

**UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE SOCIOLOGIE ȘI ASISTENȚĂ SOCIALĂ
ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE SOCIOLOGIE**

TEZĂ DE DOCTORAT

**Conducător de doctorat:
Prof. Univ. Dr. Irina Culic**

**Student-doctorand:
Pop Oana**

2025

UNIVERSITATEA „BABEȘ-BOLYAI” CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTATEA DE SOCIOLOGIE ȘI ASISTENȚĂ SOCIALĂ
ȘCOALA DOCTORALĂ DE SOCIOLOGIE

**Labor, Technology, and Gendered Subjectivity in the
„Femeia” Magazine – women as part of the Romanian
industrialization project (1965-1970)**

Conducător de doctorat:
Prof. Univ. Dr. Irina Culic

Student-doctorand:
Pop Oana

2025

Table of contents

INTRODUCTION.....	1
<i>Industrial transformation and the making of a modern socialist subject</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Women's participation in the industrial labor force and the shifting representations of women's labor in public discourse</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Narratives of Labor in "Femeia" (1965) and in Ana Gluvacov's „Afirmarea Femeii în viața societății” (1975)</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Industrial Inclusion and Reproductive Control: Structural Limits of Gender Equality ...</i>	<i>8</i>
METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	11
THESIS STRUCTURE	15
1. INDUSTRIAL MODERNIZATION AND THE SCIENTIFIC-TECHNICAL REVOLUTION	17
<i>Industrial Implementations of the Scientific Technical Revolution</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>A New Type of Labour – Wage and Educational Reforms Throughout the 1960s</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Reimagining the Socialist Subject - marxist humanism and new worker subjectivities ...</i>	<i>28</i>
2. THE FEMEIA MAGAZINE AS A CASE STUDY	33
<i>The Press as a Site of Subject Formation</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>The Socialist Press in the 1960s: Changing Functions, Changing Styles</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>The National Council of Women and the Gendered Mediation of Labor and Ideology ...</i>	<i>38</i>
<i>A Textual Archive of Socialist Womanhood: Reading Femeia in 1965</i>	<i>41</i>
<i>The Soul as a Site of Struggle: Ecaterina Oproiu's ambivalent feminist politics</i>	<i>52</i>
3. WOMEN IN THE SOCIALIST ECONOMY: STRUCTURAL CONTRADICTIONS	58

<i>Women and the reproduction of labour</i>	58
<i>Women and industrial production</i>	61
<i>Ana Gluvacov - Hopes for a scientific gender regime for the distribution of labor</i>	65
<i>The tensions between economic growth and motherhood</i>	69
<i>A taylorist workforce in a technical world</i>	71
<i>Lived contradictions</i>	74
O.P. – seamstress and economist at Someșul (1970)	74
R.B. - weaver at the România Muncitoare Enterprise (1956)	76
I. - shoemaker at the Clujana Factory (1969)	78
Doamna T. – chemical engineer at Carbochim (1958)	80
Conclusions	83
CONCLUSION	85

Labor, Technology, and Gendered Subjectivity in the „Femeia” Magazine – women as part of the Romanian industrialization project (1965-1970)

Summary

Industrial transformation and the making of a modern socialist subject

As part of a state-led developmental strategy, Romania industrialised at a rapid pace during the 1960 (Ban, 2014; Crowther, 1988; Murgescu, 2010). Industrial production expanded both in scale and in function, absorbing activities formerly managed by other branches of the economy such as agriculture and small commerce. The chemical industry, for example, particularly through the rise in the local production of synthetic fibers, was vital to the restructuring the textile industry, enabling the expansion of large-scale, mechanized forms of production, higher productivity, lower costs, and a greater standardization of labour processes. These developments ensured the delivery of increasingly processed products that were meant to better the position of Romania as an economy oriented towards the export of value-added goods .

