristán had found a role model. Doña Pancha had "exercised more real power than the President himself" (Kramer 803); however, when her husband lost power in 1834, Doña Pancha was sent into exile. Tristán, who had wished to create social change by ruling Peru through and alongside Colonel Escudero, understood that "the exercise of state power (even indirectly) could never offer the satisfactions of true freedom" (Ibid.). Doña Pancha was to Tristán an admirable example of sacrifice, ambition

and determination, but also of the futility of women's political ambitions.

Peru, then, became the place where Tristán's feminist consciousness emerged; it gave her a calling. As Dijkstra concludes: "Tristan had already indicated which options she rejected, which institutions she must fight, and which image of herself she could admire . . . Tristan presented herself and her reader with one possible conclusion: the necessity for social change" (72). Tristán would initially try to achieve this as a feminist writer by publishing her travel journal, *Peregrinations*, four years after her return from Peru (1838). The author's public life started after she decided not to use a pseudonym, like contemporary writers, or her initials like in her first pamphlet, but her full name: Flora Tristán.

2.2.2. London

This subchapter will illustrate Tristán's transformation into a socialist feminist, under which circumstances she would accomplish her last trip to London and what the author's goals were for it.

Tristán left France for Peru in 1833, three years after the glorious July Days and the ascendance of King Louis Philippe. During the first five years of the king's reign, while Tristán was running from her husband, fighting for custody of her children and seeking legal recognition from her family in Peru, several popular anti-republican movements and confrontations between the bourgeoisie and the initial proletariat occurred. McPhee explains that "the July Monarchy policies were pursued to smother workers' organisations and to hold wages down" (117). The new repressive legislation against the press and associations led to great discontent for the republicans and the working class, as their working conditions deteriorated. Major revolts had taken place during those years and "forces of repression [became] far more organized" (Ibid., 136). Dijkstra recounts that, during Tristán's absence, "the government had 'handled' the 1834 insurrection of Lyon in the style of the massacre of the Rue Transnonain in Paris, which occurred the previous April" (73).

Within this new political and socio-economic context after Tristán's return from Peru in 1835, she chose a more acceptable approach to manifest her feminism: writing. "She published a pamphlet and some articles in 1835–6" (Grogan 6), followed by her semi-autobiographical book in 1837 and her novel *Méphis* in 1838. In 1839, after her husband Chazal was imprisoned for attempted murder, Tristán decided to visit London for the fourth time "with the firm resolve to discover everything for [herself]" (*The London Journal*

85). *The London Journal*, "an account of the dramatic contrast between wealth and misery in the 'monstrous city'" (Grogan 6), would be the result of her observations of English society.

Tristán had been in socialist and feminist circles. However, her works before her visit to England cannot be considered socialist, only feminist. It was after the realisation of this particular trip in 1839 that Tristán's focus shifted "not only to exploring the condition of workers in her own country, but to finding a remedy for the social ills she observed" (Ibid.). Her last London visit made her into a social activist as well as a writer. Tristán went from being a spectator of social events in her country to one of its protagonists. For Grogan, *The London Journal* had more of a political purpose than that of creativity: "[t]he voice of the social reformer and political radical was certainly clearer than ever before in this work" (70). In *The London Journal*, social issues were thoroughly described and criticised, and were, along with women's subordination, approached from a perspective based on economics. To understand the reason why Tristán decided to enter feminist and socialist politics and study the evolution of her feminist socialist ideas, it is key to look at her visit to the "monstrous city" and what she witnessed and experienced there.

Tristán had been to England three times before while working for some English women. However, thirteen years after her first visit, "between May and August 1839" (55), her perception of the English society changed. The new socio-economic context and its effects on class society were shocking to the author. At the time, England was one of the most industrialised countries in the world and its capital one of the most populated cities. The advances and progress industrialisation had triggered were evident. Nonetheless, the consequences brought by the Industrial Revolution were devastating. For Tristán, the prosperity was only for a few and not equitably shared. As Cross affirms, after having visited London three times, Tristán "was unable to restrict herself to the subject of architecture . . . (she) knew exactly what was behind the lavish exteriors of London banks and industrial machines: power of wealth and the power to exclude" (57). The author was determined to document the human suffering she witnessed in England and dedicate her work to "the very people she was criticizing" (Ibid.), as she had done with her *Peregrinations*, but also to "[warn] French workers to avoid similar mistakes" (Ibid.).

The London Journal was different from *Peregrinations* as "Tristan eliminated autobiographical elements entirely" (Dijkstra 139). However, the author could not avoid certain elements of a memoir, such as the moment she thought she had found Chabrié in the madhouse. Unlike in *Peregrinations*, the text is not chronologically ordered. Tristán organised it in chapters dedicated to the different institutions she visited and to situations she

wanted to analyse in order to expose those oppressed women and the working class. "[T]he 'travel' elements were overshadowed by deeper concerns . . . that [led] to unavoidable conclusions" (140), just as in *Peregrinations*.

> The book opens with an impressionistic description of London seen through the eyes of the bewildered newcomer, followed by . . . the effect of climate upon mental development. . . . Then come first-hand accounts of visits to political meetings, factories, prisons, schools, slums, a brothel, an asylum and the races, all used as a base from which to investigate the functions of institutions in a repressive society . . . (Hawkes xxiii)

In finding evidence of the detrimental effects of industrial capitalism and the new economic system in England, Tristán not only reported what she witnessed during her travel, but also presented authoritative documentation about London in the first half of the nineteenth century, which made the book more convincing.

Throughout the book, Tristán shows her concern with the social outcasts in London – the prostitutes, the criminals and the mentally ill. One of the book's chapters is devoted to evincing women's oppression through prostitution. According to Dijkstra, Tristán aimed to expose "the two situations in which women found themselves most often, as prostitute and housewife. In both cases, women were alienated in an even more basic sense than men: they were alienated from their own bodies" (178). Tristán's empathy for prostitutes was non-existent, as she found this act a "revolting degradation":

> But I cannot understand the prostitute. To surrender all rights over herself, annihilate her will and feelings, deliver her body to brutality and suffering, her soul to contempt! The prostitute is an impenetrable mystery to me. . . . I see prostitution as either an appalling madness or an act so sublime that my mortal understanding cannot comprehend it. To brave death is nothing – but what sort of death faces the prostitute? She is wedded to sorrow and doomed to degradation: physical torture endlessly repeated, moral death every moment, and – worst of all – *boundless self-disgust*! (*The London Journal* 81).

While visiting the Jewish quarter, Tristán recounted:

> Not far from Petticoat Lane is the street where Jewish prostitutes live; its appearance is so hideous and disgusting that however much I may be upbraided for my weakness, I must confess that I did not have the courage to venture inside. At the windows I

> noticed five or six nearly naked women . . . it was too repulsive for words! Not a single policeman is ever to be seen in this quarter; the poor pariahs are left to themselves. (172)

For Tristán, surrendering willingly to wealth, the "world reserved for men's sole enjoyment" (82), showed their complicity in their own subjugation. The low self-respect and lack of dignity in the absence of money were an aberration for the author. To understand why this became a social issue, Tristán suggested "[p]rejudice, poverty and servitude" (81) as the main reasons most women from lower classes chose prostitution. She maintained:

> [I]f . . . men did not impose chastity on women as a necessary virtue while refusing to practice it [themselves], they would not be rejected by society for yielding to the sentiments of their hearts, nor would seduced, deceived and abandoned girls be forced into prostitution. If you allowed women to receive the same education and follow the same professions as men, they would not be crushed by poverty while men prospered. If you did not expose them to the violence and abuses that parental despotism and the indissolubility of the marriage bond entail, they would never be forced to choose between oppression and dishonour. (Ibid.)

Prejudices and laws oppressing women developed from a double standard with regards to virginity and married life. In Fourier's *Theory of the Four Movements* (1808), quoted by Tristán, he denounced: "Is not her consent to the marriage bond a mockery, forced upon her by the tyranny of the prejudices which beset her from her earliest childhood?" (244). Women from the high and middle classes were expected to marry and be chaste and have no sexual freedom before matrimony. Their moral education came from the Bible, which Tristán considered a "paradox" in English society. The "scriptural education . . . insist[ed] that a young girl should be pure, chaste and innocent" (247). However, Tristán knew that the Bible also carried "a number of obscenities, indecent stories and improper descriptions . . . with scenes of rape, orgy, adultery and prostitution" (248). According to Shulman, "sex was considered a strictly biological, psychological, personal, or religious matter" (590); something within the private sphere which was not publicly discussed by the first-wave feminists. Tristán's criticism of sexual inequality and the double standards of morality in a way resonates with radical feminism and sexual liberation. As Shulman affirms, it was the "radical feminists (who) boldly declared that 'personal is political', opening for political analysis the most intimate aspects of male-female relations" (Ibid.). Tristán

concluded that women only married due to the social pressure upon them; men either considered women as "a machine for manufacturing babies" (*The London Journal* 252) or "an object for [their] sole use" (249). Women could not call their bodies their own either in marriage or as prostitutes.

Prostitution was a lower-class issue. For Tristán, it was "the most hideous of all the evils caused by the unequal distribution of wealth" (81). Young women from the lowest social order were driven into prostitution by poverty or hunger. Tristán stated that "women [were] barred from working on the land, so when they [could] find no work in the factory, their only resources [were] servitude or prostitution" (83). Walkowitz, who considers prostitution an occupation in the Victorian era, explains that "[p]laced in a vulnerable economic and social position, some (women) may have found the shorter hours and better pay of prostitution a temporary solution to their immediate difficulties" (14). Some of them later managed to find respectable jobs or settle down. For other poor women, prostitution played an important economic role in their families and continued longer, as the political economy of the poor working class did not seem to see any improvements. Walkowitz states that: "Being poor, these young women had left home for economic reasons; hence, on a daily basis they were expected to survive on their own resources" (16). Prostitution was their only opportunity for economic independence or to stop being a burden for their parents. "The stereotyped sequence of girls seduced, pregnant, and abandoned to the streets fitted only a small minority of women who ultimately moved into prostitution" (18) because of prejudices. One of the sources Tristán used to back up her claims and everything she witnessed was Dr. Michael Ryan's book *Prostitution in London* (1839). Dr. Ryan was an English evangelical physician who dared to "provoke an outcry from the upper classes whom it unmasked, and outrage the hypocritical conventions of English morality" (*The London Journal* 90). Tristán used his work to quote figures and statistics regarding the number of prostitutes in London and their socio-economic backgrounds. She aimed at unveiling the extremely limited opportunities for women from the working class and how the English system would only see them as objects from whom they could benefit, just as they did with the workers. Tristán's solution for this "social evil" echoes liberal feminists' proposals, which was giving both sexes the same education and job opportunities. A social, economic and educational equality between the sexes would free women.

