

LESSON 8 What Arguments Were Made For and Against Women's Rights?

Part I—Seneca Falls

The documents which follow were shortened (portions were edited out). The documents were written and adopted at a convention held in Seneca Falls, New York, on July 19-20, 1848. The first is the Declaration of Sentiments; the second is a series of Resolutions taken by the convention. Read the two documents and answer the questions.

A. Declaration of Sentiments

We hold these rights to be self evident; that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness....

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and seizures of power on the part of man toward woman, seeking to establish an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws in the formation of which she has no voice.

He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.

...In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her

husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master....

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall be the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to disregard the happiness of women....

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty pay. He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education, all colleges being closed against her.

He has created a false public sentiment by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society are not only tolerated but deemed to be of little account to man.

He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her self-respect and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life.

[continued on next page]

Declaration of Sentiments

[continued from previous page]

Now...in view of the unjust laws above mentioned, and because women feel themselves deprived of their most sacred rights, we insist that they have

immediate admission to all rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens of the United States....

B. Resolutions at Seneca Falls

Resolved, That all laws which prevent woman from occupying such a station in society as her conscience shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature, and therefore of no force or authority.

Resolved, That woman is man's equal—was intended to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race demands that she should be recognized as such.

Resolved, That inasmuch as man, while claiming for himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman

moral superiority, it is preeminently his duty to encourage her to speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

Resolved, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state, should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise [voting].



Part I—Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions

1. Read the first and second paragraphs of the Declaration of Sentiments again. Why was it written this way?

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

2. List the four most important grievances in this declaration.

3. How do you think most people would have reacted to these documents?
Men:

Women:

4. How would opponents of this view have argued against it?

5. What can you tell about the authors of these documents? (minimum of three things)

6. Should the Declaration of Sentiments be as famous as the Declaration of Independence? Explain your answer.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

7. Write a Declaration of Sentiments for women or men today of at least three paragraphs. Include at least three grievances women or men have today. (Use additional paper if necessary.)

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

8. How many of the original grievances outlined in the Declaration of Sentiments still exist in some form today?

9. In 1852, the *New York Herald* ran an article on the women's conventions in which it asked, "Who are these women?" Its answer:

Some of them are old maids, whose personal charms were never very attractive, and who have been sadly slighted by the masculine gender in general; some of them are women who have been badly mated... and they are therefore down upon the whole opposite sex; some, having so much of the virago [a strong, large, man-like woman] in their disposition, that nature appears to have made a mistake in their gender—mannish women, like hens that crow...there is [also] a class of wild enthusiasts and visionaries—very sincere but very mad....

Of the male sex who attend these conventions for the purpose of taking part in them, the majority are hen-pecked husbands, and all of them ought to wear petticoats.

Evaluate this argument.

10. Why do you think some people reacted this way?

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Part II — Woman Suffrage

One of the resolutions of the Seneca Falls Convention referred to the “sacred right to the elective franchise.” The convention members wanted women to have the right to vote. In 1920, an amendment to the Constitution giving

women the right to vote was ratified as the Nineteenth Amendment. The documents below consist of arguments made in the years prior to 1920. Some are arguments for and some are against woman suffrage.

Document A — Do a Majority of Women...Want the Ballot?

Statement of Mr. Franklin W. Collins of Nebraska before Senate Woman Suffrage Committee, April 1912

U.S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Woman Suffrage, 62nd Cong., 2d sess., Document no. 601, pp. 26-31.

Mr. Chairman and members of the honorable committee, I am opposed to the proposed amendment to the constitution granting the privileges and burdens of the franchise to women, and with your indulgence, shall outline my objections to the same in a series of questions, intelligent and candid answers to which would seem to dispose of the plea which has been made for this so-called relief.

Why an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the preliminary steps leading thereto, when the States possess the power to extend the suffrage to women if they will?

Do a majority of the women of the United States want the ballot?

If not, and it is no where seriously contended that they do, should it be forced upon the majority by the minority?

Would it benefit womankind to have it?

Would it be wise to thrust the ballot upon those who do not seek it or want it?

Would it benefit the country?

Is it not incumbent upon its advocates to show that it would be beneficial to womankind or country, if not both?

Are there not too many stay-at-homes among the voters as it is?

After the novelty has worn away, and the privilege of voting becomes irksome, would not women be liable to stay at home in large and ever increasing numbers?

Is not this the experience of those States and communities where the experiment has been tried?