These transformations were enmeshed in the broader, global context of the scientific-technical revolution, which the state embraced as a means to accelerate economic development. This orientation was formally articulated at the Third Congress of the Romanian Workers' Party in 1960, where increasing the technical level of production became a central goal of economic planning. Initially, mechanization and automation were key: the state prioritized the replacement of manual labor with machinery, the modernization of outdated industrial equipment, and the development of a domestic machine-building sector. High levels of investment in industry continued throughout the '60s.

As the 1960s rolled out, technical progress was reframed as the engine of economic efficiency and societal transformation, necessitating the rapid automation and mechanization of production across all industrial sectors. In turn, this technological transformation required the professionalization and rationalization of labor. Workers were no longer valued simply for physical endurance or manual repetition, but for their capacity to adapt, innovate, and collaborate.

These new demands were institutionalized through wage reforms that rewarded education and technical qualifications, and through education reforms that sought to align educational development with the needs of the emerging industries.

By the mid-1960s Romania's social structure had undergone a transformation as profound as that of its economy. The most striking demographic trend was the large-scale migration from rural areas to expanding industrial centers, accompanied by a significant shift in the labor force from agriculture to industrial employment.

Thus, the restructuring of the industrial economy in the context of the scientific-technical revolution had sweeping effects on the reorganization of labor and social life. New occupational categories were generated, requiring not just more workers, but a new kind of worker: technically skilled, ideologically committed, and emotionally equipped to function within complex, mechanized production environments. As such, industrial development also became a site where the new socialist worker was expected to emerge.

The ideological infrastructure accompanying these material transformations was shaped by a shift from Stalinist orthodoxy toward Marxist humanism, which re-centered the human subject - not as a passive executor of historical necessity, but as a conscious, self-actualizing agent. Alienation, once framed in narrow economic terms, was beginning to be reinterpreted as a psychological and moral problem. This move re-legitimized the social sciences -especially sociology and psychology- which had been previously marginalized, and positioned them as important tools in governing the new socialist industrial subject. This reconceptualization of labor created new openings for the scientific management of subjectivity. Workers became objects of study in surveys, interviews and psychological assessments, as part of a broader effort to optimize their integration into socialist development.

Women's participation in the industrial labor force and the shifting representations of women's labor in public discourse

A massive mobilization of labor resources to fuel this industrial project was achieved by bringing women into productive activities and by transferring labor from agriculture to industry, especially given that the collectivisation of agriculture was completed in 1962. Women were strongly represented in traditionally feminized sectors such as textiles, healthcare and education.

While many of these fields were traditionally associated with women, their status was redefined under socialism: sectors such as the textile industry were modernized and mechanized, gaining in prestige and wage increases relative to some male-dominated sectors such as constructions. Women were also increasingly present in domains that required higher education and that had been previously almost exclusively dominated by men (finance, justice, architecture, electronics...).

It is this mobilisation of women in the context of rapidly growing technologised industrial sectors and the socialist project of women's emancipation that is the central focus of my thesis. In order to account for the particular ways in which women and their roles were envisioned and addressed throughout the late 1960s and early '70s, I rely primarily on the „*Femeia*” magazine and the shifting discursive landscapes that emerged within its pages.

Edited and published monthly by the National Council of Women, and self-defined as a „socio-political and cultural magazine”, *Femeia* functioned as a key ideological medium for articulating, translating, and popularizing the Party's evolving vision of womanhood under socialism. While its official function was to publicize achievements in gender equality and mobilize women into productive and political life, its pages also reveal deep tensions within this vision - particularly as the scientific-technical revolution began to redefine what labor, femininity, and modernity meant. Rather than a simple propaganda tool, *Femeia* offers an archive of ideological negotiation, in which modern socialist womanhood was continually redefined through a mix of policy alignment, editorial autonomy, and aspirational discourse. I align my reading of the *Femeia* magazine with more recent attempts to look at socialist women's magazines and organisations not simply as mouthpieces for the Party, but as carved-out spaces where multiple narratives were both articulated and contested.