Servitude was Tristán's third reason for prostitution in London. Her idea of servitude focuses on the oppression and subordination women suffered due to the patriarchal system. As Dijkstra explains, "Tristan, we should remember, was the victim the 'pouvoir maternel'

['the rule of her mother'], which had consigned her to Chazal and condemned her for leaving him" (184). According to Tristán, a woman while single had to endure "parental despotism" and tyranny; once married she had to submit to her husband who demanded "respect and the passive obedience of a slave . . . because he consider[ed] her to be his property" (*The London Journal* 249). The author believed the structures of parental and marital domination were as big as those with prostitution. She criticised the fact that women within marriage or prostitution were seen as objects of men's desires from which the latter benefited sexually or economically. Tristán found "repulsive" the fact that "young [men] *marri[ed] for a dowry*" (88), like in the case of her Peruvian cousin Carmen. Grogan suggests that: "In this sense, the prostitute's situation in selling her body for money was different in degree rather than in kind from that of the legal wife, who was also 'sold' in marriage under the dowry system" (136), none of them freely consenting. Women, pressed by social prejudices, married hoping to enjoy "a more important place in the world" (*The London Journal* 251) and have some kind of social security, though ended up "cloistered" at home. Prostitutes, who initially chose more economic freedom, eventually became social outcasts. To Tristán "the married woman [was] very much sadder than that of the spinster; . . . In England, the wife [was] not mistress of the household . . . she [was] almost a stranger . . . the husband [held] the money and the keys . . . he [had] sole charge of everything" (249). Prostitution, then, was not the only system oppressing English women. Tristán's judgement again echoed radical feminism's tenets. Shulman explains that radical feminists sought to regain the power to their sexuality, to take "the control of [their] lives and [their] bodies that men – through the laws, customs, and other institutions of a male-ruled society – had appropriated" (596–597).

When Tristán visited London for the fourth time, England was the world's most industrialised country and had the biggest working class. Portal affirms that the Industrial Revolution and its impact on the lower class in "the monstrous city" "became the school to [Tristan's] social experiences . . . Flora made it a task to learn . . . the life and sorrows of the British working class, which according to her version the proletariat was exploited even harder than the French" (88). At that time, as Dijsktra explains, "[i]n England the economic effects of industrialism were more obvious and the class struggle more advanced" (151) than in France. The industrialism effects and capitalism in France "[were] at an earlier stage of development. In a sense, Tristan had to go to London to discover the truth about France's future" (Ibid.).

Sperber indicates that socialism was "developed after about 1830" (319). This political movement was "characterized by a search for totality, one that centred on the rapidly

expanded economy" (Ibid.). This author acknowledges French authors Henri de Saint-Simon and Charles Fourier, along with the English industrialist Robert Owen, as "the three intellectual founding fathers of socialism" (Ibid.). According to Grogan, "Tristan's interest in socialism only [became] visible historically on her return to Paris from Peru in 1835. At that point she deliberately sought to make contact with the socialist community and to evaluate what their theories had to offer, and it was Charles Fourier who attracted her initial interest" (99). Tristán's affinity with these three doctrines was initially due to the feminist aspect involved in them. Sperber explains that:

> [A]bolishing private property seemed to go hand in hand with abolishing women's inferior position in society. In one way or another, the thinkers . . . asserted that the capitalist system oppressed women. It forced them into marriage as a property transaction . . . With the abolition of private property, socialists asserted, relations between men and women would be characterized by . . . voluntary commitment; collective and cooperative labour would lessen the burdens of child-rearing and housework. Women and their labour would gain a dignity equal to that of men. (319)

Women's emancipation was Tristán's initial goal prior to her concern about the proletariat. It was her first-hand observations in London that made her realise the need to emancipate the working class and also the importance of unifying women along with the workers for a common good.

Before addressing women's plights in London, Tristán analysed and described the different hardships of the working class, whom she called the "pariahs of society". The author noticed how socially fragmented and divided the English society was. She indicated that the real struggle was between:

> [L]andowners and capitalists on the one hand, and urban and rural workers on the other: that is between men who possess both wealth and power, and for whose profit the land is governed; and men who possess nothing – no land, no capital or political power – yet pay two-thirds of the taxes . . . and are starved by the rich whenever it suits their interests to make them work for less pay. (*The London Journal* 37)

Tristán recognised the workers as the impoverished and exploited class. As Sperber explains:

> At the bottom of this industrial social pyramid were the factory workers themselves, whose lives differed in three crucial respects from those other wage-earners of the era . . . First, they worked their twelve- or fourteen-hour days to the rhythm of machines,

> standing in front of the untiring mule-jennies and power looms. . . . Second, factory workers were dependent of their wage for their living, and would have nothing in the foreseeable future but further wage labour. . . . Finally, the social distance between capitalist elites and their "hands" was very large and pronounced. The two groups lived in separate worlds, with little or no personal interaction. (237)

Tristán emphasised the lack of laws protecting the workers or any legal representative. To the author, their situation was worse to that of enslaved people: "I only want to show that English laws treats the workers more harshly than the autocratic French master treats his negroes, and that the slave of English capitalism has a far heavier task to earn his daily bread and pay his taxes . . . the English worker and his family are at the mercy of the manufacturer for their very existence" (*The London Journal* 67). The division of labour had been carried to extremes. The industry had made considerable progress, but the workers' functions had turned dull and reduced them to "cogs in the machine". Sanitary conditions in and out of their workplace were not at all ideal: "Most workers lack clothing, bed, furniture, fuel, wholesome food – even potatoes!" (68). At work they breathed "fibres of cotton, wool or flax, or particles of copper, lead or iron" (69). Tristán also perceived how the absence of enjoyment or interaction at work gave the workers a "stupid, brutish, thoroughly evil expression" (Ibid.) on their faces. Tristán recounted: "In English factories, unlike ours, you never hear snatches of song, conversation and laughter. The master does not like his workers to be distracted from their toil for one moment by any reminder that they are human beings; he insists on silence, and a deathly silence reigns" (Ibid.). Despite Tristán's "admiration for all the machines" (73), her protest in these first chapters of *The London Journal* aimed to reveal the downsides of industrialism: the injustice, oppression and inequality from the upper classes against the working class. Tristán was repulsed by this social evil, considering it "worse than the *slave trade*; [she could] think of no crime more monstrous, except cannibalism!" (75). As Dijkstra suggests, the author regarded the upper classes as "murderers". Tristán's account of the working-class conditions not only intended "to make the upper-class aware of the effects of their well-being, and to make them uncomfortable" (150), but also to condemn "the inhumanity and immorality of a system which allowed such abuses to continue" (Grogan 86).

The degradation and demoralisation caused by capitalism were witnessed in not only factories but also neighbourhoods. Tristán chose St Giles Parish, more precisely the Irish Quarter, to exemplify the overpopulation and misery of its inhabitants. She could not avoid feeling "indefinable compassion" while recounting:

> Hardly have you gone ten paces when you are almost suffocated by the poisonous smell. The alley, completely blocked by the huge coal-yard, is impassable. . . . another unpaved muddy alley with evil-smelling soapy water and other household slops even more fetid lying everywhere in stagnant pools. . . . the atmosphere is stifling; there is no fresh air to breathe nor daylight to guide your steps. . . . The slimy mud beneath your feet gives off all manner of noxious vapours, while the wretched rags above you drip their dirty rain upon your head. . . . Picture, if you can, barefoot men, women and children picking their way through the foul morass; some huddled against the wall . . . children wallowing in the mud like pigs. But unless you have seen it for yourself, it is impossible to imagine such extreme poverty, such total degradation. I saw children without a stitch of clothing, barefoot girls and women with babies at their breast, wearing nothing but a torn shirt . . . I saw old men cowering on dunghills, young men covered in rags. (*The London Journal* 156–157)

Gauldie explains: "The working man's family had most often not enough space, not enough warmth, not enough light, not enough furniture" (92). However, with the Irish quarter example, Tristán wanted to show the extreme poverty of rural and Irish people who were forced to migrate in search of work. Tristán also wanted to emphasise the "logical" moral consequences of the unequal social order, which were "reflected in the problems of prostitution, crime and drunkenness that plagued working-class life" (Grogan 87).

Despite witnessing unfortunate scenarios regarding working-class life and working conditions, Tristán's socialist idealism can be seen when she confesses:

> If at first I felt humiliated to see Man brought so low, his functions reduced to those of a machine, I was quick to realise the immense advances which all these scientific discoveries would bring: brute force banished, less time expended on physical labour, more leisure for Man to cultivate his intelligence. But if these great benefits are to be realised, there must be a social revolution; and that revolution will come . . . (*The London Journal* 71)

Although at this stage it is uncertain what kind of social revolution she had in mind, it is evident that her trip to London marked her transition from a feminist into a socialist feminist.

3. Flora Tristán and the initial construction of her feminism

Throughout Tristán's travels and, most importantly, her journals, her concern regarding women's oppression and thoughts on how to liberate them is visible. Feminism was, since the very beginning, her inspiration and strength in her writing and proposals. In this chapter we will follow what ideologies, experiences and people influenced Tristán's feminism in the first place and how they shaped it into a socialist feminism in the end.