Is it not a fact that the persons we least like to see vote are the ones who invariably vote, and those we most desire to vote are the persons who often refrain from voting? Will this be changed when women secure the ballot?

Is not the influence of woman to-day greater without the ballot than it would or could be with it?

Is she not the life and hope of the home, the church, of charity work, and society, and are not her hands full to overflowing already?

In other words, is not the average good woman at the present time carrying all the burdens which she has the time and strength to carry?

[continued on next page]

Document A

[continued from previous page]

Can she add to her responsibilities without materially subtracting from her efficiency in the home, the church, and society?

Is not her influence as home-maker and a home-keeper far more helpful to humanity than it would be were she given the ballot, together with its accompaniments?

If, by her ballot, she should plunge the country into war, would she not be honor bound to fight by the side of man—to accept the consequences of her own exercise of political power?

Judged by its fruits, has the experiment of equal suffrage proven a success in Colorado, Wyoming, or elsewhere?

Have the women who would secure this privilege counted the cost of adding not alone the vote of the good and the cultured women to the electorate, but that of the illiterate, the ignorant, and the bad?

Show me the Congress or State legislature which would dare to overlook the wish and the will of womankind when once made known. Much has been said about the suffrage being a natural right, as, for instance, "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Is suffrage such a right?

Is it not both a privilege and a burden imposed by the sovereignty which is the Government of the United States, under its Constitution, upon certain of the people of the country, who possess the qualifications fixed by that Constitution, and only upon those who measure up to such requirements?

If a natural or absolute right, to which all persons without regard to race or sex or color or what not are entitled to have and hold and exercise without question, why do we deprive our men of it until

they arrive at the age of 21 years, why is it this so-called right is denied to the people of the Territories and the people of the District of Columbia?

If an absolute right, by what authority or color of authority does the State of Massachusetts, as well as other States, bar from the use and enjoyment of the suffrage men who do not possess certain prescribed educational qualifications?

Is it not true that every free lover, every socialist, every communist, and every anarchist the country over is openly in favor of female suffrage?

Does not the ballot in the hands of woman seem to give aid and comfort to schemes to overthrow the family and the private home?

Is not one of the saddest problems which the country faces to-day the disintegration of the American home?

Are not too many homes torn with discord and dissension, are not the divorce courts strewn with family skeletons, thick as leaves in the forests in Valambrosa?

Will the ballot in the hands of women pour oil on the troubled domestic waters?

Will not its inevitable tendency be to furnish still another cause of friction and irritation?

Speaking very seriously, and not wishing to be thought guilty of indelicacy, is it not a fact requiring no argument to support it that woman by her very organism and temperament—so fundamentally different and so delicate as compared with man—is not fitted to blaze man's trail or do man's work in the world any more than man is fitted to fill woman's sacred place

[continued on next page]

Document A*[continued from previous page]*

and do her work in the world?

In other words, is not the so-called reform sought, a reform against nature, unscientific and unsound?

Much has been said about the emancipation of woman, as if she were held in bondage through the tyranny of man or government. Are not the women of America the freest beings of their sex on the planet, and fully able to secure any of their sovereign rights, or redress any and all of their wrongs, if they will only unite and make their wants known—that is to say, if remedy by legislative action is possible?

There is a growing and a distinctly alarming tendency in this country on the part of women to escape the so-called drudgery of housekeeping, and particularly the burdens of child-bearing and child-rearing, so that we find many of those who are best equipped for wifehood and motherhood refusing to listen to its sacred call, while those who are illy equipped for it answering the same call unquestioningly.

Do you not think this movement has a strong tendency to encourage this exodus from “the land of bondage,” otherwise known as matrimony and motherhood?

Is not the need of the land and the age to return to the old-fashioned, cardinal, and never-to-be-improved-upon virtues—a return to the first principles of right thinking and right, living—a renaissance of the American family, which is fast being deserted by

its former devotees; to speak plainly, that woman shall not flee from her high and holy mission as though it were a plague, so that no longer the finest product of America—the children—shall, in case they are permitted to arrive at all, be turned over to the tender mercies of hirelings for the training and mothering, or be allowed to bring themselves up with the chances that in the end, away they will go to perdition, across lots; but instead of that they shall be trained in their own homes by their own mothers (I never knew a father who amounted to very much in this line, though he should boost all he can in the right direction); trained in the way they should go, in the full assurance of Holy Writ that when they are old they will not depart therefrom.