This line of thought was partly inspired by the discussions raised in the forum article „Ten Years After: Communism and Feminism Revisited”, published in the tenth volume of the *Aspasia* journal in 2016 (de Haan et al. 2016). The forum advocates for a more nuanced, historically grounded, and pluralistic understanding of women's condition under socialism. It challenges Cold War binaries that equate liberal democracy with feminism and socialism with oppression. Instead, it shows that socialist regimes, despite their contradictions, created conditions in which many women actively pursued social justice, gender equality, and political participation. The forum collectively argues against the simplistic view that women's organizations under socialism were merely “footsoldiers for the Party”. Instead, contributors highlight that these organizations were

complex political spaces where women exercised and negotiated forms of agency, sometimes aligning with state goals, other times subtly pushing against patriarchal structures.

A key catalyst for the forum is Nanette Funk's article, which criticized scholars for attributing too much agency or feminist potential to women in socialist institutions (Funk, 2014). Funk's approach is seen as Western-centric and dismissive, particularly for assuming that feminism can only be defined in liberal or Western terms. Contributors like Kristen Ghodsee, Raluca Maria Popa, and Chiara Bonfiglioli argue for the need to understand women's activism in its own historical and political context, rather than by Western feminist standards. Scholars like Alexandra Ghit suggest that women's organizations should be studied as part of broader processes of state-building, mass mobilization, and welfare development, not just as ideological tools. Perhaps the most relevant contribution for my argument, Popa's essay uncovers, through interviews and documentation, that the Romanian National Council of Women opposed the 1966 abortion ban (Decree 770), which is an important counterpoint to the prevailing generalised assumptions about the Council's total alignment with Party policy.

Additionally, I use Benedict Anderson's concept of the "imagined community" to help illuminate how *Femeia* created a sense of shared experience among women who were otherwise dispersed across social strata, regions, and professions. Through its serialized features, readers' letters, expert columns, and ritualized monthly appearance, the magazine provided a symbolic universe that interpellated women as part of a gendered socialist public. Even though *Femeia* was not a product of commercial print capitalism, it still functioned as a form of imagined community-building, one that was embedded in the centralized rhythms of the socialist state rather than the market.

Similarly, Lauren Berlant's idea of the "intimate public" deepens this analysis by foregrounding the affective dimension of how such communities are formed. In *Femeia*, emotional tone and moral narratives, whether in profiles of model workers or pedagogical parenting advice, operated as a shared language through which women were invited to recognize themselves and one another. Berlant's idea that intimate publics are defined by a common emotional world, structured around familiar cultural forms and the promise of social belonging, helps explain why *Femeia* resonated with so many readers. It was not only a space of ideological transmission but also one of emotional identification and collective pedagogy, where modern socialist femininity was continuously articulated and negotiated. Anderson and Berlant thus provide complementary

lenses for reading „*Femeia*” as both a political and affective infrastructure, an instrument of governance that worked as much through sentiment and community as through doctrine.

In addition to the articles published in *Femeia*, I draw on the writings of Ana Gluvacov and Ecaterina Oproiu to account for how ideas about women and women’s labor were publicly shaped in the decade between 1965-1975. Both were intellectuals whose work contributed to the ideological consolidation of gender roles under socialism. They both had their volumes published in 1975, presumably to mark Romania’s contribution to the celebration of the UN designated „International Women’s Year”. Gluvacov, in her „Afirmarea femeii în viața societății” (Gluvacov, 1975) framed women’s integration into the labor force during the scientific-technical revolution. She believed that modern industry, combined with a scientifically guided redistribution of labor, could enable a more equitable gender order, and warned against the over-feminization of certain sectors like education and healthcare. Despite her overall optimistic position, she is also structurally attuned, being one of the main voices that recognized policy contradictions (women’s reinforced maternal role simultaneous with increased industrial labor participation) and intervened critically in debates around the persistence of occupational segregation in later years.