3.1. Flora Tristán's feminist influences

The fight for the vindication of women's rights began during the Enlightenment years. It was the French Revolution of 1789 that influenced the evolution of feminism indirectly and shaped the political context in which Tristán would grow up. During the last decade of the eighteenth century, pamphlets, brochures and publications addressing women's social and political issues circulated. The aspirations of "liberty, equality and fraternity" had inspired feminists to hope for equal legal rights. It was primarily the principle of equality that guided the Enlightened feminism, one which challenged the perpetuating patriarchal system. As Grogan affirms: "To Tristan's way of thinking, the moral principles on which a transformed society might be constructed had been incarnate in the French Revolution, . . . [which] marked one significant historical moment when the 'spirit of liberty' had made progress" (108). Tristán, however, was also influenced by Romanticism, which had a meaningful effect on politics at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This movement valued emotions over reason and stressed the differences between men and women. Women were idealised and expected to follow a variety of roles in society, such as Angel, Muse, Saint or Madonna. Romantic feminism defended the rights of women by virtue of their moral superiority, not the equality of sexes like Enlightened feminism. Both feminist approaches are reflected in both of Tristán's books studied in this dissertation. Nonetheless, the author's shift of feminist approach happened after her social observations in London, where she learned more about the situation of women and the working class in industrial England. Hence her last writing, *Union Ouvrière*, which will not be used for this dissertation, echoed a socialist feminism.

3.1.1. Enlightenment feminism

The *Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen* (1789) reflected the Enlightened values of the French Revolution. This declaration put an end to the system of privileges of the Ancien Régime, which had fostered legal inequality among French citizens, by recognising equal natural rights solely to men. Excluding women from this juridical progress exposed the irony of the equality formulation principle in the French Revolution. It can be said that it marked the greatest failure for women's emancipation. However, to Tristán, it was a triumph of liberty: "The Revolution had introduced freedom everywhere" (*The London Journal* 190). Not only had the principle of equality terminated class differences, but it had also acknowledged that reason belonged to all human beings.

Women's general discontent was eminent considering that women's exclusion contradicted the enlightened and universalist theory of natural law, yet they found a way to demand "to be treated as full human beings" (Dijkstra 17). As Moses explains: "The most important feminist publicists of the early years of the Revolution . . . Condorcet, Olympe de Gouges, Etta Pal d'Aëlders, and Théroigne de Méricourt . . . demanded full political equality of the sexes" (10) through their writings. Grogan affirms that, "Tristan was familiar with a range of Revolutionary publications, including some of its most radical literature, suggesting some familiarity with women's role in Revolutionary Politics" (109).

However, as Dijkstra states: "If the Revolution marked the culmination of a period dominated by feminist energies, so the period that followed marked their repression" (18). In 1804, Enlightened rationalism was reflected in the Napoleonic Code, which worsened women's subordination to men. Moses explains:

> The Civil Code recognized the equal rights of all citizens but excluded women from the definition of citizenship. Women had been reduced to the status of a legal caste at the same time that the *ancient régime* legal class system was abolished for men. . . . The code would serve as a rallying point for feminist protest not only because it discriminated against women but also because it intensified women's sense of sex identification. . . . the code helped shape a feminist consciousness. (18)

The French Civil Code stressed gender differences. As Barbara Taylor notes: "All nations within the Enlightened orbit (particularly France . . . as well as Scotland and England) produced thinkers who pondered, among other things, the social functions of the family, the

respective duties of husbands and wives in domestic life, the biological and psychological differences between the sexes, [and] the impact of sexuality on manner and morals" (265). Tristán grew up well aware of the restrictions society had placed on women in the public and private spheres. She denounced them in both of her travel journals: "[Napoleon] transformed marriage into servitude and trade into sharp practice; he attacked equality" (*The London Journal* 189). Women had lost nearly all the rights they had won during the Revolution. The more egalitarian laws became among men, the more evident inequality towards women was; patriarchy had continued to dominate the system through absolute parental and marital control. Tristán concluded that women without "civil or political rights . . . [were] inured to hypocrisy: [they] alone [had] to bear the brunt of public censure" (245).

As a result of her travels, Tristán realised women suffered the same misfortunes in Peru and London as in France. Unlike Peru, Barbara Taylor explains: "Britain, and to a lesser extent France, took the lead in this feminist advocacy . . . The world of Enlightened intellectuals, both male and female, was a cosmopolitan one, in which national boundaries were readily crossed" (263). Taylor states that English and French feminists were familiar with each other's works as well as Scottish and German publications. Tristán was conversant with the works of English middle-class writers such as Lady Montagu, Lady Morgan, Lady Blessington and Lady Bulwer Lytton. In *The London Journal*, Tristán condemned English writers for not daring "to embrace the cause of women's liberty" (253) and fight. She believed public opinion could function as a fundamental tool to change women's status of subordination. Thus, for Tristán, female writers had the responsibility towards their sex to denounce their plights and oppression. Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), a work inspired by French revolutionary events, would be the exception for the author. Tristán acknowledged Wollstonecraft as the only "voice which was not afraid to attack every prejudice and expose the lies and iniquities of which they [were] made" (*The London Journal* 253). Tristán incorporated passages from the book to demonstrate that "civil and political rights belong[ed] in equal measure to *both* sexes" (254), and to persuade women to abandon "their subordinate status and become full moral agents in the world" (Hunt 11).

Wollstonecraft's ideas in favour of civil and political rights for women echo Liberal Feminism. Her egalitarian vision was strengthened after the French Revolution disappointment regarding women's rights for independence and education. Both authors aimed to fight the patriarchal system and the appearance of rationality encouraging claims of women's inferiority. Challenging Rousseau's ideal role and behaviour of women stated in *Emile* created not only enthusiasm but also controversy and criticism. Both authors' personal

lives were used against them to discredit their fight for the equality of the sexes, and they were disregarded as "bluestockings". Perpetuating Rousseau's concept of women "that woman must be *weak and passive,* . . . that woman was made *to be subject to man*; . . . make herself agreeable and obey her master" (*The London Journal* 256), restraining women from the public sphere and denying them their natural rights despite the revolutionary events in France, encouraged Wollstonecraft to dedicate *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* to the French minister M. Talleyrand-Périgord as a protest against the biased principles on which their legislations were based:

> Consider . . . whether, when men contend for their freedom, and to be allowed to judge for themselves respecting their own happiness, it be not inconsistent and unjust to subjugate women, even though you firmly believe that you are acting in the manner best calculated to promote their happiness? Who made man the exclusive judge, if woman partake with him the gift of reason?
>
> In this style, argue tyrants of every denomination, from the weak king to the weak father of a family; they are all eager to crush reason . . . Do you not act a similar part, when you *force* all women, by denying them civil and political rights, to remain immured in their families groping in the dark? . . .
>
> But, if women are to be excluded, without having a voice, from a participation of the natural rights of mankind, prove first, to ward off the charge of injustice and inconsistency, that they want reason – else this flaw in your NEW CONSTITUTION will ever shew that man must, in some shape, act like a tyrant, and tyranny, in whatever part of society it rears its brazen front, will ever undermine morality. (viii–xi)

Wollstonecraft's enlightened ideas to claim "freedom for women as a *right*, in the name of the principle on which human justice and injustice [were] founded" (*The London Journal* 255), decisively influenced Tristán, who urged the working class to do the same in her last book *Union Ouvrière*.

Tristán would also become an advocate for women's right to education. In Peru, after meeting the *rabonas*[13], whom Tristán considered superior native women for enduring "far greater hardships than the men" (*Peregrinations* 180) while also fulfilling motherhood duties,

[13] *Rabona* was the name given to the Peruvian native woman who silently accompanied her husband or partner on endless military campaigns during the nineteenth-century wars for emancipation.

she admitted: "I do not believe it possible to adduce a more striking proof of the superiority of woman in primitive societies; would not the same be true of peoples at a more advanced stage of civilization if both sexes received a similar education?" (Ibid.). Leonardini[14] states that *rabonas* were "frowned upon by the conservative society of [their] time for breaking pre-established schemes as well as by the military authorities not only because of [their] sex, but because of [their] miserable appearance . . ." (178). Tristán detailed the *rabonas*'s situation to demonstrate the capacities of women and the importance of equal education to break down social differences. Like Wollstonecraft, Tristán also considered rational education could make better citizens in society, admitting that: "I ardently desire to see this nation prosper. Educate people . . . and you will see public prosperity advance in giant strides" (*Peregrinations* 237).

Clark points out that Wollstonecraft "was bolder with regard to what women might do with a better education" (31) as a right. Using rationality principles from the Enlightenment ideology to reject women's education in dependency Wollstonecraft stated:

> Contending for the rights of woman, my main argument is built on this simple principle, that if she be not prepared by education to become the companion of man, she will stop the progress of knowledge and virtue; for truth must be common to all, or it will be inefficacious with respect to its influence on general practice. . . . If children are to be educated to understand the true principle of patriotism, their mother must be a patriot. (vi–vii)

Demanding the same educational opportunities for women, Wollstonecraft maintained her belief that women were rational creatures and not slaves to their passions without any control, as Rousseau had suggested. Tristán acknowledged Wollstonecraft's claim that "without freedom no kind of moral obligation can exist, because the sexes morality has no foundation and ceases to be real" (*The London Journal* 255). For Wollstonecraft, women were neither inferior nor superior to men, merely different, hence "both [had to] receive the same degree of development" (256).

[14] Nanda Leonardini's article *Presencia Feminina durante la Guerra del Pacífico. El Caso de las Rabonas* was written in Spanish. The English translation is mine.

3.1.2. Romantic feminism

During the first quarter of the nineteenth century, women had been silenced and feminist movements repressed. Moses states that "the very concept of womanhood had changed" (17); unlike the eighteenth century, where intellectual superiority and equality had been valuable, during the nineteenth century, Romanticism highly regarded moral superiority and difference. "[W]omen were now idealized and, at the same time, sharply differentiated from men" (Ibid.), particularly bourgeois women. This new ideal image of the Romantic woman influenced feminists to "[employ] Romantic language . . . to further their cause" (18). However, Moses explains, feminists "recognized, too, that the ideal Romantic woman was no equal to man; she was childlike, dependent on men's power for her very survival; she was also self-sacrificing, subordinating herself to men's interests" (Ibid.). Hence the ambivalence in their writings. Tristán's feminist ideas also had a Romantic approach, and this chapter will illustrate who influenced the author in the construction of her Romantic feminism.