Finally, gentlemen, can the good women of the land help themselves, their country, or humanity, now or hereafter, in a more effective way than by the organization of a nationwide back-to-home movement?

Do not present propaganda and program mean a long step in the backward direction?

Is it not emphatically a movement away from home, away from nature, and away from those exalted ideals following which man and woman have struggled upward together from the depths of barbarism to the loftiest plane of civilization and progress the world has ever known?

I thank you.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document B — Some Reasons Why Women Oppose Votes for Women

Because the suffrage is not a question of right or of justice, but of what is best for the State; and if there is no question of right or of justice, there is no case for woman suffrage.

Because the demand for the ballot is made by a small minority of women and the majority of women depend upon men not to force it upon them.

Because the great advance of women in the last century—moral, intellectual, and economic—has been made without the vote, which goes to prove that the vote is not needed for their further advancement along the same lines.

Because women standing outside of politics, and therefore free to appeal to any party, are able to achieve reforms of greater benefit to the State than they could possibly achieve by working along partisan political lines.

Because the basis of government is physical force. It isn't law, but law enforcement, that protects society, and the physical power to enforce the law is neither possible nor desirable for women.

Vote no on Woman Suffrage Nov. 2

Woman Suffrage and Its Allies

Woman suffrage, goes hand in hand with Feminism, Sex Antagonism and Socialism—doctrines which would abolish the marriage ceremony, strike a blow at the fundamentals of Christianity and revolutionize our social system.

If Suffragists deny this, ask them these questions:

Why is the National American Woman Suffrage Association publishing and selling the book entitled "The Case for

Woman Suffrage"—a book filled with the most extreme feministic and socialistic arguments as reasons why women should vote?

Why has the National Woman Suffrage Association published and circulated "Bondwomen"—an infamous pamphlet attacking the marriage ceremony and characterizing wifehood as a species of slavery?

Why do suffrage organizations engage Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Winifred Harper Cooley, Rheta Childe Dehrr, Inez Milholand-Boisevain, Max Eastman and other radical feminists and socialists to speak and write for Woman Suffrage?

Why is every socialist and feminist an ardent woman suffragist?

Why, has the New York Men's League for Woman Suffrage employed as its secretary Max Eastman, editor of "The Masses," a socialist publication, which printed the blasphemous poem, "God's Blunder"?

Why has no suffragist leader arisen to contradict the statement of Braverman, a socialist writer, that "No two social movements ever had so much in common as Woman Suffrage and Socialism"?

Why has no suffragist organization ever repudiated Socialism or Feminism, and why has no suffragist leader of any prominence ever written or spoken against those immoral propagandas?

No one can afford to be neutral regarding Socialism or Feminism, and no one can do anything, directly or indirectly, to advance those movements without helping to lay, the axe at the tap-root of Christian civilization.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document C

The Ohio Ass'n Opposed to Woman's Suffrage, Chamber of Commerce Building, Columbus, Ohio

Voters.

In our campaign before the voters of the State, we rest our cause on these fundamental truths:

First—The Majority of women do not want the vote.

According to the public statement of the Ohio Suffrage Association its membership is 32,000, or less than 3 percent of the women of the State over 21 years of age.

It is unwise, unfair and unjust to force upon a majority of women, a measure which is obnoxious to all their ideals of womanhood.

Second—There is no evidence in the states where women vote that they have contributed anything to the general welfare which has not been duplicated in other states where female franchise does not exist.

All necessary and permanent moral and social reform must be rooted in the home life of the people. It is in the retirement of this quiet home life and not in the publicity of a noisy political campaign that true womanhood seeks an opportunity to serve the state.

Third—The payment of taxes and the right to vote have no connection whatever.

A man may own, property in half a dozen places in the State, and in other states, but he can vote in only one place—the place of his residence.

Minors are fully taxed on their property and so are aliens, but neither class can vote.

Fourth—Women lack the physical ability to exercise the franchise on the same terms as men.

Women are now exempt from jury service and liabilities to police service, including a call to arms in defense of the country.

This exemption far more than compensates any gain which even the most ardent suffragists claim would result from conferring the right of suffrage upon women.

Fifth—It is a mistake to presume that all women will vote right on moral issues. Experience proves that many of the worst ills of social life are due to the influence of women of low ideals of right and wrong, or of degrading morals. Women of this type would be a most dangerous element in political life and would lend themselves to support of immoral issues, backed by designing demagogues in a manner which could not be counteracted by women of reputation and character.

