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PREFACE

To strive for liberty and for a democratic way of life has always been

a noble tradition of our country. Susan B. Anthony followed this

tradition. Convinced that the principle of equal rights for all, as

stated in the Declaration of Independence, must be expressed in the

laws of a true republic, she devoted her life to the establishment of

this ideal.

Because she recognized in Negro slavery and in the legal bondage of

women flagrant violations of this principle, she became an active,

courageous, effective antislavery crusader and a champion of civil and

political rights for women. She saw women's struggle for freedom from

legal restrictions as an important phase in the development of

American democracy. To her this struggle was never a battle of the

sexes, but a battle such as any freedom-loving people would wage for

civil and political rights.

While her goals for women were only partially realized in her

lifetime, she prepared the soil for the acceptance not only of her

long-hoped-for federal woman suffrage amendment but for a worldwide

recognition of human rights, now expressed in the United Nations

Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights. She looked forward to the

time when throughout the world there would be no discrimination

because of race, color, religion, or sex.
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QUAKER HERITAGE

"If Sally Ann knows more about weaving than Elijah," reasoned

eleven-year-old Susan with her father, "then why don't you make her

overseer?"

"It would never do," replied Daniel Anthony as a matter of course. "It

would never do to have a woman overseer in the mill."

This answer did not satisfy Susan and she often thought about it. To

enter the mill, to stand quietly and look about, was the best kind of

entertainment, for she was fascinated by the whir of the looms, by the

nimble fingers of the weavers, and by the general air of efficiency.

Admiringly she watched Sally Ann Hyatt, the tall capable weaver from

Vermont. When the yarn on the beam was tangled or there was something

wrong with the machinery, Elijah, the overseer, always called out to

Sally Ann, "I'll tend your loom, if you'll look after this." Sally Ann

never failed to locate the trouble or to untangle the yarn. Yet she

was never made overseer, and this continued to puzzle Susan.[1]

The manufacture of cotton was a new industry, developing with great

promise in the United States, when Susan B. Anthony was born on

February 15, 1820, in the wide valley at the foot of Mt. Greylock,

near Adams, Massachusetts. Enterprising young men like her father,

Daniel Anthony, saw a potential cotton mill by the side of every

rushing brook, and young women, eager to earn the first money they

could call their own, were leaving the farms, for a few months at

least, to work in the mills. Cotton cloth was the new sensation and

the demand for it was steadily growing. Brides were proud to display a

few cotton sheets instead of commonplace homespun linen.

When Susan was two years old, her father built a cotton factory of

twenty-six looms beside the brook which ran through Grandfather Read's

meadow, hauling the cotton forty miles by wagon from Troy, New York.

The millworkers, most of them young girls from Vermont, boarded, as

was the custom, in the home of the millowner; Susan's mother, Lucy

Read Anthony, although she had three small daughters to care for,

Guelma, Susan, and Hannah, boarded eleven of the millworkers with

only the help of a thirteen-year-old girl who worked for her after

school hours. Lucy Anthony cooked their meals on the hearth of the big

kitchen fireplace, and in the large brick oven beside it baked crisp

brown loaves of bread. In addition, washing, ironing, mending, and

spinning filled her days. But she was capable and strong and was doing

only what all women in this new country were expected to do. She

taught her young daughters to help her, and Susan, even before she was

six, was very useful; by the time she was ten she could cook a good

meal and pack a dinner pail.

[Illustration: Daniel Anthony, father of Susan B. Anthony]

\* \* \* \* \*

Hard work and skill were respected as Susan grew up in the rapidly

expanding young republic which less than fifty years before had been

founded and fought for. Settlers, steadily pushing westward, had built

new states out of the wilderness, adding ten to the original thirteen.

Everywhere the leaven of democracy was working and men were putting

into practice many of the principles so boldly stated in the

Declaration of Independence, claiming for themselves equal rights and

opportunities. The new states entered the Union with none of the

traditional property and religious limitations on the franchise, but

with manhood suffrage and all voters eligible for office. The older

states soon fell into line, Massachusetts in 1820 removing property

qualifications for voters. Before long, throughout the United States,

all free white men were enfranchised, leaving only women, Negroes, and

Indians without the full rights of citizenship.

[Illustration: Lucy Read Anthony, mother of Susan B. Anthony]

Although women freeholders had voted in some of the colonies and in

New Jersey as late as 1807,[2] just as in England in the fifteenth

franchise had gradually found its way into the statutes, and women's

rights as citizens were ignored, in spite of the contribution they had

made to the defense and development of the new nation. However,

European travelers, among them De Tocqueville, recognized that the

survival of the New World experiment in government and the prosperity

and strength of the people were due in large measure to the

superiority of American women. A few women had urged their claims:

Abigail Adams asked her husband, a member of the Continental Congress,

"to remember the ladies" in the "new code of laws"; and Hannah Lee

Corbin of Virginia pleaded with her brother, Richard Henry Lee, to

make good the principle of "no taxation without representation" by

enfranchising widows with property.[3]

Yet the legal bondage of women continued to be overlooked. It seemed a

less obvious threat to free institutions and democratic government

than the Negro in slavery. In fact, Negro slavery presented a problem

which demanded attention again and again, flaring up alarmingly in

1820, the year Susan B. Anthony was born, when Missouri was admitted

to the Union as a slave state.[4]

\* \* \* \* \*

These were some of the forces at work in the minds of Americans during

Susan's childhood. Her father, a liberal Quaker, was concerned over

the extension of slavery, and she often heard him say that he tried to

avoid purchasing cotton raised by slave labor. This early impression

of the evil of slavery was never erased.

The Quakers' respect for women's equality with men before God also

left its mark on young Susan. As soon as she was old enough she went

regularly to Meeting with her father, for all of the Anthonys were

Quakers. They had migrated to western Massachusetts from Rhode Island,

and there on the frontier had built prosperous farms, comfortable

homes, and a meeting house where they could worship God in their own

way. Susan, sitting with the women and children on the hand-hewn

benches near the big fireplace in the meeting house[5] which her

ancestors had built, found peace and consecration in the simple

unordered service, in the long reverent silence broken by both the men

and the women in the congregation as they were led to say a prayer or

give out a helpful message. Forty families now worshiped here, the

women sitting on one side and the men on the other; but women took

their places with men in positions of honor, Susan's own grandmother,

Hannah Latham Anthony, an elder, sitting in the "high seat," and her

aunt, Hannah Anthony Hoxie, preaching as the spirit moved her. With

this valuation of women accepted as a matter of course in her church

and family circle, Susan took it for granted that it existed

everywhere.

Although her father was a devout Friend, she discovered that he had

the reputation of thinking for himself, following the "inner light"

even when its leading differed from the considered judgment of his

fellow Quakers. For this he became a hero to her, especially after she

heard the romantic story of his marriage to Lucy Read who was not a

Quaker. The Anthonys and the Reads had been neighbors for years, and

Lucy was one of the pupils at the "home school" which Grandfather

Humphrey Anthony had built for his children on the farm, under the

weeping willow at the front gate. Daniel and Lucy were schoolmates

until Daniel at nineteen was sent to Richard Mott's Friends' boarding

school at Nine Partners on the Hudson. When he returned as a teacher,

he found his old playmate still one of the pupils, but now a beautiful

tall young woman with deep blue eyes and glossy brown hair. Full of

fun, a good dancer, and always dressed in the prettiest clothes, she

was the most popular girl in the neighborhood. Promptly Daniel Anthony

fell in love with her, but an almost insurmountable obstacle stood in

the way: Quakers were not permitted to "marry out of Meeting." This,

however, did not deter Daniel.

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony Homestead, Adams, Massachusetts]

It was harder for Lucy to make up her mind. She enjoyed parties,

dances, and music. She had a full rich voice, and as she sat at her

spinning wheel, singing and spinning, she often wished that she could

"go into a ten acre lot with the bars down"[6] and let her voice out.

If she married Daniel, she would have to give all this up, but she

decided in favor of Daniel. A few nights before the wedding, she went

to her last party and danced until four in the morning while Daniel

looked on and patiently waited until she was ready to leave.

For his transgression of marrying out of Meeting, Daniel had to face

the elders as soon as he returned from his wedding trip. They weighed

the matter carefully, found him otherwise sincere and earnest, and

decided not to turn him out. Lucy gave up her dancing and her singing.

She gave up her pretty bright-colored dresses for plain somber

clothes, but she did not adopt the Quaker dress or use the "plain

speech." She went to meeting with Daniel but never became a Quaker,

feeling always that she could not live up to their strict standard of

righteousness.[7]

This was Susan's heritage--Quaker discipline and austerity lightened

by her father's independent spirit and by the kindly understanding of

her mother who had not forgotten her own fun-loving girlhood; an

environment where men and women were partners in church and at home,

where hard physical work was respected, where help for the needy and

unfortunate was spontaneous, and where education was regarded as so

important that Grandfather Anthony built a school for his children and

the neighbors' in his front yard. Her childhood was close enough to

the Revolution to make Grandfather Read's part in it very real and a

source of great pride. Eagerly and often she listened to the story of

how he enlisted in the Continental army as soon as the news of the

Battle of Lexington reached Cheshire and served with outstanding

bravery under Arnold at Quebec, Ethan Allen at Ticonderoga, and

Colonel Stafford at Bennington while his young wife waited anxiously

for him throughout the long years of the war.

\* \* \* \* \*

The wide valley in the Berkshire Hills where Susan grew up made a

lasting impression on her. There was beauty all about her--the fruit

trees blooming in the spring, the meadows white with daisies, the

brook splashing over the rocks and sparkling in the summer sun, the

flaming colors of autumn, the strength and companionship of the hills

when the countryside was white with snow. She seldom failed to watch

the sun set behind Greylock.

Her father's cotton mill flourished. Regarded as one of the most

promising, successful young men of the district, he soon attracted the

attention of Judge John McLean, a cotton manufacturer of Battenville,

New York, who, eager to enlarge his mills, saw in Daniel Anthony an

able manager. Daniel, always ready to take the next step ahead,

accepted McLean's offer, and on a sunny July day in 1826, Susan drove

with her family through the hills forty-four miles to the new world of

Battenville.

Here in the home of Judge McLean, she saw Negroes for the first time,

Negroes working to earn their freedom. Startled by their black faces,

she was a little afraid, but when her father explained that in the

South they could be sold like cattle and torn from their families, her

fear turned to pity.

At the district school, taught by a woman in summer and by a man in

the winter, she learned to sew, spell, read, and write, and she wanted

to study long division but the schoolmaster, unable to teach it, saw

no reason why a woman should care for such knowledge. Her father, then

realizing the need of better education for his five children, Guelma,

Susan, Hannah, Daniel, and Mary, established a school for them in the

new brick building where he had opened a store. Later on when their

new brick house was finished, he set aside a large room for the

school, and here for the first time in that district the pupils had

separate seats, stools without backs, instead of the usual benches

around the schoolroom walls. He engaged as teachers young women who

had studied a year or two in a female seminary; and because female

seminaries were rare in those days, women teachers with up-to-date

training were hard to find. Only a few visionaries believed in the

education of women. Nearby Emma Willard's recently established Troy

Female Seminary was being watched with interest and suspicion. Mary

Lyon, who had not yet founded her own seminary at Mt. Holyoke, was

teaching at Zilpha Grant's school in Ipswich, Massachusetts, and one

of her pupils, Mary Perkins, came to Battenville to teach the Anthony

children. Mary Perkins brought new methods and new studies to the

little school. She introduced a primer with small black illustrations

which fascinated Susan. She taught the children to recite poetry,

drilled them regularly in calisthenics, and longed to add music as

well, but Daniel Anthony forbade this, for Quakers believed that music

might seduce the thoughts of the young. So Susan, although she often

had a song in her heart, had to repress it and never knew the joy of

singing the songs of childhood.

Her father, looking upon the millworkers as part of his family,

started an evening school for them, often teaching it himself or

calling in the family teacher. He organized a temperance society among

the workers, and all signed a pledge never to drink distilled liquor.

When he opened a store in the new brick building, he refused to sell

liquor, although Judge McLean warned him it would ruin his trade.

Daniel Anthony went even further. He resolved not to serve liquor when

the millworkers' houses were built and the neighbors came to the

"raising." Again Judge McLean protested, feeling certain that the men

and boys would demand their gin and their rum, but Susan and her

sisters helped their mother serve lemonade, tea, coffee, doughnuts,

and gingerbread in abundance. The men joked a bit about the lack of

strong drink which they expected with every meal, but they did not

turn away from the good substitutes which were offered and they were

on hand for the next "raising." Hearing all of this discussed at home,

Susan, again proud of her father, ardently advocated the cause of

temperance.

\* \* \* \* \*

The mill was still of great interest to her and she watched every

operation closely in her spare time, longing to try her hand at the

work. One day when a "spooler" was ill, Susan and her sister Hannah

eagerly volunteered to take her place. Their father was ready to let

them try, pleased by their interest and curious to see what they could

do, but their mother protested that the mill was no place for

children. Finally Susan's earnest pleading won her mother's reluctant

consent, and the two girls drew lots for the job. It went to

twelve-year-old Susan on the condition that she divide her earnings

with Hannah. Every day for two weeks she went early to the mill in her

plain homespun dress, her straight hair neatly parted and smoothed

over her ears. Proudly she tended the spools. She was skillful and

quick, and received the regular wage of $1.50 a week, which she

divided with Hannah, buying with her share six pale blue coffee cups

for her mother who had allowed her this satisfying adventure.

A few weeks before her thirteenth birthday, Susan became a member of

the Society of Friends which met in nearby Easton, New York, and

learned to search her heart and ask herself, "Art thou faithful?"

Parties, dancing, and entertainments were generally ruled out of her

life as sinful, and rarely were a temptation, but occasionally her

mother, remembering her own good times, let her and her sisters go to

parties at the homes of their Presbyterian neighbors, and for this her

father was criticized at Friends' Meeting. Condemning bright colors,

frills, and jewelry as vain and worldly, Susan accepted plain somber

clothing as a mark of righteousness, and when she deviated to the

extent of wearing the Scotch-plaid coat which her mother had bought

her, she wondered if the big rent torn in it by a dog might not be

deserved punishment for her pride in wearing it.

That same year, the family moved into their new brick house of fifteen

rooms, with hard-finish plaster walls and light green woodwork, the

finest house in that part of the country. Here Susan's brother Merritt

was born the next April, and her two-year-old sister, Eliza, died.

Susan, Guelma, and Hannah continued their studies longer than most

girls in the neighborhood, for Quakers not only encouraged but

demanded education for both boys and girls. As soon as Susan and her

sister Guelma were old enough, they taught the "home" school in the

summer when the younger children attended, and then went further

afield to teach in nearby villages. At fifteen Susan was teaching a

district school for $1.50 a week and board, and although it was hard

for her to be away from home, she accepted it as a Friend's duty to

provide good education for children. Now Presbyterian neighbors

criticized her father, protesting that well-to-do young ladies should

not venture into paid work.

Daniel Anthony was now a wealthy man, his factory the largest and most

prosperous in that part of the country, and he could afford more and

better education for his daughters. He sent Guelma, the eldest, to

Deborah Moulson's Friends' Seminary near Philadelphia, where for $125

a year "the inculcation of the principles of Humility, Morality, and

Virtue" received particular attention; and when Guelma was asked to

stay on a second year as a teacher, he suggested that Susan join her

there as a pupil.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was a long journey from Battenville to Philadelphia in 1837, and

when Susan left her home on a snowy afternoon with her father, she

felt as if the parting would be forever. Her first glimpse of the

world beyond Battenville interested her immensely until her father

left her at the seminary, and then she confessed to her diary, "Oh

what pangs were felt. It seemed impossible for me to part with him. I

could not speak to bid him farewell."[8] She tried to comfort herself

by writing letters, and wrote so many and so much that Guelma often

exclaimed, "Susan, thee writes too much; thee should learn to be

concise." As it was a rule of the seminary that each letter must first

be written out carefully on a slate, inspected by Deborah Moulson,

then copied with care, inspected again, and finally sent out after

four or five days of preparation, all spontaneity was stifled and her

letters were stilted and overvirtuous. This censorship left its mark,

and years later she confessed, "Whenever I take my pen in hand, I

always seem to be mounted on stilts."[9]

To her diary she could confide her real feelings--her discouragement

over her lack of improvement and her inability to understand her many

"sins," such as not dotting an \_i\_, too much laughter, or smiling at

her friends instead of reproving them for frivolous conduct. She

wrote, "Thought so much of my resolutions to do better in the future

that even my dreams were filled with these desires.... Although I have

been guilty of much levity and nonsensical conversation, and have also

admitted thoughts to occupy my mind which should have been far distant

from it, I do not consider myself as having committed any wilful

offense but perhaps the reason I cannot see my own defects is because

my heart is hardened."[10]

The girls studied a variety of subjects, arithmetic, algebra,

literature, chemistry, philosophy, physiology, astronomy, and

bookkeeping. Men came to the school to conduct some of the classes,

and Deborah Moulson was also assisted by several student teachers, one

of whom, Lydia Mott, became Susan's lifelong friend. Susan worked

hard, for she was a conscientious child, but none of her efforts

seemed to satisfy Deborah Moulson, who was a hard taskmaster. Her

reproofs cut deep, and once when Susan protested that she was always

censured while Guelma was praised, Deborah Moulson sternly replied,

"Thy sister Guelma does the best she is capable of, but thou dost not.

Thou hast greater abilities and I demand of thee the best of thy

capacity."[11]

Mail from home was a bright spot, bringing into those busy austere

days news of her friends, and when she read that one of them had

married an old widower with six children, she reflected sagely, "I

should think any female would rather live and die an old maid."[12]

Then came word that her father's business had been so affected by the

financial depression that the family would have to give up their home

in Battenville. Sorrowfully she wrote in her diary, "O can I ever

forget that loved residence in Battenville, and no more to call it

home seems impossible."[13] It helped little to realize that countless

other families throughout the country were facing the future penniless

because banks had failed, mills were shut down, and work on canals and

railroads had ceased. In April 1838, Daniel Anthony came to the

seminary to take his daughters home.

Susan felt keenly her father's sorrow over the failure of his business

and the loss of the home he had built for his family, and she resolved

at once to help out by teaching in Union Village, New York. In May

1838, she wrote in her diary, "On last evening ... I again left my

home to mingle with strangers which seems to be my sad lot. Separation

was rendered more trying on account of the embarrassing condition of

our business affairs, an inventory was expected to be taken today of

our furniture by assignees.... Spent this day in school, found it

small and quite disorderly. O, may my patience hold out to persevere

without intermission."[14]

Her patience did hold out, and also her courage, as the news came from

home telling her how everything had to be sold to satisfy the

creditors, the furniture, her mother's silver spoons, their clothing

and books, the flour, tea, coffee, and sugar in the pantries. She

rejoiced to hear that Uncle Joshua Read from Palatine Bridge, New

York, had come to the rescue, had bought their most treasured and

needed possessions and turned them over to her mother.

On a cold blustery March day in 1839, when she was nineteen, Susan

moved with her family two miles down the Battenkill to the little

settlement of Hardscrabble, later called Center Falls, where her

father owned a satinet factory and grist mill, built in more

prosperous times. These were now heavily mortgaged but he hoped to

save them. They moved into a large house which had been a tavern in

the days when lumber had been cut around Hardscrabble. It was

disappointing after their fine brick house in Battenville, but they

made it comfortable, and their love for and loyalty to each other made

them a happy family anywhere. As it had been a halfway house on the

road to Troy and travelers continued to stop there asking for a meal

or a night's lodging, they took them in, and young Daniel served them

food and nonintoxicating drinks at the old tavern bar.

Susan, when her school term was over, put her energies into housework,

recording in her diary, "Did a large washing today.... Spent today at

the spinning wheel.... Baked 21 loaves of bread.... Wove three yards

of carpet yesterday."[15]

The attic of the tavern had been finished off for a ballroom with

bottles laid under the floor to give a nice tone to the music of the

fiddles, and now the young people of the village wanted to hold their

dancing school there. Susan's father, true to his Quaker training,

felt obliged to refuse, but when they came the second time to tell him

that the only other place available was a disreputable tavern where

liquor was sold, he relented a little, and talked the matter over with

his wife and daughters. Lucy Anthony, recalling her love of dancing,

urged him to let the young people come. Finally he consented on the

condition that Guelma, Hannah, and Susan would not dance. They agreed.

Every two weeks all through the winter, the fiddles played in the

attic room and the boys and girls of the neighborhood danced the

Virginia reel and their rounds and squares, while the three Quaker

girls sat around the wall, watching and longing to join in the fun.

Such frivolous entertainment in the home of a Quaker could not be

condoned, and Daniel Anthony was not only severely censured by the

Friends but read out of Meeting, "because he kept a place of amusement

in his house." But he did not regret his so-called sin any more than

he regretted marrying out of Meeting. He continued to attend Friends'

Meeting, but grew more and more liberal as the years went by. At this

time, like all Quakers, he refused to vote, not wishing in any way to

support a government that believed in war, and this influenced Susan

who for some years regarded voting as unimportant. He refused to pay

taxes for the same reason, and she often saw him put his pocketbook on

the table and then remark drily to the tax collector, "I shall not

voluntarily pay these taxes. If thee wants to rifle my pocketbook,

thee can do so."[16]

\* \* \* \* \*

To help her father with his burden of debt was now Susan's purpose in

life, and in the spring she again left the family circle to teach at

Eunice Kenyon's Friends' Seminary in New Rochelle, New York. There

were twenty-eight day pupils and a few boarders at the seminary, and

for long periods while Eunice Kenyon was ill, Susan took full charge.

She wrote her family all the little details of her life, but their

letters never came often enough to satisfy her. Occasionally she

received a paper or a letter from Aaron McLean, Judge McLean's

grandson, who had been her good friend and Guelma's ever since they

had moved to Battenville. His letters almost always started an

argument which both of them continued with zest. After hearing the

Quaker preacher, Rachel Barker, she wrote him, "I guess if you would

hear her you would believe in a woman's preaching. What an absurd

notion that women have not intellectual and moral faculties sufficient

for anything but domestic concerns."[17]

When New Rochelle welcomed President Van Buren with a parade, bands

playing, and crowds in the streets, this prim self-righteous young

woman took no part in this hero worship, but gave vent to her

disapproval in a letter to Aaron.

Disturbed over the treatment Negroes received at Friends' Meeting in

New Rochelle, she impulsively wrote him, "The people about here are

anti-abolitionist and anti everything else that's good. The Friends

raised quite a fuss about a colored man sitting in the meeting house,

and some left on account of it.... What a lack of Christianity is

this!"[18]

Her school term of fifteen weeks, for which she was paid $30, was over

early in September, just in time for her to be at home for Guelma's

wedding to Aaron McLean, and afterward she stayed on to teach the

village school in Center Falls. This made it possible for her to join

in the social life of the neighborhood. Often the young people drove

to nearby villages, twenty buggies in procession. On a drive to

Saratoga, her escort asked her to give up teaching to marry him. She

refused, as she did again a few years later when a Quaker elder tried

to entice her with his fine house, his many acres, and his sixty cows.

Although she had reached the age of twenty, when most girls felt they

should be married, she was still particular, and when a friend married

a man far inferior mentally, she wrote in her diary, "'Tis strange,

'tis passing strange that a girl possessed of common sense should be

willing to marry a lunatic--but so it is."[19]

During the next few years, both she and Hannah taught school almost

continuously, for $2 to $2.50 a week. Time and time again Susan

replaced a man who had been discharged for inefficiency. Although she

made a success of the school, she discovered that she was paid only a

fourth the salary he had received, and this rankled.

Almost everywhere except among Quakers, she encountered a false

estimate of women which she instinctively opposed. After spending

several months with relatives in Vermont, where she had the unexpected

opportunity of studying algebra, she stopped over for a visit with

Guelma and Aaron in Battenville, where Aaron was a successful

merchant. Eagerly she told them of her latest accomplishment. Aaron

was not impressed. Later at dinner when she offered him the delicious

cream biscuits which she had baked, he remarked with his most

tantalizing air of male superiority, "I'd rather see a woman make

biscuits like these than solve the knottiest problem in algebra."

"There is no reason," she retorted, "why she should not be able to do

both."[20]

FOOTNOTES:

[1] \_Report of the International Council of Women\_, 1888 (Washington,

1888), p. 163.

[2] Charles B. Waite, "Who Were the Voters in the Early History of

This Country?" \_Chicago Law Times\_, Oct., 1888.

[3] Janet Whitney, \_Abigail Adams\_ (Boston, 1947), p. 129. In 1776,

Abigail Adams wrote her husband, John Adams, at the Continental

Congress in Philadelphia, "In the new code of laws which I suppose it

will be necessary for you to make, I desire you would remember the

ladies and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors!

Do not put such unlimited powers into the hands of husbands. Remember

all men would be tyrants if they could. If particular care and

attention is not paid to the ladies, we are determined to foment a

rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we

have no voice or representation." Ethel Armes, \_Stratford Hall\_

(Richmond, Va., 1936), pp. 206-209.

[4] Under the Missouri Compromise, Maine was admitted as a free state,

Missouri as a slave state, and slavery was excluded from all of the

Louisiana Purchase, north of latitude 36°31'.

[5] The meeting house, built in 1783, is still standing. It is owned

by the town of Adams, and cared for by the Adams Society of Friends

Descendants. Susan traced her ancestry to William Anthony of Cologne

who migrated to England and during the reign of Edward VI, was made

Chief Graver of the Royal Mint and Master of the Scales, holding this

office also during the reign of Queen Mary and part of Queen

Elizabeth's reign. In 1634, one of his descendants, John Anthony,

settled in Rhode Island, and just before the Revolution, his great

grandson, David, Susan's great grandfather, bought land near Adams,

Massachusetts, then regarded as the far West.

[6] Ida Husted Harper, \_The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony\_

(Indianapolis, 1898), I, p. 10.

[7] Daniel and Susannah Richardson Read gave Lucy and Daniel Anthony

land for their home, midway between the Anthony and Read farms. Here

Susan was born in a substantial two-story, frame house, built by her

father.

[8] Ms., Diary, 1837.

[9] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 25.

[10] Ms., Diary, Jan. 21, Feb. 10, 1838

[11] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 31.

[12] Ms., Diary, Feb. 26, 1838.

[13] \_Ibid.\_, Feb. 6, 1838.

[14] \_Ibid.\_, May 7, 1838.

[15] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 36.

[16] \_Ibid.\_, p. 37.

[17] \_Ibid.\_, p. 40.

[18] \_Ibid.\_, p. 39.

[19] \_Ibid.\_

[20] \_Ibid.\_, pp. 43-44.

WIDENING HORIZONS

Unable to recoup his business losses in Center Falls and losing even

the satinet factory, Susan's father had looked about in Virginia and

Michigan as well as western New York for an opportunity to make a

fresh start. A farm on the outskirts of Rochester looked promising,

and with the money which Lucy Anthony had inherited from Grandfather

Read and which had been held for her by Uncle Joshua Read, the first

payment had been made on the farm by Uncle Joshua, who held it in his

name and leased it to Daniel.[21] Had it been turned over to Susan's

mother, it would have become Daniel Anthony's property under the law

and could have been claimed by his creditors.

Only Susan, Merritt, and Mary climbed into the stage with their

parents, early in November 1845, on the first lap of their journey to

their new home, near Rochester, New York. Guelma and Hannah[22] were

both married and settled in homes of their own, and young Daniel,

clerking in Lenox, had decided to stay behind.

After a visit with Uncle Joshua at Palatine Bridge, they boarded a

line boat on the Erie Canal, taking with them their gray horse and

wagon; and surrounded by their household goods, they moved slowly

westward. Standing beside her father in the warm November sunshine,

Susan watched the strong horses on the towpath, plodding patiently

ahead, and heard the wash of the water against the prow and the noisy

greeting of boat horns. As they passed the snug friendly villages

along the canal and the wide fertile fields, now brown and bleak after

the harvest, she wondered what the new farm would be like and what the

future would bring; and at night when the lights twinkled in the

settlements along the shore, she thought longingly of her old home and

the sisters she had left behind.

After a journey of several days, they reached Rochester late in the

afternoon. Her father took the horse and wagon off the boat, and in

the chill gray dusk drove them three miles over muddy roads to the

farm. It was dark when they arrived, and the house was cold, empty,

and dismal, but after the fires were lighted and her mother had cooked

a big kettle of cornmeal mush, their spirits revived. Within the next

few days they transformed it into a cheerful comfortable home.

The house on a little hill overlooked their thirty-two acres. Back of

it was the barn, a carriage house, and a little blacksmith shop.[23]

Looking out over the flat snowy fields toward the curving Genesee

River and the church steeples in Rochester, Susan often thought

wistfully of the blue hills around Center Falls and Battenville and of

the good times she had had there.