Meanwhile, best known as the editor-in-chief of the „Cinema” magazine and as the host of the popular television show „Telecinemateca”, Oproiu cultivated a reputation as an incisive, witty, and morally reflective commentator. Her contributions to the women’s magazine *Femeia*, especially through the column „Cosmetică Sufletească”, articulated a humanist perspective on questions of gender and work. Rather than engaging in overt structural or political critique, Oproiu consistently framed inequality as a moral or emotional issue, emphasizing the need for personal transformation and the moral cultivation of the self within socialist modernity, for both men and women.

This orientation is also central to her 1975 volume „3x8 plus infinitul: dialoguri despre condiția femeii”, a collection of interviews with women from diverse walks of life (scientists, factory workers, artists, intellectuals) intended as a kind of montage of gendered experiences of socialist modernity (Oproiu, 1975). I specifically engage with its final chapter, a dialogue with sociologist Călina Mare, in which Oproiu includes snippets from readers’ reactions to Oproiu’s column titled „Woman’s condition” from the „*Contemporanul*” magazine.

Narratives of Labor in "*Femeia*" (1965) and in Ana Gluvacov's „Afirmarea Femeii în viața societății” (1975)

In 1965, *Femeia* magazine presented women's integration into industrial labor as a central pillar of Romania's modernization project, aligning it with both ideological aspirations and material transformations driven by the scientific-technical revolution. Across multiple issues, women workers, especially in fields like textiles, food production, and engineering, were portrayed not only as contributors to national economic goals but as key agents of cultural and emotional modernization. This representation combined affective labor with technical skill, recoding naturalized feminine qualities like precision, cleanliness, and care into valuable attributes for socialist production. Whether as engineers, quality controllers, or seasonal food industry workers, women were framed as moral, emotionally engaged, and pedagogically inclined producers, ideal figures for a new kind of labor that demanded flexibility, responsibility, and self-regulation. It is difficult to choose among the many examples discussed later in the thesis, but maybe the article titled "Gospodine la scară națională" („Housewives at the national level") (Moraru & Alexandrescu, 1965) published in the September 1965 issue is a great example of the gender-coding of new industrial sectors (the industrial food sector). The article explores how the modernization of the food industry took over traditional domestic roles associated with women (such as baking, preserving, and preparing dairy), elevating them to the level of industrialized, highly technologised processes. This is framed as a “qualitative leap” in women's historical responsibilities. The article cites the Ninth Congress of the Romanian Communist Party, which set a target to increase food industry output by 50% throughout the five year plan, and to build new factories. In this context, women were central actors, continuing their domestic role on a superior, modernized plane, now producing at the scale of a nation. What is exceptional is the revaluing of certain forms of labour: old roles (the domestic food maker) are not abolished, but extended to the industrialized arena and symbolically revalued.

These portrayals also reflected an expanded understanding of technical labor. Factory work was no longer seen as strictly physical or masculine, but increasingly intellectualized and feminized through the integration of psychology, design, and planning. Articles celebrated women's capacity to embody both technical rationality and emotional commitment and endurance.

The gender equalising potential of modernised industry was noted outside the *Femeia* magazine by thinkers such as Ana Gluvacov, who, in her work „Afirmarea Femeii în viața societății” (Gluvacov, 1975) provided a detailed analysis of the evolution of women’s active social participation after the war, with a focus on the decade between 1965-1975. She combined data from Censuses and statistical yearbooks with sociological and political insights in order to account for women’s shifting role in society, for the spectacular growth in the recent employment rates of women across the economy, and for the distribution of women across various economic sectors and within professional and educational strata. In her analysis, Gluvacov paid attention to two distinctive factors. First, the fact that technological progress tended to undermine traditional gender divisions of labor. Gluvacov argued that modern technology disrupted the historical division between “masculine” and “feminine” labor by eliminating the physical strength requirements that once underpinned gendered occupational hierarchies. As production became increasingly mechanized and automated, intellectual, technical, and affective competencies became more important than brute force. This shift opened new professional domains to women and made many previously male-dominated jobs accessible to them on equal footing. In her view, the technical restructuring of labor was not just a matter of economic efficiency, but also an important lever for human development, as it allowed work to be “adapted to the worker,” rather than the other way around.