To the ever increasing courtesy of men as shown in the social relation of life as well as to their constant protection in business affairs, women owe a debt of gratitude. In view of this courtesy and protection, the demand for so-called "Women's rights" is both unbecoming and ungenerous.

Vote no on Amendment No. 23

Further literature upon request.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document D

Grace Duffield Goodwin, *The Westfield Leader*, Wednesday, February 18, 1914.
Issued by the Plainfield Branch N. J. Assn.
Opposed to Woman Suffrage

Theory vs. Fact

The suffragists are urging an amendment to the Federal Constitution by which all the States shall speedily enfranchise their women. These women are citizens now in the eyes of the law; no ballot will make them more so. They are entitled to the same protection of life, property and civil rights, which is accorded to men, and in many instances they are given more than their share of all these things.

They are at present exempt from political burdens and responsibilities, free from political intrigues and alliances, in demand in all States as intelligent non-partisan servants of the common weal. They are kept out of no occupation or profession; they have every educational advantage; they have in this State and in many others no disabilities under the law. The effort to represent them as oppressed, enslaved, suffering under grave legal and economic injustice is futile, because such a statement is disproved in the making. The generous endeavors of men have produced within the last ten years a body of protective legislation for woman in industry which puts her in a privileged class under the law. The Maternity Law of Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Connecticut and New York is a case in point. The men did this.

We do not need women to “mother” the government. We do not need to see the “mother spirit” in the Supreme Court. We need mothers where mothering counts—in personal contact with the

lives of individual children. This is being made a matter of legislation when it should be parental control and parental love. We need better fathers and mothers, better homes, the family still the social unit with a common interest and sympathy. We do not need more women politicians, more women office seekers, more women street orators—which types are appearing in this suffrage agitation far too frequently for safety.

The theory that conditions will be bettered by the entrance for women into political life is disproved by the facts. The theories of injustice, oppression, etc., are refuted by the facts. The government's need of such help is not apparent; a woman's power to render any better service than a man is not apparent. Women's unrest, discontent, confused thinking, and selfish individualism are everywhere in evidence in an agitation which has no claim to the attention of those who want the best for the country and the best for its womanhood.

The country does not need it.

The women as a whole do not want it. The conditions do not warrant it. Comparisons are not favorable to it.

Our present governmental system makes for general justice. Only 10% of the women are taxpayers, and in several States they have “taxpaying suffrage”—which they do not use. Property is not the basis of the American ballot. The statement that “one half of the country is governed without its consent” is fallacious. The women as a whole appear to agree that the present system of government is well adapted

[continued on next page]

Document D*[continued from previous page]*

to our needs and circumstances. The government has the consent of its governed, except that minority of women who are apparently neither

students of history, political science nor logic, therefore who are better off to be governed than to be governors.

Document E—Eminent Catholic Prelates Oppose Woman Suffrage**The Voice of Common Sense**

From the Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 15, p. 694, published in 1912 under the imprimatur of Archbishop (now Cardinal) Farley of New York.

“The indirect influence of women which in a well-ordered state makes for the moral order, would suffer severe injury by political equality. The opposition expressed by many women to the introduction of woman suffrage as for instance, the New York Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, should be regarded by Catholics as, at least, the voice of common sense.”

James Cardinal Gibbons

From a letter to Mrs. Robert Garrett of Baltimore, April 22, 1913.

Equal rights do not imply that both sexes should engage promiscuously in the same pursuits, but that each should discharge those duties which are adapted to its physical constitution. The insistence on a right of participation in active political life is undoubtedly calculated to rob woman of all that is amiable and gentle, tender and

attractive; to rob her of her innate grace of character and give her nothing in return but masculine boldness and effrontery. When I deprecate female suffrage, I am pleading for the dignity of woman, I am contending for her honor, I am striving to perpetuate those peerless prerogatives inherent in her sex, those charms and graces which exalt womankind and make her the ornament and coveted companion of man. Woman is queen indeed, but her empire is the domestic kingdom. The greatest political triumphs she would achieve in public life fade into insignificance compared with the serene glory which radiates from the domestic shrine, and which she illuminates and warms by her conjugal and motherly virtues. If she is ambitious of the dual empire of public and private life, then like the fabled dog beholding his image in the water she will lose both, she will fall from the lofty pedestal where nature and Christianity have placed her and will fail to grasp the scepter of political authority from the strong hand of her male competitor.

[continued on next page]

Document E*[continued from previous page]***Cardinal Farley**

(From a newspaper interview in Los Angeles.)