The winter was lonely for her in spite of the friendliness of their

Quaker neighbors, the De Garmos, and the Quaker families in Rochester

who called at once to welcome them. Her father found these neighbors

very congenial and they readily interested him in the antislavery

movement, now active in western New York. Within the next few months,

several antislavery meetings were held in the Anthony home and opened

a new world to Susan. For the first time she heard of the Underground

Railroad which secretly guided fugitive slaves to Canada and of the

Liberty party which was making a political issue of slavery. She

listened to serious, troubled discussion of the annexation of Texas,

bringing more power to the proslavery block, which even the

acquisition of free Oregon could not offset. She read antislavery

tracts and copies of William Lloyd Garrison's \_Liberator\_, borrowed

from Quaker friends; and on long winter evenings, as she sat by the

fire sewing, she talked over with her father the issues they raised.

When spring came and the trees and bushes leafed out, she took more

interest in the farm, discovering its good points one by one--the

flowering quince along the driveway, the pinks bordering the walk to

the front door, the rosebushes in the yard, and cherry trees, currant

and gooseberry bushes in abundance. Her father planted peach and apple

orchards and worked the "sixpenny farm,"[24] as he called it, to the

best of his ability, but the thirty-two acres seemed very small

compared with the large Anthony and Read farms in the Berkshires, and

he soon began to look about for more satisfying work. This he found a

few years later with the New York Life Insurance Company, then

developing its business in western New York. Very successful in this

new field, he continued in it the rest of his life, but he always kept

the farm for the family home.

\* \* \* \* \*

The first member of the family to leave the Rochester farm was Susan.

The cherry trees were in bloom when she received an offer from

Canajoharie Academy to teach the female department. As Canajoharie was

across the river from Uncle Joshua Read's home in Palatine Bridge and

he was a trustee of the academy, she read between the lines his kindly

interest in her. He was an influential citizen of that community, a

bank director and part owner of the Albany-Utica turnpike and the

stage line to Schenectady. Accepting the offer at once, she made the

long journey by canal boat to Canajoharie, and early in May 1846 was

comfortably settled in the home of Uncle Joshua's daughter, Margaret

Read Caldwell.

She soon loved Margaret as a sister and was devoted to her children.

None of her new friends were Quakers and she enjoyed their social life

thoroughly, leaving behind her forever the somber clothing which she

had heretofore regarded as a mark of righteousness. She began her

school with twenty-five pupils and a yearly salary of approximately

$110. This was more than she had ever earned before, and for the first

time in her life she spent her money freely on herself.

Her first quarterly examination, held before the principal, the

trustees, and parents, established her reputation as a teacher, and in

addition everyone said, "The schoolmarm looks beautiful."[25] She had

dressed up for the occasion, wearing a new plaid muslin, purple,

white, blue, and brown, with white collar and cuffs, and had hung a

gold watch and chain about her neck. She wound the four braids of her

smooth brown hair around her big shell comb and put on her new

prunella gaiters with patent-leather heels and tips. She looked so

pretty, so neat, and so capable that many of the parents feared some

young man would fall desperately in love with her and rob the academy

of a teacher. She did have more than her share of admirers. She soon

saw her first circus and went to her first ball, a real novelty for

the young woman who had sat demurely along the wall in the attic room

of her Center Falls home while her more worldly friends danced.

In spite of all her good times, she missed her family, but because of

the long trip to Rochester, she did not return to the farm for two

years. She spent her vacations with Guelma and Hannah, who lived only

a few hours away, or in Albany with her former teacher at Deborah

Moulson's seminary, Lydia Mott, a cousin by marriage of Lucretia Mott.

In anticipation of a vacation at home, she wrote her parents,

"Sometimes I can hardly wait for the day to come. They have talked of

building a new academy this summer, but I do not believe they will. My

room is not fit to stay in and I have promised myself that I would not

pass another winter in it. If I must forever teach, I will seek at

least a comfortable house to do penance in. I have a pleasant school

of twenty scholars, but I have to manufacture the interest duty

compels me to exhibit.... Energy and something to stimulate is

wanting! But I expect the busy summer vacation spent with my dearest

and truest friends will give me new life and fresh courage to

persevere in the arduous path of duty. Do not think me unhappy with my

fate, no not so. I am only a little tired and a good deal lazy. That

is all. Do write very soon. Tell about the strawberries and peaches,

cherries and plums.... Tell me how the yard looks, what flowers are in

bloom and all about the farming business."[26]

\* \* \* \* \*

During her visits in Albany with Lydia Mott, who was now an active

abolitionist, Susan heard a great deal about antislavery work. At this

time, however, Canajoharie took little interest in this reform

movement, but temperance was gaining a foothold. Throughout the

country, Sons of Temperance were organizing and women wanted to help,

but the men refused to admit them to their organizations, protesting

that public reform was outside women's sphere. Unwilling to be put off

when the need was so great, women formed their own secret temperance

societies, and then, growing bolder, announced themselves as Daughters

of Temperance.

Canajoharie had its Daughters of Temperance, and Susan, long an

advocate of temperance, gladly joined the crusade, and made her first

speech when the Daughters of Temperance held a supper meeting to

interest the people of the village. Few women at this time could have

been persuaded to address an audience of both men and women, believing

this to be bold, unladylike, and contrary to the will of God; but the

young Quaker, whose grandmother and aunts had always spoken in

Meeting when the spirit moved them, was ready to say her word for

temperance, taking it for granted that it was not only woman's right

but her responsibility to speak and work for social reform.

About two hundred people assembled for the supper, and entering the

hall, Susan found it festooned with cedar and red flannel and to her

amazement saw letters in evergreen on one of the walls, spelling out

Susan B. Anthony.

"I hardly knew how to conduct myself amidst so much kindly

regard,"[27] she confided to her family.

She had carefully written out her speech and had sewn the pages

together in a blue cover. Now in a clear serious voice, she read its

formal flowery sentences telling of the weekly meetings of "this now

despised little band" which had awakened women to the great need of

reform.

"It is generally conceded," she declared, "that our sex fashions the

social and moral state of society. We do not assume that females

possess unbounded power in abolishing the evil customs of the day; but

we do believe that were they en masse to discontinue the use of wine

and brandy as beverages at both their public and private parties, not

one of the opposite sex, who has any claim to the title of gentleman,

would so insult them as to come into their presence after having

quaffed of that foul destroyer of all true delicacy and refinement....

Ladies! There is no neutral position for us to assume...."[28]

The next day the village buzzed with talk of the meeting; only a few

criticized Susan for speaking in public, and almost all agreed that

she was the smartest woman in Canajoharie.

While she was busy with her temperance work, there were stirrings

among women in other parts of New York State in the spring and early

summer of 1848. Through the efforts of a few women who circulated

petitions and the influence of wealthy men who saw irresponsible

sons-in-law taking over the property they wanted their daughters to

own, a Married Women's Property Law passed the legislature; this made

it possible for a married woman to hold real estate in her own name.

Heretofore all property owned by a woman at marriage and all received

by gift or inheritance had at once become her husband's and he had had

the right to sell it or will it away without her consent and to

collect the rents or the income. The new law was welcomed in the

Anthony household, for now Lucy Anthony's inheritance, which had

bought the Rochester farm, could at last be put in her own name and

need no longer be held for her by her brother.

In the newspapers in July, Susan read scornful, humorous, and

indignant reports of a woman's rights convention in Seneca Falls, New

York, at which women had issued a Declaration of Sentiments,

announcing themselves men's equals. They had protested against legal,

economic, social, and educational discriminations and asked for the

franchise. A woman's rights convention in the 1840s was a startling

event. Women, if they were "ladies" did not attend public gatherings

where politics or social reforms were discussed, because such subjects

were regarded as definitely out of their sphere. Much less did they

venture to call meetings of their own and issue bold resolutions.

Susan was not shocked by this break with tradition, but she did not

instinctively come to the defense of these rebellious women, nor

champion their cause. She was amused rather than impressed. Yet

Lucretia Mott's presence at the convention aroused her curiosity.

Among her father's Quaker friends in Rochester, she had heard only

praise of Mrs. Mott, and she herself, when a pupil at Deborah

Moulson's seminary, had been inspired by Mrs. Mott's remarks at

Friends' Meeting in Philadelphia.

So far Susan had encountered few barriers because she was a woman. She

had had little personal contact with the hardships other women

suffered because of their inferior legal status. To be sure, it had

been puzzling to her as child that Sally Hyatt, the most skillful

weaver in her father's mill, had never been made overseer, but the

fact that her mother had not the legal right to hold property in her

own name did not at the time make an impression upon her. Brought up

as a Quaker, she had no obstacles put in the way of her education. She

had an exceptional father who was proud of his daughters' intelligence

and ability and respected their opinions and decisions. Her only real

complaint was the low salary she had been obliged to accept as a

teacher because she was a woman. She sensed a feeling of male

superiority, which she resented, in her brother-in-law, Aaron McLean,

who did not approve of women preachers and who thought it more

important for a woman to bake biscuits than to study algebra. She met

the same arrogance of sex in her Cousin Margaret's husband, but she

had not analyzed the cause, or seen the need of concerted action by

women.

Returning home for her vacation in August, she found to her surprise

that a second woman's rights convention had been held in Rochester in

the Unitarian church, that her mother, her father, and her sister

Mary, and many of their Quaker friends had not only attended, but had

signed the Declaration of Sentiments and the resolutions, and that her

cousin, Sarah Burtis Anthony, had acted as secretary. Her father

showed so much interest, as he told her about the meetings, that she

laughingly remarked, "I think you are getting a good deal ahead of the

times."[29] She countered Mary's ardent defense of the convention with

good-natured ridicule. The whole family, however, continued to be so

enthusiastic over the meetings and this new movement for woman's

rights, they talked so much about Elizabeth Cady Stanton "with her

black curls and ruddy cheeks"[30] and about Lucretia Mott "with her

Quaker cap and her crossed handkerchief of the finest muslin," both

"speaking so grandly and looking magnificent," that Susan's interest

was finally aroused and she decided she would like to meet these women

and talk with them. There was no opportunity for this, however, before

she returned to Canajoharie for another year of teaching.

It proved to be a year of great sadness because of the illness of her

cousin Margaret whom she loved dearly. In addition to her teaching,

she nursed Margaret and looked after the house and children. She saw

much to discredit the belief that men were the stronger and women the

weaker sex, and impatient with Margaret's husband, she wrote her

mother that there were some drawbacks to marriage that made a woman

quite content to remain single. In explanation she added, "Joseph had

a headache the other day and Margaret remarked that she had had one

for weeks. 'Oh,' said the husband, 'mine is the real headache, genuine

pain, yours is sort of a natural consequence.'"[31]

Within a few weeks Margaret died. This was heart-breaking for Susan,

and without her cousin, Canajoharie offered little attraction.

Teaching had become irksome. The new principal was uncongenial, a

severe young man from the South whose father was a slaveholder. Susan

longed for a change, and as she read of the young men leaving for the

West, lured by gold in California, she envied them their adventure and

their opportunity to explore and conquer a whole new world.

[Illustration: Frederick Douglass]

\* \* \* \* \*

The peaches were ripe when Susan returned to the farm. The orchard

which her father had planted, now bore abundantly. Restless and eager

for hard physical work, she discarded the stylish hoops which impeded

action, put on an old calico dress, and spent days in the warm

September sunshine picking peaches. Then while she preserved, canned,

and pickled them, there was little time to long for pioneering in the

West.

She enjoyed the active life on the farm for she was essentially a

doer, most happy when her hands and her mind were busy. As she helped

with the housework, wove rag carpet, or made shirts by hand for her

father and brothers, she dreamed of the future, of the work she might

do to make her life count for something. Teaching, she decided, was

definitely behind her. She would not allow her sister Mary's interest

in that career to persuade her otherwise, even if teaching were the

only promising and well-thought-of occupation for women. Reading the

poems of Elizabeth Barrett Browning, she was deeply stirred and looked

forward romantically to some great and useful life work.

The \_Liberator\_, with its fearless denunciation of Negro slavery, now

came regularly to the Anthony home, and as she pored over its pages,

its message fired her soul. Eagerly she called with her father at the

home of Frederick Douglass, who had recently settled in Rochester and

was publishing his paper, the \_North Star\_. Not only did she want to

show friendliness to this free Negro of whose intelligence and

eloquence she had heard so much, but she wanted to hear first-hand

from him and his wife of the needs of his people.

Almost every Sunday the antislavery Quakers met at the Anthony farm.

The Posts, the Hallowells, the De Garmos, and the Willises were sure

to be there. Sometimes they sent a wagon into the city for Frederick

Douglass and his family. Now and then famous abolitionists joined the

circle when their work brought them to western New York--William Lloyd

Garrison, looking with fatherly kindness at his friends through his

small steel-rimmed spectacles; Wendell Phillips, handsome, learned,

and impressive; black-bearded, fiery Parker Pillsbury; and the

friendly Unitarian pastor from Syracuse, the Reverend Samuel J. May.

Susan, helping her mother with dinner for fifteen or twenty, was torn

between establishing her reputation as a good cook and listening to

the interesting conversation. She heard them discuss woman's rights,

which had divided the antislavery ranks. They talked of their

antislavery campaigns and the infamous compromises made by Congress to

pacify the powerful slaveholding interests. Like William Lloyd

Garrison, all of them refused to vote, not wishing to take any part in

a government which countenanced slavery. They called the Constitution

a proslavery document, advocated "No Union with Slaveholders," and

demanded immediate and unconditional emancipation. All about them and

with their help the Underground Railroad was operating, circumventing

the Fugitive Slave Law and guiding Negro refugees to Canada and

freedom. Amy and Isaac Post's barn, Susan knew, was a station on the

Underground, and the De Garmos and Frederick Douglass almost always

had a Negro hidden away. She heard of riots and mobs in Boston and

Ohio; but in Rochester not a fugitive was retaken and there were no

street battles, although the New York \_Herald\_ advised the city to

throw its "nigger printing press"[32] into Lake Ontario and banish

Douglass to Canada.

As the Society of Friends in Rochester was unfriendly to the

antislavery movement, Susan with her father and other liberal Hicksite

Quakers left it for the Unitarian church. Here for the first time they

listened to "hireling ministry" and to a formal church service with

music. This was a complete break with what they had always known as

worship, but the friendly Christian spirit expressed by both minister

and congregation made them soon feel at home. This new religious

fellowship put Susan in touch with the most advanced thought of the

day, broke down some of the rigid precepts drilled into her at Deborah

Moulson's seminary, and encouraged liberalism and tolerance. Although

there had been austerity in the outward forms of her Quaker training,

it had developed in her a very personal religion, a strong sense of

duty, and a high standard of ethics, which always remained with her.

It had fostered a love of mankind that reached out spontaneously to

help the needy, the unfortunate, and the oppressed, and this now

became the driving force of her life. It led her naturally to seek

ways and means to free the Negro from slavery and to turn to the

temperance movement to wipe out the evil of drunkenness.

These were the days when the reformed drunkard, John B. Gough, was

lecturing throughout the country with the zeal of an evangelist,

getting thousands to sign the total-abstinence pledge. Inspired by his

example, the Daughters of Temperance were active in Rochester. They

elected Susan their president, and not only did she plan suppers and

festivals to raise money for their work but she organized new

societies in neighboring towns. Her more ambitious plans for them were

somewhat delayed by home responsibilities which developed when her

father became an agent of the New York Life Insurance Company. This

took him away from home a great deal, and as both her brothers were

busy with work of their own and Mary was teaching, it fell to Susan to

take charge of the farm. She superintended the planting, the

harvesting, and the marketing, and enjoyed it, but she did not let it

crowd out her interest in the causes which now seemed so vital.

Horace Greeley's New York \_Tribune\_ came regularly to the farm, for

the Anthonys, like many others throughout the country, had come to

depend upon it for what they felt was a truthful report of the news.

In this day of few magazines, it met a real need, and Susan, poring

over its pages, not only kept in touch with current events, but found

inspiration in its earnest editorials which so often upheld the ideals

which she felt were important. She found thought-provoking news in the

full and favorable report of the national woman's rights convention

held in Worcester, Massachusetts, in October 1850. Better informed now

through her antislavery friends about this new movement for woman's

rights, she was ready to consider it seriously and she read all the

stirring speeches, noting the caliber of the men and women taking

part. Garrison, Phillips, Pillsbury, and Lucretia Mott were there, as

well as Lucy Stone, that appealing young woman of whose eloquence on

the antislavery platform Susan had heard so much, and Abby Kelley

Foster, whose appointment to office in the American Antislavery

Society had precipitated a split in the ranks on the "woman question."

\* \* \* \* \*

A year later, when Abby Kelley Foster and her husband Stephen spoke at

antislavery meetings in Rochester, Susan had her first opportunity to

meet this fearless woman. Listening to Abby's speeches and watching

the play of emotion on her eager Irish face under the Quaker bonnet,

Susan wondered if she would ever have the courage to follow her

example. Like herself, Abby had started as a schoolteacher, but after

hearing Theodore Weld speak, had devoted herself to the antislavery

cause, traveling alone through the country to say her word against

slavery and facing not only the antagonism which abolition always

provoked, but the unreasoning prejudice against public speaking by

women, which was fanned into flame by the clergy. For listening to

Abby Kelley, men and women had been excommunicated. Mobs had jeered at

her and often pelted her with rotten eggs. She had married a

fellow-abolitionist, Stephen Foster, even more unrelenting than she.

Sensing Susan's interest in the antislavery cause and hoping to make

an active worker of her, Abby and Stephen suggested that she join them

on a week's tour, during which she marveled at Abby's ability to hold

the attention and meet the arguments of her unfriendly audiences and

wondered if she could ever be moved to such eloquence.

Not yet ready to join the ranks as a lecturer, she continued her

apprenticeship by attending antislavery meetings whenever possible and

traveled to Syracuse for the convention which the mob had driven out

of New York. Eager for more, she stopped over in Seneca Falls to hear

William Lloyd Garrison and the English abolitionist, George Thompson,

and was the guest of a temperance colleague, Amelia Bloomer, an

enterprising young woman who was editing a temperance paper for women,

\_The Lily\_.

To her surprise Susan found Amelia in the bloomer costume about which

she had read in \_The Lily\_. Introduced in Seneca Falls by Elizabeth

Smith Miller, the costume, because of its comfort, had so intrigued

Amelia that she had advocated it in her paper and it had been dubbed

with her name. Looking at Amelia's long full trousers, showing beneath

her short skirt but modestly covering every inch of her leg, Susan was

a bit startled. Yet she could understand the usefulness of the costume

even if she had no desire to wear it herself. In fact she was more

than ever pleased with her new gray delaine dress with its long full

skirt.

Seneca Falls, however, had an attraction for Susan far greater than

either William Lloyd Garrison or Amelia Bloomer, for it was the home

of Elizabeth Cady Stanton whom she had longed to meet ever since 1848

when her parents had reported so enthusiastically about her and the

Rochester woman's rights convention. Walking home from the antislavery

meeting with Mrs. Bloomer, Susan met Mrs. Stanton. She liked her at

once and later called at her home. They discussed abolition,

temperance, and woman's rights, and with every word Susan's interest

grew. Mrs. Stanton's interest in woman's rights and her forthright,

clear thinking made an instant appeal. Never before had Susan had such

a satisfactory conversation with another woman, and she thought her

beautiful. Mrs. Stanton's deep blue eyes with their mischievous

twinkle, her rosy cheeks and short dark hair gave her a very youthful

appearance, and it was hard for Susan to realize she was the mother of

three lively boys.

Susan listened enthralled while Mrs. Stanton told how deeply she had

been moved as a child by the pitiful stories of the women who came to

her father's law office, begging for relief from the unjust property

laws which turned over their inheritance and their earnings to their

husbands. For the first time, Susan heard the story of the exclusion

of women delegates from the World's antislavery convention in London,

in 1840, which Mrs. Stanton had attended with her husband and where

she became the devoted friend of Lucretia Mott. She now better

understood why these two women had called the first woman's rights

convention in 1848 at which Mrs. Stanton had made the first public

demand for woman suffrage.

[Illustration: Elizabeth Cady Stanton in her "Bloomer costume"]

They talked about the bloomer costume which Mrs. Stanton now wore and

about dress reform which at the moment seemed to Mrs. Stanton an

important phase of the woman's rights movement, and she pointed out to

Susan the advantages of the bloomer in the life of a busy housekeeper

who ran up and down stairs carrying babies, lamps, and buckets of

water. She praised the freedom it gave from uncomfortable stays and

tight lacing, confident it would be a big factor in improving the

health of women.

Thoroughly interested, Susan left Seneca Falls with much to think

about, but not yet converted to the bloomer costume, or even to woman

suffrage. Of one thing, however, she was certain. She wanted this

woman of vision and courage for her friend.
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FREEDOM TO SPEAK

Susan was soon rejoicing at the prospect of meeting Lucy Stone and

Horace Greeley, the editor of the New York \_Tribune\_. Mrs. Stanton had

invited her to Seneca Falls to discuss with them and other influential

men and women the founding of a people's college. Unhesitatingly she

joined forces with Mrs. Stanton and Lucy Stone to insist that the

people's college be opened to women on the same terms as men. Lucy had

proved the practicability of this as a student at Oberlin, the first

college to admit women, and was one of the first women to receive a

college degree. However, to suggest coeducation in those days was

enough to jeopardize the founding of a college, and Horace Greeley

stood out against them, his babylike face, fringed with throat

whiskers, getting redder by the moment as he begged them not to

agitate the question.

The people's college did not materialize, but out of this meeting grew

a friendship between Susan, Elizabeth Stanton, and Lucy Stone, which

developed the woman's rights movement in the United States. Susan

discovered at once that Lucy, like Mrs. Stanton, was an ardent

advocate of woman's rights. Brought up in a large family on a farm in

western Massachusetts where a woman's lot was an unending round of

hard work with no rights over her children or property, Lucy had seen

much to make her rebellious. Resolving to free herself from this

bondage, she had worked hard for an education, finally reaching

Oberlin College. Here she held out for equal rights in education, and

now as she went through the country, pleading for the abolition of

slavery, she was not only putting into practice woman's right to

express herself on public affairs, but was scattering woman's rights

doctrine wherever she went. Listening to this rosy-cheeked,

enthusiastic young woman with her little snub nose and soulful gray

eyes, Susan began to realize how little opposition in comparison she

herself had met because she was a woman. Not only had her father

encouraged her to become a teacher, but he had actually aroused her

interest in such causes as abolition, temperance, and woman's rights,

while both Lucy and Mrs. Stanton had met disapproval and resistance

all the way.

[Illustration: Lucy Stone]

She found Lucy, as well as Mrs. Stanton, in the bloomer dress,

praising its convenience. As Lucy traveled about lecturing, in all

kinds of weather, climbing on trains, into carriages, and walking on

muddy streets, she found it much more practical and comfortable than

the fashionable long full skirts. Nevertheless, there was discomfort

in being stared at on the streets and in the chagrin of her friends.

This reform was much on their minds and they discussed it pro and con,

for Mrs. Stanton was facing real persecution in Seneca Falls, with

boys screaming "breeches" at her when she appeared in the street and

with her husband's political opponents ridiculing her costume in their

campaign speeches. Both women, however, felt it their duty to bear

this cross to free women from the bondage of cumbersome clothing,

hoping always that the bloomer, because of its utility, would win

converts and finally become the fashion. Susan admired their courage,

but still could not be persuaded to put on the bloomer.

Fired with their zeal, she began planning what she herself might do

to rouse women. The idea of a separate woman's rights movement did not

as yet enter her mind. Her thoughts turned rather to the two national

reform movements already well under way, temperance and antislavery.

While a career as an antislavery worker appealed strongly to her, she

felt unqualified when she measured herself with the courageous Grimké

sisters from South Carolina, or with Abby Kelley Foster, Lucy Stone,

and the eloquent men in the movement. She had made a place for herself

locally in temperance societies, and she decided that her work was

there--to make women an active, important part of this reform.

That winter, as a delegate of the Rochester Daughters of Temperance,

she went with high hopes to the state convention of the Sons of

Temperance in Albany, where she visited Lydia Mott and her sister

Abigail, who lived in a small house on Maiden Lane. Both Lydia and

Abigail, because of their independence, interested Susan greatly. They

supported themselves by "taking in" boarders from among the leading

politicians in Albany. They also kept a men's furnishings store on

Broadway and made hand-ruffled shirt bosoms and fine linen accessories

for Thurlow Weed, Horatio Seymour, and other influential citizens.

Their political contacts were many and important, and yet they were

also among the very few in that conservative city who stood for

temperance, abolition of slavery, and woman's rights. Their home was a

rallying point for reformers and a refuge for fugitive slaves. It was

to be a second home to Susan in the years to come.

When Susan and the other women delegates entered the convention of the

Sons of Temperance, they looked forward proudly, if a bit timidly, to

taking part in the meetings, but when Susan spoke to a motion, the

chairman, astonished that a woman would be so immodest as to speak in

a public meeting, scathingly announced, "The sisters were not invited

here to speak, but to listen and to learn."[33]

This was the first time that Susan had been publicly rebuked because

she was a woman, and she did not take it lightly. Leaving the hall

with several other indignant women delegates, amid the critical

whisperings of those who remained "to listen and to learn," she

hurried over to Lydia's shop to ask her advice on the next step to be

taken. Lydia, delighted that they had had the spirit to leave the

meeting, suggested they engage the lecture room of the Hudson Street

Presbyterian Church and hold a meeting of their own that very night.

She went with them to the office of her friend Thurlow Weed, the

editor of the \_Evening Journal\_, who published the whole story in his

paper.

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony at the age of thirty-four]

Well in advance of the meeting, Susan was at the church, feeling very

responsible, and when she saw Samuel J. May enter, she was greatly

relieved. He had read the notice in the \_Evening Journal\_ and

persuaded a friend to come with him. To see his genial face in the

audience gave her confidence, for he would speak easily and well if

others should fail her. Only a few people drifted into the meeting,

for the night was snowy and cold. The room was poorly lighted, the

stove smoked, and in the middle of the speeches, the stovepipe fell

down. Yet in spite of all this, a spirit of independence and

accomplishment was born in that gathering and plans were made to call

a woman's state temperance convention in Rochester with Susan in

charge.

All this Susan reported to her new friend, Elizabeth Stanton, who

promised to help all she could, urging that the new organization lead

the way and not follow the advice of cautious, conservative women.

Susan agreed, and as a first step in carrying out this policy, she

asked Mrs. Stanton to make the keynote speech of the convention. Soon

the Woman's State Temperance Society was a going concern with Mrs.

Stanton as president and Susan as secretary. There was no doubt about

its leading the way far ahead of the rank and file of the temperance

movement when Mrs. Stanton, with Susan's full approval, recommended

divorce on the grounds of drunkenness, declaring, "Let us petition our

State government so to modify the laws affecting marriage and the

custody of children that the drunkard shall have no claims on wife and

child."[34]

Such independence on the part of women could not be tolerated, and

both the press and the clergy ruthlessly denounced the Woman's State

Temperance Society. Susan, however, did not take this too seriously,

familiar as she was with the persecution antislavery workers endured

when they frankly expressed their convictions.

\* \* \* \* \*

Now recognized as the leader of women's temperance groups in New York,

Susan traveled throughout the state, organizing temperance societies,

getting subscriptions for Amelia Bloomer's temperance paper, \_The

Lily\_, and attending temperance conventions in spite of the fact that

she met determined opposition to the participation of women. Impressed

by the success of political action in Maine, where in 1851 the first

prohibition law in the country had been passed, she now signed her

letters, "Yours for Temperance Politics."[35] She appealed to women to

petition for a Maine law for New York and brought a group of women

before the legislature for the first time for a hearing on this

prohibition bill. Realizing then that women's indirect influence could

be of little help in political action, she saw clearly that women

needed the vote.