Her second observation was that a rational, scientific redistribution of labor could achieve gender balance across the industrial landscape. Gluvacov envisioned a future in which the distribution of labor across sexes was guided not by stereotypes or biological essentialism, but by scientific research. She advocated for a scientific reorganization of the workforce that allocated men and women based on skill, aptitude, and workplace conditions, not on culturally inherited assumptions. While she was not an advocate for complete gender neutrality, she rejected „irrational” rigid occupational segregation and called for mixed-gender workplaces and a more equitable distribution of women across all economic sectors. This would not only improve gender equality but also contribute to more efficient socialist planning.

Industrial Inclusion and Reproductive Control: Structural Limits of Gender Equality

However, a sharp turning point for the emancipatory potential inscribed in these transformations was marked by the introduction, in October 1966, of the antiabortion Decree 770,

which meant the beginning of an increasingly repressive pronatalist turn that had a dire structural impact on the project of women's emancipation through participation in the modern labour-force. After 1966, the discursive space provided by *Femeia* –although still open to reimagining not only women but also the public spaces that they increasingly belonged to- was steadily reoriented towards more conservative tropes, mostly articulated in terms of scientifically sanctioned ideas about the biological determination of women.

By 1966, *Femeia* was already registering the institutional ambivalence surrounding women's integration into emerging industrial and technical professions. An investigative piece titled "What professions should girls choose?" (*Femeia* 1966-03-01 / nr. 3) reveals how official discourse attempted to reconcile the egalitarian ethos of socialist modernization with reinvigorated gendered assumptions about physical capacity and productivity. Ministry of Education officials interviewed in the article framed labor distribution as a scientific matter, echoing the rationalist arguments of thinkers like Ana Gluvacov. Yet, in contrast to Gluvacov's emancipatory vision, these officials also reiterated biological essentialist views, cautioning that women's "physical constitution" should guide their professional orientation toward sectors like textiles, food production, education, and light engineering -fields already feminized or considered "suitable." What appeared as scientific reasoning was, in practice, a method of reinforcing occupational boundaries without appearing overtly discriminatory.

The same article gestured toward the pending creation of a gender-specific „nomenclator” of professions, a tool meant to “objectively” determine and publicly advertise which occupations were appropriate for women. While this was presented as a rational, technical fix, it marked a turning point in the state's quiet retrenchment into normative gender frameworks. Over the following years, *Femeia* began regularly publishing updates on the nomenclator and eventually gave voice to women who openly criticized its restrictive application, such as a 1973 letter from a young woman denied entry to the Marine Institute (*Femeia* 1973-09-01 / nr. 9). This evolution highlights a key contradiction: while policy claimed to elevate women's status through participation in industrial modernity, it increasingly deployed scientific language to regulate and contain that very participation within traditionally gendered sectors.

Although initially the push for wage reform, professional advancement, and educational inclusion reflected a homogenizing logic where gender difference was to be overcome through skill acquisition, political participation, and economic contribution, even as women were absorbed

into the technical-industrial complex of the scientific-technical revolution, their biological and moral specificity as women, and especially as mothers, was being reasserted with growing force.

While the wage and promotion structures rewarded technical expertise and professional training, many women were denied access to vocational education or excluded from higher-paid sectors on the basis of essentialist and medicalized views of femininity. As Ana Gluvacov and others noted, women were often confined to low-skilled, repetitive tasks, justified by assumptions about their biological suitability for such roles. At the same time, women were instrumentalized as “flexible labor,” whose unpredictable work rhythms -shaped by pronatalist policy and caregiving responsibilities- made them less attractive to factory directors who were pressured to meet (and overcome) production plans.

