

---

# PANEL I: ONE HUNDRED YEARS OF THE “END OF MEN”: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

## THE RHETORIC OF GENDER UPHEAVAL DURING THE CAMPAIGN FOR THE NINETEENTH AMENDMENT

LYNDA G. DODD\*

*[S]uffrage, if it means anything, means entering upon the field of political life, and politics is modified war. In politics there is struggle, strife, contention, bitterness, heart-burning, excitement, agitation, everything which is adverse to the true character of woman. Woman rules to-day by the sweet and noble influences of her character. Put woman into the arena of conflict and she abandons these great weapons which control the world, and she takes into her hands, feeble and nerveless for strife, weapons with which she is unfamiliar and which she is unable to wield. Woman in strife becomes hard, harsh, unlovable, repulsive; as far removed from that gentle creature to whom we all owe allegiance and to whom we confess submission . . . .*

*The true government is in the family. The true throne is in the household. The highest exercise of power is that which forms the conscience, influences the will, controls the impulses of men, and there to-day woman is supreme and woman rules the world.<sup>1</sup>*

- Elihu Root

---

\* J.D. Yale Law School, 2000, Ph.D. Politics, Princeton University, 2004. Joseph H. Flom Professor of Legal Studies and Political Science, City University of New York – City College. I would like to thank Linda McClain and Kristin Collins for inviting me to participate in this symposium, Evelyn Bodden of the City College Interlibrary Loan Department for tremendously helpful assistance obtaining research materials, and the editors of *Boston University Law Review* for their thorough editing and review.

<sup>1</sup> Elihu Root, Address at the New York State Constitutional Convention (Aug. 15, 1894), reprinted in 2 REVISED RECORD OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK 521, 522-23 (1900).

In his May 3, 1915, letter to Alice Hill Chittenden, President of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, former Senator Elihu Root succinctly described the core ideas of the opponents of woman suffrage.<sup>2</sup> In the final decades of the suffrage campaign, the leading opponents of suffrage were based in the Eastern cities, especially Boston and New York. In addition to Root, an elite group of lawyers, corporate leaders, politicians, academics, and ministers opposed woman suffrage. Their wives and daughters took on leading roles in anti-suffrage organizations.<sup>3</sup> These women focused much of their attention on the threats woman suffrage posed to the “true woman” and the traditional family.<sup>4</sup> Their focus was generally not on men, except as the inextricably linked “other” in the dyad at the core of the gendered division of labor.<sup>5</sup> Much of their rhetoric warned against the upheaval they

---

<sup>2</sup> Before serving as a U.S. Senator for New York from 1909 to 1915, Elihu Root served as Secretary of War in the McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations, and as Secretary of State under Roosevelt. He was a leader in the legal profession, and in 1915 served as the President of the New York Constitutional Convention during the state’s suffrage campaign. As one of the most prominent male opponents of the woman suffrage campaign, his statements on this issue were regularly reprinted and circulated by leading anti-suffrage organizations. His 1915 letter to Alice Hill Chittenden offered excerpts from an earlier speech made by Root at the 1894 New York Constitutional Convention. See ANNE M. BENJAMIN, *A HISTORY OF THE ANTI-SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1895 TO 1920: WOMEN AGAINST EQUALITY* 19, 25-26 (1991); *Elihu Root’s Position Reaffirmed*, *WOMAN’S PROTEST*, July 1915, at 12, *microformed on* The History of Women, Reel 252 (Research Publ’ns) (quoting from Root’s letter to Alice Chittenden on May 3, 1915 and explaining that it reaffirms opinions Root expressed in the 1894 Constitutional Convention); *Why Root Opposes Woman Suffrage*, *N.Y. TIMES*, Feb. 26, 1909, at 7 (“Mr. Root’s views on the subject [of woman suffrage] represent the strongest arguments which advocates of the equal suffrage movement will have to confute . . . .”); Jane Jerome Camhi, *Women Against Women: American Antisuffragism 1880-1920*, at 69-70 (Oct. 1973) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Tufts University) (on file with author).

<sup>3</sup> SUSAN E. MARSHALL, *SPLINTERED SISTERHOOD: GENDER AND CLASS IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE* 5 (1997).

<sup>4</sup> For more on the ideal of true womanhood and changing women’s roles, see, for example, NANCY F. COTT, *THE BONDS OF WOMANHOOD: “WOMAN’S SPHERE” IN NEW ENGLAND, 1780-1835*, at 10 (1977); AILEEN S. KRADITOR, *THE IDEAS OF THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE MOVEMENT, 1890-1920*, at 96 (1965); MARY P. RYAN, *MYSTERIES OF SEX: TRACING WOMEN AND MEN THROUGH AMERICAN HISTORY* 2-3 (2006); MARY P. RYAN, *THE EMPIRE OF THE MOTHER: AMERICAN WRITING ABOUT DOMESTICITY 1830-1860*, at 16-18 (1982); MARY P. RYAN, *WOMANHOOD IN AMERICA: FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE PRESENT* 6-17 (3d ed. 1983); Barbara Welter, *The Cult of True Womanhood: 1820-1860*, 18 *AM. Q.* 151, 152 (1966).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Linda K. Kerber, *Separate Spheres, Female Worlds, Woman’s Place: The Rhetoric of Women’s History*, 75 *J. AM. HIST.* 9, 18 (1988) (describing scholarship addressing “how women’s allegedly ‘separate sphere’ was affected by what men did, and how activities defined by women in their own sphere influenced and even set constraints and limitations on what men might choose to do”).

predicted would follow the abandonment of the prescriptions of “true womanhood” idealizing women’s domestic roles.<sup>6</sup>

These ideals, however, were under pressure during the final decade of the campaign for the Nineteenth Amendment. Historian Nancy Cott has shown that the word “feminism” came into wider use approximately a century ago.<sup>7</sup> In 1913 the word appeared more widely in journals and newspapers,<sup>8</sup> and the alternative vision of an independent “new woman” gained more prominence and respectability.<sup>9</sup>

Women’s second-class citizenship had been justified by appealing to the sense of meaning and identity found in the traditional family and its status as the key unit in the polity.<sup>10</sup> Husbands and fathers leading the family were considered to be the proper political representatives protecting the interests of women and children.<sup>11</sup> In this way, women’s civic membership was defined by their adherence to the tenets of true womanhood and their roles in the traditional family.<sup>12</sup>

Many suffragists exemplified the traits of the “new woman” and were ardent feminists, intent on overturning gendered prescriptions regarding marriage, family, and sexual propriety.<sup>13</sup> Other suffragists – Alice Paul most prominent

---

<sup>6</sup> For more on the defense of the ideology of separate spheres in the writings of opponents of woman suffrage, see THOMAS J. JABLONSKY, *THE HOME, HEAVEN, AND MOTHER PARTY: FEMALE ANTI-SUFFRAGISTS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1868-1920*, at 3 (1994); Camhi, *supra* note 2, at 8; Martha Ann Hagan, *The Rhetoric of the American Anti-Suffrage Movement, 1867-1920*, at 1-5 (May 1993) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington State University) (on file with author).

<sup>7</sup> NANCY F. COTT, *THE GROUNDING OF MODERN FEMINISM* 3 (1987) (addressing “the time when the word *feminism* came into use in the United States” and suggesting that “[t]he appearance of Feminism in the 1910s signaled a new phase in the debate and agitation about women’s rights and freedoms that had flared for hundreds of years”); see also CHRISTINE STANSELL, *THE FEMINIST PROMISE: 1792 TO THE PRESENT*, at xvi (2010).