However, it was the woman's rights convention in Syracuse, New York,

in September 1852, which turned her thoughts definitely in the

direction of votes for women. It was the first woman's rights

gathering she had ever attended and she was enthusiastic over the

people she met. She talked eagerly with the courageous Jewish

lecturer, Ernestine Rose; with Dr. Harriot K. Hunt of Boston, one of

the first women physicians, who was waging a battle against taxation

without representation; with Clarina Nichols of Vermont, editor of

the \_Windham County Democrat\_, and with Matilda Joslyn Gage, the

youngest member of the convention. All of these became valuable, loyal

friends in the years ahead. Susan renewed her acquaintance with Lucy

Stone, and met Antoinette Brown who had also studied at Oberlin

College and was now the first woman ordained as a minister. With real

pleasure she greeted Mrs. Stanton's cousin, Gerrit Smith, now

Congressman from New York, and his daughter, Elizabeth Smith Miller,

the originator of the much-discussed bloomer. Best of all was her

long-hoped-for meeting with James and Lucretia Mott and Lucretia's

sister, Martha C. Wright. Only Paulina Wright Davis of Providence and

Elizabeth Oakes Smith of Boston were disappointing, for they appeared

at the meetings in short-sleeved, low-necked dresses with

loose-fitting jackets of pink and blue wool, shocking her deeply

intrenched Quaker instincts. Although she realized that they wore

ultrafashionable clothes to show the world that not all woman's rights

advocates were frumps wearing the hideous bloomer, she could not

forgive them for what to her seemed bad taste. How could such women,

she asked herself, hope to represent the earnest, hard-working women

who must be the backbone of the equal rights movement? Always

forthright, when a principle was at stake, she expressed her feelings

frankly when James Mott, serving with her on the nominating committee,

proposed Elizabeth Oakes Smith for president. His reply, that they

must not expect all women to dress as plainly as the Friends, in no

way quieted her opposition. To her delight, Lucretia Mott was elected,

and her dignity and poise as president of this large convention of

2,000 won the respect even of the critical press. Susan was elected

secretary and so clearly could her voice be heard as she read the

minutes and the resolutions that the Syracuse \_Standard\_ commented,

"Miss Anthony has a capital voice and deserves to be clerk of the

Assembly."[36]

[Illustration: James and Lucretia Mott]

Not all of the newspapers were so friendly. Some labeled the gathering

"a Tomfoolery convention" of "Aunt Nancy men and brawling women";

others called it "the farce at Syracuse,"[37] but for Susan it marked

a milestone. Never before had she heard so many earnest, intelligent

women plead so convincingly for property rights, civil rights, and the

ballot. Never before had she seen so clearly that in a republic women

as well as men should enjoy these rights. The ballot assumed a new

importance for her. Her conversion to woman suffrage was complete.

\* \* \* \* \*

This new interest in the vote was steadily nurtured by Elizabeth

Stanton, whom Susan now saw more frequently. Whenever she could, Susan

stopped over in Seneca Falls for a visit. Here she found inspiration,

new ideas, and good advice, and always left the comfortable Stanton

home ready to battle for the rights of women. While Susan traveled

about, organizing temperance societies and attending conventions, Mrs.

Stanton, tied down at home by a family of young children, wrote

letters and resolutions for her and helped her with her speeches.

Susan was very reluctant about writing speeches or making them. The

moment she sat down to write, her thoughts refused to come and her

phrases grew stilted. She needed encouragement, and Mrs. Stanton gave

it unstintingly, for she had grown very fond of this young woman whose

mental companionship she found so stimulating.

During one of these visits, Susan finally put on the bloomer and cut

her long thick brown hair as part of the stern task of winning

freedom for women. It was not an easy decision and she came to it only

because she was unwilling to do less for the cause than Mrs. Stanton

or Lucy Stone. Comfortable as the new dress was, it always attracted

unfavorable attention and added fuel to the fire of an unfriendly

press. This fire soon scorched her at the World's Temperance

convention in New York, where women delegates faced the determined

animosity of the clergy, who held the balance of power and quoted the

Bible to prove that women were defying the will of God when they took

part in public meetings. Obliged to withdraw, the women held meetings

of their own in the Broadway Tabernacle, over which Susan presided

with a poise and confidence undreamed of a few months before. A

success in every way, they were nevertheless described by the press as

a battle of the sexes, a free-for-all struggle in which shrill-voiced

women in the bloomer costume were supported by a few "male Betties."

The New York \_Sun\_ spoke of Susan's "ungainly form rigged out in the

bloomer costume and provoking the thoughtless to laughter and ridicule

by her very motions on the platform."[38] Untruth was piled upon

untruth until dignified ladylike Susan with her earnest pleasing

appearance was caricatured into everything a woman should not be. Less

courageous temperance women now began to wonder whether they ought to

associate with such a strong-minded woman as Susan B. Anthony.

There were rumblings of discontent when the Woman's State Temperance

Society met in Rochester for its next annual convention in June 1853,

and Susan and Mrs. Stanton were roundly criticized because they did

not confine themselves to the subject of temperance and talked too

much about woman's rights. Not only was Mrs. Stanton defeated for the

presidency but the by-laws were amended to make men eligible as

officers. Men had been barred when the first by-laws were drafted by

Susan and Mrs. Stanton because they wished to make the society a

proving ground for women and were convinced that men holding office

would take over the management, and women, less experienced, would

yield to their wishes.

This now proved to be the case, as the men began to do all the

talking, calling for a new name for the society and insisting that all

discussion of woman's rights be ruled out. In the face of this clear

indication of a determined new policy which few of the women wished to

resist, Susan refused re-election as secretary and both she and Mrs.

Stanton resigned.

This was Susan's first experience with intrigue and her first rebuff

by women whom she had sincerely tried to serve. Defeated, hurt, and

uncertain, she poured out her disappointment in troubled letters to

Elizabeth Stanton, who, with the steadying touch of an older sister,

roused her with the challenge, "We have other and bigger fish to

fry."[39]

\* \* \* \* \*

A few months later, Susan was off on a new crusade as she attended the

state teachers' convention in Rochester. Of the five hundred teachers

present, two-thirds were women, but there was not the slightest

recognition of their presence. They filled the back seats of

Corinthian Hall, forming an inert background for the vocal minority,

the men. After sitting through two days' sessions and growing more and

more impatient as not one woman raised her voice, Susan listened, as

long as she could endure it, to a lengthy debate on the question, "Why

the profession of teacher is not as much respected as that of lawyer,

doctor, or minister."[40] Then she rose to her feet and in a

low-pitched, clear voice addressed the chairman.

At the sound of a woman's voice, an astonished rustle of excitement

swept through the audience, and when the chairman, Charles Davies,

Professor of Mathematics at West Point, had recovered from his

surprise, he patronizingly asked, "What will the lady have?"

"I wish, sir, to speak to the subject under discussion," she bravely

replied.

Turning to the men in the front row, Professor Davies then asked,

"What is the pleasure of the convention?"

"I move that she be heard," shouted an unexpected champion. Another

seconded the motion. After a lengthy debate during which Susan stood

patiently waiting, the men finally voted their approval by a small

majority, and Professor Davies, a bit taken aback, announced, "The

lady may speak."

"It seems to me, gentlemen," Susan began, "that none of you quite

comprehend the cause of the disrespect of which you complain. Do you

not see that so long as society says woman is incompetent to be a

lawyer, minister, or doctor, but has ample ability to be a teacher,

every man of you who chooses this profession tacitly acknowledges that

he has no more brains than a woman? And this, too, is the reason that

teaching is a less lucrative profession; as here men must compete with

the cheap labor of woman. Would you exalt your profession, exalt those

who labor with you. Would you make it more lucrative, increase the

salaries of the women engaged in the noble work of educating our

future Presidents, Senators, and Congressmen."

For a moment after this bombshell, there was complete silence. Then

three men rushed down the aisle to congratulate her, telling her she

had pluck, that she had hit the nail on the head, but the women near

by glanced scornfully at her, murmuring, "Who can that creature be?"

Susan, however, had started a few women thinking and questioning, and

the next morning, Professor Davies, resplendent in his buff vest and

blue coat with brass buttons, opened the convention with an

explanation. "I have been asked," he said, "why no provisions have

been made for female lecturers before this association and why ladies

are not appointed on committees. I will answer." Then, in flowery

metaphor, he assured them that he would not think of dragging women

from their pedestals into the dust.

"Beautiful, beautiful," murmured the women in the back rows, but Mrs.

Northrup of Rochester offered resolutions recognizing the right of

women teachers to share in all the privileges and deliberations of the

organization and calling attention to the inadequate salaries women

teachers received. These resolutions were kept before the meeting by a

determined group and finally adopted. Susan also offered the name of

Emma Willard as a candidate for vice-president, thinking the

successful retired principal of the Troy Female Seminary, now

interested in improving the public schools, might also be willing to

lend a hand in improving the status of women in this educational

organization. Mrs. Willard, however, declined the nomination, refusing

to be drawn into Susan's rebellion.[41] Susan, nevertheless, left the

convention satisfied that she had driven an entering wedge into

Professor Davies' male stronghold, and she continued battering at

this stronghold whenever she had an opportunity. She meant to put

women in office and to win approval for coeducation and equal pay.

\* \* \* \* \*

Teachers' conventions, however, were only a minor part of her new

crusade, plans for which were still simmering in her mind and

developing from day to day. Going back to many of the towns where she

had held temperance meetings, she found that most of the societies she

had organized had disbanded because women lacked the money to engage

speakers or to subscribe to temperance papers. If they were married,

they had no money of their own and no right to any interest outside

their homes, unless their husbands consented.

Discouraged, she wrote in her diary, "As I passed from town to town I

was made to feel the great evil of woman's entire dependency upon man

for the necessary means to aid on any and every reform movement.

Though I had long admitted the wrong, I never until this time so fully

took in the grand idea of pecuniary and personal independence. It

matters not how overflowing with benevolence toward suffering humanity

may be the heart of woman, it avails nothing so long as she possesses

not the power to act in accordance with these promptings. Woman must

have a purse of her own, and how can this be, so long as the \_Wife\_ is

denied the right to her individual and joint earnings. Reflections

like these, caused me to see and really feel that there was no true

freedom for Woman without the possession of all her property rights,

and that these rights could be obtained through legislation only, and

so, the sooner the demand was made of the Legislature, the sooner

would we be likely to obtain them."[42]
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A PURSE OF HER OWN

The next important step in winning further property rights for women,

it seemed to Susan, was to hold a woman's rights convention in the

conservative capital city of Albany. This was definitely a challenge

and she at once turned to Elizabeth Stanton for counsel. Somehow she

must persuade Mrs. Stanton to find time in spite of her many household

cares to prepare a speech for the convention and for presentation to

the legislature. As eager as Susan to free women from unjust property

laws, Mrs. Stanton asked only that Susan get a good lawyer, and one

sympathetic to the cause, to look up New York State's very worst laws

affecting women.[43] She could think and philosophize while she was

baking and sewing, she assured Susan, but she had no time for

research. Susan produced the facts for Mrs. Stanton, and while she

worked on the speech, Susan went from door to door during the cold

blustery days of December and January 1854 to get signatures on her

petitions for married women's property rights and woman suffrage. Some

of the women signed, but more of them slammed the door in her face,

declaring indignantly that they had all the rights they wanted. Yet at

this time a father had the legal authority to apprentice or will away

a child without the mother's consent and an employer was obliged by

law to pay a wife's wages to her husband.

In spite of the fact that the bloomer costume made it easier for her

to get about in the snowy streets, she now found it a real burden

because it always attracted unfavorable attention. Boys jeered at her

and she was continually conscious of the amused, critical glances of

the men and women she met. She longed to take it off and wear an

inconspicuous trailing skirt, but if she had been right to put it on,

it would be weakness to take it off. By this time Elizabeth Stanton

had given it up except in her own home, convinced that it harmed the

cause and that the physical freedom it gave was not worth the price.

"I hope you have let down a dress and a petticoat," she now wrote

Susan. "The cup of ridicule is greater than you can bear. It is not

wise, Susan, to use up so much energy and feeling in that way. You

can put them to better use. I speak from experience."[44]

[Illustration: Elizabeth Cady Stanton and her son, Henry]

Lucy Stone too was wavering and was thinking of having her next dress

made long. The three women corresponded about it, and Lucy as well as

Mrs. Stanton urged Susan to give up the bloomer. With these entreaties

ringing in her ears, Susan set out for Albany in February 1854 to make

final arrangements for the convention. On the streets in Albany, in

the printing offices, and at the capitol, men stared boldly at her,

some calling out hilariously, "Here comes my bloomer." She endured it

bravely until her work was done, but at night alone in her room at

Lydia Mott's she poured out her anguish in letters to Lucy. "Here I am

known only," she wrote, "as one of the women who ape men--coarse,

brutal men! Oh, I can not, can not bear it any longer."[45]

Even so she did not let down the hem of her skirt, but wore her

bloomer costume heroically during the entire convention, determined

that she would not be stampeded into a long skirt by the jeers of

Albany men or the ridicule of the women. However, she made up her mind

that immediately after the convention she would take off the bloomer

forever. She had worn it a little over a year. Never again could she

be lured into the path of dress reform.

The Albany \_Register\_ scoffed at the "feminine propagandists of

woman's rights" exhibiting themselves in "short petticoats and

long-legged boots."[46] Nevertheless, the convention aroused such

genuine interest that evening meetings were continued for two weeks,

featuring as speakers Ernestine Rose, Antoinette Brown, Samuel J. May,

and William Henry Channing, the young Unitarian minister from

Rochester; and when the men appeared on the platform, the audience

called for the women.

Susan could not have asked for anything better than Elizabeth

Stanton's moving plea for property rights for married women and the

attention it received from the large audience in the Senate Chamber.

Her heart swelled with pride as she listened to her friend, and so

important did she think the speech that she had 50,000 copies printed

for distribution.

To back up Mrs. Stanton's words with concrete evidence of a demand for

a change in the law, Susan presented petitions with 10,000 signatures,

6,000 asking that married women be granted the right to their wages

and 4,000 venturing to be recorded for woman suffrage.

Enthusiastic over her Albany success, she impetuously wrote Lucy

Stone, "Is this not a wonderful time, an era long to be

remembered?"[47]

Although the legislature failed to act on the petitions, she knew that

her cause had made progress, for never before had women been listened

to with such respect and never had newspapers been so friendly. She

cherished these words of praise from Lucy, "God bless you, Susan dear,

for the brave heart that will work on even in the midst of

discouragement and lack of helpers. Everywhere I am telling people

what your state is doing, and it is worth a great deal to the cause.

The example of positive action is what we need."[48]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan continued her "example of positive action," this time against

the Kansas-Nebraska bill, pending in Congress, which threatened repeal

of the Missouri Compromise by admitting Kansas and Nebraska as

territories with the right to choose for themselves whether they

would be slave or free. "I feel that woman should in the very capitol

of the nation lift her voice against that abominable measure," she

wrote Lucy Stone, with whom she was corresponding more and more

frequently. "It is not enough that H. B. Stowe should write."[49]

Harriet Beecher Stowe's \_Uncle Tom's Cabin\_ had been published in 1852

and during that year 300,000 copies were sold.

[Illustration: Ernestine Rose]

With Ernestine Rose, Susan now headed for Washington. These two women

had been drawn together by common interests ever since they had met in

Syracuse in 1852. Susan was not frightened, as many were, by

Ernestine's reputed atheism. She appreciated Ernestine's intelligence,

her devotion to woman's rights, and her easy eloquence. Conscious of

her own limitations as an orator, she recognized her need of Ernestine

for the many meetings she planned for the future.

As they traveled to Washington together, she learned more about this

beautiful, impressive, black-haired Jewess from Poland, who was ten

years her senior. The daughter of a rabbi, Ernestine had found the

limitations of orthodox religion unbearable for a woman and had left

her home to see and learn more of the world in Prussia, Holland,

France, Scotland, and England. She had married an Englishman

sympathetic to her liberal views, and together they had come to New

York where she began her career as a lecturer in 1836 when speaking in

public branded women immoral. She spoke easily and well on education,

woman's rights, and the evils of slavery. Her slight foreign accent

added charm to her rich musical voice, and before long she was in

demand as far west as Ohio and Michigan. With a colleague as

experienced as Ernestine, Susan dared arrange for meetings even in the

capital of the nation.

Washington was tense over the slavery issue when they arrived, and

Ernestine's friends warned her not to mention the subject in her

lectures. Unheeding she commented on the Kansas-Nebraska bill, but the

press took no notice and her audiences showed no signs of

dissatisfaction. In fact, two comparatively unknown women, billed to

lecture on the "Educational and Social Rights of Women" and the

"Political and Legal Rights of Women," attracted little attention in a

city accustomed to a blaze of Congressional oratory. Hoping to draw

larger audiences and to lend dignity to their meetings, Susan asked

for the use of the Capitol on Sunday, but was refused because

Ernestine was not a member of a religious society. Making an attempt

for Smithsonian Hall, Ernestine was told it could not risk its

reputation by presenting a woman speaker.[50]

A failure financially, their Washington venture was rich in

experience. Susan took time out for sightseeing, visiting the

"President's house" and Mt. Vernon, which to her surprise she found in

a state of "delapidation and decay." "The mark of slavery o'ershadows

the whole," she wrote in her diary. "Oh the thought that it was here

that he whose name is the pride of this Nation, was the \_Slave

Master\_."[51]

Again and again in the Capitol, she listened to heated debates on the

Kansas-Nebraska bill, astonished at the eloquence and fervor with

which the "institution of slavery" could be defended. Seeing slavery

first-hand, she abhorred it more than ever and observed with dismay

its degenerating influence on master as well as slave. She began to

feel that even she herself might be undermined by it almost

unwittingly and confessed to her diary, "This noon, I ate my dinner

without once asking myself are these human beings who minister to my

wants, Slaves to be bought and sold and hired out at the will of a

master?... Even I am getting \_accustomed\_ to \_Slavery\_ ... so much so

that I have ceased continually to be made to feel its blighting,

cursing influence."[52]

\* \* \* \* \*

A few months later, Susan and Ernestine were in Philadelphia at a

national woman's rights convention, and when Ernestine was proposed

for president, Susan had her first opportunity to champion her new

friend. A foreigner and a free-thinker, Ernestine encountered a great

deal of prejudice even among liberal reformers, and Susan was

surprised at the strength of feeling against her. Impressed during

their trip to Washington by Ernestine's essentially fine qualities and

her value to the cause, Susan fought for her behind the scenes,

insisting that freedom of religion or the freedom to have no religion

be observed in woman's rights conventions, and she had the

satisfaction of seeing Ernestine elected to the office she so richly

deserved.

Freedom of religion or freedom to have no religion had become for

Susan a principle to hold on to, as she listened at these early

woman's rights meetings to the lengthy fruitless discussions regarding

the lack of Scriptural sanction for women's new freedom. Usually a

clergyman appeared on the scene, volubly quoting the Bible to prove

that any widening of woman's sphere was contrary to the will of God.

But always ready to refute him were Antoinette Brown, now an ordained

minister, William Lloyd Garrison, and occasionally Susan herself. To

the young Quaker broadened by her Unitarian contacts and unhampered by

creed or theological dogma, such debates were worse than useless; they

deepened theological differences, stirred up needless antagonisms,

solved no problems, and wasted valuable time.

During this convention, she was one of the twenty-four guests in

Lucretia Mott's comfortable home at 238 Arch Street. Every meal, with

its stimulating discussions, was a convention in itself. Susan's great

hero, William Lloyd Garrison, sat at Lucretia's right at the long

table in the dining room, Susan on her left, and at the end of each

meal, when the little cedar tub filled with hot soapy water was

brought in and set before Lucretia so that she could wash the silver,

glass, and fine china at the table, Susan dried them on a snowy-white

towel while the interesting conversation continued. There was talk of

woman's rights, of temperance, and of spiritualism, which was

attracting many new converts. There were thrilling stories of the

opening of the West and the building of transcontinental railways; but

most often and most earnestly the discussion turned to the progress of

the antislavery movement, to the infamous Kansas-Nebraska bill, to the

New England Emigrant Aid Company,[53] which was sending free-state

settlers to Kansas, to the weakness of the government in playing again

and again into the hands of the proslavery faction. Most of them saw

the country headed toward a vast slave empire which would embrace

Cuba, Mexico, and finally Brazil; and William Lloyd Garrison fervently

reiterated his doctrine, "No Union with Slaveholders."

Before leaving home Susan had heard first-hand reports of the bitter

bloody antislavery contest in Kansas from her brother Daniel, who had

just returned from a trip to that frontier territory with settlers

sent out by the New England Emigrant Aid Company. Now talking with

William Lloyd Garrison, she found herself torn between these two great

causes for human freedom, abolition and woman's rights, and it was

hard for her to decide which cause needed her more.

\* \* \* \* \*

She had not, however, forgotten her unfinished business in New York

State. The refusal of the legislature to amend the property laws had

doubled her determination to continue circulating petitions until

married women's civil rights were finally recognized. It took courage

to go alone to towns where she was unknown to arrange for meetings on

the unpopular subject of woman's rights. Not knowing how she would be

received, she found it almost as difficult to return to such towns as

Canajoharie where she had been highly respected as a teacher six years

before. In Canajoharie, however, she was greeted affectionately by her

uncle Joshua Read. He and his friends let her use the Methodist church

for her lecture, and when the trustees of the academy urged her to

return there to teach, Uncle Joshua interrupted with a vehement "No!"

protesting that others could teach but it was Susan's work "to go

around and set people thinking about the laws."[54]

Returning to the scene of her girlhood in Battenville and Easton,

visiting her sisters Guelma and Hannah, and meeting many of her old

friends, Susan realized as never before how completely she had

outgrown her old environment. In her enthusiasm for her new work, she

exposed "many of her heresies," and when her friends labeled William

Lloyd Garrison an agnostic and rabble rouser, she protested that he

was the most Christlike man she had ever known. "Thus it is belief,

not Christian benevolence," she confided to her diary in 1854, "that

is made the modern test of Christianity."[55]

After eight strenuous months away from home, she was welcomed warmly

by a family who believed in her work. She found abolition uppermost in

everyone's mind. Her brother Merritt, fired by Daniel's tales of the

West and the antislavery struggle in Kansas, was impatient to join the

settlers there and could talk of nothing else. While he poured out the

latest news about Kansas, he and a cousin Mary Luther helped Susan

fold handbills for future woman's rights meetings. Susan listened

eagerly and approvingly as he told of the 750 free-state settlers who

during the past summer had gone out to Kansas, traveling up the

Missouri on steamboats and over lonely trails in wagons marked

"Kansas." Most of them were not abolitionists but men who wanted

Kansas a free-labor state which they could develop with their own hard

work. She heard of the ruthless treatment these "Yankee" settlers

faced from the proslavery Missourians who wanted Kansas in the slavery

bloc. There was bloodshed and there would be more. John Brown's sons

had written from Kansas, "Send us guns. We need them more than

bread."[56] Merritt was ready and eager to join John Brown.

The Anthony farm was virtually a hotbed of insurrection with Merritt

planning resistance in Kansas and Susan reform in New York. Susan

mapped out an ambitious itinerary, hoping to canvass with her

petitions every county in the state. With her father as security, she

borrowed money to print her handbills and notices, and then wrote

Wendell Phillips asking if any money for a woman's rights campaign had

been raised by the last national convention. He replied with his own

personal check for fifty dollars. His generosity and confidence

touched her deeply, for already he had become a hero to her second

only to William Lloyd Garrison. This tall handsome intellectual, a

graduate of Harvard and an unsurpassed orator, had forfeited friends,

social position, and a promising career as a lawyer to plead for the

slave. He was also one of the very few men who sympathized with and

aided the woman's rights cause.

Horace Greeley too proved at this time to be a good friend, writing,

"I have your letter and your programme, friend Susan. I will publish

the latter in all our editions, but return your dollars."[57]

Her earnestness and ability made a great appeal to these men. They

marveled at her industry. Thirty-four years old now, not handsome but

wholesome, simply and neatly dressed, her brown hair smoothly parted

and brought down over her ears, she had nothing of the scatterbrained

impulsive reformer about her, and no coquetry. She was practical and

intelligent, and men liked to discuss their work with her. William

Henry Channing, admiring her executive ability and her plucky reaction

to defeat, dubbed her the Napoleon of the woman's rights movement.

Parker Pillsbury, the fiery abolitionist from New Hampshire,

broad-shouldered, dark-bearded, with blazing eyes and almost fanatical

zeal, had become her devoted friend. He liked nothing better than to

tease her about her idleness and pretend to be in search of more work

for her to do.

\* \* \* \* \*

So impatient was Susan to begin her New York State campaign that she

left home on Christmas Day to hold her first meeting on December 26,

1854, at Mayville in Chatauqua County. The weather was cold and damp,

but the four pounds of candles which she had bought to light the court

house flickered cheerily while the small curious audience, gathered

from several nearby towns, listened to the first woman most of them

had ever heard speak in public. She would be, they reckoned, worth

hearing at least once.

Traveling from town to town, she held meetings every other night.

Usually the postmasters or sheriffs posted her notices in the town

square and gave them to the newspapers and to the ministers to

announce in their churches. Even in a hostile community she almost

always found a gallant fair-minded man to come to her aid, such as the

hotel proprietor who offered his dining room for her meetings when

the court house, schoolhouse, and churches were closed to her, or the

group of men who, when the ministers refused to announce her meetings,

struck off handbills which they distributed at the church doors at the

close of the services. The newspapers too were generally friendly.

As men were the voters with power to change the laws, she aimed to

attract them to her evening meetings, and usually they came, seeking

diversion, and listened respectfully. Some of them scoffed, others

condemned her for undermining the home, but many found her reasoning

logical and by their questions put life into the meetings. A few even

encouraged their wives to enlist in the cause.

The women, on the other hand, were timid or indifferent, although she

pointed out to them the way to win the legal right to their earnings

and their children. It was difficult to find among them a rebellious

spirit brave enough to head a woman's rights society.

"Susan B. Anthony is in town," wrote young Caroline Cowles, a

Canandaigua school girl, in her diary at this time. "She made a

special request that all seminary girls should come to hear her as

well as all the women and girls in town. She had a large audience and

she talked very plainly about our rights and how we ought to stand up

for them and said the world would never go right until the women had

just as much right to vote and rule as the men.... When I told

Grandmother about it, she said she guessed Susan B. Anthony had

forgotten that St. Paul said women should keep silence. I told her,

no, she didn't, for she spoke particularly about St. Paul and said if

he had lived in these times ... he would have been as anxious to have

women at the head of the government as she was. I could not make

Grandmother agree with her at all."[58]

Many of the towns Susan visited were not on a railroad. Often after a

long cold sleigh ride she slept in a hotel room without a fire; in the

morning she might have to break the ice in the pitcher to take the

cold sponge bath which nothing could induce her to omit since she had

begun to follow the water cure, a new therapeutic method then in

vogue.

For a time Ernestine Rose came to her aid and it was a relief to turn

over the meetings to such an accomplished speaker. But for the most

part Susan braved it alone. Steadily adding names to her petitions

and leaving behind the leaflets which Elizabeth Stanton had written,

she aroused a glimmer of interest in a new valuation of women.

[Illustration: Parker Pillsbury]

On the stagecoach leaving Lake George on a particularly cold day, she

found to her surprise a wealthy Quaker, whom she had met at the Albany

convention, so solicitous of her comfort that he placed heated planks

under her feet, making the long ride much more bearable. He turned up

again, this time with his own sleigh, at the close of one of her

meetings in northern New York, and wrapped in fur robes, she drove

with him behind spirited gray horses to his sisters' home to stay over

Sunday, and then to all her meetings in the neighborhood. It was

pleasant to be looked after and to travel in comfort and she enjoyed

his company, but when he urged her to give up the hard life of a

reformer to become his wife, there was no hesitation on her part. She

had dedicated her life to freeing women and Negroes and there could be

no turning aside. If she ever married, it must be to a man who would

encourage her work for humanity, a great man like Wendell Phillips, or

a reformer like Parker Pillsbury.

Returning home in May 1855, she took stock of her accomplishments. She

had canvassed fifty-four counties and sold 20,000 tracts. Her expenses

had been $2,291 and she had paid her way by selling tracts and by a

small admission charge for her meetings. She even had seventy dollars

over and above all expenses. She promptly repaid the fifty dollars

which Wendell Phillips had advanced, but he returned it for her next

campaign.

However, her heart quailed at the prospect of another such winter, as

she recalled the long, bitter-cold days of travel and the indifference

of the women she was trying to help. Even the unfailing praise of her

family and of Elizabeth Stanton, even the kindness and interest of the

new friends she made paled into insignificance before the thought of

another lone crusade. She was exhausted and suffering with rheumatic

pains, and yet she would not rest, but prepared for an ambitious

convention at Saratoga Springs, then the fashionable summer resort of

the East.

She had braved this center of fashion and frivolity the year before

with her message of woman's rights, and to her great surprise, crowds

seeking entertainment had come to her meetings, their admission fees

and their purchase of tracts making the venture a financial success.

Here was fertile ground. Susan was counting on Lucy Stone and

Antoinette Brown to help her, for Elizabeth Stanton, then expecting

her sixth baby, was out of the picture. Now, to her dismay, Lucy and

Antoinette married the Blackwell brothers, Henry and Samuel.

Fearing that they too like Elizabeth Stanton would be tied down with

babies and household cares, Susan saw a bleak lonely road ahead for

the woman's rights movement. She did so want her best speakers and

most valuable workers to remain single until the spade work for

woman's rights was done. Almost in a panic at the prospect of being

left to carry on the Saratoga convention alone, Susan wrote Lucy

irritable letters instead of praising her for drawing up a marriage

contract and keeping her own name. Later, however, she realized what

it had meant for Lucy to keep her own name, and then she wrote her, "I

am more and more rejoiced that you have declared by actual doing that

a woman has a name and may retain it all through her life."[59]

So persistently did she now pursue Lucy and Antoinette that they both

kept their promise to speak at the Saratoga convention, Lucy traveling

all the way from Cincinnati where she was visiting in the Blackwell

home. Lucy was loudly cheered by a large audience, eager to see this

young woman whose marriage had attracted so much notice in the press.