I do not believe in woman suffrage. I think it best for all women to leave to man politics, and, as far as possible, the affairs of government. It is my belief that women will soon tire of the ballot, in states in which they have secured it. A fad, I do not believe it will last.

**The Rt. Rev. John S. Foley,
Bishop of Detroit**

The political arena is not the place for the highest development of all that is best in woman. Nothing but degradation can come from placing gentle women in the voting places to come in contact with all sorts and conditions of men. No good can be accomplished by merely placing the ballot in the hands of women, and the evils which will certainly result will make every husband and father who has respect for the women of his family regret that woman suffrage was ever adopted.

**Archbishop Messmer of
Milwaukee**

(From an address on "Woman's Rights.")

The theory that demands equal rights between the sexes must be denied absolutely. It is a mistake to say equal rights instead of similar rights, for women have certain rights that men have not, and men have certain rights

that women have not. In regard to politics, why should woman have equal rights? Politics means the ruling of nations, and no one who understands this would demand equal rights. Equal rights would interfere with woman's calling. It would destroy her influence on mankind. The modern women's question is the outcome of the French Revolution.

**Archbishop Moeller of
Cincinnati**

(From a letter to the clergy of his diocese.)

It is a movement that does not appeal to us, because we feel that it will bring women into a sphere of activities that is not in accord with their retiring modesty, maidenly dignity and refinement. We fear that suffrage women will cease to be the queens of the home. Let the women devote themselves, as far as their duties permit, to works of charity for which nature has so well fitted them. It not infrequently happens that owing to apathy and indifference, measures have been carried that have not the proper endorsement. We request the women not to fail to sign the anti-suffrage list if they do not wish to, or do not believe that they should, enroll themselves under the banner of the suffragists. Pastors might urge the women from the pulpit to declare themselves in regard to this matter when the opportunity presents itself.

Issued for Massachusetts Anti-Suffrage Committee

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document F

Issued by The Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League

Wage Earning Women

Stop—Think—Reason

Can the workingman use his vote to get work? No.

Thousands of voters are out of work in this country today.

Can the working man use his vote to raise wages? No.

The ballot has no relation to man and his work.

Why should the vote do for you what it has failed to do for men?

What must a woman do to obtain work and raise her wages?

She must apply herself—application develops efficiency; efficiency develops success.

Ask those who have succeeded.

Do not believe those who have failed.

* * *

Wage Earning Women

Stop! Think! Reason!

Can the workingman use his vote to get work? No.

Thousands of voters are out of work in this country to-day.

Can the workingman use his vote to raise his wages? No.

The ballot has no relation to man and his wages. Neither would it have any relation to woman and her wages.

Votes cannot make work when there is no work.

Votes cannot increase wages when there is no natural increase in business.

Document F — Quotations from the Opinions of Authorities on the Subject of Woman Suffrage

Former Attorney General

George W. Wickersham:

“The real significance of the ballot as not being a detached privilege in itself, but as indicative of full citizenship, implies obligations of various kinds, such as service on juries, willingness to perform military service when required, etc. In my opinion, the effect of injecting women into politics is bound to be injurious upon society as a whole and to result in the destruction of the family organization as it has been known in the past. At present a great

many women are inclined to regard the subject as involving merely the dropping of a ballot in the box taking a short time, but, as a matter of fact, a woman cannot fitly discharge all those duties of citizenship unless she gives to them an amount of time inconsistent with the performance of her home duties. This aspect of it is particularly acute in large cities.”

[continued on next page]

Document G*[continued from previous page]***Richard H. Dana:**

"The truth is, the ballot for women is not needed—and if they were ever called upon to combine and work in antagonism to the men, which they must do if their vote is really needed, the evils of the conflict would strike at the very foundations of our social system."

Hon. Thos. F. Bayard:

"There never was a falser statement than that the women of America need any greater protection further than the love borne to them by their fellow countrymen. Do not imperil the advantages which they have or interfere with relations which are founded upon the laws of nature herself."

**Hon. Stanley Bowdle of Ohio,
Member of Congress:**

"No, we cannot have the millennium by law, and women will learn this, as men have been compelled to learn it. If we could, this nation would long since have been the scene of millennial glory surpassing anything dreamed of by prophets of Israel, for we certainly have the laws."

**Melinda Scott, President of the
Trade Unionists:**

"We are skeptical—we cannot see that Suffrage will mean all to us that Suffragists purpose."