<sup>8</sup> COTT, *supra* note 7, at 13 (“Only a rare quirk prior to 1910, usage of *feminism* became frequent by 1913 . . .”).

<sup>9</sup> See generally JEAN V. MATTHEWS, *THE RISE OF THE NEW WOMAN: THE WOMEN’S MOVEMENT IN AMERICA, 1875-1930* (2003).

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Rogers M. Smith, “*One United People*”: *Second-Class Female Citizenship and the American Quest for Community*, 1 *YALE J.L. & HUMAN.* 229, 230 (1989) (observing that, during periods of significant social upheaval, there is typically an unleashing of anxiety “about the survival of the communal identities, including gender roles, from which [Americans] drew much of their own senses of personhood and worth”).

<sup>11</sup> GRETCHEN RITTER, *THE CONSTITUTION AS SOCIAL DESIGN: GENDER AND CIVIC MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL ORDER* 63 (2006) (“Prior to the Nineteenth Amendment, women’s civic membership was conceived of in relational terms and they were represented in the public realm by male family members.”)

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 6 (defining “civic membership” to include “legal and political status” as well as “broader political, legal, and social meanings that attach to one’s place within the polity”).

<sup>13</sup> See, e.g., SANDRA ADICKES, *TO BE YOUNG WAS VERY HEAVEN: WOMEN IN NEW YORK BEFORE THE FIRST WORLD WAR* (1997); JUDITH SCHWARZ, *RADICAL FEMINISTS OF*

among them – preferred to avoid broader feminist claims in order to unify suffragists around a single goal: the pursuit of woman suffrage.<sup>14</sup> Rather than promote feminist themes, Paul made effective, strategic use of conventional gender norms throughout her campaign – highlighting traditional female virtues and exceptional beauty in the Woman Suffrage Parade of 1913; sending valentines to members of Congress; featuring emotional tributes after the death of suffragist Inez Milholland; publicizing the injuries of vulnerable, suffering suffragist pickets; and the like.<sup>15</sup> Yet at the same time, she sent out young and single paid female organizers to speak publicly throughout the country, employed paid female lobbyists to directly challenge politicians to support suffrage and to threaten them with organized reprisals, and projected to the public a sense of unyielding determination during the wartime picketing of the White House.<sup>16</sup> Her pairing of feminine vulnerability with ruthlessly combative determination proved to be extraordinarily effective. This alternating deployment and subversion of traditional gender norms played an important role in shaping the opinions of the public and political leaders in the final years of the suffrage campaign.<sup>17</sup>

Although suffrage leaders like Alice Paul exploited the continuing power of traditional gender norms during the final years of the campaign for the Nineteenth Amendment, conservative women believed that the traditional virtues of true womanhood – the ideological apparatus justifying their entire

---

HETERODOXY: GREENWICH VILLAGE 1912-1940 (1986); JUNE SOCHEN, *THE NEW WOMAN: FEMINISM IN GREENWICH VILLAGE, 1910-1920* (1972); CHRISTINE STANSELL, *AMERICAN MODERNS: BOHEMIAN NEW YORK AND THE CREATION OF A NEW CENTURY* (2000). Many of the suffragists who worked with Alice Paul were members of radical feminist groups like the Heterodoxy Club – for example, Rheta Childe Dorr, Crystal Eastman, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Inez Haynes Irwin, Inez Milholland, and Doris Stevens.

<sup>14</sup> *The Suffragist*, the journal of the Congressional Union and National Woman's Party, rarely included lengthy articles addressing women's changing roles or feminist themes. Instead, each issue was filled with reports about public actions taken by suffragists, upcoming elections, and responses to speeches by President Wilson or developments in the House or Senate. As Charles Beard wrote in *The New Republic* in 1916, Paul's organizations "believe[d] in nothing but *Realpolitik*." Charles Beard, *The Woman's Party*, *NEW REPUBLIC*, July 29, 1916, excerpted in *SUFFRAGIST*, Aug. 12, 1916, at 8.

<sup>15</sup> See generally Lynda G. Dodd, *Parades, Pickets, and Prison: Alice Paul and the Virtues of Unruly Constitutional Citizenship*, 24 *J.L. & POL.* 339 (2008).

<sup>16</sup> See generally *id.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 359-60; Lynda Dodd, *Sisterhood of Struggle: Leadership and Strategy in the Campaign for the Nineteenth Amendment*, in *FEMINIST LEGAL HISTORY: ESSAYS ON WOMEN AND LAW* 189, 190 (Tracy A. Thomas & Tracey Jean Boisseau eds., 2011). Given the role that Alice Paul played, and the techniques she used, I disagree with views suggesting that the domestic feminist or "municipal housekeeping" views of suffragists mostly associated with the National Association of Woman Suffrage (NAWSA) were solely or even primarily responsible for the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment. Cf. Smith, *supra* note 10, at 286 (suggesting that "the Nineteenth Amendment is traceable largely to the power of more conservative 'domestic feminist' views").

way of life and form of civic membership – were under threat. This Essay examines the anti-suffragists’ rhetoric of gender upheaval during the final years of the suffrage campaign in order to more precisely identify their concerns and justifications regarding women’s separate status in the polity. Although a few prominent men, most notably Elihu Root and Everett P. Wheeler,<sup>18</sup> were vocal opponents of woman suffrage, women took the lead in organizing against suffrage during the final decades of the campaign. The women opposed to suffrage had connections to publishers of leading magazines and newspapers,<sup>19</sup> and they were also able to disseminate anti-suffrage propaganda through journals published by the various anti-suffrage organizations they founded.<sup>20</sup> When scholars of the history of women’s civic status focus on “patriarchy’s appeal” to “dominant white male citizens,” they miss the prevalence of the women who opposed changes to their own civic status.<sup>21</sup> What could explain such opposition? This Essay explores their arguments against suffrage and considers what their legacy might offer to today’s debates regarding the evolution of women’s roles.

The oldest anti-suffrage journal, *The Remonstrance*, was published in Boston, “a nerve center of anti-suffrage propaganda to the nation,” during the final decades of the suffrage campaign.<sup>22</sup> Scholars have explained this seeming paradox by exploring how elite women, the wives and daughters of prominent men in Boston, came to believe that they had the most to lose from the passage of woman suffrage. They believed their position in society as nonpartisan reformers and leaders of charitable causes would be threatened by the passage

---

<sup>18</sup> Everett P. Wheeler was the Chairman of the Man-Suffrage Association Opposed to Political Suffrage for Women, formed in 1917. A longtime opponent of woman suffrage, he became one of the most prominent male opponents, regularly delivering speeches and writing articles against woman suffrage. See, e.g., MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 76-77; Everett P. Wheeler, *Introduction to MAN-SUFFRAGE ASS’N, THE CASE AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE: A MANUAL FOR SPEAKERS, DEBATERS, LECTURERS, WRITERS, AND ANYONE WHO WANTS THE FACTS* 3, 4 (1915) (introducing a booklet offering resources for opponents of suffrage, including lists of and quotations by prominent individuals opposed to suffrage, detailed comparisons of laws concerning women and children in suffrage and non-suffrage states, and quotations linking suffrage leaders to feminism); *Anti-Suffrage Men Unite: Under Everett P. Wheeler Association Starts Fight Against Amendment*, N.Y. TIMES, Sept. 28, 1917, at 4.

<sup>19</sup> MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 80-88, 226.

<sup>20</sup> In addition to *The Remonstrance*, published by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (MAOFESW), in 1911 opponents of woman suffrage formed a national umbrella organization, the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage (NAOWS), which published an influential journal, *The Woman’s Protest*. There were other local journals, but the journals published by MAOFESW and NAOWS were by far the most influential.