In fact Lucy Stone, who had kept her own name and who with her husband

had signed a marriage protest against the legal disabilities of a

married woman, was as much of a novelty in this fashionable circle as

one of Barnum's high-priced curiosities.

Pleased at Lucy's reception, Susan surveyed the audience

hopefully--handsome men in nankeen trousers, red waistcoats, white

neckcloths, and gray swallowtail coats, sitting beside beautiful young

women wearing gowns of bombazine and watered silk with wide hoop

skirts and elaborately trimmed bonnets which set off their curls. To

her delight, they also applauded Antoinette Brown Blackwell, the first

woman minister they had ever seen, and Ernestine Rose with her

appealing foreign accent. They clapped loudly when she herself asked

them to buy tracts and contribute to the work.

Complimentary as this was, she did not flatter herself that they had

endorsed woman's rights. That they had come to her meetings in large

numbers while vacationing in Saratoga Springs, this was important. In

some a spark of understanding glowed, and this spark would light

others. They came from the South, from the West, and from the large

cities of the East. There were railroad magnates among them, rich

merchants, manufacturers, and politicians. Charles F. Hovey, the

wealthy Boston dry-goods merchant, listened attentively to every word,

and in the years that followed became a generous contributor to the

cause.

\* \* \* \* \*

Realizing how very tired she was and that she must feel more

physically fit before continuing her work, Susan decided to take the

water cure at her cousin Seth Rogers' Hydropathic Institute in

Worcester, Massachusetts. This well-known sanitorium prescribed water

internally and externally as a remedy for all kinds of ailments, and

in an age when meals were overhearty, baths infrequent, and clothing

tight and confining, the drinking of water, tub baths, showers, and

wet packs had enthusiastic advocates. The soothing baths relaxed

Susan and the leisure to read refreshed and strengthened her. She

read, one after another, Carlyle's \_Sartor Resartus\_, George Sand's

\_Consuelo\_, Madame de Stael's \_Corinne\_, then Frances Wright's \_A Few

Days in Athens\_ and Mrs. Gaskell's \_Life of Charlotte Brontë\_, making

notes in her diary (1855) of passages she particularly liked. She

discussed current events with her cousin Seth on long drives in the

country, finding him a delightful companion, well-read, understanding,

and interested in people and causes. He took her to her first

political meeting, where she was the only woman present and had a seat

on the platform. It was one of the first rallies of the new Republican

party which had developed among rebellious northern Whigs,

Free-Soilers, and anti-Nebraska Democrats who opposed the extension of

slavery. After listening to the speakers, among them Charles Sumner,

she drew these conclusions: "Had the accident of birth given me place

among the aristocracy of sex, I doubt not I should be an active,

zealous advocate of Republicanism; unless perchance, I had received

that higher, holier light which would have lifted me to the sublime

height where now stand Garrison, Phillips, and all that small band

whose motto is 'No Union with Slaveholders.'"[60]

After listening to the satisfying sermons of Thomas Wentworth

Higginson at his Free Church in Worcester, she wrote in her diary, "It

is plain to me now that it is not sitting under preaching I dislike,

but the fact that most of it is not of a stamp that my soul can

respond to."[61]

In September she interrupted "the cure" to attend a woman's rights

meeting in Boston, and with Lucy Stone, Antoinette and Ellen Blackwell

visited in the home of the wealthy merchant, Francis Jackson, making

many new friends, among them his daughter, Eliza J. Eddy, whose

unhappy marriage was to prove a blessing to the woman's rights

cause.[62]

At tea at the Garrisons', she met many of the "distinguished" men and

women she had "worshiped" from afar. She heard Theodore Parker preach

a sermon which filled her soul, and with Mr. Garrison called on him in

his famous library. "It really seemed audacious in me to be ushered

into such a presence and on such a commonplace errand as to ask him to

come to Rochester to speak in a course of lectures I am planning," she

wrote her family, "but he received me with such kindness and

simplicity that the awe I felt on entering was soon dissipated. I then

called on Wendell Phillips in his sanctum for the same purpose. I have

invited Ralph Waldo Emerson by letter and all three have promised to

come. In the evening with Mr. Jackson's son James, Ellen Blackwell and

I went to see \_Hamlet\_. In spite of my Quaker training, I find I enjoy

all these worldly amusements intensely."[63]

\* \* \* \* \*

In January 1856, Susan set out again on a woman's rights tour of New

York State to gather more signatures for her petitions. This time she

persuaded Frances D. Gage of Ohio, a temperance worker and popular

author of children's stories, to join her. An easy extemporaneous

speaker, Mrs. Gage was an attraction to offer audiences, who drove

eight or more miles to hear her; and in the cheerless hotels at night

and on the long cold sleigh rides from town to town, she was a

congenial companion.

The winter was even colder and snowier than that of the year before.

"No trains running," Susan wrote her family, "and we had a 36-mile

ride in a sleigh.... Just emerged from a long line of snow drifts and

stopped at this little country tavern, supped, and am now roasting

over the hot stove."[64]

Confronted almost daily with glaring examples of the injustices women

suffered under the property laws, she was more than ever convinced

that her work was worth-while. "We stopped at a little tavern where

the landlady was not yet twenty and had a baby, fifteen months old,"

she reported. "Her supper dishes were not washed and her baby was

crying.... She rocked the little thing to sleep, washed the dishes and

got our supper; beautiful white bread, butter, cheese, pickles, apple

and mince pie, and excellent peach preserves. She gave us her warm

room to sleep in.... She prepared a six o'clock breakfast for us,

fried pork, mashed potatoes, mince pie, and for me at my special

request, a plate of sweet baked apples and a pitcher of rich milk....

When we came to pay our bill, the dolt of a husband took the money and

put it in his pocket. He had not lifted a finger to lighten that

woman's burdens.... Yet the law gives him the right to every dollar

she earns, and when she needs two cents to buy a darning needle she

has to ask him and explain what she wants it for."[65]

When after a few weeks Mrs. Gage was called home by illness in her

family, Susan appealed hopefully to Lucretia Mott's sister, Martha C.

Wright, in Auburn, New York, "You can speak so much better, so much

more wisely, so much more everything than I can." Then she added, "I

should like a particular effort made to call out the Teachers, the

Sewing Women, the Working Women generally--Can't you write something

for your papers that will make them feel that it is for them that we

work more than [for] the wives and daughters of the rich?"[66] Mrs.

Wright, however, could help only in Auburn, and Susan was obliged to

continue her scheduled meetings alone. She interrupted them only to

present her petitions to the legislature.

The response of the legislature to her two years of hard work was a

sarcastic, wholly irrelevant report issued by the judiciary committee

some weeks later to a Senate roaring with laughter. In the Albany

\_Register\_ Susan read with mounting indignation portions of this

infuriating report: "The ladies always have the best places and the

choicest tidbit at the table. They have the best seats in cars,

carriages, and sleighs; the warmest place in winter, the coolest in

summer. They have their choice on which side of the bed they will lie,

front or back. A lady's dress costs three times as much as that of a

gentleman; and at the present time, with the prevailing fashion, one

lady occupies three times as much space in the world as a gentleman.

It has thus appeared to the married gentlemen of your committee, being

a majority ... that if there is any inequality or oppression in the

case, the gentlemen are the sufferers. They, however, have presented

no petitions for redress, having doubtless made up their minds to

yield to an inevitable destiny."[67]

Why, Susan wondered sadly, were woman's rights only a joke to most

men--something to be laughed at even in the face of glaring proofs of

the law's injustice.

There was encouragement, however, in the letters which now came from

Lucy Stone in Ohio: "Hurrah Susan! Last week this State Legislature

passed a law giving wives equal property rights, and to mothers equal

baby rights with fathers. So much is gained. The petitions which I set

on foot in Wisconsin for suffrage have been presented, made a rousing

discussion, and then were tabled with three men to defend them!... In

Nebraska too, the bill for suffrage passed the House.... The world

moves!"[68]

The world was moving in Great Britain as well, for as Susan read in

her newspaper, women there were petitioning Parliament for married

women's property rights, and among the petitioners were her

well-beloved Elizabeth Barrett Browning, Harriet Martineau, Mrs.

Gaskell, and Charlotte Cushman. Better still, Harriet Taylor, inspired

by the example of woman's rights conventions in America, had written

for the \_Westminster Review\_ an article advocating the enfranchisement

of women.

All this reassured Susan, even if New York legislators laughed at her

efforts.

FOOTNOTES:

[43] Judge William Hay of Saratoga Springs, New York.

[44] Feb. 19, 1854, Elizabeth Cady Stanton Papers, Library of

Congress.

[45] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 116. Among those who wore the bloomer

costume were Angelina and Sarah Grimké, many women in sanitoriums and

some of the Lowell, Mass. mill workers. In Ohio, the bloomer was so

popular that 60 women in Akron wore it at a ball, and in Battle Creek,

Michigan, 31 attended a Fourth of July celebration in the bloomer.

Amelia Bloomer, moving to the West wore it for eight years. Garrison,

Phillips, and William Henry Channing disapproved of the bloomer

costume, but Gerrit Smith continued to champion it and his daughter

wore it at fashionable receptions in Washington during his term in

Congress.

[46] \_History of Woman Suffrage\_, I, p. 608.

[47] 1854 (copy), Blackwell Papers, Edna M. Stantial Collection.

[48] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, pp. 111-112.

[49] March 3, 1854 (copy), Blackwell Papers, Edna M. Stantial

Collection.

[50] Ms., Diary, March 24, 28, 1854.

[51] \_Ibid.\_, March 29, 1854.

[52] \_Ibid.\_, March 30, 1854.

[53] The New England Emigrant Aid Company, headed by Eli Thayer of

Worcester, was formed to send free-soil settlers to Kansas, offering

reduced fare and farm equipment. Their first settlers reached Kansas

in August, 1854, founding the town of Lawrence in honor of one of

their chief patrons, the wealthy Amos Lawrence of Massachusetts.

[54] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 121.

[55] Diary, April 28, 1854.

[56] Leonard C. Ehrlich, \_God's Angry Man\_ (New York, 1941), p. 57.

[57] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 122.

[58] Caroline Cowles Richards, \_Village Life in America\_ (New York,

1913), p. 49.

[59] 1858, Blackwell Papers, Edna M. Stantial Collection.

[60] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 133.

[61] \_Ibid.\_

[62] Eliza J. Eddy's husband, James Eddy, took their two young

daughters away from their mother and to Europe, causing her great

anguish. This led her father, Francis Jackson, to give liberally to

the woman's rights cause. Mrs. Eddy, herself, left a bequest of

$56,000 to be divided between Susan B. Anthony and Lucy Stone.

[63] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, pp. 131-133.

[64] \_Ibid.\_, p. 138.

[65] \_Ibid.\_, p. 139.

[66] Jan. 18, 1856, Garrison Papers, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith

College.

[67] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, pp. 140-141.

[68] May 25, 1856, Blackwell Papers, Edna M. Stantial Collection.

NO UNION WITH SLAVEHOLDERS

Susan's thoughts during the summer of 1856 often strayed from woman's

rights meetings toward Kansas, where her brother Merritt had settled

on a claim near Osawatomie. Well aware of his eagerness to help John

Brown, she knew that he must be in the thick of the bloody antislavery

struggle. In fact the whole Anthony family had been anxiously waiting

for news from Merritt ever since the wires had flashed word in May

1856 of the burning of Lawrence by proslavery "border ruffians" from

Missouri and of John Brown's raid in retaliation at Pottawatomie

Creek.

Merritt had built a log cabin at Osawatomie. While Susan was at home

in September, the newspapers reported an attack by proslavery men on

Osawatomie in which thirty out of fifty settlers were killed. Was

Merritt among them? Finally letters came through from him. Susan read

and reread them, assuring herself of his safety. Although ill at the

time, he had been in the thick of the fight, but was unharmed. Weak

from the exertion he had crawled back to his cabin on his hands and

knees and had lain there ill and alone for several weeks.

Parts of Merritt's letters were published in the Rochester \_Democrat\_,

and the city took sides in the conflict, some papers claiming that his

letters were fiction. Susan wrote Merritt, "How much rather would I

have you at my side tonight than to think of your daring and enduring

greater hardships even than our Revolutionary heroes. Words cannot

tell how often we think of you or how sadly we feel that the terrible

crime of this nation against humanity is being avenged on the heads of

our sons and brothers.... Father brings the \_Democrat\_ giving a list

of killed, wounded, and missing and the name of our Merritt is not

therein, but oh! the slain are sons, brothers, and husbands of others

as dearly loved and sadly mourned."[69]

With difficulty, she prepared for the annual woman's rights

convention, for the country was in a state of unrest not only over

Kansas and the whole antislavery question, but also over the

presidential campaign with three candidates in the field. Even her

faithful friends Horace Greeley and Gerrit Smith now failed her,

Horace Greeley writing that he could no longer publish her notices

free in the news columns of his \_Tribune\_, because they cast upon him

the stigma of ultraradicalism, and Gerrit Smith withholding his

hitherto generous financial support because woman's rights conventions

would not press for dress reform--comfortable clothing for women

suitable for an active life, which he believed to be the foundation

stone of women's emancipation.

[Illustration: Merritt Anthony]

She watched the lively bitter presidential campaign with interest and

concern. The new Republican party was in the contest, offering its

first presidential candidate, the colorful hero and explorer of the

far West, John C. Frémont. She had leanings toward this virile young

party which stood firmly against the extension of slavery in the

territories, and discussed its platform with Elizabeth and Henry B.

Stanton, both enthusiastically for "Frémont and Freedom." Yet she was

distrustful of political parties, for they eventually yielded to

expediency, no matter how high their purpose at the start. Her ideal

was the Garrisonian doctrine, "No Union with Slaveholders" and

"Immediate Unconditional Emancipation," which courageously faced the

"whole question" of slavery. There was no compromise among

Garrisonians.

With the burning issue of slavery now uppermost in her mind, she began

seriously to reconsider the offer she had received from the American

Antislavery Society, shortly after her visit to Boston in 1855, to act

as their agent in central and western New York. Unable to accept at

that time because she was committed to her woman's rights program, she

had nevertheless felt highly honored that she had been chosen. Still

hesitating a little, she wrote Lucy Stone, wanting reassurance that no

woman's rights work demanded immediate attention. "They talk of

sending two companies of Lecturers into this state," she wrote Lucy,

"wish me to lay out the route of each one and accompany one. They seem

to think me possessed of a vast amount of executive ability. I shrink

from going into Conventions where speaking is expected of me.... I

know they want me to help about finance and that part I like and am

good for nothing else."[70]

She also had the farm home on her mind. With her father in the

insurance business, her brothers now both in Kansas, her sister Mary

teaching in the Rochester schools and "looking matrimonially-wise,"

and her mother at home all alone, Susan often wondered if it might not

be as much her duty to stay there to take care of her mother and

father as it would be to make a home comfortable for a husband.

Sometimes the quietness of such a life beckoned enticingly. But after

the disappointing November elections which put into the presidency the

conservative James Buchanan, from whom only a vacillating policy on

the slavery issue could be expected, she wrote Samuel May, Jr., the

secretary of the American Antislavery Society, "I shall be very glad

if I am able to render even the most humble service to this cause.

Heaven knows there is need of earnest, effective radical workers. The

heart sickens over the delusions of the recent campaign and turns

achingly to the unconsidered \_whole question\_."[71]

His reply came promptly, "We put all New York into your control and

want your name to all letters and your hand in all arrangements."

For $10 a week and expenses, Susan now arranged antislavery meetings,

displayed posters bearing the provocative words, "No Union with

Slaveholders," planned tours for a corps of speakers, among them

Stephen and Abby Kelley Foster, Parker Pillsbury, and two free

Negroes, Charles Remond and his sister, Sarah.

In debt from her last woman's rights campaign, she could not afford a

new dress for these tours, but she dyed a dark green the merino which

she had worn so proudly in Canajoharie ten years before, bought cloth

to match for a basque, and made a "handsome suit." "With my Siberian

squirrel cape, I shall be very comfortable," she noted in her

diary.[72]

She had met indifference and ridicule in her campaigns for woman's

rights. Now she faced outright hostility, for northern businessmen had

no use for abolition-mad fanatics, as they called anyone who spoke

against slavery. Abolitionists, they believed, ruined business by

stirring up trouble between the North and the South.

Usually antislavery meetings turned into debates between speakers and

audience, often lasting until midnight, and were charged with

animosity which might flame into violence. All of the speakers lived

under a strain, and under emotional pressure. Consequently they were

not always easy to handle. Some of them were temperamental, a bit

jealous of each other, and not always satisfied with the tours Susan

mapped out for them. She expected of her colleagues what she herself

could endure, but they often complained and sometimes refused to

fulfill their engagements.

When no one else was at hand, she took her turn at speaking, but she

was seldom satisfied with her efforts. "I spoke for an hour," she

confided to her diary, "but my heart fails me. Can it be that my

stammering tongue ever will be loosed?"

Lucy Stone, who spoke with such ease, gave her advice and

encouragement. "You ought to cultivate your power of expression," she

wrote. "The subject is clear to you and you ought to be able to make

it so to others. It is only a few years ago that Mr. Higginson told me

he could not speak, he was so much accustomed to writing, and now he

is second only to Phillips. 'Go thou and do likewise.'"[73]

In March 1857, the Supreme Court startled the country with the Dred

Scott decision, which not only substantiated the claim of

Garrisonians that the Constitution sanctioned slavery and protected

the slaveholder, but practically swept away the Republican platform of

no extention of slavery in the territories. The decision declared that

the Constitution did not apply to Negroes, since they were citizens of

no state when it was adopted and therefore had not the right of

citizens to sue for freedom or to claim freedom in the territories;

that the Missouri Compromise had always been void, since Congress did

not have the right to enact a law which arbitrarily deprived citizens

of their property.

Reading the decision word for word with dismay and pondering

indignantly over the cold letter of the law, Susan found herself so

aroused and so full of the subject that she occasionally made a

spontaneous speech, and thus gradually began to free herself from

reliance on written speeches. She spoke from these notes: "Consider

the fact of 4,000,000 slaves in a Christian and republican

government.... Antislavery prayers, resolutions, and speeches avail

nothing without action.... Our mission is to deepen sympathy and

convert into right action: to show that the men and women of the North

are slaveholders, those of the South slave-owners. The guilt rests on

the North equally with the South. Therefore our work is to rouse the

sleeping consciousness of the North....[74]

"We ask you to feel as if you, yourselves, were the slaves. The

politician talks of slavery as he does of United States banks, tariff,

or any other commercial question. We demand the abolition of slavery

because the slave is a human being and because man should not hold

property in his fellowman.... We say disobey every unjust law; the

politician says obey them and meanwhile labor constitutionally for

repeal.... We preach revolution, the politicians, reform."

Instinctively she reaffirmed her allegiance to the doctrine, "No Union

with Slaveholders," and she gloried in the courage of Garrison,

Phillips, and Higginson, who had called a disunion convention,

demanding that the free states secede. It was good to be one of this

devoted band, for she sincerely believed that in the ages to come "the

prophecies of these noble men and women will be read with the same

wonder and veneration as those of Isaiah and Jeremiah inspire

today."[75]

She gave herself to the work with religious fervor. Even so, she could

not make her antislavery meetings self-supporting, and at the end of

the first season, after paying her speakers, she faced a deficit of

$1,000. This troubled her greatly but the Antislavery Society,

recognizing her value, wrote her, "We cheerfully pay your expenses and

want to keep you at the head of the work." They took note of her

"business enterprise, practical sagacity, and platform ability," and

looked upon the expenditure of $1,000 for the education and

development of such an exceptional worker as a good investment.

This new experience was a good investment for Susan as well. She made

many new friends. She won the further respect, confidence, and good

will of men like William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips, and Francis

Jackson. Her friendship with Parker Pillsbury deepened. "I can truly

say," she wrote Abby Kelley Foster, "my spirit has grown in grace and

that the experience of the past winter is worth more to me than all my

Temperance and Woman's Rights labors--though the latter were the

school necessary to bring me into the Antislavery work."[76]

Only the crusading spirit of the "antislavery apostles"[77] and what

to them seemed the desperate state of the nation made the hard

campaigning bearable. The animosity they faced, the cold, the poor

transportation, the long hours, and wretched food taxed the physical

endurance of all of them. "O the crimes that are committed in the

kitchens of this land!"[78] wrote Susan in her diary, as she ate heavy

bread and the cake ruined with soda and drank what passed for coffee.

A good cook herself, she had little patience with those who through

ignorance or carelessness neglected that art. Equally bad were the

food fads they had to endure when they were entertained in homes of

otherwise hospitable friends of the cause. Raw-food diets found many

devotees in those days, and often after long cold rides in the

stagecoach, these tired hungry antislavery workers were obliged to sit

down to a supper of apples, nuts, and a baked mixture of coarse bran

and water. Nor did breakfast or dinner offer anything more. Facing

these diets seemed harder for the men than for Susan. Repeatedly in

such situations, they hurried away, leaving her to complete two-or

three-day engagements among the food cranks. How she welcomed a good

beefsteak and a pot of hot coffee at home after these long days of

fasting!

A night at home now was sheer bliss, and she wrote Lucy Stone, "Here

I am once more in my own Farm Home, where my weary head rests upon my

own home pillows.... I had been gone \_Four Months\_, scarcely sleeping

the second night under the same roof."[79]

It was good to be with her mother again, to talk with her father when

he came home from work and with Mary who had not married after all but

continued teaching in the Rochester schools. Guelma and her husband,

Aaron McLean, who had moved to Rochester, often came out to the farm

with their children.

Turning for relaxation to work in the garden in the warm sun, Susan

thought over the year's experience and planned for the future. "I can

but acknowledge to myself that Antislavery has made me richer and

braver in spirit," she wrote Samuel May, Jr., "and that it is the

school of schools for the true and full development of the nobler

elements of life. I find my raspberry field looking finely--also my

strawberry bed. The prospect for peaches, cherries, plums, apples, and

pears is very promising--Indeed all nature is clothed in her most

hopeful dress. It really seems to me that the trees and the grass and

the large fields of waving grain did never look so beautifully as now.

It is more probable, however, that my soul has grown to appreciate

Nature more fully...."[80]

Susan needed that growth of soul to face the events of the next few

years and do the work which lay ahead. The whole country was tense

over the slavery issue, which could no longer be pushed into the

background. On public platforms and at every fireside, men and women

were discussing the subject. Antislavery workers sensed the gravity of

the situation and felt the onrush of the impending conflict between

what they regarded as the forces of good and evil--freedom and

slavery. When the Republican leader, William H. Seward, spoke in

Rochester, of "an irrepressible conflict between opposing and enduring

forces,"[81] he was expressing only what Garrisonian abolitionists,

like Susan, always had recognized. In the West, a tall awkward country

lawyer, Abraham Lincoln, debating with the suave Stephen A. Douglas,

declared with prophetic wisdom, "'A house divided against itself

cannot stand.' I believe this government cannot endure permanently

half slave and half free.... It will become all one thing or all the

other.'"[82]

So Susan believed, and she was doing her best to make it all free.

Not only was she holding antislavery meetings, making speeches, and

distributing leaflets whenever and wherever possible, but she was also

lobbying in Albany for a personal liberty bill to protect the slaves

who were escaping from the South. "Treason in the Capitol," the

Democratic press labeled efforts for a personal liberty bill, and as

Susan reported to William Lloyd Garrison,[83] even Republicans shied

away from it, many of them regarding Seward's "irrepressible conflict"

speech a sorry mistake. Such timidity and shilly-shallying were

repugnant to her. She could better understand the fervor of John Brown

although he fought with bullets.

Yet John Brown's fervor soon ended in tragedy, sowing seeds of fear,

distrust, and bitter partisanship in all parts of the country. When,

in October 1859, the startling news reached Susan of the raid on

Harper's Ferry and the capture of John Brown, she sadly tried to piece

together the story of his failure. She admired and respected John

Brown, believing he had saved Kansas for freedom. That he had further

ambitious plans was common knowledge among antislavery workers, for he

had talked them over with Gerrit Smith, Frederick Douglass, and the

three young militants, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Frank Sanborn, and

Samuel Gridley Howe. Somehow these plans had failed, but she was sure

that his motives were good. He was imprisoned, accused of treason and

murder, and in his carpetbag were papers which, it was said,

implicated prominent antislavery workers. Now his friends were fleeing

the country, Sanborn, Douglass, and Howe. Gerrit Smith broke down so

completely that for a time his mind was affected. Thomas Wentworth

Higginson, defiant and unafraid, stuck by John Brown to the end,

befriending his family, hoping to rescue him as he had rescued

fugitive slaves.

Scanning the \_Liberator\_ for its comment on John Brown, Susan found it

colored, as she had expected, by Garrison's instinctive opposition to

all war and bloodshed. He called the raid "a misguided, wild,

apparently insane though disinterested and well-intentioned effort by

insurrection to emancipate the slaves of Virginia," but even he added,

"Let no one who glories in the Revolutionary struggle of 1776 deny the

right of the slaves to imitate the example of our fathers."[84]

Behind closed doors and in public meetings, abolitionists pledged

their allegiance to John Brown's noble purpose. He had wanted no

bloodshed, they said, had no thought of stirring up slaves to brutal

revenge. The raid was to be merely a signal for slaves to arise, to

cast off slavery forever, to follow him to a mountain refuge, which

other slave insurrections would reinforce until all slaves were free.

To him the plan seemed logical and he was convinced it was

God-inspired. To some of his friends it seemed possible--just a step

beyond the Underground Railroad and hiding fugitive slaves. To Susan

he was a hero and a martyr.

Southerners, increasingly fearful of slave insurrections, called John

Brown a cold-blooded murderer and accused Republicans--"black

Republicans," they classed them--of taking orders from abolitionists

and planning evil against them. To law-abiding northerners, John Brown

was a menace, stirring up lawlessness. Seward and Lincoln, speaking

for the Republicans, declared that violence, bloodshed, and treason

could not be excused even if slavery was wrong and Brown thought he

was right. All saw before them the horrible threat of civil war.

During John Brown's trial, his friends did their utmost to save him.

The noble old giant with flowing white beard, who had always been more

or less of a legend, now to them assumed heroic proportions. His

calmness, his steadfastness in what he believed to be right captured

the imagination.

The jury declared him guilty--guilty of treason, of conspiring with

slaves to rebel, guilty of murder in the first degree. The papers

carried the story, and it spread by word of mouth--the story of those

last tense moments in the courtroom when John Brown declared, "It is

unjust that I should suffer such a penalty. Had I interferred ... in

behalf of the rich, the powerful, the intelligent, the so-called

great, or in behalf of any of their friends ... it would have been all

right.... I say I am yet too young to understand that God is any

respecter of persons. I believe that to have interferred as I have

done, in behalf of His despised poor, I did no wrong but right. Now if

it is deemed necessary that I should forfeit my life for the

furtherance of the ends of justice and mingle my blood further with

the blood of my children and with the blood of millions in this slave

country whose rights are disregarded by wicked, cruel, and unjust

enactments, I say, let it be done...."[85]

He was sentenced to die.

Susan, sick at heart, talked all this over with her abolitionist

friends and began planning a meeting of protest and mourning in

Rochester if John Brown were hanged. She engaged the city's most

popular hall for this meeting, never thinking of the animosity she

might arouse, and as she went from door to door selling tickets, she

asked for contributions for John Brown's destitute family. She tried

to get speakers from among respected Republicans to widen the popular

appeal of the meeting, but her diary records, "Not one man of

prominence in religion or politics will identify himself with the John

Brown meeting."[86] Only a Free Church minister, the Rev. Abram Pryn,

and the ever-faithful Parker Pillsbury were willing to speak.

There was still hope that John Brown might be saved and excitement ran

high. Some like Higginson, unwilling to let him die, wanted to rescue

him, but Brown forbade it. Others wanted to kidnap Governor Wise of

Virginia and hold him on the high seas, a hostage for John Brown.

Wendell Phillips was one of these. Parker Pillsbury, sending Susan the

latest news from "the seat of war" and signing his letter, "Faithfully

and fervently yours," wrote, "My voice is against any attempt at

rescue. It would inevitably, I fear, lead to bloodshed which could not

compensate nor be compensated. If the people dare murder their victim,

as they are determined to do, and in the name of the law ... the moral

effect of the execution will be without a parallel since the scenes on

Calvary eighteen hundred years ago, and the halter that day sanctified

shall be the cord to draw millions to salvation."[87]

On Friday, December 2, 1859, John Brown was hanged. Through the North,

church bells tolled and prayers were said for him. Everywhere people

gathered together to mourn and honor or to condemn. In New York City,

at a big meeting which overflowed to the streets, it was resolved

"that we regard the recent outrage at Harper's Ferry as a crime, not

only against the State of Virginia, but against the Union itself...."