**Right Rev. Daniel Sylvester
Tuttle, Presiding Episcopal
Bishop of the United States:**

"It is not fair to women to give them the ballot. Already women are doing more than half the world's work. It is said that suffrage would eliminate many of the social evils. That remains to be seen. Many of the women who would vote are degraded women, who could be influenced by prejudice and money, and it seems to me there would be merely an addition to the corrupt vote."

Dr. S. Wier Mitchell:

"The best of the highest evolution of mind will never be safely reached until woman accepts the irrevocable decree which made her woman and not man. Something in between she cannot be."

Document H

From: *Political Equality*, leaflet published by the National American Woman Suffrage Association. (after 1900)
(Pamphlet distributed to women.)

**Women In the Home
by Susan W. Fitzgerald**

We are forever being told that the place

of woman is in the home. Well, so be it. But what do we expect of her in the home? Merely to stay in the home is not enough. She is a failure unless she does certain things for the home. She must make the home minister, as far as her means allow, to the health and

[continued on next page]

Document H*[continued from previous page]*

welfare, moral as well as physical, of her family, and especially her children. She, more than anyone else, is held responsible for what they become.

She is responsible for the cleanliness of her house.

She is responsible for the wholesomeness of the food.

She is responsible for the children's health.

She, above all, is responsible for their morals, for their sense of truth, of honesty and of decency, for what they turn out to be.

How far can the mother control these things? She can clean her own rooms, but if the neighbors are allowed to live in filth, she cannot keep her rooms from being filled with bad airs and smells, or from being infested by vermin.

She can cook her food well, but if dealers are permitted to sell poor food, unclean milk or stale eggs, she cannot make the food wholesome for her children.

She can care for her own plumbing and refuse, but if the plumbing in the rest of the house is unsanitary, garbage accumulates and the halls and stairs are left dirty, she cannot protect her children from the sickness and infection that these conditions bring.

She can take every care to avoid fire, but if the house has been badly built, if the fire-escapes are insufficient or not fireproof, she cannot guard her children from the horrors of being maimed or killed by fire.

She can open her windows to give her children the air that we are told is so

necessary, but if the air is laden with infection, with tuberculosis and other contagious diseases, she cannot protect her children from this danger.

She can send her children out for air and exercise, but if the conditions that surround them on the streets are immoral and degrading, she cannot protect them from these dangers.

Alone, she cannot make these things right. Who or what can? The city can do it, the city government that is elected by the people, to take care of the interests of the people.

And who decides what the city government shall do?

First, the officials of that government; and, second, those who elect them.

Do the women elect them? No, the men do. So it is the men and not the women that are really responsible for the unclean houses, unwholesome food, bad plumbing, danger of fire, risk of tuberculosis and other diseases, immoral influences of the street. In fact, men are responsible for the conditions under which the children live, but we hold women responsible for the results of those conditions. If we hold women responsible for the results, must we not, in simple justice, let them have something to say as to what these conditions shall be? There is one simple way of doing this. Give them the same means that men have, let them vote.

Women are by nature and training, housekeepers, let them have a hand in the city's housekeeping, even if they introduce an occasional housecleaning.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document I

From: U.S., Congress, Senate, Joint Committee, 62nd Cong., 2nd sess., S. Document 601, pp. 16-20. Statements by Caroline Lowe and Leonora O'Reilly to the Joint Judiciary Committee and Woman Suffrage Committee of the Senate, April 23, 1912.

Statement of Miss Caroline A. Lowe, of Kansas City, Mo.

Gentleman of the committee, it is as a wage earner and on behalf of the 7,000,000 wage-earning women in the United States that I wish to speak.

I entered the ranks of the wage earners when 18 years of age. Since then I have earned every cent of the cost of my own maintenance, and for several years was a potent factor in the support of my widowed mother.

Need of the Ballot. The need of the ballot for the wage-earning women is a vital one. No plea can be made that we have the protection of the home or are represented by our fathers or brothers. We need the ballot that we may broaden our horizon and assume our share in the solution of the problems that seriously affect our daily lives. There is no question that the exercise of the right to vote on matters of public concern enlarges the sense of public responsibility. While in Colorado, where the women have the full right of franchise, is as fully informed on all political matters as is the average man teacher in Kansas, while the average woman teacher in Kansas ranks below the man in this respect.