In her 1975 book, and in one of her rare interventions in „*Femeia*” in 1972 (*Femeia*, 1972-07-01 / nr. 7) Gluvacov also acknowledged that persistent structural inequalities -including lack of access to formal training and entrenched biases- continued to hinder women’s advancement. Ultimately, the socialist promise of gender equality through labor was both enabled and limited by the very logics of modernization and technocratic planning it sought to fulfill.

Women were now simultaneously hailed as symbols of socialist progress and subjected to reproductive surveillance. The integration of women into wage labor was never accompanied by a full socialization of reproductive labor. Instead, women were expected to embody dual, and often conflicting, roles: the efficient industrial producer and the sacrificial mother. While the ideology of the scientific-technical revolution demanded flexible, emotionally intelligent, and collaborative workers, qualities often framed in feminized terms, the essentialist understanding of femininity persisted. This tension is especially visible in cultural and psychological discourse: women were praised for their emotional steadiness and moral resilience, which were reframed as technical virtues necessary for certain kinds of industrial work. Thus, biological essentialism was not replaced by socialist egalitarianism, but strategically folded into it.

By the late 1960s, *Femeia* magazine emerged as a site of critical reflection on the contradictions embedded in the socialist promise of women's emancipation through labor. While earlier years had emphasized the progressive inclusion of women in industrial labor, especially in sectors modernized by the scientific-technical revolution, such as the textile, electrotechnical and chemical sectors, articles from 1969 begin to register a dissonance between the official discourse of equality and the material and institutional realities women faced. A four-part investigative

series, including the articles “Can Women Lead?” and “Why Does a Profession Become a Job?”, explicitly interrogated why women remained underrepresented in leadership despite formal equality. Drawing on expert interviews and institutional data, the articles highlighted how structural barriers, social prejudices, and persistent domestic expectations limited women’s professional advancement, even in sectors where they were numerically dominant. The pieces signaled a growing awareness that women’s integration into modern industrial sectors had not led to full equality, but had instead entrenched a gendered division of labor under new forms.

Concurrently, *Femeia* also endorsed policies that marked a retreat from the earlier vision of full professional integration. On the very pages following its inquiry into women’s lack of advancement, the magazine praised the revival of “industria casnică” (household industry) as a flexible means for women to contribute economically while remaining at home. This policy shift, which saw women subcontracted for home-based textile and craft production, was framed as both a recovery of traditional skills and a practical solution to reconcile domestic responsibilities with wage-earning. Yet in practice, it re-embedded women’s labor in the private sphere and effectively excluded them from the formal industrial workforce.

These developments revealed deep contradictions in the socialist gender project. The same chemical and technological advances that initially promised to rationalize and elevate women’s work now served as the basis for intensified labor discipline and informalization. By the end of the 1960s, *Femeia* was registering, albeit cautiously, the cracks in the emancipatory narrative, foreshadowing the strategic turn of the 1970s, when labor policy would increasingly prioritize productivity and flexibility over gender equity.

Methodological approach

This study is largely based on a socio-historical, qualitative analysis of a body of texts that were produced between 1965 and 1975, namely several issues published by the „*Femeia*” magazine patroned by the National Council of Women in Romania. I also engage with two volumes written by Ecaterina Oproiu and Ana Gluvacov in 1975 („3x8 plus infinitul: dialoguri despre condiția femeii”, and „Afirmarea femeii în viața societății”, respectively), in which they address, in their own terms, the contemporary and pressing issues regarding the condition of women in socialist Romania. If any, I feel that one of the main merits of my thesis is to draw attention to the existence of these critical voices in a landscape too often depicted as ideologically

stifling and non-permissive of contestation. Rather than aiming to produce a comprehensive institutional history or a purely ideological critique, I approach this material as a situated archive of discursive production, my core objective being to understand how the socialist project of modernization, particularly in its technocratic and gendered dimensions, was articulated and negotiated through official media and expert discourse during a key transformative period (1965–1970).