Tristán clarified in *Promenades dans Londres*[15] that: "In order to avoid any false interpretation, I declare that I am neither a Saint-Simonian, nor a Fourierist, nor an Owenian. . . . for the time being I am only concerned with making the English socialist doctrine known, because my book is not a treatise on social theories" (355). However, Tristán was rather familiar with their theories, and their influence was reflected in her feminist socialist approach, especially in her last book *Union Ouvrière*. These three thinkers would be labelled utopian socialists, though Tristán valued the feminist aspect of their doctrine that sought to abolish women's inferior place in society. According to Tristán, they had also: "demonstrate[d], with evidence . . . that work by association [was] the only thing that [could] preserve men from oppression and starvation, and to uproot the vices and crimes that produce[d] the organization and the internal struggles of our societies" (356). Tristán was initially attracted to the way that Saint-Simonians, Charles Fourier and Robert Owen pursued social change. Moses explains that utopian socialist feminists "opposed revolution because of its association with violence and terror. . . . they were Romantics rather than Enlightenment rationalists. They were spiritual, mystical and visionary. Concerned with morality, sentiment and emotions, they were non-political or even antipolitical . . . internationalists and pacifists"

[15] Jean Hawkes used the fourth edition of *Promenades dans Londres*, published in 1842, for her translation work. However, in the publication of 1840, there were more chapters from which I will cite in this dissertation. I will translate all the references from the French version (1840) into English.

(41–42). These characteristics depicted Tristán's character during the construction of her feminism. The author particularly praised the rationale behind Owen's ideology in her book:

> I find Owen admirable when he organizes the material interests. He invites the immense population of the proletariat of Europe to form associations, he shows them the urgent need, if they do not want to starve, the well-being that would result for them, and indicates the means to achieve them. He demonstrates to them, by calculation and reasoning founded on experience, that, by association, labor and capital would produce the most, and that the expenses would be smaller, relative to the sum of enjoyments. (*Promenades dans Londres* 358)

The dedication of a chapter to Owen in *Promenades dans Londres* to analyse his work and philosophy evidences her shift to socialism; her valuing associations or unions to transform society shows how Romanticism had influenced the way she thought.

After Tristán's return from Peru in 1835, Grogan recounts, Tristán "deliberately sought to make contact with the socialist community to evaluate what their theories had to offer, and it was Charles Fourier who attracted her initial interest" (99). Fourierism was a political movement created during the 1830s, and Moses explains it had been "influenced as much by the history of Saint-Simonism as by the ideas of Fourier himself" (90). Saint-Simonians' doctrine propagandised the emancipation of women just as Fourier would later do in his publications.

Sperber states that Claude Henri, comte de Saint-Simon[16], "was the advocate of economic planning, of creating a total system of order and progress" (319). Henri de Saint-Simon acknowledged how society and economy were affected by the scientific and technological advances of the era, and thus created the political economic ideology known as Saint-Simonianism, which addressed the necessity to recognise and fulfil the needs of the "industrial class" or working class to achieve an effective economy and a society without idleness. Although Saint-Simonianism's focus was not initially women's emancipation, it became so after his death in 1825. Sperber states:

[16] Claude Henri, comte de Saint-Simon (1760–1825) was a French political, economic and social critic and philosopher. "He belonged to a distinguished aristocratic family which claimed to be directly descended from Charlemagne" (K. Taylor 39). He envisaged an "industrial society" through association and Christianity; "Saint-Simon was to stress the moral virtues of industrialism, seen primarily in terms of its capacity to improve the standard of living of the poor – virtues which were seen to correspond to Christian ethics" (45).

> [H]is disciples . . . asserted that the capitalist system oppressed women. It forced them into marriage as a property transaction, rather than as an affair of the heart and the emotions. . . . It burdened them with all the labour of housework and raising children; it imposed chastity and monogamy, while allowing men much more freedom. With the abolition of private property, socialists asserted, relations between men and women would be characterized by intense, mutual, emotional involvement and voluntary commitment . . . Women and their labour would gain a dignity equal to that of men. (Ibid.)

Tristán's denouncement of women's injustice and the double standards of the English society in *The London Journal* echoed the Saint-Simonians'. By the 1830s, Moses states, "the group had reorganized into a religion, . . . Their 'new Christianity' was organizationally not unlike the 'old'; it was both hierarchical and dogmatic" (44), where adherents were ranked by their "work, capital and talent". Initially, prominent men and women within the degrees of hierarchy were related to each other and belonged to the bourgeoisie. However, "working-class women were also attracted to Saint-Simonism" (53) and later became adherents within the working-class degree. Power equality between the sexes was furthered by women's involvement in the governance within the "church". Although, "[i]n early 1831, the . . . sex-segregated hierarchies were combined" (55) and women shared responsibilities with the leading men, women were never at the apex of the hierarchy, as Moses explains: "the seat next to Enfantin remained vacant, waiting to be filled by the longed-for Woman Messiah" (56), the one fated to bring about a new moral law. Tristán rejected Saint-Simonian theories due to its emphasis on authority. According to Grogan, "the authoritarian tendency in the . . . movement, with its hierarchical structure and its member's adulation of the leader, Prosper Enfantin" (101) made Tristán hostile to the movement.

However, the Saint-Simonians' Romantic preach of hope for the future, the assurance of a social and human transformation through peaceful and harmonious progress, was reflected in Tristán's feminist socialist approach. During her last mission in France in 1844, when organising the French working class to form a union, the religious discourse of the Woman Messiah was employed. Tristán had been particularly critical of the Catholic Church, her scepticism apparent in *Peregrinations* and *The London Journal* for being one of the social institutions perpetuating women's oppression. However, the spiritual dimension of her discourse had been influenced by the Romantic mystical context of the first half of the nineteenth century.

Grogan affirms:

> Tristan's objective was not an atheistic society but a society in which superior spiritual and moral values reigned. The failure of Catholicism, she believed, lay in its inadequate interpretation of the Divine message . . . She sought to replace it with a religious faith consistent with the exhortation to social justice which she believed was the essence of the Christian message . . . Her own version of a "new Christianity" was a doctrine of divinely-ordained progress, accomplished with the assistance of special "Divine agents" like herself. (192)

Tristán, like the Saint-Simonians, also envisaged a moral and sociopolitical transformation through a religious discourse. Grogan explains: "This new religion held the key to achieving a loving and harmonious society. . . . A religious interpretation of Tristan's mission to the workers followed from this concept, too, transforming her in her own eyes from socialist propagandist to missionary, apostle, and female messiah" (192). Tristán's messianic personification was recounted during her visit to the Bethlem Hospital in *The London Journal*. She noted visiting with Mr. Holm and Mrs. Wheeler[17], "a socialist who [was] also friend of Fourier" (208). Mrs. Wheeler had offered to give Tristán details of every inmate at the hospital, and one of them was a Frenchman called Chabrier. Tristán initially thought he was the captain of the *Mexicain* who had fallen in love with her, and whom she could not love in return. Tristán's messianic discourse starts by confessing she believed: "God had inspired [her] to come to London and rescue this unhappy man!" (210). However, the sailor, who was not Chabrié, claimed to be "the Messiah announced by Jesus Christ" (212). He cursed at Mrs. Wheeler and accused her of being an "evil woman" and the embodiment of "*matter, corruption and sin*". Mrs. Wheeler fled in panic, though Tristán was never alarmed. Chabrier gave Tristán a little straw cross as a symbol of redemption, explaining "[he] judge[d] [her] worthy to receive it" (213). Tristán recounted:

> He went down on a knee and took my hand . . . saying meanwhile, "My sister, dry your tears, for soon the *kingdom of God* will succeed the *kingdom of the devil*!" . . . then he prostrated himself upon the ground, kissed the hem of my gown and said . . . "Oh, Woman is the image of the Virgin sent down to earth! And men spurn her, humiliate her and drag her through the mud!". (Ibid.)

[17] Anna Wheeler was an Irish socialist and feminist who had "escaped from an unhappy marriage to act as a link between radicals in France and England" (*The London Journal* 215). She was an acquaintance of Robert Owen and worked translating works of French philosophers, among them Charles Fourier.

With this, Tristán was probably convinced that she had been chosen to emancipate women, and possibly when writing her journal she already saw herself as the redeemer and liberator. However, in *The London Journal* we can only follow her shift to socialist feminism and the social role she would play in her fight to free women and the working class in France. Tristán's claim to be the Woman Messiah along with her socialist-feminist project would be more explicit in *Union Ovrière*.

As Dijkstra explains:

> Indeed, Tristan identified more closely with this self-proclaimed messiah than with Mrs. Wheeler. Disregarding the dangerous and illogical way in which he (Chabrier) had treated her companion, Tristan focused on the idea which attracted her. This choice indicates the tendency she was to heed, and prepares us for the consolidation of Tristan's own project: to immolate herself and become the messiah. She had in the course of her *Promenades* found an object worthy of her attention, the unrealizable goal worthy of her sacrifice. In this project, to be elaborated in her next book, *Union ovrière* (1843) . . . Tristan's own martyrization would glorify "la femme", especially "la femme guide", the role she would assume. (188)

Charles Fourier, unlike the Saint-Simonians, had "little interest in industry and technology; his concern was with the distinction between toil and leisure, work and pleasure" (Sperber 319). He believed that "all individuals, male and female, were born equal and were basically similar in nature" (Moses 90). Hence his theory also supported women's freedom and individuality to achieve human progress. Fourier, also called a utopian socialist, believed in "the reorganization of work by means of 'phalanstères'[18], or communities based upon a kind of selective socialism, experiments within the bounds of bourgeois society dependent upon that society for material help" (Dijkstra 38). Fourier's proposal put emphasis on the eradication of poverty through "economic cooperation, and although private ownership property and inequality of wealth were not abolished, they would cease to have significance" (Moses 91).