We need the ballot for the purpose of self-protection. Last Saturday afternoon, at the closing hour at

Marshall Field's in Chicago, a young woman cashier fell on the floor in a dead faint and was carried away by her fellow workers. Long hours of the rush and strain of the Saturday shopping had overcome her. The 10-hour law is not a 10-hour law for us. We must be up at 6 in order to be at work by 8. It requires two hours after work for us to reach home and eat our evening meal. Fourteen hours out of the twenty-four are consumed entirely by our daily efforts to make a living. If we secure any education or amusement it leaves us but seven or eight hours for sleep, and this generally in unsanitary and unwholesome surroundings.

Does the young woman clerk in Marshall Field's need any voice in making the law that sets the hours of labor that shall constitute a day's work?

Has the young woman whose scalp was torn from her head at the Lawrence mill any need of a law demanding that safety appliances be placed upon all dangerous machinery?

The Working Woman and the Workingman. From the standpoint of wages received we wage earners know it to be almost universal that the men in the industries receive twice the wage granted to us, although we may be doing the same work and should have the same pay. We women work side by side with our brothers. We are children of the same parents, reared in the same homes, educated in the same schools, ride to and fro on the same early morning and late evening cars, work together the same number of hours in the same shops, and we

[continued on next page]

Document I*[continued from previous page]*

have equal need of food, clothing, and shelter. But at 21 years of age our brothers are given a powerful weapon for self-defense, a larger means for growth and self-expression.

We working women, even because we are women and find our sex not a source of strength, but a source of weakness and offering a greater opportunity for exploitation, are denied this weapon.

Gentlemen of the committee, is there any justice underlying such a condition? If our brother workingmen are granted the ballot with which to protect themselves, do you not think that the working women should be granted this same right?

Discrimination Against Disfranchised Class. You say the ballot is not a factor as a means of discrimination between the workingman and the working woman. We found the most striking example of the falsity of this statement a few years ago in Chicago. The Chicago teachers (mostly women), firemen, and policemen had had their salaries cut because of the poverty of the city. The teachers' salaries were cut the third time. They organized to investigate the reason for the reduction. Margaret Haley was selected to carry on the investigation. As a result, she unearthed large corporations that were not paying the legal amount of taxes. The teachers forced the issue, and as a result nearly \$600,000 in taxes was annually forced from the corporations and turned into the public treasury. What was done with it? The policemen and firemen had the cut in their salaries restored, while the teachers did not. Instead, the finance committee recommended and the board of education appropriated the teachers' share to pay coal bills, repairs,

etc. Why was this? It was a clear case of the usual treatment accorded to a disfranchised class.

Industrial Revolution Precedes Political Evolution. However, Mr. Chairman, as students of sociology we are forced to recognize the fact that the ballot has never yet been granted by a ruling class because of the needs of a serving class.

Almost without exception the extension of the franchise has taken place only when the needs of the industrial development have demanded a larger degree of freedom upon the part of the serving class, so that the serving class, driven by the very pressure of economic need, has organized as a class, and, after a struggle, has wrested from the grasp of the ruling class a larger share in the powers of government.

If to-day, taking your places as men of affairs in the world's progress, you step out in unison with the eternal upward trend toward true democracy, you will support the suffrage amendment now before the committee. [continued applause.]

Statement of Miss Leonora O'Reilly, of New York City.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: Yes; I have outdone the lady who went to work at 18 by five years. I have been a wage earner since I was a little over 13. I, too, know whereof I speak; that is the reason I do not want to play a bluff game with you any longer. You can not or will not make laws for us; we must make laws for ourselves. We working women need the ballot for self-protection; that is all there is to it. We have got to have it.

[continued on next page]

Document I*[continued from previous page]*

We work long, long hours and we do not get half enough to live on. We have got to keep decent, and if we go “the easy way” you men make the laws that will let you go free and send us into the gutter. [Applause.]

We have gone before legislature after legislature making our pleas for justice. We have seen the game as you play it. What is it? We go there and we are told the same old tommyrot—let men do this for you. I tell you as a bit of business experience if you let anybody do a thing for you they will do you. That is business. [Applause.]

We are not getting a square deal; we go before legislature after legislature to tell our story, but they fail to help the women who are being speeded so high in the mills and in factories, from 54 to 72 hours in stores in New York, and 92 hours in one week in subcellar laundries. Who cares? Nobody! Nobody does; nobody cares about making laws so long as we get cheap and nasty things in the market. Working women come before you and tell you these things and think you will do something for them. Every man listening is convinced that the girls are telling the truth. It is only when you think of them as your own girls that you

have the right to make laws for them. Every man listening wants to do the fair thing, but just as soon as our backs are turned, up comes the representative of the big interest and says, “Lad, you are dead politically if you do what those women ask.” They know it is true, and we get nothing, because all the votes are owned.