<sup>21</sup> Smith, *supra* note 10, at 240-41.

<sup>22</sup> Lois Bannister Merk, *Massachusetts and the Woman-Suffrage Movement*, at ii-iii (Aug. 1961) (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Northeastern University) (on file with author).

of suffrage. They feared their influence would diminish and they would be treated as minor elements of opposing party machines, or as an amorphous category of women voters, lumped together with uneducated and inexperienced women.<sup>23</sup>

When the Massachusetts state legislature gave women the right to vote in school elections in 1879, traditionalists were sufficiently alarmed by these developments that they organized a petition in 1882 – called a “remonstrance” – to oppose further extensions of woman suffrage.<sup>24</sup> In 1895, to oppose a state referendum on woman suffrage,<sup>25</sup> they formed a new organization, the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (MAOFESW). This organization was led by a circle of upper-class women from Cambridge and Boston, wives and daughters of elite Brahmin and other wealthy families – the list of names includes Humans, Peabody, Gardner, Lyman, Winthrop, Parkman, Lothrop, Coolidge, Cabot, Lowell, and Houghton. They were the wives of men typically educated at Harvard and Harvard Law School, who became leading lawyers, publishers, politicians, and civic reformers. They were the daughters of prominent professors, physicians, lawyers, and politicians.<sup>26</sup> Although they were involved in many civic causes, fewer anti-suffragists, compared to their suffragist counterparts, had pursued higher education or independent careers.<sup>27</sup> But they were influential opinion leaders, and within just a few years several thousand women had joined their new organization.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 20; MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 22-23.

<sup>24</sup> BENJAMIN, *supra* note 2, at 1. Their opposition helped later in 1882 to defeat a legislative proposal giving women the vote in municipal elections. *Id.* Suffrage activists in Massachusetts would reintroduce a similar measure every year beginning in 1894, and the original committee of remonstrants organized each year to oppose these and other bills related to woman suffrage. *Id.* at 2, 5-6. The remonstrants not only submitted petitions, but also testified before legislative committees, a task they found “most repugnant to all their instincts and habits.” *Id.* at 6 (quoting MASS. ASS’N OPPOSED TO THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF SUFFRAGE TO WOMEN, SECOND ANNUAL REPORT OF THE MAOFESW 4 (1897)). During the 1915 campaign against a suffrage amendment to the Massachusetts Constitution, MAOFESW changed its name to the Women’s Anti-Suffrage Association of Massachusetts.

<sup>25</sup> Both men and women could vote in the nonbinding statewide referendum. Opponents did not encourage women to participate, and suffragists considered the whole process a “sham.” BENJAMIN, *supra* note 2, at 3-4 (quoting 4 THE HISTORY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE 1883-1900, at 734 (Susan B. Anthony and Ida Husted Harper eds., 1902)). The proposal was rejected, with 187,837 opposed and 108,974 in favor. *Id.* at 4. Women as a group voted in favor 22,204 to 861. *Id.* MAOFESW emphasized that there were 575,000 women qualified to vote, and only a tiny percentage of that number voted in favor. *Id.*

<sup>26</sup> MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 28-32.

<sup>27</sup> JABLONSKY, *supra* note 6, at 54-55; MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 44.

<sup>28</sup> BENJAMIN, *supra* note 2, at 3 (stating that 1500 women joined MAOFESW during the first year, with twice that number joining the following year). MAOFESW was never a mass organization on the scale of the national suffrage organizations. Its strength lay in the elite

MAOFESW became such a powerful force that its influence extended far beyond the boundaries of Massachusetts.<sup>29</sup> Its journal, *The Remonstrance*,<sup>30</sup> offered coverage of suffrage campaigns in states across the nation from 1890 to 1920, when its publication abruptly ended with Tennessee's ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment. Each issue of *The Remonstrance* offered brief news about state-level campaigns, reports from annual meetings of the MAOFESW, members' testimony at hearings in the Massachusetts legislature, and excerpts from other periodicals about the suffrage debate. Occasionally the journal editors would offer commentary on suffrage activists in the United States and England, critiquing their speeches, writings, and political work.

In 1911 the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage (NAOWS or the National) was formed in New York City in response to the need for a national umbrella organization that could coordinate work by the state organizations and respond more effectively to developments at the national level.<sup>31</sup> The women leading the new organization shared a similar upper-class background with their counterparts in Massachusetts. The new organization received modest financial support from MAOFESW and other state organizations and in 1912 began publishing a substantial anti-suffrage journal of its own, *The Woman's Protest*.<sup>32</sup> *The Woman's Protest* was published monthly beginning in 1912, and it offered the same combination of coverage as *The Remonstrance* – including coverage of anti-suffrage activities and victories across the country, excerpts from anti-suffrage literature, and critiques of suffragists' writings and activities – but on a more regular basis and often in

---

social status of its leaders, a fact not lost on the suffragists. In *The History of Woman Suffrage*, Ida Husted Harper criticized MAOFESW:

Massachusetts was the home of the oldest and most influential anti-suffrage organization of women in the United States. . . . Few of its members did any active work but they were connected through the men of their families with the richest, most powerful and best organized groups of men in the State, who worked openly or behind the scenes against woman suffrage. They had an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. . . . While always posing as a woman's protest, the real strength of the movement was in the men.

6 THE HISTORY OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE 1900-1920, at 288 (Ida Husted Harper ed., 1922).

<sup>29</sup> Camhi, *supra* note 2, at 143; Hagan, *supra* note 6, at 36-37.

<sup>30</sup> REMONSTRANCE, *microformed on* The History of Women, Reel 249 (Research Publ'ns). *The Remonstrance* was published annually from 1890 to 1907, and then as a quarterly until 1920.

<sup>31</sup> For more on the organizational history of NAOWS, see BENJAMIN, *supra* note 2, at 103-38; JABLONSKY, *supra* note 6, at 83-94; and MARSHALL, *supra* note 3, at 189-209, 214-18.

<sup>32</sup> In 1918 *The Woman's Protest* was transformed into *The Woman's Patriot*. The change was in part due to a change in leadership, and evidently also in response to a sense that priorities had changed during the war. The new journal offered much more coverage of women's war work and developed a harsher anti-radical rhetoric. See Kristy Maddux, *When Patriots Protest: The Anti-Suffrage Discursive Transformation of 1917*, 7 RHETORIC & PUB. AFF. 283, 284-85 (2004).

greater depth. For this reason a survey of the full run of *The Remonstrance* offers extremely useful insight into the claims of suffrage opponents during the final years of the campaign.

These journals provide especially valuable insight into opponents' arguments regarding the potential impact of woman suffrage. Historian Aileen Kraditor has famously identified a shift in suffrage rhetoric from claims regarding natural rights in the nineteenth century to an increasing prominence of arguments about the expediency of woman suffrage by the turn of the century.<sup>33</sup> Suffrage opponents focused almost exclusively on the expediency arguments and regularly sought to rebut them. Anti-suffrage articles often referred to suffragists' claims about the policy impact of woman suffrage and sought to rebut them.<sup>34</sup> If there were claims regarding municipal sanitation, child labor, or infant mortality, articles would follow seeking to challenge and refute the evidence used to support those claims.<sup>35</sup> Articles also pointed out

---

<sup>33</sup> KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 43-74.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Elizabeth V. Burt, *The Ideology, Rhetoric, and Organization Structure of a Countermovement Publication: The Remonstrance, 1890-1920*, 75 JOURNALISM & MASS COMM. Q. 69, 71 (1998) (asserting that the main purpose of *The Remonstrance* was to rebut and react to suffrage rhetoric, rather than to develop a proactive rhetorical campaign); Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, *Case Against Votes for Women: Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge Gives Reasons Why the Ballot Should Not Be Granted to Women*, N.Y. TIMES, Mar. 7, 1915, at SM15 ("Woman's right to the ballot, like man's right to the ballot, is based on one, and only one, consideration – the question of the greatest good to the greatest number."); Mrs. A.J. George, *The Value of Disinterested Non-Partisanship*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Aug. 1913, at 13, 14 ("It is not a question of right, it is not a question of woman's inferiority or her superiority: it is a question of what is expedient for the State . . .").