For the detailed insights on the evolution of the industrial landscape in the early 1960s I rely on the volume “Dezvoltarea Economică a României 1944-1964” (“The Economic Development of Romania 1944-1964”), published in 1964 by the Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Române (Publishing House of the Academy of the Romanian People's Republic) and coordinated and edited by a collective of scholars under the supervision of Mircea Biji, Vasile Malinschi and Manea Mănescu (Biji et al., 1964). Each chapter of the roughly 700-page volume is authored by a different team of experts, which I do not explicitly reference despite citing information from more than one chapter of the volume.

Also essential for sketching out the institutional evolution of the National Council of Women during the 1960s, as well as for grasping a sense of the landscape in which women's participation in paid labour took place during this period was Luciana Jinga's comprehensive volume on gendered politics in socialist Romania, „Gen și reprezentare în România Comunistă 1944-1989” (Jinga, 2015).

Crucial in framing my interest in the issue of the representation of women's labor was my participation in the reading and discussion circle organised by the Ecaterina Arbore Collective in the spring of 2024, which focused on representations of women's work in Romanian literature from the 1950s. The discussions generated invaluable insights, especially in the way that they opened up spaces for questioning the dominant approaches to representing women in state socialism.

Another key element to my approach of this theme, already mentioned in the introduction, was my reading of the forum article „Ten Years After: Communism and Feminism Revisited”, published in the tenth volume of the *Aspasia* journal in 2016 (de Haan et al. 2016). Rather than viewing socialist regimes solely through the lens of authoritarianism, the contributors emphasize that these systems, despite their internal contradictions, enabled many women to engage in struggles for social justice, gender equality, and political participation. Rejecting the reductive notion that women's organizations under socialism functioned only as “footsoldiers for the Party,”

the forum presents them instead as multifaceted political arenas where women navigated, enacted, and sometimes contested the boundaries of state power and patriarchal norms.

Apart from the forum, but especially relevant for this new line of approaching the subject of women's organisations in socialism are the works of Khristen Ghodsee (who investigates the role of the Bulgarian Women's Association in local but also international women's struggles (Ghodsee, 2012); Maxine Molyeux' work on the relationship between the socialist state and women's interests in Nicaragua, which complicates the idea of "emancipation from above" by showing how women's participation could be both instrumentalized by the state and at the same time a site of agency and collective identity (Molyneux, 2001); Zsófia Lóránd, who sees socialist women's activism as a political project with internal debates, contradictions, and transnational resonances and shows how the Hungarian Women's Democratic Federation and its magazine "Asszonyok" grounded its identity in internationalist solidarity (Lóránd, 2022); and Chiara Bonfiglioli who argues for revisiting and correcting the dominant Western feminist narrative that obscures the contributions of socialist and non-aligned women at the 1975 Mexico City conference (the main event during the UN backed National Women's Year in 1975) (Bonfiglioli, 2016).

At the heart of this research lies a thematic content analysis of the Romanian women's magazine *Femeia*, published monthly by the National Council of Women. I treat *Femeia* as a discursive site where narratives about gender, labor, modernization, and affect were assembled, stabilized, and sometimes contested. As such, I do not treat *Femeia* as a transparent reflection of state ideology, but as a complex site of ideological negotiation, where official directives, editorial autonomy, and shifting cultural tropes intersected. My approach to *Femeia* is informed particularly by Benedict Anderson's concept of the "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991) and Lauren Berlant's notion of "intimate publics" (Berlant, 2008). These frameworks allow me to account for how *Femeia* addressed its readership not only as political subjects, but as emotional, relational, and aspirational beings. In this sense, the magazine functioned as an affective infrastructure, creating a space of mediated belonging that translated large-scale socialist goals into intimate, gendered narratives.