Every vote you cast is owned, and it is the owned vote which has fought our women. Go before legislatures as you will, the only argument that you can bring in to the man in politics—he is there to go up the ladder, decently if he can, but he will go up anyhow, if he can—the only argument that you can bring to that man is the power of the ballot. When we can say to him. “Man do this and we will return you so many million votes,” he will listen and act.

We working women want the ballot, not as a privilege but as a right. You say you have only given the ballot as an expediency; you have never given it as a right; then we demand it as an expediency for the 8,000,000 working women. All other women ought to have it, but we working women must have it. [Applause.]

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

Document J

Remarks by Mrs. Zerelda G. Wallace, of Indiana to Senate Judiciary Committee, January 1880 From: U.S., Congress, Senate, Judiciary Committee, *Appendix to the Report on Suffrage*, 49th Cong., 1st Sess., S. Rept. 70, pp. 21-22.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee: It is scarcely necessary to recite that there is not an effect without a cause. Therefore it would be well for the statesmen of this nation to ask themselves the question, What has brought women from all parts of this nation to the capital at this time? What has been the strong motive that has taken us away from the quiet and comfort of our own homes and brought us before you to-day?

A short time ago I went before the legislature of Indiana with a petition signed by 25,000 women, the best women in the State. I appeal to the memory of Judge McDonald to substantiate the truth of what I say. Judge McDonald knows that I am a home-loving, law-abiding, tax-paying woman of Indiana, and have been for fifty years. When I went before our legislature and found that one hundred of the vilest men in our State, merely by possession of the ballot, had more influence with the law-makers of our land than the wives and mothers of the nation, it was a revelation that was perfectly startling.

You must admit that in popular government the ballot is the most potent means of all moral and social reforms. As members of society, as those who are deeply interested in the promotion of good morals, of virtue, and of the proper protection of men from the

consequences of their own vices, and of the protection of women, too, we are deeply interested in all the social problems with which you grappled so long unsuccessfully. We do not intend to depreciate your efforts, but you have attempted to do an impossible thing. You have attempted to represent the whole by one-half; and we come to you to-day for a recognition of the fact that humanity is not a unit; that it is a unity; and because we are one-half that go to make up that grand unity we come before you today and ask you to recognize our rights as citizens of this Republic.

I say to you, then, we come as one-half of the great whole. There is an essential difference in the sexes. Mr. Parkman labored very hard to prove what no one would deny, that there is an essential difference in the sexes, and it is because of that very differentiation, the union of which in home, the recognition of which in the church brings the greatest power and influence for good, and the recognition of which in the Government would enable us finally, as near as it is possible for humanity, to perfect our form of government. Probably we can never have a perfect form of government, but the nearer we approximate to the divine the nearer will we attain to perfection; and the divine government recognizes neither caste, class, sex, nor nationality. The nearer we approach to that divine ideal the nearer we will come to realizing our hopes of finally securing at least the most perfect form of human government that it is possible for us to secure.

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]



Part II—Woman Suffrage

11. On a separate piece of paper, write at least five arguments for or against woman suffrage. Use arguments taken from the documents (write the document letter next to each argument), and add some of your own if you'd like.

12. Evaluate the arguments made by Franklin Collins in Document A.

13. Evaluate one argument made in Document B.

14. What assumption do the Catholic clergymen make in Document E?

[continued on next page]

[continued from previous page]

15. To what groups were the antisuffragists appealing?
16. To what group was the suffragist Susan Fitzgerald appealing in Document H?
17. Evaluate an argument made in Document I.
18. Evaluate an argument made in Document J.

Should Women Have the Right to Vote?

Read Documents A—J in this lesson (pp. 53-67) and fill in this chart. Use another sheet of paper if you need more space. After completing the chart, write your view on whether women should have the right to vote on a separate piece of paper.

Document	2 or 3 Key Arguments	Evaluate 1 Argument
A Franklin Collins		
B Antisuffrage Leaflets		
C Ohio Association Opposed to Woman's Suffrage		
D Plainfield Branch N. J. Assn. Opposed to Woman Suffrage		
E Eminent Catholic Prelates		
F Wage Earners' Anti-Suffrage League		
G Quotations by Authorities		
H Susan Fitzgerald		
I Caroline Lowe and Leonora O'Reilly		
J Mrs. Zerelda Wallace		