<sup>35</sup> See, e.g., *Another Suffrage Claim Exploded*, REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1915, at 11, 11 (stating that Chicago's new garbage disposal law was not attributable to women's votes); *As to Colorado*, REMONSTRANCE, July 1914, at 2, 2 (claiming the woman's suffrage vote had done little to change a culture of corruption in Colorado politics); *By Its Fruits*, REMONSTRANCE, July 1910, at 4, 4 (discussing how the "wets" won a city election in Denver, despite women's predicted support for the "drys" and claiming that "Colorado has the poorest laws of the Nation when it comes to questions where women are affected"); *How Children Fare in Suffrage States*, REMONSTRANCE, Oct. 1914, at 12, 12 ("Tested by its fruits, suffrage has done little for the children."); *Laws of Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States Compared*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, July 1913, at 8, 8-11 (comparing Colorado and Pennsylvania); *Laws of Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States Compared*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Feb. 1913, at 11, 11 (comparing Colorado and Michigan); *Laws of Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States Compared*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Jan. 1913, at 10, 10 (comparing Colorado and New Jersey); *Laws of Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States Are Compared*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Dec. 1912, at 8, 8-9 (comparing Colorado and Connecticut); *Laws of Suffrage and Non-Suffrage States Are Compared*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, June 1912, at 3, 3 (comparing Colorado and Wisconsin); *Massachusetts v. Colorado*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1913, at 6, 6 ("The absurdity of the suffragist claim that giving the ballot to women ensures better legislation in general, and better laws in particular for the protection of women and children can in no way be more clearly demonstrated than by a comparison of the statutes of suffrage



that the best prospects for change existed in non-suffrage states where elite women, untainted by the charge of political partisanship, could serve as volunteers and leaders in civil society and in reform organizations.<sup>36</sup>

---

and non-suffrage states.”); *Promise and Performance: Actual Results of Woman Suffrage in Suffrage States*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1911, at 4 (summarizing an article in the *Ladies’ Home Journal* examining policies in the four suffrage states and concluding that conditions in four key policy areas – working conditions for women, child labor, divorce and marriage, and moral legislation – had not improved); *Some Points from Colorado*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1910, at 3, 3 (discussing a study showing that woman suffrage resulted in few improvements in working conditions); *Suffrage and Child Labor*, REMONSTRANCE, Oct. 1915, at 12, 12 (recognizing that woman suffrage states had weaker laws limiting children’s work in street trades); *Suffrage and the Babies*, REMONSTRANCE, July 1916, at 2, 2 (debunking claims that infant mortality rates in Kansas dropped due to woman suffrage); *The Influence of Colorado*, REMONSTRANCE, 1906, at 3, 3 (presenting an excerpt from a Montana newspaper blaming suffrage defeat in Montana on Colorado, because “the latter state has shown none of the benefits guaranteed as inevitable when the ballot was placed in the hands of the gentler sex”); *The Proof of the Pudding*, REMONSTRANCE, Oct. 1911, at 1 (reporting that Colorado passed a bill to legalize racetrack gambling and all four female state legislators – in the nation’s only state legislature with female members – voted in favor of legalization); Dodge, *supra* note 34 (“In mothers’ pensions, child labor, limitation of hours for working women, maternity acts, supervision of dairies, pure food, weights and measures, extension of educational facilities, improved sanitation, &c., the great Eastern States have worked out their social problems without woman suffrage to a higher standard than that reached by the States where women vote.”); *Suffrage’s Cost High, Effect on Elections Nil: Illinois, Only State with Accurate Records of Men and Women Voting Separately, Proves That Big Expense Leaves Results Unchanged*, N.Y. TIMES, Nov. 4, 1917, at SM6 (finding that women often “vote as their husbands do” or do not even vote).

<sup>36</sup> See, e.g., Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, *Woman Suffrage and Woman’s Rights*, REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1915, at 7, 7 (“The exceptional woman, who by some combination of circumstances is released from these obligations of the average woman, is today rendering public service which is distinctive because it is removed from personal, political ambitions.”); Clara T. Leonard, *Woman’s Best Public Service*, REMONSTRANCE, 1892, at 3, 3 (“It is the opinion of many of us that woman’s power is greater without the ballot or possibility of office-holding for gain, when, standing outside of politics, she discusses great questions upon their merit. . . . Is it not well that we should have one sex who have no political ends to serve, who can fill responsible positions of public trust?”); Mrs. G. Howland Shaw, *Remonstrance Against the Bills*, REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1908, at 1, 2 (“Women who have the leisure and the ability are rendering valuable service both to the state and in their own localities. . . . Women are willing and ready to do this work, but they wish to continue to do it free from partisan complications. Women now stand outside of politics. We are neither Republicans nor Democrats, and therefore our suggestions in matters of education, charity, and reform are welcomed and successful. No suspicion arises that we have partisan ends to serve.”); *The National Association, WOMAN’S PROTEST*, May 1912, at 3, 3 (“The women who are leading the movement against suffrage are well known for their work in municipal, civic, educational and philanthropic lines. . . . [T]hey regard the franchise as a non-essential for them, and consider that their efforts for the amelioration of the conditions of women and children can be better accomplished without suffrage.”); *Why Women Oppose Woman Suffrage*, REMONSTRANCE, Oct. 1914, at 1, 2 (“[T]he moment they

This is an important argument to highlight, as the elite women leading the anti-suffrage movement were not simply claiming that all women belonged in the home. They acknowledged and regularly claimed approval of women's advances in education and status,<sup>37</sup> but at the same time they wanted to limit women's participation in the public sphere to charitable and civic causes, in which a few elite women would be appointed to positions and lend their expertise in a nonpartisan manner.<sup>38</sup> Their successful leadership in these roles largely explained, they argued, the existence of so many laws favorable to women and children in the non-suffrage states. They argued that the "municipal housekeeping" argument for woman suffrage ignored the reality that the nonpartisan role of elite women was working well,<sup>39</sup> and that male voters in non-suffrage states were capably protecting the interests of women and children.

But anti-suffragists went further than simply challenging the "municipal housekeeping" justification for woman suffrage. They also offered stirring statements in defense of "true womanhood." Indeed, perhaps the major theme throughout their journals concerned the profound threat suffrage posed to

---

enter the field of politics, they forfeit the unique influence which they now possess by reason of their non-partisanship."); *Fear Ballot Would Lessen Influence*, BOS. DAILY GLOBE, Jan. 24, 1915, at 32 (quoting Mrs. James M. Codman, President of MAOFESW, as stating: "It is because we are jealous of anything which may curtail or destroy the influence and power which we now enjoy that we are opposing the movement which aims to force us to become political partisans."); see also KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 18; Manuela Thurner, "Better Citizens Without the Ballot": *American AntiSuffrage Women and Their Rationale During the Progressive Era*, 5 J. WOMEN'S HIST. 33, 38 (1993).