The first part of the analysis focuses on the year 1965, which I treat as a liminal moment, marking both the consolidation of post-collectivization industrial policy and the transitional period between the Dej and Ceaușescu regimes. I closely read all twelve issues of *Femeia* published that year, identifying recurring motifs and representational tropes. I paid special attention to certain

genres of text (such as plenary reports, interviews with women workers and experts, field investigations (“anchete”), technical profiles, and parenting columns) which I found to be particularly revealing of how labor, femininity, and social responsibility were reframed under the banner of the scientific-technical revolution. Some recurring themes emerged through the close reading and annotation of these texts: the professionalization of women’s labor; the naturalization of maternal and pedagogical affect; the feminization of certain technical sectors (such as textiles, food processing, and architecture); and the emergence of discourses that fused scientific rationality with emotional and moral labor.

I end my analysis of the *Femeia* issues by focusing on a shift in tone that occurs at the end of the 1960s, when the magazine calls for reader engagement with what was seen as a failure of the socialist project to deliver on its promises of gender equality through labor. Investigative articles titled suggestively “Can Women Lead?” and “Why Does a Profession Become Just a Job?” interrogated the persistent structural and cultural barriers preventing women’s advancement, even as they filled the ranks of Romania’s rapidly modernizing industrial workforce. In a revealing juxtaposition, the same issues of *Femeia* that addressed women’s underrepresentation in leadership also promoted the revival of „household industry” (industrie domestică) as a “flexible” solution for integrating women into the economy. Framed as a recovery of tradition and a pragmatic response to women’s dual role as workers and caregivers, this policy effectively re-embedded women's labor within the private sphere and signaled a retreat from the earlier vision of full industrial integration.

In parallel with the primary source analysis, I consulted a small corpus of expert literature from the same period, including Ana Gluvacov’s „Afirmarea femeii în viața societății” (Gluvacov, 1975) and Ecaterina Oproiu’s „3x8 plus infinitul” (Oproiu, 1975).

In sum, this research combines close textual reading with a historical sociological approach, emphasizing the role of discursive formations in shaping subjectivities and mediating the contradictions of policy. It brings together official discourse, affective labor, and institutional practices in order to understand how gendered labor was imagined, mobilized, and regulated during a key phase of socialist modernization.

I have used IAGen for the editing and writing of this paper according to the rules proposed by the Scientific Council of the Babeș-Bolyai University, in the „Artificial intelligence in academic

writing: point of view” document (<https://ubbcluj.ro/ro/infoubb/comunicate/consiliul-stiintific-ubb-despre-inteligenta-artificiala-in-scrierea-academica>)

Bibliography

- Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Verso.
- Ban, C. (2014). *Dependență și dezvoltare. Economia politică a capitalismului românesc*. Tact.
- Berlant, L. G. (2008). *The female complaint: the unfinished business of sentimentality in American culture*. Duke University Press.
- Bonfiglioli, C. (2016). The First UN World Conference on Women (1975) as a Cold War Encounter: Recovering Anti-Imperialist, Non-Aligned and Socialist Genealogies. *Filozofija i Društvo XXVII* (3).
- Crowther, W. E. (1988). *The Political Economy of Romanian Socialism*. Praeger.
- Funk, N. (2014). A very tangled knot: Official state socialist women’s organizations, women’s agency and feminism in Eastern European state socialism. *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 344-360.
- Ghodsee, K. (2012). Rethinking State Socialist Mass Women's Organizations: The Committee of the Bulgarian Women's Movement and the United Nations Decade for Women, 1975-1985. *Journal of Women's History*, 49-73.
- Jinga, L. (2015). *Gen și Reprezentare în România Comunistă. Femeile în cadrul Partidului Comunist Român 1944-1989*. București: Polirom .
- Lóránd, Z. (2022). International Solidarity as the Cornerstone of the Hungarian Post-War Socialist Women's Rights Agenda in the Magazine Asszonyok. *International Review of Socialist History*, 103-129.
- Molyneux, M. (2001). *Women’s Movements in International Perspective, Latin America and Beyond*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moraru, E., & Alexandrescu, V. (1965, September). Gospodine la scară națională. *Femeia*, pg. 1-3.
- Murgescu, B. (2010). *România și Europa. Acumularea decalajelor economice (1500-2010)*. Polirom.