Tristán saw reflected in Fourier's social theory the three motives of the French Revolution: "egalité, liberté and fraternité". She was initially attracted to Fourier's ideas regarding social and economic equality, women's right to work and freedom from a marriage

[18] Phalanstère comes from the combination of the words "phalanx" (a body of troops) and "monastère" (monastery). This associationist community was designed to house up to 1,800 residents, and was meant to be located far from the city to constitute a "moral quarantine".

of servitude, and a community free of every inequality, even sexual inequality. Tristán affirmed:

> Fourier dissect[ed] social organization, expose[d] all the frauds, and all the violence, and all the turpitude; by induction he [was] led from the attraction of bodies to the passionate attraction, from the harmony of sounds to the harmony of human passions; attraction and harmony [were] the two pivots of its organization and its law reflect[ed] that of the worlds. (*Promenades dans Londres* 356)

However, as Grogan states, her "initial enthusiasm for his theory proved short-lived. As Tristán's own views on socialism developed, she became more convinced of the shortcomings of the ideas of others, and after Fourier's death in 1837 her relations with his followers, while they remained friendly, were to diverge along theoretical and tactical lines" (99). Talbot remarks that when Tristán "first made contact with the Fouriests in Paris, [she] was acutely concerned with the communication of Fourier's ideas to a wider audience. She publicly fretted that their presentation in journals like *La Phalange* was too fragmentary, too erudite, and too oblique to interest workers" (225). Tristán was critical of the way Fourier had detailed his system as it was too complicated for everybody to understand and hence be part of, especially for the lower classes. In a letter to *La Phalange* newspaper in September 1836, Tristán wrote:

> I tell you, sir, that may people, amongst whom I count myself, find the science of Mr Fourier very obscure.
>
> No doubt for you, and for many of his followers, educated in colleges where the advanced sciences are taught and from which one graduates with a master's degree . . . the science of Mr Fourier is *lucid and clear*; but then,. . . how many years have you spent studying this science? Well, sir, you will understand perfectly that if, to be a phalansterian, one must first of all have spent four years at university, understand in depth astronomy, mathematics, physics, etc. etc.; then spend another four years *studying Fourier*; oh! you will understand, sir, that by this score very few people will be suited to become *phalansterians*. (qtd. in Grogan 99)

Nonetheless Fourier had influenced Tristán's organisational planning for her future French worker's union project: the workers' palace. Dijkstra affirms that Tristán never denied the influence of Fouriesm on her socialist plans. However, she was "[d]etermined to proceed on

her own, she must have known too well that without allies the realization of her dream was unlikely. . . . (though) the solitude of her quest [made] it even more heroic" (197).

Tristán had publicly declared her support for Robert Owen[19]: "At a public meeting addressed by Owen during his visit in Paris 1837, a supporter of Saint-Simon objected that Owen's doctrine was no woman by his side, whereupon a lady in the audience sprang to her feet, raised her hand and declared, 'Oh yes, there is!' This was Flora Tristan" (*The London Journal* 242). Although Tristán had made it clear in her chapter about Owen that she was no Owenite, both shared the idea of eradicating poverty, hunger and oppression through work by associations and put great importance on education in their theories. As Keith Taylor states: "Owen was certainly the most persistent in his call for educational reform, and in many of his writings education was presented as a panacea for almost every ill" (89). Owen and Tristán believed that not enough had been done to provide a proper education to children. Tristán declared: "When we observe the fate of children in every class of society we can only marvel that infant schools were not invented long ago, and that they are not being set up faster and in greater numbers to meet the needs of the population" (*The London Journal* 219). Tristán emphasised the elimination of social differences through education. She considered that children from wealthier classes as well as workers' children could benefit from infant schools. She remarked:

> Education may be said to begin with life itself, and the system of instruction followed in the infant school is so superior to any that the child, whatever his class, can obtain at home, . . . Infant schools inculcate the principle of mutual aid and respect for communal property in the heart of the child. In his eyes all social distinctions are obliterated and he defers only to the monitors who instruct him. (218)

Tristán claimed this educational system would "bring [them] a little nearer to organising society on Phalansterian principles" (219), as this would shape children's character and moral quality. Owen also believed his new system of education would be "a community responsibility rather than a parental function . . . and the system would be based on the

[19] Robert Owen was a Welsh textile manufacturer who "devoted his life to the theory and practice of a new moral order based on co-operative principles" (*The London Journal* 241) combining agricultural and industrial production. He became a cotton-factory manager in Manchester at the age of nineteen and co-owner of the New Lanark mill in Scotland not long after. This would become the place where his social and economic ideas were put into practice to improve his worker's lives and working conditions. Owen regarded educational reforms as fundamental tools to bring about social change.

principle of equality in the sense that the same general educational methods would be used for teaching all children irrespective of distinctions in their social backgrounds" (K. Taylor 90). In this way, Fourier's influence on her socialist thought of building a future workers' palace becomes evident, along with how Tristán regarded education as indispensable for Phalansteries to succeed and a driving force for a social change.

Sperber states that "Robert Owen voluntarily turned his textile factory into a worker-owned and managed cooperative, to illustrate the value of his ideas" (320) after witnessing the deplorable working conditions of his workers. In 1816, Owen founded an infant school in New Lanark with the hope of creating a world with new morals. Tristán admired Owen's educational principles based on moral development in infant schools as she believed they would improve the parents' morals as well: "Owen has learned from experience what unlimited power love and kindness exert over children: mutual acts of benevolence and generosity are the foundations of his educational system" (*The London Journal* 226). For Grogan, "it [was] not surprising that what Tristan admired most about Owen was his deep humanitarianism" (100). Tristán claimed the "antisocial educational methods" that had perpetuated for centuries had had poor results compared to the fundamental law of the Owenist school, which responded to "the need of love, the desire for knowledge and that thirst for truth" (*The London Journal* 227).

During the 1830s and 1840s, women joined different socialist groups either because they did not meet their expectations or because the utopian socialist communities failed. As Clarks affirms: "Some socialist women also demanded women's 'emancipation' and created their own publications, particularly when disillusioned by certain male socialists" (241), one of whom was Tristán. Moses states that, "during 1836–37, [Tristan] attended the Thursday night meetings of the *Gazette des femmes*[20] group. She published several short pamphlets on topics that showed the influence of these groups" (108). It can be said that Tristán took what she considered the best from each socialist thinker's ideology and constructed her own theory to emancipate not only women but also the working class. She chose not to belong to any of

[20] The *Gazette des femmes* group (1836–1838) was founded in Paris by Eugénie Niboyet. It "consisted mainly of bourgeois women and men. Most likely these members of the bourgeoisie were particularly sensitive to the law codes' double standard based on sex … They had an interest in governmental politics that distinguished them from both Saint-Simonians and associationists" (Moses 98). Eugénie gathered several feminists to discuss political and civil issues that women were struggling with at the time, one of whom was Tristán.

the socialist groups and worked alone. However, her feminism, after her last visit to England, had become socialist.

It would seem then that the Saint-Simonians' concept of an "industrial class" influenced Tristán to understand the need to create the working class in France, calling for an international association of the proletariat later. Fourier's Phalansteries system clearly influenced her vision to set up the workers' palaces and design a system that would initially embrace the elderly, the sick and the children. However, her approach would eventually evolve and be more ambitious. Owen's educational theory resonated with Tristán's belief that education would bring about a social transformation. His successful infant schools' programme in New Lanark proved to Tristán that non-sectarian education worked and she highly approved of it.

4. Flora Tristán, the travel writer

In this chapter, we will encounter Tristán, the traveller, through her travel accounts studied in this dissertation: *Peregrinations* and *The London Journal*. Tristán's experiences, comments and stories detailed in her books about the Peruvian and English societies during her trips illustrate what it was like to be a solo woman traveller and a female travel writer in the first half of the nineteenth century. The process of finding her true identity and the evolution of her personality in the course of her journeys is also depicted in both travel books. Tristán had mixed ethnicity and different social backgrounds, elements which influenced her discourse and the importance of her travels to become a feminist socialist.

When Tristán started travelling, not many women dared to do the same without a chaperone. Initially it was necessity that forced Tristán to travel, but as Grogan explains, her travels were also "inspired by curiosity" (44) and her adventurous personality. Her many travels in France and Europe and particularly her voyage to Peru, "made of Tristan a well-travelled woman by the standards of the day, but nevertheless she was far from unique" (Ibid.). Tristán would die travelling, at the age of forty-one, from typhoid fever, going on a tour around France in her attempt to unite the French working class and form the workers' union.

By the start of the nineteenth century, women, especially from the middle class, had been confined to the private sphere and were expected to dedicate themselves to their home. They had limited or no economic independence and a very restricted life. During the

Victorian era, however, Mills explains "it is surprising that it [was] primarily from the ranks of the middle class that women writers sprang" (27).

Tristán had been born in an aristocratic home, but after her father's death she lost all of the upper-class privileges and her "childhood became a story of deepening poverty, perpetual hardship and lingering fantasy about a Peruvian family that seemed forever beyond reach" (Kramer 791). At the age of eighteen, she was forced to marry André Chazal, a minor artist and engraver, eventually being compelled to help in his engraving workshop to survive. Grogan states that Tristán had "discovered her husband had large debts" (29). This might have been the reason why Tristán "described her marriage as 'endless torture'" (Ibid.). However, Chazal claimed Tristán had always been "discontent with the modest life of an artisan's wife. She wanted to be a lady and gave herself airs" (Ibid.). Dijkstra suggests Tristán's "own class status was ambiguous, if not precarious" (26), and this was reflected in her social-class identity ambivalence and socialist discourse in her books. It was never clear whether Tristán considered herself part of the lower class or the upper class, or which role she really wanted to play in her quest to emancipate women along with the working class. Dijkstra concludes: "In reality, . . . although she had for the most part of her life been poor, she never considered herself as such and never identified her class status with that of the poor" (142). Perhaps due to the stories her mother Anne-Pierre Laisnay constantly told her about her noble past and aristocratic family in South America, Tristán never accepted her new reality of an artisan's wife, even more so after she "found herself in a terrible cycle of domestic violence, angry separations and bitter struggles over the custody of two small children" (Kramer 791). As Hawkes explains: "Her mother had brought her up to regard herself as a superior being by reason of her aristocratic birth, and the conviction was to remain with her all her life" (xi).