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., Mrs. J.W. Birdsall, *The Advancement of Women Independent of Suffrage*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Sept. 1913, at 7, 7 ("Higher education for woman has been the special mark of her progress during this era . . .").

<sup>38</sup> The precise concern was not only the perceived stigma of partisanship, it was also the danger, according to female anti-suffragist Mrs. Francis Markoe Scott, of needing to "compete for public favor" and the predicted "ease of getting out the questionable female vote and the difficulty of inducing the best women to go to the polls." Edward Marshall, *A Woman Tells Why Woman Suffrage Would Be Bad*, N.Y. TIMES, May 19, 1912, at SM2; see also JABLONSKY, *supra* note 6, at xxvii ("Enfranchisement would give every woman some power, not just those who thought they were better than the rest. Power based upon informal influence was comfortable, safe, and controlled."); O.J. Campbell, *Woman Suffrage and Social Welfare*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Sept. 1912, at 10, 10 ("[T]he women of the sort who are now a power in politics are forced to work vigorously to keep their intelligence from being completely nullified. . . . The number of women possessing the time and energy to devote to the intelligent study of politics will inevitably remain limited. Such women are now the only ones who exercise any real influence on politics. The indifferent, the ignorant and the vicious woman is without influence. . . . Power is vested only in the fit. Universal woman suffrage would immediately destroy this ideal situation.").

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Margaret C. Robinson, *Woman Suffrage a Menace to Social Reform*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN 98, 98 (Ernest Bernbaum ed., 1916) (arguing that "woman suffrage will destroy the present non-partisan power of women").

traditional gender norms, a threat that was discussed primarily in terms of suffragists' rejection of the traditional gendered division of labor.<sup>40</sup> Anti-suffragists strongly defended men's role of protecting the interests of wives, sisters, and daughters at the polls.<sup>41</sup> They disclaimed any need for the ballot in traditional families.<sup>42</sup>

In a few articles, suspicions about the feminist agenda underlying the claim for suffrage were laid bare: were suffragists seeking to do more than add women to the voting list? Were they after "something more"?<sup>43</sup> To support

<sup>40</sup> See, e.g., *Is Man Woman's Enemy?*, REMONSTRANCE, 1896, at 3, 3 (quoting Elizabeth Cady Stanton's assessment of women's oppression in *The Woman's Bible* and asking: "Is it true that in this country, at the end of the nineteenth century, man is eagerly seeking reasons for the 'oppression' of women? And if this conception of the relations of the sexes is wholly false, misleading, and unjust, what shall be said of the movement which takes such a conception for its motive?").

<sup>41</sup> See, e.g., *Goldwin Smith on Suffrage*, REMONSTRANCE: SPECIAL S.D. EDITION, 1901, at 1, 2 ("What special interest of women can be named which is in danger of suffering at the hands of a legislature composed of their husbands, sons, and brothers?").

<sup>42</sup> KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 17; Shaw, *supra* note 36, at 1, 1 ("Men will do as much for the welfare of their mothers, their daughters, and their wives as women will do for other women . . ."); see also Mrs. A.J. George, *Suffrage Fallacies*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN, *supra* note 39, at 24, 25 [hereinafter George, *Suffrage Fallacies*] ("The sexes do not stand in the position of master and slave, of tyrant and victim. . . . [T]here is no rivalry between men and women . . . . [T]he women of every social group are represented in a well-ordered government, automatically and inevitably, by the men of that group."); Mrs. A.J. George, *Why We Are Anti-Suffragists*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Oct. 1915, at 5, 5 (stressing "the family as the unit of society"); Mrs. Herbert Lyman, *The Anti-Suffrage Ideal*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN, *supra* note 39, at 118, 119 ("[T]he suffragist (like the socialist) persists in regarding the individual as the unit of society . . . . Anti-suffrage is founded upon the conception of co-operation between the sexes. Men and women must be regarded as partners, not competitors; and the family, to be preserved as a unit, must be represented by having one political head."). In 1914, the then-Dean of Smith College, Ada Comstock, defended the protective role of men in a poem published in *The Remonstrance*:

Are they then recreant in whom we  
trust,  
The men who are our brothers,  
husbands, sons?  
Will they not serve our needs, ex-  
cept a "Must"  
Be thundered at them like dis-  
charge of guns?  
When have they failed us,  
when, —  
Our Massachusetts men?

Ada B. Comstock, *Let Us Trust Massachusetts Men*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1914, at 1.

<sup>43</sup> "Something More?," REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1913, at 7, 7 (quoting "one of the most brilliant and conspicuous of the younger suffragist leaders" as stating: "Is this new freedom

these suspicions, they quoted feminist women associated with the suffrage movement – including Charlotte Perkins Gilman,<sup>44</sup> Rheta Childe Dorr,<sup>45</sup> and Inez Milholland<sup>46</sup> – to show that many suffragists indeed supported fundamental changes in the family.<sup>47</sup> When confronted with the more radical claims of feminist suffragists, especially their arguments promoting the value of women’s independent work,<sup>48</sup> the anti-suffragists responded with uncommonly passionate rhetoric.<sup>49</sup>

of women to mean merely a large numerical addition to the voting list, or something more?”).

<sup>44</sup> *Id.* (quoting Charlotte Perkins Gilman: “[T]he woman should have as much to do in the home as the man – no more . . .”).

<sup>45</sup> *Id.* (quoting Rheta Childe Dorr: “Personally, I believe that the wife of the future will be self-supporting, even if her wages frequently come from the State in payment for giving it citizens.”).

<sup>46</sup> *Id.* (quoting Inez Milholland: “The institutions most certain to be touched and changed are the home and marriage itself. . . . There is no blinking the fact that we cannot liberate woman without ultimately finding ourselves facing radical changes in her relations with man as regards the two vital matters of property and sex. . . . Many of them, naturally, shrink from such radical thoughts.”).

<sup>47</sup> *Out in the Open*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1914, at 2, 2-3 (quoting a series of articles by Inez Milholland in *McClure’s Magazine*; Mrs. Winifred Harper Cooley’s article, *The Younger Suffragists*, in *Harper’s Weekly*; and Mr. W.L. George’s *Feminist Intentions*, in *The Atlantic Monthly*, and stressing that “conspicuous among the younger leaders of the suffrage movement in this country are women who do not hesitate to declare their sympathy with feminism,” before concluding that while it is “distasteful” to even quote them, “it is right that conservative men and women should recognize what the teachings of feminism are, and what headway they are making among us”).

<sup>48</sup> *Not Woman’s Work*, REMONSTRANCE, Oct. 1912, at 7. The article first quotes a statement by Mrs. O.H.P. Belmont in the *Chicago Examiner*: “The highest sphere for woman is not the home, but independence. The girl who is earning a good salary is unwise and a coward if she gives up her position to marry any man.” *Id.* The article also includes a statement by Mary Ware Dennett, Secretary of NWSA: “Keeping the house and rearing the children is, or at least ought to be, not sex work, but human work. And until it is so regarded the domestic labor problem will remain unsolved.” *Id.*; see also Mrs. A.J. George, *Woman Suffrage an Outpost for Feminism*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Jan. 1914, at 11, 11 (linking suffrage claims to demands for “economic independence”); *The Dark and Dangerous Side of Suffrage*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Feb. 1914, at 7, 7 (quoting Belmont on women’s economic independence).