In Boston, however, Ralph Waldo Emerson spoke to a tremendous audience

of "the new saint, than whom none purer or more brave was ever led by

love of man into conflict and death ... who will make the gallows

glorious," and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow recorded in his diary, "This

will be a great day in our history; the date of a new revolution." Far

away in France, Victor Hugo declared, "The eyes of Europe are fixed on

America. The hanging of John Brown will open a latent fissure that

will finally split the union asunder.... You preserve your shame, but

you kill your glory."[88]

In Rochester, three hundred people assembled. All were friends of the

cause and there was no unfriendly disturbance to mar the proceedings.

Susan presided and Parker Pillsbury, in her opinion, made "the

grandest speech of his life," for it was the only occasion he ever

found fully wicked enough to warrant "his terrific invective."[89]

Thus these two militant abolitionists, Susan B. Anthony and Parker

Pillsbury, joined hundreds of others throughout the nation in honoring

John Brown, sensing the portent of his martyrdom and prophesying that

his soul would go marching on.
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THE TRUE WOMAN

Susan's preoccupation with antislavery work did not lessen her

interest in women's advancement. Her own expanding courage and ability

showed her the possibilities for all women in widened horizons and

activities. These possibilities were the chief topic of conversation

when she and Elizabeth Stanton were together. With Mrs. Stanton's

young daughters, Margaret and Harriot, in mind, they were continually

planning ways and means of developing the new woman, or the "true

woman" as they liked to call her; and one of these ways was physical

exercise in the fresh air, which was almost unheard of for women

except on the frontier.

Taking off her hoops and working in the garden in the freedom of her

long calico dress, Susan was refreshed and exhilarated. "Uncovered the

strawberry and raspberry beds ..." her diary records. "Worked with

Simon building frames for the grapevines in the peach orchards.... Set

out 18 English black currants, 22 English gooseberries and Muscatine

grape vines.... Finished setting out the apple trees & 600 blackberry

bushes...."[90]

She knew how little this strengthening work and healing influence

touched the lives of most women. Hemmed in by the walls of their

homes, weighed down by bulky confining clothing, fed on the tradition

of weakness, women could never gain the breadth of view, courage, and

stamina needed to demand and appreciate emancipation. She thought a

great deal about this and how it could be remedied, and wrote her

friend, Thomas Wentworth Higginson "The salvation of the race depends,

in a great measure, upon rescuing women from their hot-house

existence. Whether in kitchen, nursery or parlor, all alike are shut

away from God's sunshine. Why did not your Caroline Plummer of Salem,

why do not all of our wealthy women leave money for industrial and

agricultural schools for girls, instead of ever and always providing

for boys alone?"[91]

An exceptional opportunity was now offered Susan--to speak on the

controversial subject of coeducation before the State Teachers'

Association, which only a few years before had been shocked by the

sound of a woman's voice. Deeply concerned over her ability to write

the speech, she at once appealed to Elizabeth Stanton, "Do you please

mark out a plan and give me as soon as you can...."[92]

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony, 1856]

Busy with preparations for woman's rights meetings in popular New York

summer resorts, Saratoga Springs, Lake George, Clifton Springs, and

Avon, she grew panicky at the prospect of her impending speech and

dashed off another urgent letter to Mrs. Stanton, underlining it

vigorously for emphasis: "Not a \_word written\_ ... and mercy only

knows when I can get a moment, and what is \_worse\_, as the \_Lord knows

full well\_, is, that if \_I get all the time the world has--I can't get

up a decent document\_.... It is of but small moment who writes the

Address, but of \_vast moment\_ that it be \_well done\_.... No woman but

you can write from \_my standpoint\_ for all would base their strongest

\_argument\_ on the \_un\_likeness of the \_sexes\_....

"Those of you who have the \_talent\_ to do honor to poor, oh how poor

womanhood have all given yourselves over to \_baby\_-making and left

poor brainless \_me\_ to battle alone. It is a shame. Such a lady as \_I

might\_ be \_spared\_ to \_rock cradles\_, but it is a crime for \_you\_ and

\_Lucy\_ and \_Nette\_."[93]

On a separate page she outlined for Mrs. Stanton the points she wanted

to make. Her title was affirmative, "Why the Sexes Should be Educated

Together." "Because," she reasoned, "by such education they get true

ideas of each other.... Because the endowment of both public and

private funds is ever for those of the male sex, while all the

Seminaries and Boarding Schools for Females are left to

maintain themselves as best they may by means of their tuition

fees--consequently cannot afford a faculty of first-class

professors.... Not a school in the country gives to the girl equal

privileges with the boy.... No school \_requires\_ and but very few

allow the \_girls\_ to declaim and discuss side by side with the boys.

Thus they are robbed of half of education. The grand thing that is

needed is to give the sexes \_like motives\_ for acquirement. Very

rarely a person studies closely, without hope of making that knowledge

useful, as a means of support...."[94]

Mrs. Stanton wrote her at once, "Come here and I will do what I can to

help you with your address, if you will hold the baby and make the

puddings."[95] Gratefully Susan hurried to Seneca Falls and together

they "loaded her gun," not only for the teachers' convention but for

all the summer meetings.

Addressing the large teachers' meeting in Troy, Susan declared that

mental sex-differences did not exist. She called attention to the

ever-increasing variety of occupations which women were carrying on

with efficiency. There were women typesetters, editors, publishers,

authors, clerks, engravers, watchmakers, bookkeepers, sculptors,

painters, farmers, and machinists. Two hundred and fifty women were

serving as postmasters. Girls, she insisted, must be educated to earn

a living and more vocations must be opened to them as an incentive to

study. "A woman," she added, "needs no particular kind of education to

be a wife and mother anymore than a man does to be a husband and

father. A man cannot make a living out of these relations. He must

fill them with something more and so must women."[96]

Her advanced ideas did not cause as much consternation as she had

expected and she was asked to repeat her speech at the Massachusetts

teachers' convention; but the thoughts of many in that audience were

echoed by the president when he said to her after the meeting, "Madam,

that was a splendid production and well delivered. I could not have

asked for a single thing different either in matter or manner; but I

would rather have followed my wife or daughter to Greenwood cemetery

than to have had her stand here before this promiscuous audience and

deliver that address."[97]

It was one thing to talk about coeducation but quite another to offer

a resolution putting the New York State Teachers' Association on

record as asking all schools, colleges, and universities to open their

doors to women. This Susan did at their next convention, and while

there were enough women present to carry the resolution, most of them

voted against it, listening instead to the emotional arguments of a

group of conservative men who prophesied that coeducation would

coarsen women and undermine marriage. Nor did she forget the Negro at

these conventions, but brought much criticism upon herself by offering

resolutions protesting the exclusion of Negroes from public schools,

academies, colleges, and universities.

Such controversial activities were of course eagerly reported in the

press, and Henry Stanton, reading his newspaper, pointed them out to

his wife, remarking drily, "Well, my dear, another notice of Susan.

You stir up Susan and she stirs up the world."[98]

\* \* \* \* \*

The best method of arousing women and spreading new ideas, Susan

decided, was holding woman's rights conventions, for the discussions

at these conventions covered a wide field and were not limited merely

to women's legal disabilities. The feminists of that day extolled

freedom of speech, and their platform, like that of antislavery

conventions, was open to anyone who wished to express an opinion.

Always the limited educational opportunities offered to women were

pointed out, and Oberlin College and Antioch, both coeducational, were

held up as patterns for the future. Resolutions were passed, demanding

that Harvard and Yale admit women. Women's low wages and the very few

occupations open to them were considered, and whether it was fitting

for women to be doctors and ministers. At one convention Lucy Stone

made the suggestion that a prize be offered for a novel on women,

like \_Uncle Tom's Cabin\_, to arouse the whole nation to the unjust

situation of women whose slavery, she felt, was comparable to that of

the Negro. At another, William Lloyd Garrison maintained that women

had the right to sit in the Congress and in state legislatures and

that there should be an equal number of men and women in all national

councils. Inevitably Scriptural edicts regarding woman's sphere were

thrashed out with Antoinette Brown, in her clerical capacity, setting

at rest the minds of questioning women and quashing the protests of

clergymen who thought they were speaking for God. Usually Ernestine

Rose was on hand, ready to speak when needed, injecting into the

discussions her liberal clear-cut feminist views. Nor was the

international aspect of the woman's rights movement forgotten. The

interest in Great Britain in the franchise for women of such men as

Lord Brougham and John Stuart Mill was reported as were the efforts

there among women to gain admission to the medical profession.

Distributed widely as a tract was the "admirable" article in the

\_Westminster Review\_, "The Enfranchisement of Women," by Harriet

Taylor, now Mrs. John Stuart Mill.

In New York, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Indiana, where

state conventions were held annually, women carried back to their

homes and their friends new and stimulating ideas. National

conventions, which actually represented merely the northeastern states

and Ohio and occasionally attracted men and women from Indiana,

Missouri, and Kansas, were scheduled by Susan to meet every year in

New York, simultaneously with antislavery conventions. Thus she was

assured of a brilliant array of speakers, for the Garrisonian

abolitionists were sincere advocates of woman's rights.

Both Elizabeth Stanton and Lucy Stone were a great help to Susan in

preparing for these national gatherings for which she raised the

money. Elizabeth wrote the calls and resolutions, while Lucy could not

only be counted upon for an eloquent speech, but through her wide

contacts brought new speakers and new converts to the meetings.

However, national woman's rights conventions would probably have

lapsed completely during the troubled years prior to the Civil War,

had it not been for Susan's persistence. She was obliged to omit the

1857 convention because all of her best speakers were either having

babies or were kept at home by family duties. Lucy's baby, Alice Stone

Blackwell, was born in September 1857, then Antoinette Brown's first

child, and Mrs. Stanton's seventh.

[Illustration: Lucy Stone and her daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell]

Impatient to get on with the work, Susan chafed at the delay and when

Lucy wrote her, "I shall not assume the responsibility for another

convention until I have had my ten daughters,"[99] Susan was beside

herself with apprehension. When Lucy told her that it was harder to

take care of a baby day and night than to campaign for woman's rights,

she felt that Lucy regarded as unimportant her "common work" of hiring

halls, engaging speakers, and raising money. This rankled, for

although Susan realized it was work without glory, she did expect Lucy

to understand its significance.

Mrs. Stanton sensed the makings of a rift between Susan and these

young mothers, Lucy and Antoinette, and knowing from her own

experience how torn a woman could be between rearing a family and work

for the cause, she pleaded with Susan to be patient with them. "Let

them rest a while in peace and quietness, and think great thoughts for

the future," she wrote Susan. "It is not well to be in the excitement

of public life all the time. Do not keep stirring them up or mourning

over their repose. You need rest too. Let the world alone a while. We

cannot bring about a moral revolution in a day or a year."[100]

But Susan could not let the world alone. There was too much to be

done. In addition to her woman's rights and antislavery work, she gave

a helping hand to any good cause in Rochester, such as a protest

meeting against capital punishment, a series of Sunday evening

lectures, or establishing a Free Church like that headed by Theodore

Parker in Boston where no one doctrine would be preached and all would

be welcome. There were days when weariness and discouragement hung

heavily upon her. Then impatient that she alone seemed to be carrying

the burden of the whole woman's rights movement, she complained to

Lydia Mott, "There is not one woman left who may be relied on. All

have first to please their husbands after which there is little time

or energy left to spend in any other direction.... How soon the last

standing monuments (yourself and myself, Lydia) will lay down the

individual 'shovel and de hoe' and with proper zeal and spirit grasp

those of some masculine hand, the mercies and the spirits only know. I

declare to you that I distrust the powers of any woman, even of myself

to withstand the mighty matrimonial maelstrom!"[101]

To Elizabeth Stanton she confessed, "I have very weak moments and long

to lay my weary head somewhere and nestle my full soul to that of

another in full sympathy. I sometimes fear that \_I too\_ shall faint by

the wayside and drop out of the ranks of the faithful few."[102]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan thought a great deal about marriage at this time, about how it

interfered with the development of women's talents and their careers,

how it usually dwarfed their individuality. Nor were these thoughts

wholly impersonal, for she had attentive suitors during these years.

Her diary mentions moonlight rides and adds, "Mr.--walked home with

me; marvelously attentive. What a pity such powers of intellect should

lack the moral spine."[103] Her standards of matrimony were high, and

she carefully recorded in her diary Lucretia Mott's wise words, "In

the true marriage relation, the independence of the husband and wife

is equal, their dependence mutual, and their obligations

reciprocal."[104]

Marriage and the differences of the sexes were often discussed at the

many meetings she attended, and when remarks were made which to her

seemed to limit in any way the free and full development of woman, she

always registered her protest. She had no patience with any

unrealistic glossing over of sex attraction and spurned the theory

that woman expressed love and man wisdom, that these two qualities

reached out for each other and blended in marriage. Because she spoke

frankly for those days and did not soften the impact of her words with

sentimental flowery phrases, her remarks were sometimes called

"coarse" and "animal," but she justified them in a letter to Mrs.

Stanton, who thought as she did, "To me it [sex] is not coarse or

gross. If it is a fact, there it is."[105]

She was reading at this time Elizabeth Barrett Browning's \_Aurora

Leigh\_, called by Ruskin the greatest poem in the English language,

but criticized by others as an indecent romance revolting to the

purity of many women. Susan had bought a copy of the first American

edition and she carried it with her wherever she went. After a hard

active day, she found inspiration and refreshment in its pages. No

matter how dreary the hotel room or how unfriendly the town, she no

longer felt lonely or discouraged, for Aurora Leigh was a companion

ever at hand, giving her confidence in herself, strengthening her

ambition, and helping her build a satisfying, constructive philosophy

of life. On the flyleaf of her worn copy, which in later years she

presented to the Library of Congress, she wrote, "This book was

carried in my satchel for years and read and reread. The noble words

of Elizabeth Barrett, as Wendell Phillips always called her, sunk deep

into my heart. I have always cherished it above all other books. I now

present it to the Congressional Library with the hope that women may

more and more be like Aurora Leigh."

The beauty of its poetry enchanted her, and Elizabeth Barrett

Browning's feminism found an echo in her own. She pencil-marked the

passages she wanted to reread. When her "common work" of hiring halls

and engaging speakers seemed unimportant and even futile, she found

comfort in these lines:

"Be sure no earnest work

Of any honest creature, howbeit weak

Imperfect, ill-adapted, fails so much,

It is not gathered as a grain of sand

To enlarge the sum of human action used

For carrying out God's end....

... let us be content in work,

To do the thing we can, and not presume

To fret because it's little."[106]

Glorying in work, she read with satisfaction:

"The honest earnest man must stand and work:

The woman also, otherwise she drops

At once below the dignity of man,

Accepting serfdom. Free men freely work;

Who ever fears God, fears to sit at ease."

Could she have written poetry, these words, spoken by Aurora, might

well have been her own:

"You misconceive the question like a man,

Who sees a woman as the complement

Of his sex merely. You forget too much

That every creature, female as the male,

Stands single in responsible act and thought,

As also in birth and death. Whoever says

To a loyal woman, 'Love and work with me,'

Will get fair answers, if the work and love

Being good of themselves, are good for her--the best

She was born for."

Inspired by \_Aurora Leigh\_, Susan planned a new lecture, "The True

Woman," and as she wrote it out word for word, her thoughts and

theories about women, which had been developing through the years,

crystallized. In her opinion, the "true woman" could no more than

Aurora Leigh follow the traditional course and sacrifice all for the

love of one man, adjusting her life to his whims. She must, instead,

develop her own personality and talents, advancing in learning, in the

arts, in science, and in business, cherishing at the same time her

noble womanly qualities. Susan hoped that some day the full

development of woman's individuality would be compatible with

marriage, and she held up as an ideal the words which Elizabeth

Barrett Browning put into the mouth of Aurora Leigh:

"The world waits

For help. Beloved, let us work so well,

Our work shall still be better for our love

And still our love be sweeter for our work

And both, commended, for the sake of each,

By all true workers and true lovers born."

She expressed this hope in her own practical words to Lydia Mott:

"Institutions, among them marriage, are justly chargeable with many

social and individual ills, but after all, the whole man or woman will

rise above them. I am sure my 'true woman' will never be crushed or

dwarfed by them. Woman must take to her soul a purpose and then make

circumstances conform to this purpose, instead of forever singing the

refrain, 'if and if and if.'"[107]

\* \* \* \* \*

Late in 1858, Susan received a letter from Wendell Phillips which put

new life into all her efforts for women. He wrote her that an

anonymous donor had given him $5,000 for the woman's rights cause and

that he, Lucy Stone, and Susan had been named trustees to spend it

wisely and effectively.

The man who felt that the woman's rights cause was important enough to

rate a gift of that size proved to be wealthy Francis Jackson of

Boston, in whose home Susan had visited a few years before with Lucy

and Antoinette. Jubilant over the prospects, she at once began to make

plans. She wanted to use all of the fund for lectures, conventions,

tracts, and newspaper articles; Lucy thought part of the money should

be spent to prove unconstitutional the law which taxed women without

representation and Antoinette was eager for a share to establish a

church in which she could preach woman's rights with the Gospel.

Both Wendell Phillips and Lucy Stone agreed that Susan should have

$1,500 for the intensive campaign she had planned for New York, and

for once in her life she started off without a financial worry, with

money in hand to pay her speakers. She held meetings in all of the

principal towns of the state, making them at least partially pay for

themselves. Her lecturers each received $12 a week and she kept a

like amount for herself, for planning the tour, organizing the

meetings, and delivering her new lecture, "The True Woman."

"I am having fine audiences of thinking men and women," she wrote Mary

Hallowell. "Oh, if we could but make our meetings ring like those of

the antislavery people, wouldn't the world hear us? But to do that we

must have souls baptized into the work and consecrated to it."[108]

Some souls were deeply stirred by the woman's rights gospel. One of

these was the wealthy Boston merchant, Charles F. Hovey, who in his

will left $50,000 in trust to Wendell Phillips, William Lloyd

Garrison, Parker Pillsbury, Abby Kelley Foster, and others, to be

spent for the "promotion of the antislavery cause and other reforms,"

among them woman's rights, and not less than $8,000 a year to be spent

to promote these reforms. With all this financial help available,

Susan expected great things to happen.

\* \* \* \* \*

During the winter of 1860 while the legislature was in session, Susan

spent six weeks in Albany with Lydia Mott, and day after day she

climbed the long hill to the capitol to interview legislators on

amendments to the married women's property laws. When these amendments

were passed by the Senate, Assemblyman Anson Bingham urged her to

bring their mutual friend, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, to Albany to speak

before his committee to assure passage by the Assembly.

Once again Susan hurried to Seneca Falls, and unpacking her little

portmanteau stuffed with papers and statistics, discussed the subject

with Mrs. Stanton in front of the open fire late into the night. Then

the next morning while Mrs. Stanton shut herself up in the quietest

room in the house to write her speech, Susan gave the children their

breakfast, sent the older ones off to school, watched over the babies,

prepared the desserts, and made herself generally useful. By this time

the children regarded her affectionately as "Aunt Thusan," and they

knew they must obey her, for she was a stern disciplinarian whom even

the mischievous Stanton boys dared not defy.

These visits of Susan's were happy, satisfying times for both these

young women. A few days' respite from travel in a well-run home with

a friend she admired did wonders for Susan, giving her perspective on

the work she had already done and courage to tackle new problems,

while for Mrs. Stanton this short period of stimulating companionship

and freedom from household cares was a godsend. "Miss Anthony" had

long ago become Susan to Elizabeth, but Susan all through her life

called her very best friend "Mrs. Stanton," playfully to be sure, but

with a remnant of that formality which it was hard for her to cast

off.

The speech was soon finished. Mrs. Stanton's imagination, fired by her

sympathetic understanding of women's problems, had turned Susan's cold

hard facts into moving prose, while Susan, the best of critics,

detected every weak argument or faltering phrase. They both felt they

had achieved a masterpiece.

Mrs. Stanton delivered this address before a joint session of the New

York legislature in March 1860. Susan beamed with pride as she watched

the large audience crowd even the galleries and heard the long loud

applause for the speech which she was convinced could not have been

surpassed by any man in the United States.

The next day the Assembly passed the Married Women's Property Bill,

and when shortly it was signed by the governor, Susan and Mrs. Stanton

scored their first big victory, winning a legal revolution for the

women of New York State. This new law was a challenge to women

everywhere. Under it a married woman had the right to hold property,

real and personal, without the interference of her husband, the right

to carry on any trade or perform any service on her own account and to

collect and use her own earnings; a married woman might now buy, sell,

and make contracts, and if her husband had abandoned her or was

insane, a convict, or a habitual drunkard, his consent was

unnecessary; a married woman might sue and be sued, she was the joint

guardian with her husband of her children, and on the decease of her

husband the wife had the same rights that her husband would have at

her death.

Susan did not then realize the full significance of what she had

accomplished--that she had unleashed a new movement for freedom which

would be the means of strengthening the democratic government of her

country.
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THE ZEALOT

With a spirit of confidence inspired by her victory in New York State,

Susan looked forward to the tenth national woman's rights convention

in New York City in May 1860. At this convention she reported progress

everywhere. Four thousand dollars from the Jackson and Hovey funds had

been spent in the successful New York campaign, and similar work was

scheduled for Ohio. In Kansas, women had won from the constitutional

convention equal rights and privileges in state-controlled schools and

in the management of the public schools, including the right to vote

for members of school boards; mothers had been granted equal rights

with fathers in the control and custody of their children, and married

women had been given property rights. In Indiana, Maine, Missouri, and

Ohio, married women could now control their own earnings.

"Each year we hail with pleasure," she continued, "new accessions to

our faith. Brave men and true from the higher walks of literature and

art, from the bar, the bench, the pulpit, and legislative halls are

now ready to help woman wherever she claims to stand." She was

thinking of the aid given her by Andrew J. Colvin and Anson Bingham of

the New York legislature, of the young journalist, George William

Curtis, just recently speaking for women, of Samuel Longfellow at his

first woman's rights convention, and of the popular Henry Ward Beecher

who, just a few months before, had delivered his great woman's rights

speech, thereby identifying himself irrevocably with the cause. She

announced with great satisfaction the news, which the papers had

carried a few days before, that Matthew Vassar of Poughkeepsie had set

aside $400,000 to found a college for women equal in all respects to

Harvard and Yale.[109]

Progress and good feeling were in the air, and the speakers were not

heckled as in past years by the rowdies who had made it a practice to

follow abolitionists into woman's rights meetings to bait them. Into

this atmosphere of good will and rejoicing, Susan and Elizabeth

Stanton now injected a more serious note, bringing before the

convention the controversial question of marriage and divorce which

heretofore had been handled with kid gloves at all woman's rights

meetings, but which they sincerely believed demanded solution.

\* \* \* \* \*

Divorce had been much in the news because several leading families in

America and in England were involved in lawsuits complicated by

stringent divorce laws. Invariably the wife bore the burden of censure

and hardship, for no matter how unprincipled her husband might be, he

was entitled to her children and her earnings under the property laws

of most states.

In New York efforts were now being made to gain support for a liberal

divorce bill, patterned after the Indiana law, and a variety of

proposals were before the legislature, making drunkenness, insanity,

desertion, and cruel and abusive treatment grounds for divorce. Horace

Greeley in his \_Tribune\_ had been vigorously opposing a more liberal

law for New York, while Robert Dale Owen of Indiana wrote in its

defense. Everywhere people were reading the Greeley-Owen debates in

the \_Tribune\_. Through his widely circulated paper, Horace Greeley had

in a sense become an oracle for the people who felt he was safe and

good; while Robert Dale Owen, because of his youthful association with

the New Harmony community and Frances Wright, was branded with

radicalism which even his valuable service in the Indiana legislature

and his two terms in Congress could not blot out.

Susan and Mrs. Stanton had no patience with Horace Greeley's smug

old-fashioned opinions on marriage and divorce. In fact these

Greeley-Owen debates in the \_Tribune\_ were the direct cause of their

decision to bring this subject before the convention, where they hoped

for support from their liberal friends. They counted especially on

Lucy Stone, who seemed to give her approval when she wrote, "I am glad

you will speak on the divorce question, provided you yourself are

clear on the subject. It is a great grave topic that one shudders to

grapple, but its hour is coming.... God touch your lips if you speak

on it."[110]

Neither Susan nor Mrs. Stanton shuddered to grapple with any subject

which they believed needed attention. In fact, the discussion of

marriage and divorce in woman's rights conventions had been on their

minds for some time. Three years before Susan had written Lucy, "I

have thought with you until of late that the Social Question must be

kept separate from Woman's Rights, but we have always claimed that our

movement was \_Human Rights\_, not Woman's specially.... It seems to me

we have played on the surface of things quite long enough. Getting the

right to hold property, to vote, to wear what dress we please, etc.,

are all to the good, but \_Social Freedom\_, after all, lies at the

bottom of all, and unless woman gets that she must continue the slave

of man in all other things."[111]

\* \* \* \* \*

Consternation spread through the genial ranks of the convention as

Mrs. Stanton now offered resolutions calling for more liberal divorce

laws. Quick to sense the temper of an audience, Susan felt its

resistance to being jolted out of the pleasant contemplation of past

successes to the unpleasant recognition that there were still

difficult ugly problems ahead. She was conscious at once of a stir of

astonishment and disapproval when Mrs. Stanton in her clear compelling

voice read, "Resolved, That an unfortunate or ill-assorted marriage is

ever a calamity, but not ever, perhaps never a crime--and when society

or government, by its laws or customs, compels its continuance, always

to the grief of one of the parties, and the actual loss and damage of

both, it usurps an authority never delegated to man, nor exercised by

God, Himself...."[112]

Listening to Mrs. Stanton's speech in defense of her ten bold

resolutions on marriage and divorce, Susan felt that her brave

colleague was speaking for women everywhere, for wives of the present

and the future. As the hearty applause rang out, she concluded that

even the disapproving admired her courage; but before the applause

ceased, she saw Antoinette Blackwell on her feet, waiting to be heard.

She knew that Antoinette, like Horace Greeley, preferred to think of

all marriages as made in heaven, and true to form Antoinette contended

that the marriage relation "must be lifelong" and "as permanent and

indissoluble as the relation of parent and child."[113] At once

Ernestine Rose came to the rescue in support of Mrs. Stanton.

Then Wendell Phillips showed his displeasure by moving that Mrs.

Stanton's resolutions be laid on the table and expunged from the

record because they had no more to do with this convention than

slavery in Kansas or temperance. "This convention," he asserted, "as I

understand it, assembles to discuss the laws that rest unequally upon

men and women, not those that rest equally on men and women."[114]

Aghast at this statement, Susan was totally unprepared to have his

views supported by that other champion of liberty, William Lloyd

Garrison, who, however, did not favor expunging the resolutions from

the record.

It was incomprehensible to Susan that neither Garrison nor Phillips

recognized woman's subservient status in marriage under prevailing

laws and traditions, and she now stated her own views with firmness:

"As to the point that this question does not belong to this

platform--from that I totally dissent. Marriage has ever been a

one-sided matter, resting most unequally upon the sexes. By it, man

gains all--woman loses all; tyrant law and lust reign supreme with

him--meek submission and ready obedience alone befit her."[115]

Warming to the subject, she continued, "By law, public sentiment, and

religion from the time of Moses down to the present day, woman has

never been thought of other than as a piece of property, to be

disposed of at the will and pleasure of man. And this very hour, by

our statute books, by our so-called enlightened Christian

civilization, she has no voice in saying what shall be the basis of

the relation. She must accept marriage as man proffers it or not at

all...."

When finally the vote was taken, Mrs. Stanton's resolutions were laid

on the table, but not expunged from the record, and the convention

adjourned with much to talk about and think about for some time to

come.

The newspapers, of course, could not overlook such a piece of news as

this heated argument on divorce in a woman's rights convention, and

fanned the flames pro and con, most of them holding up Miss Anthony

and Mrs. Stanton as dangerous examples of freedom for women. The Rev.

A. D. Mayo, Unitarian clergyman of Albany, heretofore Susan's loyal

champion, now made a point of reproving her. "You are not married," he

declared with withering scorn. "You have no business to be discussing

marriage." To this she retorted, "Well, Mr. Mayo, you are not a

slave. Suppose you quit lecturing on slavery."[116]

Both Susan and Mrs. Stanton, amazed at the opposition and the

disapproval they had aroused, were grateful for Samuel Longfellow's

comforting words of commendation[117] and for the letters of approval

which came from women from all parts of the state. Most satisfying of

all was this reassurance from Lucretia Mott, whose judgment they so

highly valued: "I was rejoiced to have such a defense of the

resolutions as yours. I have the fullest confidence in the united

judgment of Elizabeth Stanton and Susan Anthony and I am glad they are

so vigorous in the work."[118]

Hardest to bear was the disapproval of Wendell Phillips whom they both

admired so much. Difficult to understand and most disappointing was

Lucy Stone's failure to attend the convention or come to their

defense. Thinking over this first unfortunate difference of opinion

among the faithful crusaders for freedom to whom she had always felt

so close in spirit, Susan was sadly disillusioned, but she had no

regrets that the matter had been brought up, and she defied her

critics by speaking before a committee of the New York legislature in

support of a liberal divorce bill. Nor was she surprised when a group

of Boston women, headed by Caroline H. Dall, called a convention which

they hoped would counteract this radical outbreak in the woman's

rights movement by keeping to the safe subjects of education,

vocation, and civil position.