After her unsuccessful attempt to be legally recognised as a Tristán in Peru and regain her upper-class status, Tristán reinforced her sense of identification with France substantially, and began to strongly identify with social outcasts. In her book *Peregrinations*, the author exemplifies the non-Europeans pariahs' struggles, stressing her own plights of being a separated woman along with the circumstances under which she had to travel. Kramer claims "this strong personal identification with 'pariahs' led her to the European working class" (792), whom she also described as pariahs and could relate to. Nonetheless, during her stay in South America, Tristán initially recounted that she realised "[i]n Peru, as in the whole of South America, European origin [was] the supreme *title of nobility*" (*Peregrinations* 127). She recognised and appreciated the aristocratic relations, the differential treatment

everywhere she went, and the influence she had in Peru due to the social status of the Tristáns and being French. These privileges let her visit cloisters of the most important churches, witness and be part of the first civil war in Peru, and talk to the most influential politicians in the republic.

After her uncle, royalist Pío Tristán's refusal to give her an inheritance, Tristán showed her devastation: "How I suffered! My last hope destroyed! 'Oh! uncle, uncle!' I cried, 'who can make you understand how much your accursed condemns me to suffer?" (144). It was evident that Tristán hoped to reclaim her ties to the upper class, but unfortunately, as Dijkstra suggests, "she had to recognize finally that her mythic family heritage would never be restored, and that even as she continued to believe herself a member of the upper classes, in reality she was a member of a much lower social stratum" (29).

This rejection was a turning point for Tristán's discourse, and we can see that she started to relate more to the "pariahs of society" (lower class) and criticise the privileged, yet also that, in her two travel journals, she used the pronoun "they" to refer to the poor and the proletariat, but also the aristocracy. Grogan and Dijkstra agree on the ambivalence of her discourse regarding her social status. Dijkstra claims it was through writing that Tristán "tried to recuperate the lost status of nobility" (142). Nonetheless, by criticising the upper class and voicing the proletariat's plights in *The London Journal*, Tristán could only appeal to the working class. It was then inconceivable to attempt to attract both social classes. As Dijkstra states:

> *Promenades* shocked the upper classes (and their women) because it presented the part of society they preferred not to see . . . The distance that separated these two publics and their demands was enormous. To please the upper-class "beaux arts" establishment, Tristan would have had to renounce the very characteristics of her writing that attracted the other public, the working-class press. To please the latter, she would have had to renounce her gender! (144)

Perhaps Tristán was seeking to be the voice and defender of both social classes and sexes, and this gave her books a hybrid style. Moses states that she could not fully declare herself the "political representative" of the proletariat due to her gender's political restrictions. "Tristan believed it necessary to deny her self-interest in order to gain credibility. The historian who reads her words must conclude Flora Tristan believed herself the Woman Messiah who alone . . . would emancipate workers and women alike" (115).

Travelling to Peru allowed Tristán, as a young adult, to experience the life that had been meant for her, everything she aspired to be and to have. Though, it also enabled her to witness the struggles of the Peruvian women from the social class she wanted to belong to. This particular journey, especially her family's rejection, made the author question her identity regarding her social status, national identity and purpose in life. Tristán would return to France with "a new pride in European culture" (Kramer 792), especially the French, and determined to "live and to act in the world" (793) as a writer.

Due to the feminist agenda of both Tristán's travel books, the author aimed to recount the numerous ways women were oppressed by society, and its laws and prejudices. Tristán made sure to detail the many adversities she went through as a separated woman travelling on her own in her voyage to South America in a pamphlet first. After her trip to Peru, in 1835, Tristán published *Nécessité de faire un bon accueil aux femmes étrangères*. As Grogan states:

> She had recently returned from Peru, and the impact of that journey, along with her earlier travels, was reflected in this pamphlet, which emphasised the problems faced by women travelling on their own. As she explained, they were hampered by social conventions which decreed that "respectable" women did not appear in society without a male chaperone. (45)

In *Peregrinations* and *The London Journal*, Tristán also voiced the concerns and difficulties of solo women travellers. She aimed to expose their plights by disclosing the challenges she had to overcome, something not many women would dare to do at the time, though scholars believe Tristán intended to encourage women to speak out.

When Tristán visited London for the fourth time in 1839, Queen Victoria had ascended to the throne. The country had a female ruler, but Tristán found women's hardships had not ameliorated. In her attempt to visit the Houses of Parliament and finding herself not allowed to enter due to her gender, Tristán denounced the paradox of these norms of a "body that claims to represent the *whole* nation, if not in reality, at least on paper, and which goes down upon its knees to receive the orders of a queen, carries inconsistency to such lengths that it *refuses women* the right of admission to its sittings!" (*The London Journal* 57). Tristán's boldness to visit different institutions without a male companion in Peru as well as England attracted unfavourable notice and was used against her by Chazal in court. However, Tristán's great determination to study these cultures also demonstrated that certain "conventions could be broken or ignored" (Grogan 45). Tristán confessed: "Being forbidden to attend a sitting of the honourable gentlemen made me want to gain admittance all the

more" (*The London Journal* 58). Through a Turkish gentleman sent to London by his government, Tristán managed to dress as a man in Turkish garments and gain admittance to the House of Commons. She went against etiquette rules and social customs and visited places that were considered inappropriate for a woman at the time, such as Waterloo Road (a prostitution area), and the "finishes"[21], places which Tristán described as a "courting danger to go . . . alone at night" (83). She also dared to visit the men's quarters at Millbank prison, whose "guides thought it *improper* for a woman to visit" (142). This may create the impression that Tristán took pride in recounting these visits. While visiting the Irish quarter, she said: "It is not without fear that the visitor ventures into the dark, narrow alley known as Bainbridge Street" (156). As Grogan suggests: "Tristan [did] not seem to have let them stand in her way" (49), to Tristán "all the obstacles [were] a challenge which only [made] [her] persevere the more" (*The London Journal* 59).

Her biggest burden as a traveller was prejudice. Making a transatlantic journey without a chaperone and having to spend 133 days aboard the *Mexicain* with men only made her civil status an issue. Tristán's plan was to pose as a single woman for the whole trip to Peru and keep her daughter's existence a secret. She recounted: "I had been obliged to lie to M Chabrié. When I told him briefly about my life, I had kept my marriage from him. However, I still had to account for the birth of my daughter" (*Peregrinations* 38). Disguised as a single woman, Tristán made herself socially available for courtship and proposals, which she was forced to refuse as divorce was still illegal in France.

Aboard the *Mexicain*, seasickness became a ceaseless struggle for Tristán, as she narrated: "[M]y illness followed a regular pattern: I was sick every morning, . . . This daily pattern continued until we reached Valparaiso, but when the sea became rough I was ill all day and night without interruption" (31). Grogan remarks that, "Tristan shared the same problems and dangers faced by male companions. But women travellers also faced additional problems, particularly as targets of sexual harassment or attack" (47). During the whole voyage, Tristán lacked privacy as the only woman aboard, as she recounted:

> Life on board ship is antipathetic to our nature: it is not just the perpetual torture of the ship's motion, the lack of fresh food and exercise, and the effect these constant

[21] Tristán used the term "finishes" to refer to both, "squalid taverns or vast resplendent gin-palaces" (84). In the former, people drank ale or smoked cheap tobacco with women dressed in tawdry dresses, while the latter was frequented by fashionable men of high society who had expensive drinks and cigars, and flirted "with beautiful young girls in splendid gowns. But in both places scenes of orgy are acted out in all their brutality and horror" (Ibid.).

> trials have upon the temper, it is also the cruel ordeal of living in a little saloon only ten to twelve feet across in close proximity to seven or eight people morning, noon and night. To understand such torture you have to experience it yourself. (*Peregrinations* 44)

Tristán abstained from breakfast during the whole voyage to be able to attend her toilette and ablutions while the men were on deck. Having Captain M. Chabrié's love and attention made Tristán feel protected aboard the *Mexicain*. However, aboard the *Leonidas* on her way from Valparaíso to Islay, Tristán felt emotionally vulnerable and exposed. She illustrated "the horrors of isolation" in her account: "All eyes turned towards me and although they were speaking English I knew I was the subject of conversation. Their insolent stares and derisive laughter disgusted me, and I felt how *alone* I was among these men of dissolute habits who cared nothing for the consideration due to a woman or for the first social law, which is decency" (64). Her trip from Islay to Arequipa would be a perilous journey as well, crossing the desert and the Cordilleras mounted on a horse at such high heat during the day and extreme cold during the night was not an easy feat. As Tristán narrated:

> The sun and the heat reflected from the sand burned my face, a raging thirst parched my throat; finally, a general lassitude overcame my will and I collapsed. I was so ill that twice I fainted right away. My three companions were in despair: the doctor wanted to bleed me, but fortunately for me Don Balthazar prevented him, or I am sure I would have died. (87)

Grogan suggests Tristán "adopted a distinctly feminine pose" (49) as a strategy for her travel writing. It was not expected for women to write about heroic experiences and adventures. The author made "frequent references to her own delicacy – suffering from seasickness more than the men, at risk of sexual attack or of perishing in the desert, and needing the frequent support and assistance of men" (Ibid.) as a way to show the readers her "femininity". Through her writing, Tristán introduced herself as a traveller, breaking social conventions by doing so unaccompanied. Hence the author was well aware she was being a "transgressor". During the first civil war in Peru, Tristán held conversations with powerful people, such as high-ranking military men, religious men and even governors, with whom she exchanged points of view and even counselled. The author detailed her fear of being accused of exaggeration or deception about her encounters and experiences in Peru through her confession to Colonel Escudero:

> "when I tell people in Europe the sort of things [Peruvians] do, nobody will believe me".
>
> "You must not let that stop you from writing about your travels, though, and if the French do not believe you, perhaps the Peruvians will profit from your courage in telling them the truth about themselves". (*Peregrinations* 239)

With this confession, it becomes evident that the discourse of femininity that Tristán chose was designed to appeal to her readers alone, and it suggests that the author did not aim to present an entirely "feminine" text. Tristán was concerned with the reception of her travel writing back in France, and how it could be judged or treated. As Grogan explains, "she might [have] revert[ed] to the feminine stance which made it more likely that she would be comprehended . . . Flora Tristan had to negotiate the complex expectations concerning what women could and did experience" (49). It is not possible to know which experiences, or details of those, the author found inappropriate to recount and ended up omitting. The proto-feminist reading approach that Mills introduces can be used for both of Tristán's books as she is an example of a "strong, exceptional women who somehow managed to escape the structures of patriarchy . . . since these images of women travelling alone in dangerous situations transgress the notion of the necessity for women to be chaperoned" (29).