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., George, *Suffrage Fallacies*, *supra* note 42, at 24, 29 (“Woman suffrage is the political phase of feminism; the whole sweep of the relation of the sexes must be revised if the woman’s vote is to mean anything more than two people doing what one does now.”); *id.* at 27 (“The woman’s suffrage movement is an imitation-of-man movement . . .”); *Feminine vs. Feminist*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Oct. 1912, at 4, 4 (“[Feminists are] urging women to aim at the same tasks and qualities as men. It is not a very proud position for women. . . . The Feminists have so accustomed us to hear that nothing can cover a woman with glory like the winning of permission to do what a man does, that we are no longer shocked at what is humiliating in this attitude.”); Lily Rice Foxcroft, *Suffrage a Step*

To defend the traditional gendered division of labor, a number of justifications were invoked. In many articles, claims regarding the “natural” roles and capacities of men and women appeared.<sup>50</sup> In 1893 Francis Parkman declared that “[t]he question is, whether the persistency of a few agitators shall plunge us blindfold into the most reckless of all experiments . . . [L]et us trust that the good sense of the American people will vindicate itself against this most unnatural and pestilent revolution.”<sup>51</sup> At other times, anti-suffragists emphasized that specialization of gender roles was the mark of advanced civilization and progress,<sup>52</sup> and that to upset this order would mean returning to a more “primitive” society.<sup>53</sup>

---

*Toward Feminism*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN, *supra* note 39, at 141, 141 (“The radical suffragists have little use for the home, and the radical suffragists are young and brilliant, and their following grows rapidly. It is they who are in the public eye; whom the reporters interview; who, far more than the conservatives, are really influencing the thought of the day.”); Edward Marshall, “*Our Suffrage Movement is Flirtation on a Big Scale*,” N.Y. TIMES, May 25, 1913, at SM2 (quoting Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge: “I remember well the time – and it was not so many years ago – when the ‘new woman’ was a joke in all the comic periodicals. She no longer is a joke; she is a tragedy. She threatens everything we have been taught to value . . .”).

<sup>50</sup> KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 14-15; *see also*, e.g., Rev. T.T. Munger, *Without the Legal Mind*, REMONSTRANCE, 1897, at 3. Munger wrote:

Has woman that mental quality which makes a legislator? There is a certain quality which falls under the name of the legal mind. It is not a knowledge of law, nor is it a sense of justice. It is a certain grasp on all facts and truths and circumstances bearing on the question; it is a certain penetrating conception of the way in which human society is bound together; it is the synthetic as distinct from the analytic faculty; it is a clear sense of the nature of law; it is a clear view of what can be done and what cannot be done, what ought to be attempted and what not attempted; it is that firm and steady reason which outmasters prejudice; it is all this and more; hard to define but easily recognized. It is as clearly defined a quality as imagination or taste.

My question is, Has woman ordinarily the legal mind? As it is a high quality, I hesitate to say that she has not it, and that it is a peculiarly masculine quality and it will always remain such, and that its secret will never be learned by her. When nature set out in its task of perfecting woman by specialization of function, it endowed her with certain qualities and bade her give full play to them; it gave her sympathy, insight, taste, sentiment, love of beauty, patience, reverence, piety, self-sacrifice, humility, all great and commanding qualities, but it did not give her the legal mind.

*Id.*

<sup>51</sup> Francis Parkman, *For the Sake of Womanhood*, REMONSTRANCE, 1893, at 4; *see also* Gail Hamilton, *An Unjust Burden*, REMONSTRANCE, 1892, at 2, 2 (“I regret to see women engaged in the movement, because it indicates a failure to discern the natural place of woman in the order of creation – the place of eternal superiority and supremacy.”).

<sup>52</sup> Alice Hill Chittenden, *Woman Suffrage a Mistaken Theory of Progress*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Sept. 1912, at 7, 7 (“The word progress is one of magic, potent, force at the present day. . . . The history of civilization shows that, as civilization advances, the respective functions of men and women are more definitely developed, and subtle differences of temperament or nature more pronounced.”); John R. Dos Passos, *Equality of Suffrage Means the Debasement Not Only of Women but of Men*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Jan.

Anti-suffragists sought to appeal to women's pride in the virtues and impact of "true womanhood" (their role as inculcators of virtue and uplift in the family, and their role in serving society as caregivers to the next generation and as the guardian of the future of civic virtues), calling this women's "best work."<sup>54</sup> A leading suffrage opponent, Caroline Corbin of Illinois, emphasized that a woman's "supreme work" was "creating anew the human race," and, in order to attend to the tasks of motherhood, she should be given "protection in the home and immunity from public service and labor."<sup>55</sup>

1913, at 3, 5 ("Any step which impairs the efficiency of a woman to bear children or diminishes her influence as a mother is a direct blow at civilization. Anglo-Saxon society is built upon the integrity and undiminished strength of the domestic relation – with the mother as the distinctive head and inspiration of the moral and physical education of the children – a task demanding most of her time and all of her thought."); Mrs. Herbert Lyman, *The Anti-Suffrage Ideal*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN, *supra* note 39, at 118, 120 ("[T]he twentieth century has given us its watchword, which is, differentiation or division of labor. Anti-suffragists by accepting it, and applying to their sex the new demands of specialization, put themselves abreast of the times . . .").

<sup>53</sup> KRADITOR, *supra* note 4, at 15-16 (attributing this rhetoric to the pervasive influence of Social Darwinism and suggesting that both sides in the suffrage debate invoked these themes); *see also, e.g., Must End in Disaster*, REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1915, at 9, 9 ("Any attempt to force woman from her natural sphere of activity to place her in rivalry with man in the rude business of life can end only in disaster. Twenty centuries of civilization have surrounded her with charms which are the secret of her dignity and her power. Any attack upon these endowments must end eventually in the return of the Amazon to assume the place now held by Christian womanhood."); Mrs. William Forse Scott, *Woman and Government*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, May 1912, at 5, 5 ("Only under primitive conditions have women been even superficially like men . . . No advance toward civilization is ever made until the specialization of the sexes, politically, socially and industrially begins."); Mrs. G.H. Shaw, *Reasons Against Woman Suffrage*, REMONSTRANCE, Jan. 1908, at 1, 2 ("In the history of civilization, the farther we get from savagery, the greater is the consideration shown to women and the more nearly universal the disposition among men to relieve them of the harder work and to shield them from the rougher experiences of life."); Julia Wainwright, *Five Reasons Against Woman Suffrage*, WOMAN'S PROTEST, Aug. 1913, at 13, 13 (asserting that suffrage "threatens a return to barbarism"); *Why Women Oppose Woman Suffrage*, *supra* note 36, at 1 ("Women oppose woman suffrage . . . because, so far from being a movement of 'progress,' it is a step backward toward the days when little or no discrimination was made in favor of women in the distribution of the burdens of society. It has been well said that, the farther we get from savagery, the more marked is the disposition among men to relieve women of the harder work and to shield them from the rougher experiences of life.").

<sup>54</sup> Leonard, *supra* note 36, at 3 ("The best work that a woman can do for the purifying of politics is by her influence over men, by the wise training of her children, by her intelligent, unselfish counsel to husband, brother, or friend, by a thorough knowledge and discussion of the needs of her community.").

<sup>55</sup> Caroline F. Corbin, *The Reasons for Remonstrance*, REMONSTRANCE, 1892, at 2. She goes on to explain the appropriate division of labor: "The parental work of the father is mainly material; the work of the mother is largely spiritual and tends to the formation of the

Another group of articles rested on consequentialist claims concerning the potential harms, including marital rancor and dissolution, resulting from woman suffrage.<sup>56</sup> They attempted to appeal to women by emphasizing how difficult and burdensome – indeed, how “repulsive” – it would be to women to take on roles associated with partisan politics or economic independence.<sup>57</sup>

---

moral and spiritual character of the public citizen.” *Id.*; cf. Marshall, *supra* note 38 (quoting Mrs. Francis Markoe Scott: “The woman who engages in an active outside life cannot be an ideal mother, and on ideal motherhood must the real prosperity and progress of this and every other nation rest, for ideal motherhood produces worthy citizens. Too many outside interests inevitably must – and I say this with emphasis – result either in neglect of children or in a definite refusal to bear children.”).