Having learned by this time through the hard school of experience that

the bona-fide reformer could not play safe and go forward, Susan

thoughtfully commented, "Cautious, careful people, always casting

about to preserve their reputation and social standing, never can

bring about a reform. Those who are really in earnest must be willing

to be anything or nothing in the world's estimation, and publicly and

privately, in season and out, avow their sympathy with despised and

persecuted ideas and their advocates, and bear the consequences."[119]

\* \* \* \* \*

The repercussions of the divorce debates were soon drowned out by the

noise and excitement of the presidential campaign of 1860. With four

candidates in the field, Breckenridge, Bell, Douglas, and Lincoln,

each offering his party's solution for the nation's critical problems,

there was much to think about and discuss, and Susan found woman's

rights pushed into the background. At the same time antagonism toward

abolitionists was steadily mounting for they were being blamed for the

tensions between the North and the South.

Dedicated to the immediate and unconditional emancipation of slavery,

Susan saw no hope in the promises of any political party. Even the

Republicans' opposition to the extension of slavery in the

territories, which had won over many abolitionists, including Henry

and Elizabeth Stanton, seemed to her a mild and ineffectual answer to

the burning questions of the hour. For her to further the election of

Abraham Lincoln was unthinkable, since he favored the enforcement of

the Fugitive Slave Law and had stated he was not in favor of Negro

citizenship.

At heart she was a nonvoting Garrisonian abolitionist and would not

support a political party which in any way sanctioned slavery. Had she

been eligible as a voter she undoubtedly would have refused to cast

her ballot until a righteous antislavery government had been

established. As she expressed it in a letter to Mrs. Stanton, she

could not, if she were a man, vote for "the least of two evils, one of

which the Nation must surely have in the presidential chair."[120]

She saw no possibility at this time of wiping out slavery by means of

political abolition, because in spite of the fact that slavery had for

years been one of the most pressing issues before the American people,

no great political party had yet endorsed abolition, nor had a single

prominent practical statesman[121] advocated immediate unconditional

emancipation. As the Liberty party experiment had proved, an

abolitionist running for office on an antislavery platform was doomed

to defeat. Therefore the gesture made in this critical campaign by a

small group of abolitionists in nominating Gerrit Smith for president

appeared utterly futile to Susan. Abolitionists, she believed,

followed the only course consistent with their principles when they

eschewed politics, abstained from voting, and devoted their energies

with the fervor of evangelists to a militant educational campaign.

So, whenever she could, she continued to hold antislavery meetings.

"Crowded house at Port Byron," her diary records. "I tried to say a

few words at opening, but soon curled up like a sensitive plant. It is

a terrible martyrdom for me to speak."[122] Yet so great was the need

to enlighten people on the evils of slavery that she endured this

martyrdom, stepping into the breach when no other speaker was

available. Taking as her subject, "What Is American Slavery?" she

declared, "It is the legalized, systematic robbery of the bodies and

souls of nearly four millions of men, women, and children. It is the

legalized traffic in God's image."[123]

She asked for personal liberty laws to protect the human rights of

fugitive slaves, adding that the Dred Scott decision had been possible

only because it reflected the spirit and purpose of the American

people in the North as well as the South. She heaped blame on the

North for restricting the Negro's educational and economic

opportunities, for barring him from libraries, lectures, and theaters,

and from hotels and seats on trains and buses.

"Let the North," she urged, "prove to the South by her acts that she

fully recognizes the humanity of the black man, that she respects his

rights in all her educational, industrial, social, and political

associations...."

This was asking far more than the North was ready to give, but to

Susan it was justice which she must demand. No wonder free Negroes in

the North honored and loved her and expressed their gratitude whenever

they could. "A fine-looking colored man on the train presented me with

a bouquet," she wrote in her diary. "Can't tell whether he knew me or

only felt my sympathy."[124]

\* \* \* \* \*

The threats of secession from the southern states, which followed

Lincoln's election, brought little anxiety to Susan or her

fellow-abolitionists, for they had long preached, "No Union with

Slaveholders," believing that dissolution of the Union would prevent

further expansion of slavery in the new western territories, and not

only lessen the damaging influence of slavery on northern

institutions, but relieve the North of complicity in maintaining

slavery. Garrison in his \_Liberator\_ had already asked, "Will the

South be so obliging as to secede from the Union?" When, in December

1860, South Carolina seceded, Horace Greeley, who only a few months

before had called the disunion abolitionists "a little coterie of

common scolds," now wrote in the \_Tribune\_, "If the cotton states

shall decide that they can do better out of the Union than in it, we

insist in letting them go in peace. The right to secede may be a

revolutionary one, but it exists nevertheless."[125]

[Illustration: William Lloyd Garrison]

What abolitionists feared far more than secession was that to save the

Union some compromise would be made which would fasten slavery on the

nation. Susan agreed with Garrison when he declared in the

\_Liberator\_, "All Union-saving efforts are simply idiotic. At last

'the covenant with death' is annulled, 'the agreement with Hell'

broken--at least by the action of South Carolina and ere long by all

the slave-holding states, for their doom is one."[126]

Compromise, however, was in the air. The people were appalled and

confused by the breaking up of the Union and the possibility of civil

war, and the government fumbled. Powerful Republicans, among them

Thurlow Weed, speaking for eastern financial interests, favored the

Crittenden Compromise which would re-establish the Mason-Dixon line,

protect slavery in the states where it was now legal, sanction the

domestic slave trade, guarantee payment by the United States for

escaped slaves, and forbid Congress to abolish slavery in the

District of Columbia without the consent of Virginia and Maryland.

Even Seward suggested a constitutional amendment guaranteeing

noninterference with slavery in the slave states for all time. In such

an atmosphere as this, Susan gloried in Wendell Phillips's impetuous

declarations against compromise.

While the whole country marked time, waiting for the inauguration of

President Lincoln, abolitionists sent out their speakers, Susan

heading a group in western New York which included Samuel J. May,

Stephen S. Foster, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. "All are united," she

wrote William Lloyd Garrison, "that good faith and honor demand us to

go forward and leave the responsibility of free speech or its

suppression with the people of the places we visit." Then showing that

she well understood the temper of the times, she added, "I trust ...

no personal harm may come to you or Phillips or any of the little band

of the true and faithful who shall defend the right...."[127]

Feeling was running high in Buffalo when Susan arrived with her

antislavery contingent in January 1861, expecting disturbances but

unprepared for the animosity of audiences which hissed, yelled, and

stamped so that not a speaker could be heard. The police made no

effort to keep order and finally the mob surged over the platform and

the lights went out. Nevertheless, Susan who was presiding held her

ground until lights were brought in and she could dimly see the

milling crowd.

In small towns they were listened to with only occasional catcalls and

boos of disapproval, but in every city from Buffalo to Albany the mobs

broke up their meetings. Even in Rochester, which had never before

shown open hostility to abolitionists, Susan's banner, "No Union with

Slaveholders" was torn down and a restless audience hissed her as she

opened her meeting and drowned out the speakers with their shouting

and stamping until at last the police took over and escorted the

speakers home through the jeering crowds.

All but Susan now began to question the wisdom of holding more

meetings, but her determination to continue, and to assert the right

of free speech, shamed her colleagues into acquiescence. Cayenne

pepper, thrown on the stove, broke up their meeting at Port Byron. In

Rome, rowdies bore down upon Susan, who was taking the admission fee

of ten cents, brushed her aside, "big cloak, furs, and all,"[128] and

rushed to the platform where they sang, hooted, and played cards until

the speakers gave up in despair. Syracuse, well known for its

tolerance and pride in free speech, now greeted them with a howling

drunken mob armed with knives and pistols and rotten eggs. Susan on

the platform courageously faced their gibes until she and her

companions were forced out into the street. They then took refuge in

the home of fellow-abolitionists while the mob dragged effigies of

Susan and Samuel J. May through the streets and burned them in the

square.

Not even this kept Susan from her last advertised meeting in Albany

where Lucretia Mott, Martha C. Wright, Gerrit Smith, and Frederick

Douglass joined her. Here the Democratic mayor, George H. Thatcher,

was determined to uphold free speech in spite of almost overwhelming

opposition, and calling at the Delavan House for the abolitionists,

safely escorted them to their hall. Then, with a revolver across his

knees, he sat on the platform with them while his policemen, scattered

through the hall, put down every disturbance; but at the end of the

day, he warned Susan that he could no longer hold the mob in check and

begged her as a personal favor to him to call off the rest of the

meetings. She consented, and under his protection the intrepid little

group of abolitionists walked back to their hotel with the mob

trailing behind them.

Looking back upon the tense days and nights of this "winter of

mobs,"[129] Susan was proud of her group of abolitionists who so

bravely had carried out their mission. In comparison, the Republicans

had shown up badly, not a Republican mayor having the courage or

interest to give them protection. In fact, she found little in the

attitude of the Republicans to offer even a glimmer of hope that they

were capable of governing in this crisis. Lincoln's inaugural address

prejudiced her at once, for he said, "I have no purpose directly or

indirectly to interfere with the institution of slavery in the states

where it exists. I believe I have no lawful right to do so and I have

no inclination to do so."[130] To her the future looked dark when

statesmen would save the Union at such a price.

"No Compromise" was Susan's watchword these days, as a feminist as

well as an abolitionist, even though this again set her at odds with

Garrison and Phillips, the two men she respected above all others.

They were now writing her stern letters urging her to reveal the

hiding place of a fugitive wife and her daughter. Just before she had

started on her antislavery crusade and while she was in Albany with

Lydia Mott, a heavily veiled woman with a tragic story had come to

them for help. She was the wife of Dr. Charles Abner Phelps, a highly

respected member of the Massachusetts Senate, and the mother of three

children. She had discovered, she told them, that her husband was

unfaithful to her, and when she confronted him with the proof, he had

insisted that she suffered from delusions and had her committed to an

insane asylum. For a year and a half she had not been allowed to

communicate with her children, but finally her brother, a prominent

Albany attorney, obtained her release through a writ of habeas corpus,

took her to his home, and persuaded Dr. Phelps to allow the children

to visit her for a few weeks. Now she was desperate as she again faced

the prospect of being separated from her children by Massachusetts law

which gave even an unfaithful husband control of his wife's person and

their children.

Well aware of how often her friends of the Underground Railroad had

defied the Fugitive Slave Law and hidden and transported fugitive

slaves, Susan decided she would do the same for this cultured

intelligent woman, a slave to her husband under the law. Without a

thought of the consequences, she took the train on Christmas Day for

New York with Mrs. Phelps and her thirteen-year-old daughter, both in

disguise, hoping that in the crowded city they could hide from Dr.

Phelps and the law. Arriving late at night, they walked through the

snow and slush to a hotel, only to be refused a room because they were

not accompanied by a gentleman. They tried another hotel, with the

same result, and then Susan, remembering a boarding house run by a

divorced woman she knew, hopefully rang her doorbell. She too refused

them, claiming all her boarders would leave if she harbored a runaway

wife. By this time it was midnight. Cold and exhausted, they braved a

Broadway hotel, where they were told there was no vacant room; but

Susan, convinced this was only an excuse, said as much to the clerk,

adding, "You can give us a place to sleep or we will sit in this

office all night." When he threatened to call the police, she

retorted, "Very well, we will sit here till they come to take us to

the station."[131] Finally he relented and gave them a room without

heat. Early the next morning, Susan began making the rounds of her

friends in search of shelter for Mrs. Phelps and her daughter, and

finally at the end of a discouraging day, Abby Hopper Gibbons, the

Quaker who had so often hidden fugitive slaves, took this fugitive

wife into her home.

Returning to Albany, Susan found herself under suspicion and

threatened with arrest by Dr. Phelps and Mrs. Phelps's brothers,

because she had broken the law by depriving a father of his child.

Letters and telegrams, demanding that she reveal Mrs. Phelps's hiding

place, followed her to Rochester and on her antislavery tour through

western New York. Refusing to be intimidated, she ignored them all.

When Garrison wrote her long letters in his small neat hand, begging

her not to involve the woman's rights and antislavery movements in any

"hasty and ill-judged, no matter how well-meant" action, it was hard

for her to reconcile this advice with his impetuous, undiplomatic, and

dangerous actions on behalf of Negro slaves. "I feel the strongest

assurance," she told him, "that what I have done is wholly right. Had

I turned my back upon her I should have scorned myself.... That I

should stop to ask if my act would injure the reputation of any

movement never crossed my mind, nor will I allow such a fear to stifle

my sympathies or tempt me to expose her to the cruel inhuman treatment

of her own household. Trust me that as I ignore all law to help the

slave, so will I ignore it all to protect an enslaved woman."[132]

When later they met at an antislavery convention, Garrison, renewing

his efforts on behalf of Dr. Phelps, put this question to Susan,

"Don't you know that the law of Massachusetts gives the father the

entire guardianship and control of the children?"

"Yes, I know it," she answered. "Does not the law of the United States

give the slaveholder the ownership of the slave? And don't you break

it every time you help a slave to Canada? Well, the law which gives

the father the sole ownership of the children is just as wicked and

I'll break it just as quickly. You would die before you would deliver

a slave to his master, and I will die before I will give up that child

to its father."

Susan escaped arrest as she thought she would, for Dr. Phelps could

not afford the unfavorable publicity involved. He managed to kidnap

his child on her way to Sunday School, but his wife eventually won a

divorce through the help of her friends.

The most trying part of this experience for Susan was the attitude of

Garrison and Phillips, who, had now for the second time failed to

recognize that the freedom they claimed for the Negro was also

essential for women. They believed in woman's rights, to be sure, but

when these rights touched the institution of marriage, their vision

was clouded. Just a year before, they had fought Mrs. Stanton's

divorce resolutions because they were unable to see that the existing

laws of marriage did not apply equally to men and women. Now they

sustained the father's absolute right over his child. What was it,

Susan wondered, that kept them from understanding? Was it loyalty to

sex, was it an unconscious clinging to dominance and superiority, or

was it sheer inability to recognize women as human beings like

themselves? "Very many abolitionists," she wrote in her diary, "have

yet to learn the ABC of woman's rights."[133]
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A WAR FOR FREEDOM

Six more southern states, Georgia, Alabama, Florida, Mississippi,

Louisiana, and Texas, following the lead of South Carolina, seceded

early in 1861 and formed the Confederate States of America. This

breaking up of the Union disturbed Susan primarily because it took the

minds of most of her colleagues off everything but saving the Union.

Convinced that even in a time of national crisis, work for women must

go on, she tried to prepare for the annual woman's rights convention

in New York, but none of her hitherto dependable friends would help

her. Nevertheless, she persisted, even after the fall of Fort Sumter

and the President's call for troops. Only when the abolitionists

called off their annual New York meetings did she reluctantly realize

that woman's rights too must yield to the exigencies of the hour.

Influenced by her Quaker background, she could not see war as the

solution of this or any other crisis. In fact, the majority of

abolitionists were amazed and bewildered when war came because it was

not being waged to free the slaves. Looking to their leaders for

guidance, they heard Wendell Phillips declare for war before an

audience of over four thousand in Boston. Garrison, known to all as a

nonresistant, made it clear that his sympathies were with the

government. He saw in "this grand uprising of the manhood of the

North"[134] a growing appreciation of liberty and free institutions

and a willingness to defend them. Calling upon abolitionists to stand

by their principles, he at the same time warned them not to criticize

Lincoln or the Republicans unnecessarily, not to divide the North, but

to watch events and bide their time, and he opposed those

abolitionists who wanted to withhold support of the government until

it stood openly and unequivocally for the Negro's freedom. From the

front page of the \_Liberator\_, he now removed his slogan, "No Union

with Slaveholders." Kindly placid Samuel J. May, usually against all

violence, now compared the sacrifices of the war to the crucifixion,

and to Susan this was blasphemy. Even Parker Pillsbury wrote her, "I

am rejoicing over Old Abe, but my voice is still for war."[135]

She was troubled, confused, and disillusioned by the attitude of these

men and by that of most of her antislavery friends. Only very few,

among them Lydia Mott, were uncompromising non-resistants. To one of

them she wrote, "I have tried hard to persuade myself that I alone

remained mad, while all the rest had become sane, because I have

insisted that it is our duty to bear not only our usual testimony but

one even louder and more earnest than ever before.... The

Abolitionists, for once, seem to have come to an agreement with all

the world that they are out of tune and place, hence should hold their

peace and spare their rebukes and anathemas. Our position to me seems

most humiliating, simply that of the politicians, one of expediency,

not principle. I have not yet seen one good reason for the abandonment

of all our meetings, and am more and more ashamed and sad that even

the little Apostolic number have yielded to the world's motto--'the

end justifies the means.'"[136]

Now the farm home was a refuge. Her father, leaving her in charge,

traveled West for his long-dreamed-of visit with his sons in Kansas,

with Daniel R., now postmaster at Leavenworth, and with Merritt and

his young wife, Mary Luther, in their log cabin at Osawatomie. As a

release from her pent-up energy, Susan turned to hard physical work.

"Superintended the plowing of the orchard," she recorded in her diary.

"The last load of hay is in the barn; and all in capital order....

Washed every window in the house today. Put a quilted petticoat in the

frame.... Quilted all day, but sewing seems no longer to be my

calling.... Fitted out a fugitive slave for Canada with the help of

Harriet Tubman."[137]

Although she filled her days, life on the farm in these stirring times

seemed futile to her. She missed the stimulating exchange of ideas

with fellow-abolitionists and confessed to her diary, "The all-alone

feeling will creep over me. It is such a fast after the feast of great

presences to which I have been so long accustomed."

The war was much on her mind. Eagerly she read Greeley's \_Tribune\_ and

the Rochester \_Democrat\_. The news was discouraging--the tragedy of

Bull Run, the call for more troops, defeat after defeat for the Union

armies. General Frémont in Missouri freeing the slaves of rebels only

to have Lincoln cancel the order to avert antagonizing the border

states.

"How not to do it seems the whole study of Washington," she wrote in

her diary. "I wish the government would move quickly, proclaim freedom

to every slave and call on every able-bodied Negro to enlist in the

Union Army.... To forever blot out slavery is the only possible

compensation for this merciless war."[138]

To satisfy her longing for a better understanding of people and

events, she turned to books, first to Elizabeth Barrett Browning's

\_Casa Guidi Windows\_, which she called "a grand poem, so fitting to

our terrible struggle," then to her \_Sonnets from the Portuguese\_, and

George Eliot's popular \_Adam Bede\_, recently published. More serious

reading also absorbed her, for she wanted to keep abreast of the most

advanced thought of the day. "Am reading Buckle's \_History of

Civilization\_ and Darwin's \_Descent of Man\_," she wrote in her diary.

"Have finished \_Origin of the Species\_. Pillsbury has just given me

Emerson's poems."[139]

Eager to thrash out all her new ideas with Elizabeth Stanton, she went

to Seneca Falls for a few days of good talk, hoping to get Mrs.

Stanton's help in organizing a woman's rights convention in 1862; but

not even Mrs. Stanton could see the importance of such work at this

time, believing that if women put all their efforts into winning the

war, they would, without question, be rewarded with full citizenship.

Susan was skeptical about this and disappointed that even the best

women were so willing to be swept aside by the onrush of events.

Although opposed to war, Susan was far from advocating peace at any

price, and was greatly concerned over the confusion in Washington

which was vividly described in the discouraging letters Mrs. Stanton

received from her husband, now Washington correspondent for the New

York \_Tribune\_. Both she and Mrs. Stanton chafed at inaction. They had

loyalty, intelligence, an understanding of national affairs, and

executive ability to offer their country, but such qualities were not

sought after among women.

\* \* \* \* \*

In the spring of 1862, Susan helped Mrs. Stanton move her family to a

new home in Brooklyn, and spent a few weeks with her there, getting

the feel of the city in wartime. She then had the satisfaction of

discovering that at least one woman was of use to her country, young

eloquent Anna E. Dickinson.[140] Susan listened with pride and joy

while Anna spoke to an enthusiastic audience at Cooper Union on the

issues of the war. She took Anna to her heart at once. Anna's youth,

her fervor, and her remarkable ability drew out all of Susan's

motherly instincts of affection and protectiveness. They became

devoted friends, and for the next few years carried on a voluminous

correspondence.

Harriet Hosmer and Rosa Bonheur also helped restore Susan's confidence

in women during these difficult days when, forced to mark time, she

herself seemed at loose ends. Visiting the Academy of Design, she

studied "in silent reverential awe," the marble face of Harriet

Hosmer's Beatrice Cenci, and declared, "Making that cold marble

breathe and pulsate, Harriet Hosmer has done more to ennoble and

elevate woman than she could possibly have done by mere words...." Of

Rosa Bonheur, the first woman to venture into the field of animal

painting, she said, "Her work not only surpasses anything ever done by

a woman, but is a bold and successful step beyond all other

artists."[141]

This confidence was soon dispelled, however, when a letter came from

Lydia Mott containing the crushing news that the New York legislature

had amended the newly won Married Woman's Property Law of 1860, while

women's attention was focused on the war, and had taken away from

mothers the right to equal guardianship of their children and from

widows the control of the property left at the death of their

husbands.

"We deserve to suffer for our confidence in 'man's sense of justice,'"

she confessed to Lydia. " ... All of our reformers seem suddenly to

have grown politic. All alike say, 'Have no conventions at this

crisis!' Garrison, Phillips, Mrs. Mott, Mrs. Wright, Mrs. Stanton,

etc. say, 'Wait until the war excitement abates....' I am sick at

heart, but cannot carry the world against the wish and will of our

best friends...."[142]

Unable to arouse even a glimmer of interest in woman's rights at this

time, Susan started off on a lecture tour of her own, determined to

make people understand that this war, so abhorrent to her, must be

fought for the Negroes' freedom. "I cannot feel easy in my conscience

to be dumb in an hour like this," she explained to Lydia, adding, "It

is so easy to feel your power for public work slipping away if you

allow yourself to remain too long snuggled in the Abrahamic bosom of

home. It requires great will power to resurrect one's soul.[143]

"I am speaking now extempore," she continued, "and more to my

satisfaction than ever before. I am amazed at myself, but I could not

do it if any of our other speakers were listening to me. I am entirely

off old antislavery grounds and on the new ones thrown up by the war."

Feeling particularly close to Lydia at this time, she gratefully

added, "What a stay, counsel, and comfort you have been to me, dear

Lydia, ever since that eventful little temperance meeting in that

cold, smoky chapel in 1852. How you have compelled me to feel myself

competent to go forward when trembling with doubt and distrust. I can

never express the magnitude of my indebtedness to you."

In the small towns of western New York, people were willing to listen

to Susan, for they were troubled by the defeats northern armies had

suffered and by the appalling lack of unity and patriotism in the

North. They were beginning to see that the problem of slavery had to

be faced and were discussing among themselves whether Negroes were

contraband, whether army officers should return fugitive slaves to

their masters, whether slaves of the rebels should be freed, whether

Negroes should be enlisted in the army.

Susan had an answer for them. "It is impossible longer to hold the

African race in bondage," she declared, "or to reconstruct this

Republic on the old slaveholding basis. We can neither go back nor

stand still. With the nation as with the individual, every new

experience forces us into a new and higher life and the old self is

lost forever. Hundreds of men who never thought of emancipation a year

ago, talk it freely and are ready to vote for it and fight for it

now.[144]

"Can the thousands of Northern soldiers," she asked, "who in their

march through Rebel States have found faithful friends and generous

allies in the slaves ever consent to hurl them back into the hell of

slavery, either by word, or vote, or sword? Slaves have sought shelter

in the Northern Army and have tasted the forbidden fruit of the Tree

of Liberty. Will they return quietly to the plantation and patiently

endure the old life of bondage with all its degradation, its

cruelties, and wrong? No, No, there can be no reconstruction on the

old basis...." Far less degrading and ruinous, she earnestly added,

would be the recognition of the independence of the southern

Confederacy.
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To the question of what to do with the emancipated slaves, her quick

answer was, "Treat the Negroes just as you do the Irish, the Scotch,

and the Germans. Educate them to all the blessings of our free

institutions, to our schools and churches, to every department of

industry, trade, and art.

"What arrogance in \_us\_," she continued, "to put the question, What

shall \_we\_ do with a race of men and women who have fed, clothed, and

supported both themselves and their oppressors for centuries...."

Often she spoke against Lincoln's policy of gradual, compensated

emancipation, which to an eager advocate of "immediate, unconditional

emancipation" seemed like weakness and appeasement. She had to admit,

however, that there had been some progress in the right direction, for

Congress had recently forbidden the return of fugitive slaves to their

masters, had decreed immediate emancipation in the District of

Columbia, and prohibited slavery in the territories.

President Lincoln's promise of freedom on January 1, 1863, to slaves

in all states in armed rebellion against the government, seemed wholly

inadequate to her and to her fellow-abolitionists, because it left

slavery untouched in the border states, but it did encourage them to

hope that eventually Lincoln might see the light. Horace Greeley wrote

Susan, "I still keep at work with the President in various ways and

believe you will yet hear him proclaim universal freedom. Keep this

letter and judge me by the event."[145]

It troubled her that public opinion in the North was still far from

sympathetic to emancipation. Northern Democrats, charging Lincoln with

incompetence and autocratic control, called for "The Constitution as

it is, the Union as it was." They had the support of many northern

businessmen who faced the loss of millions of credit given to

southerners and the support of northern workmen who feared the

competition of free Negroes. They had elected Horatio Seymour governor

of New York, and had gained ground in many parts of the country. A

militant group in Ohio, headed by Congressman Vallandigham, continued

to oppose the war, asking for peace at once with no terms unfavorable

to the South.

All these developments Susan discussed with her father, for she

frequently came home between lectures. He was a tower of strength to

her. When she was disillusioned or when criticism and opposition were

hard to bear, his sympathy and wise counsel never failed her. There

was a strong bond of understanding and affection between them.

His sudden illness and death, late in November 1862, were a shock from

which she had to struggle desperately to recover. Her life was

suddenly empty. The farm home was desolate. She could not think of

leaving her mother and her sister Mary there all alone. Nor could she

count on help from Daniel or Merritt, both of whom were serving in the

army in the West, Daniel, as a lieutenant colonel, and Merritt as a

captain in the 7th Kansas Cavalry. For many weeks she had no heart for

anything but grief. "It seemed as if everything in the world must

stop."[146]

Not even President Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, issued January

1, 1863, roused her. It took a letter from Henry Stanton from

Washington to make her see that there was war work for her to do. He

wrote her, "The country is rapidly going to destruction. The Army is

almost in a state of mutiny for want of its pay and lack of a leader.

Nothing can carry through but the southern Negroes, and nobody can

marshal them into the struggle except the abolitionists.... Such men

as Lovejoy, Hale, and the like have pretty much given up the struggle

in despair. You have no idea how dark the cloud is which hangs over

us.... We must not lay the flattering unction to our souls that the

proclamation will be of any use if we are beaten and have a

dissolution of the Union. Here then is work for you, Susan, put on

your armor and go forth."[147]

\* \* \* \* \*

A month later, Susan went to New York for a visit with Elizabeth

Stanton, confident that if they counseled together, they could find a

way to serve their country in its hour of need.

She was well aware that all through the country women were responding

magnificently in this crisis, giving not only their husbands and sons

to the war, but carrying on for them in the home, on the farm, and in

business. Many were sewing and knitting for soldiers, scraping lint

for hospitals, and organizing Ladies' Aid Societies, which, operating

through the United States Sanitary Commission, the forerunner of the

Red Cross, sent clothing and nourishing food to the inadequately

equipped and poorly fed soldiers in the field. In the large cities

women were holding highly successful "Sanitary Fairs" to raise funds

for the Sanitary Commission. In fact, through the women, civilian

relief was organized as never before in history. Individual women too,

Susan knew, were making outstanding contributions to the war. Lucy

Stone's sister-in-law, Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell,[148] a friend and

admirer of Florence Nightingale, was training much-needed nurses,

while Dr. Mary Walker, putting on coat and trousers, ministered

tirelessly to the wounded on the battlefield. Dorothea Dix, the

one-time schoolteacher who had awakened the people to their barbarous

treatment of the insane, had offered her services to the

Surgeon-General and was eventually appointed Superintendent of Army

Nurses, with authority to recruit nurses and oversee hospital

housekeeping. Clara Barton, a government employee, and other women

volunteers were finding their way to the front to nurse the wounded

who so desperately needed their help; and Mother Bickerdyke, living

with the armies in the field, nursed her boys and cooked for them,

lifting their morale by her motherly, strengthening presence. Through

the influence of Anna Ella Carroll, Maryland had been saved for the

Union and she, it was said, was ably advising President Lincoln.