Tristán had closely witnessed political and military struggles following the Peruvian independence due to her uncle's political rank. Although "women in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were restricted as to the type of language they might use and the sort of 'experience' they might depict, and thus their work was judged to be limited when compared to the relative freedom of male novelists" (42), Tristán's accounts were far more detailed.

Pratt concludes: "Contrary to stereotype, the political dramas of Spanish America show up far more fully in the writings of these women travelers (Flora Tristan and Maria Graham) than in those of either the capitalist vanguard or the disciples of Humboldt" (157). Pratt suggests Tristán's narrative in *Peregrinations* was more extensive, non-linear and more analytical, as she was personally engaged in the Peruvian sociopolitical context. Mills clarifies that "it is necessary to recognise that women's writing practices can vary because of the differences in discursive pressures, but that they will also share many factors with men's writing" (30). One of these factors Tristán shared with men, Pratt suggests, was how she rejected "sentimentality and romanticism almost as vehemently as the capitalist vanguard did" (159). Her *Peregrinations* dedication was addressed to the Peruvians with the most brutal honesty. The author not only denounced the church oppression towards its people, the

lack of education and its reach, and the limited scope of the press, but also, and most importantly, upper-class corruption. Tristán stated:

> I have said, after having verified it, that in Peru the upper class is deeply corrupted and its selfishness leads it to satisfy its desire for profit, its love for power and its other passions, to the most antisocial attempts. I have also said that the brutalization of its people is extreme in all the races that compose it. The brutalization of its people gives rise to the immorality of its upper classes and this immorality spreads and reaches, with all the power acquired during its career, the last rungs of the social hierarchy. (*Peregrinaciones* 71–72)

Unfortunately, the Peruvians were not appreciative of her exhortation and advice, and instead "they burned the book in Lima's public square" (Dijkstra 47). Her uncle's reputation had been affected by Tristán's account and personal opinion of him after her inheritance denial, and as a result, "the Tristan y Mocoso family cut her off from all funds" (Ibid.). In this way, Tristán's ties with her Peruvian family as well as her upper-class belonging were severely affected. Her book's unfavourable reception "reinforced her feelings of isolation and ostracism, further justifying her proclaimed status as pariah" (Ibid.). Back in France, Chazal used her travel book in court as evidence of her lack of morals, adultery and how unfit she was as a mother and a wife. As Grogan concludes: "Chazal thus defended his masculinity by attacking Tristán's non-feminity" (37). However, *Peregrinations* had already given Tristán growing fame.

In both books used for this dissertation, Tristán showed "a strong ethnographic interest" (Pratt 159). She had admitted in Praia her desire to "study the manners and customs of the people and take note of everything [she] found worth recording" (*Peregrinations* 13), and although she barely spoke Spanish or English, she did not restrain herself from visiting places she found compelling.

Since Tristán was a foreign visitor in Cape Verde, Peru and England, her presence naturally aroused curiosity in its inhabitants. In Praia, Madame Watrin "had put on all her grandest clothes and assembled several of her friends who were curious to meet a young lady from abroad" (16–17). Tristán recounted: "Madame Watrin asked me many questions about Bordeaux . . . then, with an affability rare among the people of these islands, she undertook to satisfy my curiosity and tell me everything I wished to know" (17). This mutual interest between the visitor and the inhabitant was also documented during her stay in Arequipa.

Tristán constantly received guests at her uncle's house and most of them were important people. She recounted:

> I had to receive the whole town three days after my arrival, although I was still suffering from the effects of the journey and the death of my grandmother. . . . It is the custom in Peru when women of the upper class arrive in a town where they are unknown to stay at home and receive visits for the whole of the first month, after which they return all the visits they have received. (99–100)

Grogan explains: "She was a curiosity whom many wished to see, to meet, and to question about her homeland . . . Peruvian curiosity about Europe offset Tristan's curiosity about their world and customs. Tristan, the observer of Peruvian society, became herself an object of study" (54–55). One clear episode documented in Tristán's account was during her visit to the Santa Catalina convent in Arequipa. While in Santa Rosa convent, "the good nuns had satisfied their curiosity about current events and had shyly asked [her] a few hesitant questions about European ways" (*Peregrinations* 188). Tristán was welcomed differently in the Santa Catalina convent. As she recounted:

> What a deafening noise, what joyous cries when I entered! "*La Francesita! La Francesita!*" I heard on all sides. Hardly was the gate open that I was surrounded by at least a dozen nuns all speaking at once and laughing and jumping for joy. One pulled off my hat, another took my comb, a third tugged at my leg-of-mutton sleeves, because, they said, such things were *indecent*. Yet another lifted up my skirt from behind, because she wanted to see how many corsets were made. One took down my hair to see how long it was, another took hold of my foot to examine my boots from Paris, but what excited the most wonder was the discovery of my drawers. . . . they turned me this way and that like children with a new doll. (193)

This display did not cease, even after the Mother Superior came to welcome her. "The first day was spent in paying visits to the nuns; all wanted to be the first to see me, touch me, speak to me and they asked me questions about everything" (195).

Peruvians were very attentive to Tristán's response regarding different customs and remarkable events such as the 7.7 earthquake of September 18th, religious or theatrical spectacles, carnivals, Easter and even the civil war. These cross-cultural travel experiences which made strong, positive and negative impressions on Tristán are recounted in her accounts. Kramer states that:

> The European response to non-European societies has always included commentary and anxiety about the climate, racial differences, foods and languages in other parts of the world. . . . Tristan clearly became more aware of their European origins as [she] encountered material realities that differed enormously from what [she] had known in France. (794)

Tristán indeed acknowledged many unfamiliar things and situations in Peru, such as the llamas, the food, which she found "detestable", and unique Peruvian costumes such as the *Tapadas Limeñas*. This costume was made up of the *saya*, which was a skirt, and the *manto*, which was a black cloak made to cover the bust, head and face, leaving only one eye uncovered. Tristán noticed this national costume made all Liman women look alike. She recounted:

> It is accepted that *every woman may go out alone* . . . if she wants to go out, she slips on her *saya* . . . puts on her *manto* and goes wherever her fancy takes her; she meets her husband in the street, and he does not recognise her; she flirts with him, leads him on, lets him offer her ices, fruit, cakes, gives him a rendezvous, leaves him, and immediately starts a new conversation with an officer passing by. (*Peregrinations* 273–274)

Comparing Liman women with European women's circumstances, Tristán emphasised Liman women's freedom of action:

> European women, who from their earliest childhood are the slaves of the laws, morals, customs, prejudices, fashions and everything else, whereas beneath their *sayas* the women of Lima are *free*, enjoying their independence and confident in that genuine strength which all people feel within them when they are able to act in accordance with their needs. (275)

In her London account, Tristán wrote about the weather and landscapes. She had a more romantic approach when describing natural elements and geographical features on her journey, as they were different from Paris and the places she had formerly visited. When crossing the Atlantic on her voyage to Peru, Tristán recounted:

> Between the Equator and Cape Horn we had some beautiful days, and I marvelled at the magnificence of the sunrise: what an impressive spectacle it is in these latitudes! But I found the sunset even more splendid. The human eye cannot contemplate

> anything more sublime than sunset in the tropics. Words are colourless to describe the magical glow . . . Such ravishing spectacles elevate the soul to the Creator . . . (33–34)

On her way to Arequipa, while reaching the summit of a mountain in the Andes, Tristán narrated: "At the sight of this magnificent spectacle I forgot my sufferings and lived only to admire. . . . Then I turned my gaze towards the three volcanoes of Arequipa, joined at their base and branching out like a triple candlestick, a symbol of a trinity beyond our human understanding" (85). Tristán had "had no idea what such journeys were like" (84), thus she documented everything she considered interesting for her target readers back in Europe.

Travel writing for Tristán was not only a means to earn money but became her career with a purpose. In her autobiographical book *Peregrinations*, she intended to give notice of the corruption within the Peruvian government as well as her plights as a female traveller and a separated wife pursuing her inheritance; she did so within the limits socially established for female writers. *The London Journal*, however, aimed to warn French workers about the detrimental consequences of an industrialised country, and at the same time showed her aspirations as a future political activist. It was a much more serious work than *Peregrinations,* showing immoral elements of the English society that were not appropriate for women of the time to witness or write about.

Publishing her books was not an easy task due to not only her gender but also her civil status, her limited education and the books' content. Tristán dared not use a pseudonym as many other women did during the century. She subsequently experienced a lot of criticism and rejection throughout her career as a writer. Grogan explains: "As a woman writer Tristan not only threatened literary boundaries but social boundaries, and so invited assault. Tristan's failure to conform to the conventions of domesticity, to live the life of a modest wife and mother, was once again the fundamental criticism" (77).

Tristán's travel books are proof that the author sought a transnational response to the many social issues regarding women in the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, she died before witnessing the manifestation of anything she fought for.

5. Conclusion

The main objective of this dissertation was the analysis of Tristán's travels and their importance in the construction of her feminism. During this study, it became evident that her initial socio-economic context and experiences during her journeys abroad led her to become publicly known as a writer, a feminist socialist and a political activist.

If we analyse Tristán's biography, we can conclude that her own social perception as a pariah commenced after realising her illegitimate birth, followed by the impossibility of a divorce that forced her to flee her husband, and finally the loss of the legal custody of her children to her husband. While hiding, running from her husband, and finding means to survive, Tristán found other "pariahs" with whom she could relate and show support. Hence her family context and travel experiences form an important part and are key to understanding Tristán's feminist thoughts and desire to emancipate women.