<sup>56</sup> See, e.g., *A Menace to the Home*, REMONSTRANCE, 1894, at 4, 4 (suggesting that political disagreements would undermine “the peace and order of the home”); “*A Sacrifice of Happiness*,” REMONSTRANCE, 1896, at 2 (observing that suffrage leader Mrs. Livermore explained women’s failure to vote in the 1895 Massachusetts suffrage referendum by stating women “were afraid of their husbands” and that she also believed a similar “sacrifice of . . . domestic happiness” would occur if women ever became involved in politics); *Goldwin Smith on Suffrage*, *supra* note 41, at 2 (“Chivalry depends on the acknowledged need of protection, and what is accorded to a gentle helpmate would not be accorded to a rival. Man would neither be inclined nor bound to treat with tenderness and forbearance the being who was fighting and jostling him in all his walks of life, wrangling with him in the law courts, wrestling with him on the stump, maneuvering against him in elections, haggling against him in Wall Street, and perhaps encountering him on the race course and in the betting ring. But when woman has lost her privilege, what will she be but a weaker man?”); Marshall, *supra* note 38 (quoting Mrs. Francis Markoe Scott: “Nothing could be more disastrous to the Nation’s life than a general devotion of women to affairs outside the home. . . . When we anti-suffragists talk of “home and mother,” we are laughed at, but the fact remains that “home and mother” are words of the greatest possible importance to the welfare of the Nation.”); *Promise and Performance: Actual Results of Woman Suffrage in Suffrage States*, *supra* note 35, at 4 (“The statistics show that, in the four suffrage states, divorce . . . is increasing rapidly. During the twelve years from 1894 to 1906, the number of divorces rose in Idaho from 89 to 320, in Utah from 189 to 387, in Wyoming from 66 to 143, and in Colorado from 364 to 557.”); *Too Busy for Home Life*, REMONSTRANCE, 1893, at 4, 4 (describing a woman who abandoned her husband in order to devote more time to “causes” like women’s rights).

<sup>57</sup> Leonard, *supra* note 36, at 3 (“Voting alone can easily be performed by women without rude contact, but to attain any political power women must affiliate themselves with men; because women will differ on public questions, must attend primary meetings and caucuses, will inevitably hold public office and strive for it; in short, women must enter the political arena. This result will be repulsive to a large portion of the sex, and would tend to make women unfeminine and combative, which would be a detriment to society.”); Mrs. John Martin, *Women in Industry and Politics a Menace to the Nation*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Feb. 1913, at 10, 10 (“Women in industry means the decay of the race. . . . Woman in industry is a menace to the nation. The more a woman is paid the less likely she is to marry. The abler the woman the fewer children, for she postpones marriage while she is having a good time and waiting for a man with double her salary to undertake to support her. Thus the race is robbed of its best strains. Meanwhile the weaklings plentifully reproduce

They attempted to appeal to male voters by emphasizing that the end of the gendered division of labor would mean more competition for their jobs.<sup>58</sup> And they warned men not to support suffrage out of an inappropriate sense of “gallantry,” based on an assumption that women would prefer the vote.<sup>59</sup>

The alternative to the traditional gendered division of labor was difficult to imagine.<sup>60</sup> In an article entitled *The “Homes to Be,” The Remonstrance* reported on a lecture by Charlotte Perkins Gilman on March 10, 1914, in New York, presenting her ideal home of the future “in which not one stroke of work shall be done except by professional people who are paid by the hour.”<sup>61</sup> This lecture prompted a response by the *New-York Evening Post*, which the editors of *The Remonstrance* quoted at length, in evident approval:

If every home in the United States were to depend upon professional domestic labor, we should need, at a moderate estimate, say, ten million women servants, allowing one servant for the work of two families. Where are these ten million women laborers to come from? Obviously, they can come only from the ranks of the women who have been liberated

---

themselves.”); Scott, *supra* note 53, at 5 (arguing that women’s pursuit of economic independence would be harmful because “men should bear the burden of the maintenance of women and children” and suggesting that due to this responsibility “the masculine virtues are developed and sustained”). At times this line of rhetoric was unabashedly nativist. See, e.g., Alice Hill Chittenden, *Why New York State Opposes Federal Amendment*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Jan. 1914, at 5, 5 (providing testimony from Chittenden before the House of Representatives that she was concerned about the “alien” vote in New York – out of 2,257,000 females over twenty-one years old, only 900,000 were “white women of native parentage”).

<sup>58</sup> *All Trades for Women?*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, May 1913, at 11, 11 (warning of “[c]heaper labor, lower wages” (quoting *All Trades for Women!*, N.Y. SUN, Apr. 19, 1913, at 6)).

<sup>59</sup> “*Chivalrous Cowardice*,” REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1912, at 1, 1 (“It is perfectly true that men are ashamed to seem ungenerous to women, and there is considerable danger that, out of false shame and a mistaken chivalry, they may yield to the ‘Votes for Women’ clamor.”); A.H., “*If They Want It*,” WOMAN’S PROTEST, June 1913, at 7, 7 (“It is unworthy of any intelligent man to consent to female suffrage solely because some women want and clamor for it.”); *Mistaken Gallantry*, REMONSTRANCE, 1899, at 2, 2 (“The claim of women who ask for the suffrage that they speak for their sex is wholly without foundation. They speak for only a comparatively small percentage of their sex: probably, in most States, not more than in Massachusetts, where, as is noticed in an editorial article from the Boston Journal, reprinted elsewhere, not more than four per cent of the women want the ballot.”).

<sup>60</sup> Mrs. Grace D. Goodwin, *Fundamentals of the Opposition to Suffrage for Women – Theory and Practice*, WOMAN’S PROTEST, Mar. 1913, at 3, 5 (“Now the question is, are we ready to do all our own work in the world wisely and well, and to assume, too, all these other responsibilities which men are now carrying? It seems arrogance to consider that we have the strength, physical or mental, to double this tremendous load and expect to be able to carry it with unimpaired nervous force and power. It cannot be done.”).

<sup>61</sup> *The “Homes to Be,”* REMONSTRANCE, Apr. 1914, at 7, 7 (quoting Charlotte Perkins Gilman).



---

---

from the burden of toiling for their husbands and their children. It does not matter whether the cooking or the laundry work of the future will be done in individual homes – Mrs. Gilman says she wants the home preserved – or in great central institutions. Apparently, therefore, the future of women depends on adopting the institutions of China, where they make a living by taking in each other’s wash. Women are to be emancipated in order that they may do each other’s cooking. Mrs. Smith will kiss her children good-by and go out to cook Mrs. Brown’s dinner. And Mrs. Brown will kiss her children good-by and go out to cook Mrs. Smith’s dinner. Being obliged to keep professional hours, however, the chances are that they will have no time to kiss the children good-by.<sup>62</sup>

In the pages of *The Remonstrance* and *The Woman’s Protest*, there were few references to even the possibility of men sharing the tasks of domestic labor,<sup>63</sup> but other anti-suffrage propaganda, especially commercially produced postcards, considered the prospect simply farcical and offered mocking depictions of these gender reversals.<sup>64</sup>

The refrain of women opposed to suffrage was not the “end of men,” but the end of “true womanhood” and the traditional family. Although they lost the suffrage battle, examining the history of their opposition does provide useful insights for contemporary debates about gender and the family. The first is the importance of an intersectional analysis when analyzing arguments about gender roles. The opponents of woman suffrage were speaking from a privileged class position when they spoke about the virtue of the traditional family. Despite regularly claiming to be an inclusive organization,<sup>65</sup> the leading anti-suffrage organizations offered little to single, working-class women. But anti-suffragists raised concerns about the feminist vision of the family that feminists today still echo and extend when calling attention to issues like inadequate support for paid parental leave policies, low pay for

---

<sup>62</sup> *Id.*

<sup>63</sup> Camhi, *supra* note 2, at 68 (“[T]aking their cues from the suffragists who devoted most of their energies to foreseeing changes in the female role, the Antis, like the suffragists, did not really question the basic patriarchal norms that expected the male to fit into a certain mold . . .”).