Susan herself had felt no call to nurse the wounded, although she had

often skillfully nursed her own family; nor had she felt that her

qualifications as an expert housekeeper and good executive demanded

her services at the front to supervise army housekeeping. Instead she

looked for some important task to which other women would not turn in

these days when relief work absorbed all their attention. It was not

enough, she felt, for women to be angels of mercy, valuable and

well-organized as this phase of their work had become. A spirit of

awareness was lacking among them, also a patriotic fervor, and this

led her to believe that northern women needed someone to stimulate

their thinking, to force them to come to grips with the basic issues

of the war and in so doing claim their own freedom. Women, she

reasoned, must be aroused to think not only in terms of socks, shirts,

and food for soldiers or of bandages and nursing, but in terms of the

traditions of freedom upon which this republic was founded. Women must

have a part in molding public opinion and must help direct policy as

Anna Ella Carroll was proving women could do. Here was the best

possible training for prospective women voters. To all this Mrs.

Stanton heartily agreed.

As they sat at the dining-room table with Mrs. Stanton's two

daughters, Maggie and Hattie, all busily cutting linen into small

squares and raveling them into lint for the wounded, they discussed

the state of the nation. They were troubled by the low morale of the

North and by the insidious propaganda of the Copperheads, an antiwar,

pro-Southern group, which spread discontent and disrespect for the

government. Profiteering was flagrant, and through speculation and war

contracts, large fortunes were being built up among the few, while the

majority of the people not only found their lives badly disrupted by

the war but suffered from high prices and low wages. So far no

decisive victory had encouraged confidence in ultimate triumph over

the South. In newspapers and magazines, women of the North were being

unfavorably compared with southern women and criticized because of

their lack of interest in the war. Writing in the \_Atlantic Monthly\_,

March, 1863, Gail Hamilton, a rising young journalist, accused

northern women of failing to come up to the level of the day. "If you

could have finished the war with your needles," she chided them, "it

would have been finished long ago, but stitching does not crush

rebellion, does not annihilate treason...."

Thinking along these same lines, Susan and Mrs. Stanton now decided to

go a step further. They would act to bring women abreast of the issues

of the day, Susan with her flare for organizing women, Mrs. Stanton

with her pen and her eloquence. They would show women that they had an

ideal to fight for. They would show them the uselessness of this

bloody conflict unless it won freedom for all of the slaves. Freedom

for all, as a basic demand of the republic, would be their watchword.

Men were forming Union Leagues and Loyal Leagues to combat the

influence of secret antiwar societies, such as the Knights of the

Golden Circle. "Why not organize a Women's National Loyal League?"

Susan and Mrs. Stanton asked each other.

They talked their ideas over first with the New York abolitionists,

then with Horace Greeley, Henry Ward Beecher, and his dashing young

friend, Theodore Tilton, and with Robert Dale Owen, now in the city as

the recently appointed head of the Freedman's Inquiry Commission.

These men were in touch with Charles Sumner and other antislavery

members of Congress. All agreed that the Emancipation Proclamation

must be implemented by an act of Congress, by an amendment to the

Constitution, and that public opinion must be aroused to demand a

Thirteenth Amendment. If women would help, so much the better.

Susan at once thought of petitions. If petitions had won the Woman's

Property Law in New York, they could win the Thirteenth Amendment. The

largest petition ever presented to Congress was her goal.

\* \* \* \* \*

Carefully Susan and Mrs. Stanton worked over an \_Appeal to the Women

of the Republic\_, sending it out in March 1863 with a notice of a

meeting to be held in New York. It left no doubt in the minds of those

who received it that women had a responsibility to their country

beyond services of mercy to the wounded and disabled.

From all parts of the country, women responded to their call. The

veteran antislavery and woman's rights worker, Angelina Grimké Weld,

came out of her retirement for the meeting. Ernestine Rose, the ever

faithful, was on hand. Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell were

there, and the popular Hutchinson family, famous for their stirring

abolition songs. They helped Susan and Mrs. Stanton steer the course

of the meeting into the right channels, to show the women assembled

that the war was being fought not merely to preserve the Union, but

also to preserve the American way of life, based on the principle of

equal rights and freedom for all, to save it from the encroachments of

slavery and a slaveholding aristocracy. Susan proposed a resolution

declaring that there can never be a true peace until the civil and

political rights of all citizens are established, including those of

Negroes and women. The introduction of the woman's rights issue into a

war meeting with an antislavery program was vigorously opposed by

women from Wisconsin, but the faithful feminists came to the rescue

and the controversial resolution was adopted.

Although she always instinctively related all national issues to

woman's rights and vice versa, Susan did not allow this subject to

overshadow the main purpose of the meeting. Instead she analyzed the

issue of the war and reproached Lincoln for suppressing the fact that

slavery was the real cause of the war and for waiting two long years

before calling the four million slaves to the side of the North.

"Every hour's delay, every life sacrificed up to the proclamation that

called the slave to freedom and to arms," she declared, "was nothing

less than downright murder by the government.... I therefore hail the

day when the government shall recognize that it is a war for

freedom."[149]

A Women's National Loyal League was organized, electing Susan

secretary and Mrs. Stanton president. They sent a long letter to

President Lincoln thanking him for the Emancipation Proclamation,

especially for the freedom it gave Negro women, and assuring him of

their loyalty and support in this war for freedom. Their own immediate

task, they decided, was to circulate petitions asking for an act of

Congress to emancipate "all persons of African descent held in

involuntary servitude." As Susan so tersely expressed it, they would

"canvass the nation for freedom."

\* \* \* \* \*

All the oratory over, Susan now undertook the hard work of making the

Women's National Loyal League a success, assuming the initial

financial burden of printing petitions and renting an office, Room 20,

at Cooper Institute, where she was busy all day and where New York

members met to help her. To each of the petitions sent out, she

attached her battle cry, "There must be a law abolishing slavery....

Women, you cannot vote or fight for your country. Your only way to be

a power in the government is through the exercise of this one, sacred,

constitutional 'right of petition,' and we ask you to use it now to

the utmost...." She also asked those signing the petitions to

contribute a penny to help with expenses and in this way she slowly

raised $3,000.[150]

At first the response was slow, although both Republican and

antislavery papers were generous in their praise of this undertaking,

but when the signed petitions began to come in, she felt repaid for

all her efforts, and when the Hovey Fund trustees appropriated twelve

dollars a week for her salary, the financial burden lifted a little.

Yet it was ever present. For herself she needed little. She wrote her

mother and Mary, "I go to a little restaurant nearby for lunch every

noon. I always take strawberries with two tea rusks. Today I said,

'all this lacks is a glass of milk from my mother's cellar,' and the

girl replied, 'We have very nice Westchester milk.' So tomorrow I

shall add that to my bill of fare. My lunch costs, berries five cents,

rusks five, and tomorrow the milk will be three."[151]

The cost of postage mounted as the petitions continued to go out to

all parts of the country. In dire need of funds, Susan decided to

appeal to Henry Ward Beecher; and wearily climbing Columbia Heights to

his home, she suddenly felt a strong hand on her shoulder and a

familiar voice asking, "Well, old girl, what do you want now?" He took

up a collection for her in Plymouth Church, raising $200. Gerrit Smith

sent her $100, when she had hoped for $1,000, and Jessie Benton

Frémont, $50. Before long, her "war of ideas" won the support of

Wendell Phillips, Frederick Douglass, Horace Greeley, George William

Curtis, and other popular lecturers who spoke for her at Cooper Union

to large audiences whose admission fees swelled her funds; and

eventually Senator Sumner, realizing how important the petitions could

be in arousing public opinion for the Thirteenth Amendment, saved her

the postage by sending them out under his frank.[152]

She made her home with the Stantons, who had moved from Brooklyn to 75

West 45th Street, New York, and the comfortable evenings of good

conversation and her busy days at the office helped mightily to heal

her grief for her father. In the bustling life of the city she felt

she was living more intensely, more usefully, as these critical days

of war demanded. Henry Stanton, now an editorial writer for Greeley's

\_Tribune\_, brought home to them the inside story of the news and of

politics. All of them were highly critical of Lincoln, impatient with

his slowness and skeptical of his plans for slaveholders and slaves in

the border states. They questioned Garrison's wisdom in trusting

Lincoln. Susan could not feel that Lincoln was honest when he

protested that he did not have the power to do all that the

abolitionists asked. "The pity is," she wrote Anna E. Dickinson, "that

the vast mass of people really believe the man \_honest\_--that he

believes he has not the power--I wish I could...."[153]

New York seethed with unrest as time for the enforcement of the draft

drew near. Indignant that rich men could avoid the draft by buying a

substitute, workingmen were easily incited to riot, and the city was

soon overrun by mobs bent on destruction. The lives of all Negroes and

abolitionists were in danger. The Stanton home was in the thick of the

rioting, and when Susan and Henry Stanton came home during a lull,

they all decided to take refuge for the night at the home of Mrs.

Stanton's brother-in-law, Dr. Bayard. Here they also found Horace

Greeley hiding from the mob, for hoodlums were marching through the

streets shouting, "We'll hang old Horace Greeley to a sour apple

tree."

The next morning Susan started for the office as usual, thinking the

worst was over, but as not a single horsecar or stage was running, she

took the ferry to Flushing to visit her cousins. Here too there was

rioting, but she stayed on until order was restored by the army. She

returned to the city to find casualties mounting to over a thousand

and a million dollars' worth of property destroyed. Negroes had been

shot and hung on lamp posts, Horace Greeley's \_Tribune\_ office had

been wrecked and the homes of abolitionist friends burned. "These are

terrible times," she wrote her family, and then went back to work,

staying devotedly at it through all the hot summer months.[154]

By the end of the year, she had enrolled the signatures of 100,000 men

and women on her petitions, and assured by Senator Sumner that these

petitions were invaluable in creating sentiment for the Thirteenth

Amendment, she raised the number of signatures in the next few months

to 400,000.

In April 1864, the Thirteenth Amendment passed the Senate and the

prospects for it in the House were good. This phase of her work

finished, Susan disbanded the Women's National Loyal League and

returned to her family in Rochester.

\* \* \* \* \*

In despair over the possible re-election of Abraham Lincoln, Susan had

joined Henry and Elizabeth Stanton in stirring up sentiment for John

C. Frémont. Abolitionists were sharply divided in this presidential

campaign. Garrison and Phillips disagreed on the course of action,

Garrison coming out definitely for Lincoln in the \_Liberator\_, while

Phillips declared himself emphatically against four more years of

Lincoln. Susan, the Stantons, and Parker Pillsbury were among those

siding with Phillips because they feared premature reconstruction

under Lincoln. They cited Lincoln's Amnesty Proclamation as an example

of his leniency toward the rebels. They saw danger in leaving free

Negroes under the control of southerners embittered by war, and called

for Negro suffrage as the only protection against oppressive laws.

They opposed the readmission of Louisiana without the enfranchisement

of Negroes. Lincoln, they knew, favored the extension of suffrage only

to literate Negroes and to those who had served in the military

forces. In fact, Lincoln held back while they wanted to go ahead under

full steam and they looked to Frémont to lead them.

Following the presidential campaign anxiously from Rochester, Susan

wrote Mrs. Stanton, "I am starving for a full talk with somebody

posted, not merely pitted for Lincoln...." The persistent cry of the

\_Liberator\_ and the \_Antislavery Standard\_ to re-elect Lincoln and not

to swap horses in midstream did not ring true to her. "We read no more

of the good old doctrine 'of two evils choose neither,'" she wrote

Anna E. Dickinson. She confessed to Anna, "It is only safe to seek and

act the truth and to profess confidence in Lincoln would be a lie in

me."[155]

As the war dragged on through the summer without decisive victories

for the North, Lincoln's prospects looked bleak, and to her dismay,

Susan saw the chances improving for McClellan, the candidate of the

northern Democrats who wanted to end the war, leave slavery alone, and

conciliate the South. The whole picture changed, however, with the

capture of Atlanta by General Sherman in September. The people's

confidence in Lincoln revived and Frémont withdrew from the contest.

One by one the anti-Lincoln abolitionists were converted; and Susan,

anxiously waiting for word from Mrs. Stanton, was relieved to learn

that she was not one of them, nor was Wendell Phillips whose judgment

and vision both of them valued above that of any other man. With

approval she read these lines which Phillips had just written Mrs.

Stanton, "I would cut off both hands before doing anything to aid

Mac's [McClellan's] election. I would cut oft my right hand before

doing anything to aid Abraham Lincoln's election. I wholly distrust

his fitness to settle this thing and indeed his purpose."[156]

There is nothing to indicate any change of opinion on Susan's part

regarding Lincoln's unfitness for a second term. That he was the

lesser of two evils, she of course acknowledged. For her these

pre-election days were discouraging and frustrating. She had very

definite ideas on reconstruction which she felt in justice to the

Negro must be carried out, and Lincoln did not meet her requirements.

After Lincoln's re-election, she again looked to Wendell Phillips for

an adequate policy at this juncture, and she was not disappointed.

"Phillips has just returned from Washington," Mrs. Stanton wrote her.

"He says the radical men feel they are powerless and checkmated....

They turn to such men as Phillips to say what politicians dare not

say.... We say now, as ever, 'Give us immediately unconditional

emancipation, and let there be no reconstruction except on the

broadest basis of justice and equality!...' Phillips and a few others

must hold up the pillars of the temple.... I cannot tell you how happy

I am to find Douglass on the same platform with us. Keep him on the

right track. Tell him in this revolution, he, Phillips, and you and I

must hold the highest ground and truly represent the best type of the

white man, the black man, and the woman."[157]

Susan, holding "the highest ground," found it difficult to mark time

until she could find her place in the reconstruction. "The work of the

hour," she wrote Anna E. Dickinson, "is not alone to put down the

Rebels in arms, but to educate Thirty Millions of People into the idea

of a True Republic. Hence every influence and power that both men and

women can bring to bear will be needed in the reconstruction of the

Nation on the broad basis of justice and equality."[158]
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THE NEGRO'S HOUR

Susan's thoughts now turned to Kansas, as they had many times since

her brothers had settled there. Daniel and Annie, his young wife from

the East, urged her to visit them.[159] Daniel was well established in

Kansas, the publisher of his own newspaper and the mayor of

Leavenworth. He had served a little over a year in the Union army in

the First Kansas Cavalry. She longed to see him and the West that he

loved.

Now for the first time she felt free to make the long journey, for her

mother and Mary had sold the farm on the outskirts of Rochester and

had moved into the city, buying a large red brick house shaded by

maples and a beautiful horse chestnut. It had been a wrench for Susan

to give up the farm with its memories of her father, but there were

compensations in the new home on Madison Street, for Guelma, her

husband, Aaron McLean, and their family lived with them there. Hannah

and her family had also settled in Rochester, and when they bought the

house next door, Susan had the satisfaction of living again in the

midst of her family.[160]

She was particularly devoted to Guelma's twenty-three-year-old

daughter, Ann Eliza, whose "merry laugh" and "bright, joyous presence"

brought new life into the household. Ann Eliza was a stimulating

intelligent companion, and Susan looked forward to seeing many of her

own dreams fulfilled in her niece. Then suddenly in the fall of 1864,

Ann Eliza was taken ill, and her death within a few days left a great

void.[161]

In the midst of this sorrow, Daniel sent Susan a ticket and a check

for a trip to Kansas. Hesitating no longer, she waited only until her

"tip-top Rochester dressmaker" made up "the new, five-dollar silk"

which she had bought in New York.[162]

Before leaving for Kansas, in January, 1865, she pasted on the first

page of her diary a clipping of a poem by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow,

"Something Left Undone," which seemed so perfectly to interpret her

own feelings:

Labor with what zeal we will

Something still remains undone

Something uncompleted still

Waits the rising of the sun....

Till at length it is or seems

Greater than our strength can bear

As the burden of our dreams

Pressing on us everywhere....[163]

With "the burden of her dreams" pressing on her, Susan traveled

westward. The future of the Negro was much on her mind, for the

Thirteenth Amendment abolishing slavery had just been sent to the

states for ratification. That it would be ratified she had no doubt,

but she recognized the responsibility facing the North to provide for

the education and rehabilitation of thousands of homeless bewildered

Negroes trying to make their way in a still unfriendly world, and she

looked forward to taking part in this work.

Beyond Chicago, where she stopped over to visit her uncle Albert

Dickinson and his family, her journey was rugged, and when she reached

Leavenworth she reveled in the comfort of Daniel's "neat, little,

snow-white cottage with green blinds." She liked Daniel's wife, Annie,

at once, admired her gaiety and the way she fearlessly drove her

beautiful black horse across the prairie. "They have a real 'Aunt

Chloe' in the kitchen," she wrote Mrs. Stanton, "and a little Darkie

boy for errands and table waiter. I never saw a girl to match. The

more I see of the race, the more wonderful they are to me."[164]

There was always good companionship in Daniel's home, for friends from

both the East and the West found it a convenient stopping place, and

there was much discussion of politics, the Negro question, and the

future of the West. Business was booming in Leavenworth, then the most

thriving town between St. Louis and San Francisco. Eight years before,

when Daniel had first settled there, it boasted a population of 4,000.

Now it had grown to 22,000, was lighted with gas, and was building its

business blocks of brick. As Susan drove through the busy streets with

Annie, she saw emigrants coming in by steamer and train to settle in

Kansas and watched for the covered wagons that almost every day

stopped in Leavenworth for supplies before moving on to the far West.

Driving over the wide prairie, sometimes a warm brown, then again

white with snow under a wider expanse of deep blue sky than she had

ever seen before, she relaxed as she had not in many a year and began

to feel the call of the West. She even thought she might like to

settle in Kansas until she was caught up by the sharp realization of

how she would miss the stimulating companionship of her friends in the

East.

[Illustration: Daniel Anthony, brother of Susan B. Anthony]

When Daniel was busy with his campaign for his second term as mayor,

she helped him edit the \_Bulletin\_. He warned her not to fill his

paper up with woman's rights, and in spite of his sympathy for the

Negro, forbade her to advocate Negro suffrage in his paper.

"I wish I could talk through it the things I'd like to say to the

young martyr state ..." she wrote Mrs. Stanton. "The Legislature gave

but six votes for Negro suffrage the other day.... The idea of Kansas

refusing her loyal Negroes."

Again and again she was shocked at the prejudice against Negroes in

Kansas, as when Daniel employed a Negro typesetter and the printers,

refusing to admit him to their union, went out on strike until he was

discharged.

"In this city," she reported to Mrs. Stanton, "there are four thousand

ex-Missouri slaves who have sought refuge here within the three past

years." Making it her business to learn what was being done to help

them and educate them, she visited their schools, their Sunday

schools, and the Colored Home, and gave much of her time to them. To

encourage them to demand their rights, she organized an Equal Rights

League among them. This was one thing she could do, even if she could

not plead for Negro suffrage in Daniel's newspaper.[165]

Then one breath-taking piece of news followed another--Lee's

surrender, April 9, 1865, and in less than a week, Lincoln's

assassination, his death, and Andrew Johnson's succession to the

Presidency.

Susan looked upon Lincoln's assassination and death as an act of God.

She wrote to Mrs. Stanton, "Was there ever a more terrific command to

a Nation to 'stand still and know that I am God' since the world

began? The Old Book's terrible exhibitions of God's wrath sink into

nothingness. And this fell blow just at the very hour he was declaring

his willingness to consign those five million faithful, brave, and

loving loyal people of the South to the tender mercies of the ex-slave

lords of the lash."[166]

She longed "to go out and do battle for the Lord once more," but when

she could have expressed her opinions at the big mass meeting held in

memory of Lincoln, she remained silent. "My soul was full," she

confessed to Mrs. Stanton, "but the flesh not equal to stemming the

awful current, to do what the people have called make an exhibition of

myself. So quenched the spirit and came home ashamed of myself."

Then she added, "Dear-a-me--how overfull I am, and how I should like

to be nestled into some corner away from every chick and child with

you once more."

\* \* \* \* \*

Disturbing news came from the East of dissension in the antislavery

ranks, of Garrison's desire to dissolve the American Antislavery

Society after the ratification of the Thirteenth Amendment, and of

Phillips' insistence that it continue until freedom for the Negro was

firmly established. While Garrison maintained that northern states,

denying the ballot to the Negro, could not consistently make Negro

suffrage a requirement for readmitting rebel states to the Union,

Phillips demanded Negro suffrage as a condition of readmission.

Immediately abolitionists took sides. Parker Pillsbury, Lydia and

Lucretia Mott, Frederick Douglass, Anna E. Dickinson, the Stantons,

and others lined up with Phillips, whose vehement and scathing

criticism of reconstruction policies seemed to them the need of the

hour. Susan also took sides, praising "dear ever glorious Phillips"

and writing in her diary, "The disbanding of the American Antislavery

Society is fully as untimely as General Grant's and Sherman's granting

parole and pardon to the whole Rebel armies."[167]

To her friends in the East, she wrote, "How can anyone hold that

Congress has no right to demand Negro suffrage in the returning Rebel

states because it is not already established in all the loyal ones?

What would have been said of Abolitionists ten or twenty years ago,

had they preached to the people that Congress had no right to vote

against admitting a new state with slavery, because it was not already

abolished in all the old States? It is perfectly astounding, this

seeming eagerness of so many of our old friends to cover up and

apologize for the glaring hate toward the equal recognition of the

manhood of the black race."[168]

She rejoiced when word came that the American Antislavery Society

would continue under the presidency of Phillips, with Parker Pillsbury

as editor of the \_Antislavery Standard\_; but she was saddened by the

withdrawal of Garrison, whom she had idolized for so many years and

whose editorials in the \_Liberator\_ had always been her

inspiration.[169]

As she read the weekly New York \_Tribune\_, which came regularly to

Daniel, she grew more and more concerned over President Johnson's

reconstruction policy and more and more convinced of the need of a

crusade for political and civil rights for the Negro. Asked to deliver

the Fourth of July oration at Ottumwa, Kansas, she decided to put into

it all her views on the controversial subject of reconstruction.

Traveling by stage the 125 miles to Ottumwa, she found good company

en route and "great talk on politics, Negro equality, and temperance,"

and thought the "grand old prairies ... perfectly splendid and the

timber-skirted creeks ... delightful."[170]

Before a large gathering of Kansas pioneers, many of whom had driven

forty or fifty miles to hear her, she stood tall, straight, and

earnest, as she reminded them of the noble heritage of Kansas, of the

bloody years before the war when in the free-state fight, Kansas men

and women "taught the nation anew" the principles of the Declaration

of Independence. Lashing out with the vehemence of Phillips against

President Johnson's reconstruction policy, she warned, "There has been

no hour fraught with so much danger as the present.... To be foiled

now in gathering up the fruits of our blood-bought victories and to

re-enthrone slavery under the new guise of Negro disfranchisement ...

would be a disaster, a cruelty and crime, which would surely bequeath

to coming generations a legacy of wars and rumors of wars...."[171]

She then cited the results of the elections in Virginia, South

Carolina, and Tennessee to prove her point that unless Negroes were

given the vote, rebels would be put in office and a new code of laws

apprenticing Negroes passed, establishing a new form of slavery.

She urged her audience to be awake to the politicians who were using

the peoples' reverence and near idolatry of Lincoln to push through

anti-Negro legislation under the guise of carrying out his policies.

Then putting behind her the prejudice and impatience with Lincoln

which she had felt during his lifetime, she added, "If the

administration of Abraham Lincoln taught the American people one

lesson above another, it was that they must think and speak and

proclaim, and that he as their President was bound to execute their

will, not his own. And if Lincoln were alive today, he would say as he

did four years ago, 'I wait the voice of the people.'"

In her special pleading for the Negro, she did not forget women.

Calling attention to the fact that our nation had never been a true

republic because the ballot was exclusively in the hands of the "free

white male," she asked for a government "of the people," men and

women, white and black, with Negro suffrage and woman suffrage as

basic requirements.
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So enthusiastic were the Republicans over her speech that they urged

her to prepare it for publication, suggesting, however, that she

delete the passage on woman suffrage. This was her first intimation

that Republicans might balk at enfranchising women. So great had been

women's contribution to the winning of the war and so indebted were

the Republicans to women for creating sentiment for the Thirteenth

Amendment, that she had come to expect, along with Mrs. Stanton, that

the ballot would without question be given them as a reward.

\* \* \* \* \*

It was soon obvious to Susan that politicians in the East as well as

in Kansas were shying away from woman suffrage. Mrs. Stanton reported

that even Wendell Phillips was backsliding, not wishing to campaign

for Negro suffrage and woman suffrage at the same time. "While I could

continue as heretofore, arguing for woman's rights, just as I do for

temperance every day," he had written, "still I would not mix the

movements.... I think such mixture would lose for the Negro far more

than we should gain for the woman. I am now engaged in abolishing

slavery in a land where the abolition of slavery means conferring or

recognizing citizenship, and where citizenship supposes the ballot for

all men."[172]

Such reasoning filled Susan with despair, for she firmly believed that

women who had been asking for full citizenship for seventeen years

deserved precedence over the Negro. Mrs. Stanton agreed. To them,

Negro suffrage without woman suffrage was unthinkable, an unbearable

humiliation. Half of the Negroes were women, and manhood suffrage

would fasten upon them a new form of slavery. How could Wendell

Phillips, they asked each other, fail to recognize not only the

timeliness of woman suffrage, but the fact that women were better

qualified for the ballot than the majority of Negroes, who, because of

their years in slavery, were illiterate and the easy prey of

unscrupulous politicians? By all means enfranchise Negroes, they

argued with him, but enfranchise women as well, and if there must be a

limitation on suffrage, let it be on the basis of literacy, not on the

basis of sex.

Among Republican members of Congress and abolitionists, there was

serious discussion of a Fourteenth Amendment to extend to the Negro

civil rights and the ballot. Susan, reading about this in Kansas, and

Mrs. Stanton, discussing it in New York with her husband, Wendell

Phillips, and Robert Dale Owen, saw in such a revision of the

Constitution a just and logical opportunity to extend woman's rights

at the same time. Previously committed to state action on woman

suffrage but only because it had then seemed the necessary first step,

both women welcomed the more direct road offered by an amendment to

the Constitution. Only they of all the old woman's rights workers were

awake to this opportunity.

Throughout the United States, people were thinking about the

Constitution as Americans had not done since the Bill of Rights was

ratified in 1791. Not only were amendments to the federal Constitution

in the air, not only were rebel states being readmitted to the Union

with new constitutions, but state constitutions in the North were

being revised, and western territories sought statehood. In Susan's

opinion the time was ripe to proclaim equal rights for all. This

clearly was woman's hour.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Come back and help," pleaded Elizabeth Stanton, who grew more and

more alarmed as she saw all interest in woman suffrage crowded out of

the minds of reformers by their zeal for the Negro. "I have argued

constantly with Phillips and the whole fraternity, but I fear one and

all will favor enfranchising the Negro without us. Woman's cause is in

deep water.... There is pressing need of our woman's rights

convention...."[173]

Susan's spirits revived at the prospect of holding a woman's rights

convention, and plans for the future began to take shape as she read

the closing lines of Mrs. Stanton's letter: "I hope in a short time to

be comfortably located in a new house where we will have a room ready

for you.... I long to put my arms about you once more and hear you

scold me for all my sins and shortcomings.... Oh, Susan, you are very

dear to me. I should miss you more than any other living being on this

earth. You are entwined with much of my happy and eventful past, and

all my future plans are based on you as coadjutor. Yes, our work is

one, we are one in aim and sympathy and should be together. Come

home."

Parker Pillsbury also added his plea, "Why have you deserted the field

of action at a time like this, at an hour unparalleled in almost

twenty centuries?... It is not for me to decide your field of labor.

Kansas needed John Brown and may need you ... but New York is to

revise her constitution next year and, if you are absent, who is to

make the plea for woman?"

Reading her newspaper a few days later, she found that the politicians

had made their first move, introducing in the House of Representatives

a resolution writing the word "male" into the qualifications of voters

in the second section of the proposed Fourteenth Amendment. She

started at once for the East.

\* \* \* \* \*

On the long journey back, in the heat of August, traveling by stage

and railroad with many stops to make the necessary connections, Susan

not only visited her many relatives who had moved to the West, but

also called on antislavery and woman suffrage workers, and held

meetings to plead for free schools for Negroes and for the ballot for

Negroes and women. She found people relieved to have the war over and

busy with their own affairs, but with prejudices smoldering. Public

speaking was still an ordeal for her and she confessed to her diary,

"Made a labored talk.... Had a struggle to get through with speech,"

and again, "Had a hard time. Thoughts nor words would come--Staggered

through."[174] However, she was a determined woman. The message must

be carried to the people and she would do it whether she suffered in

the process or not.