During the nineteenth century, there were philosophical currents that shaped Tristán's feminist and socialist feminist thoughts. The two most relevant mentioned in this dissertation are the Enlightenment and Romanticism.

The Enlightenment, with its equality, liberty and fraternity values mostly directed at men, made Tristán question the double standard of its reasoning and defy the logic of its emancipating values. Tristán noted that these were not applied within the domestic sphere, and women were still oppressed at home as well as publicly. Hence, in her books she protests the unequal and restricted emancipating values of the Enlightenment regarding women.

Romanticism, which valued emotions and claimed they were feminine, also influenced Tristán's thoughts. She believed women were naturally superior in values, thus, during her later years, in her attempt to emancipate the working class, she played the role of Messiah, guiding them to their liberation from industrialisation and capitalism.

Tristán's socialist ideas were particularly influenced by the Saint-Simonians and Charles Fourier. Social-justice issues had been introduced by the Saint-Simonians, and their concern to organise society on a fair basis influenced Tristán to think of the proletariat as a social class. She stressed the importance of the organisation of the working class and envisaged a Workers' Union as the first step for the emancipation of labouring oppression for men and women. Tristán's vision to build palaces for the Workers' Union was inspired by Charles Fourier's phalansteries.

Tristán regarded education as the principal tool for bringing about social change and the eradication of the social issues she witnessed in the different cities she visited, including her own country. Robert Owen's educational model was Tristán's inspiration for her own educational system within the palaces, and she believed that education was key to emancipating women and uprooting social-class injustice.

We can conclude that Tristán's unfortunate socio-economic context in her early life was the stimulus for her to travel in search of economic independence and emancipation from her husband. However, these initial travel experiences forged Tristán's feminist thoughts. Writing at that time was an instrument for women to denounce social issues in an indirect way. Her trips to Peru and London helped Tristán identify what oppressed women and the double standards of certain laws, expectations and ideologies regarding women.

Her journey to Peru gave Tristán's personal issues a level of abstraction, and she noted that women from the aristocracy were as oppressed as those from lower classes, perhaps even more so due to society's prejudices. The encounters Tristán had with different Peruvian women, especially powerful ones, encouraged her to document and denounce their oppression and struggles when travelling alone. This particular trip turned Tristán into a social explorer and writer.

In her London account, Tristán was more detailed when condemning women's hardships. She noted several contradictory standards, such as women being expected to be weak and unproductive while doing a lot of hard work inside and outside their homes. Women's oppressors were not only capitalism and industrialisation but also motherhood and being the wife. They were expected to fulfil these roles thoroughly. However, they never received any type of education. The double sexual standard in London demanded women to be pure and chaste while at the same time allowing others to be prostitutes. Such experiences in London made a socialist feminist of Tristán.

As a result, these travel experiences allowed Tristán to develop a transnational feminist ideology. She dedicated each book to the people seeking social transformation in both Peru and England. Tristán eventually became a political activist and sought to emancipate women along with the working class not only in France but transnationally.

This dissertation aimed to illuminate Tristán's feminist transformation through her travels. However, her socialist plans in France have not been mentioned, leaving room for future research.

Bibliography

Almeida, Joselyn. *Reimagining the Transatlantic 1780-1890*. Routledge, 2016.

Abray, Jane. "Feminism in the French Revolution." The American Historical Review, vol. 80, no. 1, 1975, pp. 43-62. www.jstor.org/stable/1859051.

Barry, Peter. *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*. 3rd ed. Manchester University Press, 2009.

Basadre Grohmann, Jorge. *Historia de la República del Perú [1822-1933] Tomo 2*. Producciones Cantabria S.A.C. 2014.

Beckstrand, Lisa. *Deviant Women of the French Revolution and the Rise of Feminism*. Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2009.

Beier, A.L. "Identity, Language, and Resistance in the Making of the Victorian 'Criminal Class': Mayhew's Convict Revisited." Journal of British Studies, vol. 44, no. 3, [Cambridge University Press, The North American Conference on British Studies], 2005, pp. 499-515, https://doi.org/10.1086/429703.

Bloch-Dano, Évelyne. *Flora Tristan: Une femme libre*. Le Livre de Poche, 2018.

Clark, Linda L. *Women and Achievement in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Crompton, Rosemary, et al. *Women, Men, Work and Family in Europe*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Cross, Máire. *The Letter in Flora Tristan's Politics, 1835-1844*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Dijkstra, Sandra. *Flora Tristan Feminism in the Age of George Sand.* Verso, 2019.

Drew, Eileen, et al. *Women, Work and the Family in Europe*. Routledge, 1998.

Fourier, Charles. *The Theory of the Four Movements*. Edited by Gareth Stedman Jones and Ian Patterson. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Gauldie, Enid. *Cruel Habitations: A History of Working-Class Housing 1780-1918.* George Allen & Unwin, 1974.

Gomashie, Grace A. "A house of Many Rooms: Different Approaches of Two translators of Flora Tristan's *Pérégrinations d'une Paria*." *Meta Journal des traducteurs,* vol. 64, no. 1, 2019, pp. 125-144. https://doi.org/10.7202/1065331ar.

Grogan, Susan. *Flora Tristan Life Stories*. Routledge, 1998.

Gross, Izhak. “The Abolition of Negro Slavery and British Parliamentary Politics 1832-3.” *The Historical Journal*, vol. 23, no. 1, Cambridge University Press, 1980, pp. 63-85, www.jstor.org/stable/2638708.

Hart, Kathleen. “An I for an Eye: Flora Tristan and Female Visual Allegory.” *Nineteenth-Century French Studies*, vol. 26, no. ½, 1997, pp. 52-65. www.jstor.org/stable/23537029.

Hawkes, Jean. Translator’s Introduction. *The London Journal of Flora Tristan*, Virage Press Limited, 1982, pp. xiii-xlii.

Hulme, Peter, and Youngs, Tim. *The Cambridge Companion to Travel Writing*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Hunt, Eileen. “Editor’s Introduction.” *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*. Yale University Press, 2014, pp. 1-15.

Kramer, Lloyd. “Victor Jacquemont and Flora Tristan: Travel, Identity and the French Generation of 1820.” *History of European Ideas*, vol. 14, no. 6, 1992, pp. 789-816.

Leonardini Herane, Nanda. “Presencia Femenina durante la Guerra del Pacífico. El caso de las rabonas.” *Norba Revista de Arte*, vol. XXXIV, no. 34, 2014, pp. 177-195.

Leprohon, Pierre. *Flora Tristan*. Editions Corymbe, 1979.

McPhee, Peter. *A Social History of France 1789-1914.* 2nd ed. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Mills, Sara. *Discourses of Difference An Analysis of Women’s Travel Writing and Colonialism*. Routledge, 1991.

Moses, Claire. *French Feminism in the 19th Century*. State University of New York Press, 1984.

Pettinger, Alasdair, and Tim Youngs. *The Routledge Research Companion to Travel Writing.* Routledge, 2020.

Portal, Madga. *Flora Tristan, A Forerunner Woman*. 2nd ed. E-book, Trafford Publishing, 2012. Rakuten Kobo, www.kobo.com/pt/es/ebook/flora-tristan-a-forerunner-woman-1

Pratt, Mary. *Imperial Eyes Travel Writing and Transculturation*. Routledge, 1992.

Puleo, Alicia H. *El reto de la igualdad de género*. Biblioteca Nueva, 2008.

Rendall, Jane. *The Origins of Modern Feminism: Women in Britain, France, and the United States, 1780-1869*. The Macmillan Press Ltd, 1985.

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Emile or On Education*. Introduction, Translation and Notes by Allan Bloom. Basic Books, 1979.

Scott, Joan W., and Tilly, Louise A. “Women’s work and the Family in Nineteenth-Century Europe.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 17, no. 1, [Society for

Comparative Studies in Society and History, Cambridge University Press], 1975, pp. 36-64. www.jstor.org/stable/178370.

Shulman, Alix Kates. "Sex and Power: Sexual Bases of Radical Feminism." *Signs*, vol. 5, no. 4, University of Chicago Press, 1980, pp. 590-604, http://jstor.org/stable/3173832.

Sperber, Jonathan. *Revolutionary Europe 1780-1850*. Routledge, 2013.

Talbot, Margaret. "An Emancipated Voice: Flora Tristan and Utopian Allegory." *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 17, no 2, 1991, pp. 219-239. Constructing Gender Difference: The French Tradition. www.jstor.org/stable/3178332.

Taylor, Barbara. "Feminism and the Enlightenment 1650-1850." History Workshop Journal, no 47, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 261-72, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4289613.

Taylor, Barbara. *Eve and the New Jerusalem: Socialism and Feminism in the nineteenth century*. Pantheon Books, 1983.

Taylor, Keith. *The Political Ideas of the Utopian Socialists*. Frank Cass and Company Limited, 1982.

The Code Napoleon; or, The French Civil Code. Literally translated from the original and official edition, published at Paris, in 1804. By a barrister of the Inner Temple, London: William Benning, 1827.

Tilly, Louise, and Joan W. Scott. *Women, Work, and Family*. Routledge, 1989.

Tristan, Flora. *Peregrinaciones de una Paria*. Translated by Emilia Romero. Fondo Editorial de la UNMSM , 2003.

Tristan, Flora. *Peregrinations of a Pariah*. Translated, edited and introduced by Jean Hawkes. Virago Press, 1986.

Tristan, Flora. *Promenades dans Londres*. H. –L. Delloye, 1840.

Tristan, Flora. *The London Journal of Flora Tristan.* Translated, edited and introduced by Jean Hawkes. Virago Press, 1982.

Tyson, Lois. *Critical Theory Today*. 3rd ed. Routledge, 2015.

Walkowitz, Judith R. *Prostitution and Victorian society: Women, Class, and the Sttate*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman: with Strictures on Political and Moral Subjects*. 3rd ed. J. Johnson, 1796.

Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. Edited by Eileen Hunt Botting. Yale University Press, 2014.