<sup>64</sup> Catherine H. Palczewski, *The Male Madonna and the Feminine Uncle Sam: Visual Argument, Icons, and Ideographs in 1909 Anti-Woman Suffrage Postcards*, 91 Q.J. SPEECH 365, 378, 387 (2005) (observing that “the specter of the feminized man was absent in the verbal discourse opposing suffrage” and suggesting that “while no suffrage opponent (especially a male one) would want to speak of man’s (his) possible emasculation, such a fear could be explored in cartoon images”); *see also* Catherine H. Palczewski, PALCZEWSKI SUFFRAGE POSTCARD ARCHIVE, [http://www.uni.edu/palczewski/postcard\\_archive.html](http://www.uni.edu/palczewski/postcard_archive.html) (last visited Mar. 6, 2013) (containing an online archive of anti-suffrage postcards and other memorabilia).

<sup>65</sup> *See, e.g.*, Mrs. John Balch, *Who the Massachusetts Anti-Suffragists Are*, in ANTI-SUFFRAGE ESSAYS BY MASSACHUSETTS WOMEN, *supra* note 39, at 22, 22-23 (describing anti-suffrage women in Massachusetts as coming from all different backgrounds and classes).

caregiving positions, the need to protect the rights of domestic workers, and public support for single mothers.<sup>66</sup>

The second insight concerns the impact of the Nineteenth Amendment on the development of constitutional doctrines regarding women's civic status, and through the participation of women voters. With respect to constitutional doctrine, scholars like Reva Siegel and Gretchen Ritter have shown the limited impact of the Nineteenth Amendment on subsequent constitutional disputes concerning women's civic status.<sup>67</sup> Opponents of suffrage predicted that women voters would divide up and have little impact on public policies. A number of studies have confirmed that indeed was what happened after the amendment's ratification.<sup>68</sup> And, despite the continued revolution in women's consciousness about gender norms, women today remain significantly underrepresented at all levels of government, partly due to a lack of ambition to run for political office, a reluctance which is no doubt further fueled by observations of media and public scrutiny of the few female candidates for elective office. Political scientists have studied the reasons for difficulty in recruiting women candidates for public office,<sup>69</sup> and others have studied the disparate treatment of women candidates in an era of increasingly negative campaigns.<sup>70</sup> These studies do not provide an optimistic picture of the "rise of women."

---

<sup>66</sup> HANNAH ROSIN, *THE END OF MEN: AND THE RISE OF WOMEN* 124 (2012) (citing data from Heather Boushey of the Center for American Progress, showing that most new jobs taken by working-class job seekers are in areas of work that women used to perform for free).

<sup>67</sup> RITTER, *supra* note 11, at 33, 66-131 (examining "the limited impact of the Nineteenth Amendment" and analyzing how women's civic status was limited by judicial doctrines involving marriage and jury service); Reva B. Siegel, *She the People: The Nineteenth Amendment, Sex Equality, Federalism, and the Family*, 115 HARV. L. REV. 947, 949, 952 (2002) (showing that "women's struggle for enfranchisement plays no role in the ways we understand or interpret the Constitution" today and arguing that contemporary doctrines should acknowledge that the suffrage victory liberated women from "the family-based status order" that had defined women's civic membership).

<sup>68</sup> See, e.g., KRISTI ANDERSEN, *AFTER SUFFRAGE: WOMEN IN PARTISAN AND ELECTORAL POLITICS BEFORE THE NEW DEAL* 1-5, 142-45 (1996); ANNA L. HARVEY, *VOTES WITHOUT LEVERAGE: WOMEN IN AMERICAN ELECTORAL POLITICS, 1920-1970*, at 1-2 (1998); SUSAN WARE, *BEYOND SUFFRAGE: WOMEN IN THE NEW DEAL* 5-6 (1981).

<sup>69</sup> JENNIFER L. LAWLESS & RICHARD L. FOX, *IT STILL TAKES A CANDIDATE: WHY WOMEN DON'T RUN FOR OFFICE* 20-24 (2010); EILEEN McDONAGH, *THE MOTHERLESS STATE: WOMEN'S POLITICAL LEADERSHIP AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY* 6 (2009).

<sup>70</sup> KIM FRIDKIN KAHN, *THE POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES OF BEING A WOMAN: HOW STEREOTYPES INFLUENCE THE CONDUCT AND CONSEQUENCES OF POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS* 1 (1996) ("Women's changing fortunes in electoral politics are driven by the correspondence between people's stereotypical images of women candidates and the salient issues of the day. . . . [W]omen's perceived capabilities and liabilities influence the conduct and consequences of political campaigns."). *But see* DEBORAH JORDAN BROOKS, *HE RUNS, SHE RUNS: GENDER STEREOTYPES, DOUBLE STANDARDS, AND POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS*

Despite a century of attention to the changing role of women and the need to question traditional gender norms, Hanna Rosin's book, *The End of Men*, provides many hints of the resilience of the traditional view.<sup>71</sup> Even the most well-educated married women "opt-out"<sup>72</sup> of their careers for a period of time to care full-time for their children (and Rosin does not discuss the impact of attrition in areas of work like law firms or academia, where opting out often means a permanent exit); working women at all levels must continue to be especially wary of confounding gender-based expectations about proper behavior; and married working mothers today often complete a double shift by taking primary responsibility for domestic work.<sup>73</sup> After a century of the rise of women, there is still a long way to go.<sup>74</sup>

---

(forthcoming June 2013) (suggesting that female political candidates are not always harmed by gendered assumptions).

<sup>71</sup> See generally ROSIN, *supra* note 66.

<sup>72</sup> Cf. PAMELA STONE, OPTING OUT? WHY WOMEN REALLY QUIT CAREERS AND HEAD HOME 40-44 (2007); JOAN C. WILLIAMS, RESHAPING THE WORK-FAMILY DEBATE: WHY MEN AND CLASS MATTER 2-3 (2011); JOAN C. WILLIAMS ET AL., CTR. FOR WORKLIFE LAW, "OPT-OUT" OR PUSHED OUT?: HOW THE PRESS COVERS WORK/FAMILY CONFLICTS 1, 2 (2006), available at <http://www.worklifelaw.org/pubs/OptOutPushedOut.pdf>.

<sup>73</sup> Rosin describes "Plastic Woman" as "voracious" in her desire to "take up" these responsibilities. ROSIN, *supra* note 66, at 54. Although she does describe women who resent their husbands' lack of effective involvement, it would be helpful to include more comprehensive data from opinion or time-use surveys to determine the extent to which gender norms play a role.

<sup>74</sup> Many critics have found fault with Rosin's portrayal of women's "rise," but the key strength of her book is her argument that a more equal future will require more attention to how traditional gender norms limit men as well as women.