Late in September, she reached her own comfortable home in Rochester,

but she had too much on her mind to stay there long, and within a few

weeks was in New York with Elizabeth Stanton, deep in a serious

discussion of how to create an overwhelming demand for woman suffrage

at this crucial time. Again they decided to petition Congress, this

time for the vote for both women and Negroes. Five years had now

passed since the last national woman's rights convention, and the

workers were scattered; some had lost interest and others thought only

of the need of the Negro. Lucretia Mott, Lydia Mott, and Parker

Pillsbury responded at once. Susan sought out Lucy Stone in spite of

the differences that had grown up between them, and after talking with

Lucy, confessed to herself that she had been unjustly impatient with

her.[175]

Hoping for aid from the Jackson or Hovey Fund, she went to New England

to revive interest there and in Concord talked with the Emersons,

Bronson Alcott, and Frank Sanborn. When she asked Emerson whether he

thought it wise to demand woman suffrage at this time, he replied,

"Ask my wife. I can philosophize, but I always look to her to decide

for me in practical matters." Unhesitatingly Mrs. Emerson agreed with

Susan that Congress must be petitioned immediately to enfranchise

women either before Negroes were granted the vote or at the same

time.[176]

Even Wendell Phillips, who did not want to mix Negro and woman

suffrage, gave Susan $500 from the Hovey Fund to finance the

petitions, but many of the friends upon whom she had counted needed a

verbal lashing to rouse them out of their apathy. Very soon she had to

face the unpleasant fact that by pressing for woman suffrage now, she

was estranging many abolitionists. Nevertheless she and Mrs. Stanton

went ahead undaunted, determined that a petition for woman suffrage

would go to Congress even if it carried only their own two signatures.

However, petitions with many signatures were reaching Congress in

January 1866--the very first demand ever made for Congressional action

on woman suffrage. Senator Sumner, for whom women had rolled up

400,000 signatures for the Thirteenth Amendment, now presented under

protest "as most inopportune" a petition headed by Lydia Maria Child,

who for years had been his valiant aid in antislavery work; and

Thaddeus Stevens, heretofore friendly to woman suffrage and ever

zealous for the Negro, ignored a petition from New York headed by

Elizabeth Cady Stanton.[177]

By this time it was clear to Susan that since the two powerful

Republicans, Senator Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens, both basically

friendly to woman suffrage, were determined to devote themselves

wholly to Negro suffrage and to the extension of their party's

influence, she could expect no help from lesser party members. Her

only alternative was to appeal to the Democrats or to an occasional

recalcitrant Republican, and she allowed nothing to stand in her way,

not even the frenzied pleas of her abolitionist friends. She found

James Brooks of New York, Democratic leader of the House, willing to

present her petitions, and she made use of him, although he was

regarded by abolitionists as a Copperhead and although he was now

advocating conciliatory reconstruction for the South of which she

herself disapproved. Other Democrats came to the rescue in the Senate

as well as in the House--a few because they saw justice in the demands

of the women, others because they believed white women should have

political precedence over Negroes, and still others because they saw

in their support of woman suffrage an opportunity to harass the

Republicans. During 1866, petitions for woman suffrage with 10,000

signatures were presented by Democrats and irregular Republicans.

In the meantime, conferences in New York with Henry Ward Beecher and

Theodore Tilton were encouraging, and for a time Susan thought she had

found an enthusiastic ally in Tilton, the talented popular young

editor of the \_Independent\_. Theodore Tilton, with his long hair and

the soulful face of a poet, with his eloquence as a lecturer and his

flare for journalism, was at the height of his popularity. He had

winning ways and was full of ideas. After the ratification of the

Thirteenth Amendment abolishing slavery, in December 1865, he had

proposed that the American Antislavery Society and the woman's rights

group merge to form an American Equal Rights Association which would

fight for equal rights for all, for Negro and woman suffrage. Wendell

Phillips he suggested for president, and the \_Antislavery Standard\_

as the paper of the new organization.

This sounded reasonable and hopeful to Susan, and she hurried to

Boston with a group from New York, including Lucy Stone, to consult

Wendell Phillips and his New England colleagues. Wendell Phillips,

however, was cool to the proposition, pointing out the necessity of

amending the constitution of the American Antislavery Society before

any such action could be taken. Never dreaming that he would actually

oppose their plan, Susan expected this would be taken care of; but

when she convened her woman's rights convention in New York in May

1866, simultaneously with that of the American Antislavery Society,

she found to her dismay that no formal notice of the proposed union

had been given to the members of the antislavery group and therefore

there was no way for them to vote their organization into an Equal

Rights Association. Not to be sidetracked, she then asked the woman's

rights convention to broaden its platform to include rights for the

Negro. To her this seemed a natural development as she had always

thought of woman's rights as part of the larger struggle for human

rights.

"For twenty years," she declared, "we have pressed the claims of women

to the right of representation in the government.... Up to this hour

we have looked only to State action for the recognition of our rights;

but now by the results of the war, the whole question of suffrage

reverts back to the United States Constitution. The duty of Congress

at this moment is to declare what shall be the basis of representation

in a republican form of government.

"There is, there can be, but one true basis," she continued. "Taxation

and representation must be inseparable; hence our demand must now go

beyond woman.... We therefore wish to broaden our woman's rights

platform and make it in name what it has ever been in spirit, a human

rights platform."[178]

The women, so often accused in later years of fighting only for their

own rights, had the courage at this time to attempt a practical

experiment in generosity. Susan and Mrs. Stanton with all their hearts

wanted this experiment to succeed, and yet as they resolved their

woman's rights organization into the American Equal Rights

Association, they were apprehensive.

They did not have to wait long for disillusionment. Meeting Wendell

Phillips and Theodore Tilton in the office of the \_Antislavery

Standard\_ to plan a campaign for the Equal Rights Association, they

discussed with them what should be done in New York, preparatory to

the revision of the state constitution. Emphatically Wendell Phillips

declared that the time was ripe for striking the word "white" out of

the constitution, but not the word "male." That could come, he added,

when the constitution was next revised, some twenty or thirty years

later. To their astonishment, Theodore Tilton heartily agreed. Then he

added, "The question of striking out the word 'male,' we as an equal

rights association shall of course present as an intellectual theory,

but not as a practical thing to be accomplished at this convention."

Completely unprepared for such an attitude on Tilton's part, Susan

retorted with indignation, "I would sooner cut off my right hand than

ask for the ballot for the black man and not for woman." Then telling

the two men just what she thought of them for their betrayal of women,

she swept out of the office to keep another appointment.[179]

Equally exasperated with these men, Mrs. Stanton stayed on, hoping to

heal the breach, but when Susan returned to the Stanton home that

evening, she found her highly indignant, declaring she was through

boosting the Negro over her own head. Then and there they vowed that

they would devote themselves with all their might and main to woman

suffrage and to that alone.

\* \* \* \* \*

By this time, Congress had passed a civil rights bill over President

Johnson's veto, conferring the rights of citizenship upon freedmen,

and a Fourteenth Amendment to make these rights permanent was now

before Congress. The latest developments regarding the various drafts

of the Fourteenth Amendment were passed along to Susan and Mrs.

Stanton by Robert Dale Owen. Senator Sumner, he reported, had yielded

to party pressure and now supported the Fourteenth Amendment, although

in the past he had always maintained such an amendment wholly

unnecessary since there was already enough justice, liberty, and

equality in the Constitution to protect the humblest citizen. Senator

Sumner opposed and defeated a clause in the amendment referring to

"race" and "color," words which had never previously been mentioned

in the Constitution, but he raised no serious objection to the

introduction of the word "male" as a qualification for suffrage, which

was also unprecedented. That he tried time and time again to avoid the

word "male" when he was redrafting the amendment or that Thaddeus

Stevens tried to substitute "legal voters" for "male citizens" was no

comfort to Susan and Mrs. Stanton, as they saw the Fourteenth

Amendment writing discrimination against women into the federal

Constitution for the first time.[180]

As they carefully read over the first section of the Fourteenth

Amendment, which conferred citizenship on every person born or

naturalized in the United States, women's rights seemed assured:

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and

subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the

United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State

shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the

privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States;

nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or

property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person

within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

Then in the controversial second section which provided the penalty of

reduction of representation in Congress for states depriving Negroes

of the ballot, they saw themselves written out of the Constitution by

the words, "male inhabitants" and "male citizens," used to define

legal voters. It was baffling to be kept from their goal by a single

word in a provision which at best was the unsatisfactory compromise

arrived at by radical and conservative Republicans and which sincere

abolitionists felt was unfair to the Negro. That it was unfair to

women, there was no doubt.

With determination, Susan and Mrs. Stanton fought this injustice. Were

they not "persons born ... in the United States," they asked. Were

they forever to be regarded as children or as lower than persons,

along with criminals, idiots, and the insane? Were women not counted

in the basis of representation and should they not have a voice in the

election of those representatives whose office their numbers helped to

establish?

As Susan studied the Constitution, she saw that the question of

suffrage had up to this time been left to the states and that there

were no provisions defining suffrage or citizenship or limiting the

right of suffrage. Only now was the precedent being broken by the

Fourteenth Amendment which conferred citizenship on Negroes and

limited suffrage to males. How could this be constitutional, she

reasoned, when the first lines of the Constitution read, "We, the

people of the United States, in order to ... establish justice ... and

secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do

ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of

America." Of course "the people" must include women, if the English

language meant what it said.

The Fourteenth Amendment with the limiting word "male" was passed by

Congress and referred to the states for ratification in June 1866. As

never before, Susan felt the curse of the tradition of the

unimportance of women. Once more politicians and reformers had ignored

women's inherent rights as human beings. In spite of women's

intelligence and their wartime service to their country, no statesman

of power or vision felt it at all necessary to include women under the

Fourteenth Amendment's broad term of "persons." Yet according to

statements made in later years by John A. Bingham and Roscoe Conkling,

both sponsors of the amendment and concerned with its drafting, the

possibility was considered of protecting corporations and the property

of individuals from the interference of state and municipal

legislation, through the federal control extended by this amendment.

At any rate, they wrought well for the corporations which have

received abundant protection under the Fourteenth Amendment, along

with all male citizens, while women were left outside the pale.[181]

Tactfully the Republicans explained to women that even Negro suffrage

could not be definitely spelled out in the Fourteenth Amendment, if it

were to be accepted by the people; and added that Negro suffrage was

all the strain that the Republican party could bear at this time; but

neither Susan nor Mrs. Stanton were fooled by this sophistry. They

knew that Republican politicians saw in the Negro vote in the South

the means of keeping their party in power for a long time to come, and

could entirely overlook justice to Negro women since they were assured

of enough votes without them. The women of the North need not be

considered, since they had nothing to offer politically. They would

vote, it was thought, just as their husbands voted.

Completely deserted by all their former friends in the Republican

party, Susan and Mrs. Stanton now made use of an irregular Republican,

Senator Cowan of Pennsylvania, whom the abolitionists had labeled "the

watchdog of slavery." When Benjamin Wade's bill "to enfranchise each

and every male person" in the District of Columbia "without any

distinction on account of color or race," was discussed on the Senate

floor in December 1866, Senator Cowan offered an amendment striking

out the word "male" and thus leaving the door open for women. He

stated the case for woman suffrage well and with eloquence, and

although he was accused of being insincere and wishing merely to cloud

the issue, he forced the Republicans to show their hands. In the

three-day debate which followed, Senator Wilson of Massachusetts

declared emphatically that he was opposed to connecting the two

issues, woman and Negro suffrage, but would at any time support a

separate bill for woman's enfranchisement. Senator Pomeroy of Kansas

objected to jeopardizing the chances of Negro suffrage by linking it

with woman suffrage, but Senator Wade of Ohio boldly expressed his

approval of woman suffrage, even casting a vote for Senator Cowan's

amendment, as did B. Gratz Brown of Missouri. In the final vote, nine

votes were counted for woman suffrage and thirty-seven against.[182]

Susan recorded even this defeat as progress, for woman suffrage had

for the first time been debated in Congress and prominent Senators had

treated it with respect. The Republican press, however, was showing

definite signs of disapproval, even Horace Greeley's New York

\_Tribune\_. Almost unbelieving, she read Greeley's editorial, "A Cry

from the Females," in which he said, "Talk of a true woman needing the

ballot as an accessory of power when she rules the world with the

glance of an eye." With the Democratic press as always solidly against

woman suffrage and the \_Antislavery Standard\_ avoiding the subject as

if it did not exist, no words favorable to votes for women now reached

the public.[183]

It was hard for Susan to forgive the \_Antislavery Standard\_ for what

she regarded as a breach of trust. Financed by the Hovey Fund, it owed

allegiance, she believed, to women as well as the Negro. In protest

Parker Pillsbury resigned his post as editor, but among the leading

men in the antislavery ranks, only he, Samuel J. May, James Mott, and

Robert Purvis, the cultured, wealthy Philadelphia Negro, were willing

to support Susan and Mrs. Stanton in their campaign for woman suffrage

at this time. The rest aligned themselves unquestioningly with the

Republicans, although in the past they had always been distrustful of

political parties.

Discouraging as this was for Susan, their influence upon the

antislavery women was far more alarming. These women one by one

temporarily deserted the woman's rights cause, persuaded that this was

the Negro's hour and that they must be generous, renounce their own

claims, and work only for the Negroes' civil and political rights.

Less than a dozen remained steadfast, among them Lucretia Mott, Martha

C. Wright, Ernestine Rose, and for a time Lucy Stone, who wrote John

Greenleaf Whittier in January 1867, "You know Mr. Phillips takes the

ground that this is 'the Negro's hour,' and that the women, if not

criminal, are at least, not wise to urge their own claim. Now, so sure

am I that he is mistaken and that the only name given, by which the

country can be saved, is that of WOMAN, that I want to ask you ... to

use your influence to induce him to reconsider the position he has

taken. He is the only man in the nation to whom has been given the

charm which compels all men, willing or unwilling, to listen when he

speaks ... Mr. Phillips used to say, 'take your part with the perfect

and abstract right, and trust God to see that it shall prove

expedient.' Now he needs someone to help him see that point

again."[184]

FOOTNOTES:

[159] Daniel R. Anthony married Anna Osborne of Edgartown, Martha's

Vineyard, in 1864.

[160] Before buying the house on Madison Street, then numbered 7, Mrs.

Anthony and Mary lived for a time at 69 North Street, Rochester.

Hannah and Eugene Mosher bought the adjoining house on Madison Street

in 1866. Aaron McLean took over his father-in-law's profitable

insurance business.

[161] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 241.

[162] Feb. 14, 1865, Elizabeth Cady Stanton Papers, Library of

Congress.

[163] Ms., Diary, April 27, 1862.

[164] Feb. 14, 1862, Elizabeth Cady Stanton Papers, Library of

Congress.

[165] \_Ibid.\_

[166] \_Ibid.\_, April 19, 1862.

[167] Ms., Diary, April 26, 27, 1865.

[168] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 245.

[169] The \_Liberator\_ ceased publication, Dec. 29, 1865.

[170] Ms., Diary, June 30, July 3, 1865.

[171] Harper, \_Anthony\_, II, pp. 960-967.

[172] Stanton and Blatch, \_Stanton\_, II, p. 105.

[173] \_Ibid.\_; Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 244.

[174] Ms., Diary, Aug. 7, Sept. 5, 20, 1865.

[175] \_Ibid.\_, Nov. 26-27, 1865.

[176] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 251.

[177] \_History of Woman Suffrage\_, II, pp. 96-97.

[178] Harper, \_Anthony\_, I, p. 260.

[179] \_Ibid.\_, pp. 261, 323.

[180] \_History of Woman Suffrage\_, II, pp. 322-324. One of Thaddeus

Stevens' drafts read: "If any State shall disfranchise any of its

citizens on account of color, all that class shall be counted out of

the basis of representation." Then the question arose whether or not

disfranchising Negro women would carry this penalty and the result was

a rewording which struck out "color" and added "male."

[181] Beards, \_The Rise of American Civilization\_, II, pp. 111-112;

Joseph B. James, \_The Framing of the Fourteenth Amendment\_ (Urbana,

Ill., 1956), pp. 59, 166, 196-200.

[182] \_History of Woman Suffrage\_, II, p. 103. Senator Henry B.

Anthony of Rhode Island, Susan B. Anthony's cousin, spoke and voted

for woman suffrage.

[183] \_Ibid.\_, p. 101. The New York \_Post\_, which had been friendly to

woman suffrage under the editorship of William Cullen Bryant, now came

out against it.

[184] John Albree, Editor, \_Whittier Correspondence from Oakknoll\_

(Salem, Mass., 1911), p. 158. Frances D. Gage of Ohio, Caroline H.

Dall of Massachusetts, and Clarina Nichols of Kansas also supported

woman suffrage at this time.

TIMES THAT TRIED WOMEN'S SOULS

Bitterly disillusioned, Susan as usual found comfort in action. She

carried to the New York legislature early in 1867 her objections to

the Fourteenth Amendment in a petition from the American Equal Rights

Association, signed by Lucy Stone, Henry Blackwell, Elizabeth Cady

Stanton, and herself. People generally were critical of the amendment,

many fearing it would too readily reinstate rebels as voters, and she

hoped to block ratification by capitalizing on this dissatisfaction.

She saw no disloyalty to Negroes in this, for she regarded the

amendment as "utterly inadequate."[185]

This protest made, she turned her attention to New York's

constitutional convention, which provided an unusual opportunity for

writing woman suffrage into the new constitution. First she sought an

interview with Horace Greeley, hoping to regain his support which was

more important than ever since he had been chosen a delegate to this

convention. When she and Mrs. Stanton asked him for space in the

\_Tribune\_ to advocate woman suffrage as well as Negro suffrage, he

emphatically replied, "No! You must not get up any agitation for that

measure.... Help us get the word 'white' out of the constitution. This

is the Negro's hour.... Your turn will come next."[186]

Convinced that this was also woman's hour, Susan disregarded his

opinions and his threats and circulated woman suffrage petitions in

all parts of the state. She won the support of the handsome, highly

respected George William Curtis, now editor of \_Harper's Magazine\_ and

also a convention delegate, and of the popular Henry Ward Beecher and

Gerrit Smith. The sponsorship of the cause by these men helped

mightily. New York women sent in petitions with hundreds of

signatures, but the Republican party was at work, cracking its whip,

and Horace Greeley was appointed chairman of the committee on the

right of suffrage.

Both Susan and Mrs. Stanton spoke at the constitutional convention's

hearing on woman suffrage, Susan with her usual forthrightness

answering the many questions asked by the delegates, spreading

consternation among them by declaring that women would eventually

serve as jurors and be drafted in time of war. Assuming women unable

to bear arms for their country, the delegates smugly linked the ballot

and the bullet together, and Horace Greeley gleefully asked the two

women, "If you vote, are you ready to fight?" Instantly, Susan

replied, "Yes, Mr. Greeley, just as you fought in the late war--at the

point of a goose quill." Then turning to the other delegates, she

reminded them that several hundred women, disguised as men, had fought

in the Civil War, and instead of being honored for their services and

paid, they had been discharged in disgrace.[187]

Confident that Horace Greeley would sooner or later fall back on his

oft-repeated, trite remark, "The best women I know do not want to

vote," Susan had asked Mrs. Greeley to roll up a big petition in

Westchester County, and believing heartily in woman suffrage she had

complied. This gave Susan and Mrs. Stanton a trump card to play,

should Horace Greeley present an adverse report as they were informed

he would do.[188]

In Albany to hear the report, these two conspirators gloated over

their plan as they surveyed the packed galleries and noted the many

reporters who would jump at a bit of spicy news to send their papers.

Just before Horace Greeley was to give his report, George William

Curtis announced with dignity and assurance, "Mr. President, I hold in

my hand a petition from Mrs. Horace Greeley and 300 other women,

citizens of Westchester, asking that the word 'male' be stricken from

the Constitution."[189]

Ripples of amusement ran through the audience, and reporters hastily

took notes, as Horace Greeley, the top of his head red as a beet,

looked up with anger at the galleries, and then in a thin squeaky

voice and with as much authority as he could muster declared, "Your

committee does not recommend an extension of the elective franchise to

women...." As a result, New York's new constitution enfranchised only

male citizens.[190]

Horace Greeley justified his opposition to woman suffrage in a letter

to Moncure D. Conway: "The keynote of my political creed is the axiom

that 'Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the

governed....' I sought information from different quarters ... and

practically all agreed in the conclusion that \_the women of our state

do not choose to vote\_. Individuals do, at least three fourths of the

sex do not. I accepted their choice as decisive; just as I reported in

favor of enfranchising the Blacks because they do wish to vote. The

few may not; but the many do; and I think they should control the

situation.... It seems but fair to add that female suffrage seems to

me to involve the balance of the family relation as it has hitherto

existed...."[191]

Horace Greeley never forgave Susan and Mrs. Stanton for humiliating

him in the constitutional convention or for the headlines in the

evening papers which coupled his adverse report with his wife's

petition. When they met again in New York a few weeks later at one of

Alice Cary's popular evening receptions, he ignored their friendly

greeting and brusquely remarked, "You two ladies are the most

maneuvering politicians in the State of New York."[192]

\* \* \* \* \*

While Susan's work in New York State was at its height, appeals for

help had reached her from Republicans in Kansas, where in November

1867 two amendments would be voted upon, enfranchising women and

Negroes. Unable to go to Kansas herself at that time or to spare

Elizabeth Stanton, she rejoiced when Lucy Stone consented to speak

throughout Kansas and when she and Lucy, as trustees of the Jackson

Fund, outvoting Wendell Phillips, were able to appropriate $1,500 for

this campaign.

Lucy was soon sending enthusiastic reports to Susan from Kansas, where

she and her husband, Henry Blackwell, were winning many friends for

the cause. "I fully expect we shall carry the State," Lucy confidently

wrote Susan. "The women here are grand, and it will be a shame past

all expression if they don't get the right to vote.... But the Negroes

are all against us.... These men \_ought not to be allowed to vote

before we do\_, because they will be just so much dead weight to

lift."[193]

One cloud now appeared on the horizon. Republicans in Kansas began to

withdraw their support from the woman suffrage amendment they had

sponsored. It troubled Lucy and Susan that the New York \_Tribune\_ and

the \_Independent\_, both widely read in Kansas, published not one word

favorable to woman suffrage, for these two papers with their influence

and prestige could readily, they believed, win the ballot for women

not only in Kansas but throughout the nation. Soon the temper of the

Republican press changed from indifference to outright animosity,

striking at Lucy and Henry Blackwell by calling them "free lovers,"

because Lucy was traveling with her husband as Lucy Stone and not as

Mrs. Henry B. Blackwell. Still Lucy was hopeful, believing the

Democrats were ready to take them up, but she reminded Susan, "It will

be necessary to have a good force here in the fall, and you will have

to come."

Never for a moment did the importance of this election in Kansas

escape Susan, and her estimate of it was also that of John Stuart

Mill, who wrote from England to the sponsor of the Kansas woman

suffrage amendment, Samuel N. Wood, "If your citizens next November

give effect to the enlightened views of your Legislature, history will

remember one of the youngest states in the civilized world has been

the first to adopt a measure of liberation destined to extend all over

the earth and to be looked back to ... as one of the most fertile in

beneficial consequences of all improvements yet effected in human

affairs."[194]

Susan fully expected Kansas to pioneer for woman suffrage just as it

had taken its stand against slavery when the rest of the country held

back. Her first problem, however, was to raise the money to get

herself and Elizabeth Stanton there. The grant from the Jackson Fund

had been spent by the Blackwells and Olympia Brown of Michigan, who

most providentially volunteered to continue their work when they

returned to the East. Olympia Brown, recently graduated from Antioch

College and ordained as a minister in the Universalist church, was a

new recruit to the cause. Young and indefatigable, she reached every

part of Kansas during the summer, driving over the prairies with the

Singing Hutchinsons.[195]

Olympia Brown's valiant help made waiting in New York easier for Susan

as she tried in every way to raise money. Further grants from the

Jackson Fund were cut off by an unfavorable court decision; and the

trustees of the Hovey Fund, established to further the rights of both

Negroes and women, refused to finance a woman suffrage campaign in

Kansas.

"We are left without a dollar," she wrote State Senator Samuel N.

Wood. "Every speaker who goes to Kansas must \_now pay her own\_

expenses out of her own private purse, unless money should come from

some unexpected source. I shall run the risk--as I told you--and draw

upon almost my last hundred to go. I tell you this that you may not

contract \_debts\_ under the impression that \_our\_ Association can pay

for them--\_for it cannot\_."[196]

She did find a way to finance the printing of leaflets so urgently

needed for distribution in Kansas. Soliciting advertisements up and

down Broadway during the heat of July and August, she collected enough

to pay the printer for 60,000 tracts, with the result that along with

the dignified, eloquent speeches of Henry Ward Beecher, Theodore

Parker, George William Curtis, and John Stuart Mill went

advertisements of Howe sewing machines, Mme. Demorest's millinery and

patterns, Browning's washing machines, and Decker pianofortes to

attract the people of Kansas.

\* \* \* \* \*

With both New York and Kansas on her mind, Susan had had little time

to be with her family, although she had often longed to slip out to

Rochester for a visit with her mother and Guelma who had been ill for

several months. Finally she spent a few days with them on her way to

Kansas.

On the long train journey from Rochester to Kansas with such a

congenial companion as Elizabeth Stanton, she enjoyed every new

experience, particularly the new Palace cars advertised as the finest,

most luxurious in the world, costing $40,000 each. The comfortable

daytime seats transformed into beds at night and the meals served by

solicitous Negro waiters were of the greatest interest to these two

good housekeepers and the last bit of comfort they were to enjoy for

many a day.

As soon as they reached Kansas, they set out immediately on a two-week

speaking tour of the principal towns, and as usual Susan starred Mrs.

Stanton while she herself acted as general manager, advertising the

meetings, finding a suitable hall, sweeping it out if necessary,

distributing and selling tracts, and perhaps making a short speech

herself. The meetings were highly successful, but traveling by stage

and wagon was rugged; most of the food served them was green with soda

or floating in grease and the hotels were infested with bedbugs. Susan

wrote her family of sleepless nights and of picking the "tormentors"

out of their bonnets and the ruffles of their dresses.[197]

Occasionally there was an oasis of cleanliness and good food, as when

they stopped at the railroad hotel in Salina and found it run by

Mother Bickerdyke, who, marching through Georgia with General Sherman,

had nursed and fed his soldiers. At such times Kansas would take on a

rosy glow and Susan could report, "We are getting along splendidly.

Just the frame of a Methodist Church with sidings and roof, and rough

cottonwood boards for seats, was our meeting place last night ...; and

a perfect jam it was, with men crowded outside at all the windows....

Our tracts do more than half the battle; reading matter is so very

scarce that everybody clutches at a book of any kind.... All that

great trunk full were sold and given away at our first 14 meetings,

and we in return received $110 which a little more than paid our

railroad fare--eight cents per mile--and hotel bills. Our collections

thus far fully equal those at the East. I have been delightfully

disappointed for everybody said I couldn't raise money in Kansas

meetings."[198]

The reputation of both women preceded them to Kansas. Susan had to win

her way against prejudice built up by newspaper gibes of past years

which had caricatured her as a meddlesome reformer and a sour old

maid, but gradually her friendliness, hominess, and sincerity broke

down these preconceptions. Kansas soon respected this tall slender

energetic woman who, as she overrode obstacles, showed a spirit akin

to that of the frontiersman.

Mrs. Stanton, on the other hand, was welcomed at once with enthusiasm.

The fact that she was the mother of seven children as well as a

brilliant orator opened the way for her. She was good to look at, a

queenly woman at fifty-two, with a fresh rosy complexion and carefully

curled soft white hair. Her motherliness and refreshing sense of humor

built up a bond of understanding with her audiences. People were eager

to see her, hear her, talk with her, and entertain her.

This preference was obvious to Susan, but it aroused no jealousy. She

sent Mrs. Stanton out through the state by mule team to all the small

towns and settlements far from the railroad, along with their popular

and faithful Republican ally, Charles Robinson, first Free State

Governor of Kansas, counting on these two to build up good will. In

the meantime, making her headquarters in Lawrence, she reorganized the

campaign to meet the increasing opposition of the Republican machine,

against which the continued support of a few prominent Kansas

Republicans availed little. As the state was predominantly Republican,

the prospects were gloomy, for the Democrats had not yet taken them up

as Lucy Stone had predicted, but still opposed both the Negro and

woman suffrage amendments. A new liquor law, which it was thought

women would support, further complicated the situation, aligning the

liquor interests and the German and Irish settlers solidly against

votes for women.

\* \* \* \* \*

While Susan was searching desperately for some way of appealing to the

Democrats, help came from an unexpected source. The St. Louis Suffrage

Association urged George Francis Train to come to the aid of women in

Kansas, and always ready to champion a new and unpopular cause, he

telegraphed his willingness to win the Democratic vote and pay his own

expenses. Knowing little about him except that he was wealthy,

eccentric, and interested in developing the Union Pacific Railroad,

Susan turned tactfully to her Kansas friends for advice, although she

herself welcomed his help. They wired him, "The people want you, the

women want you";[199] and he came into the state in a burst of glory,

speaking first in Leavenworth and Lawrence to large curious audiences.

A tall handsome man with curly brown hair and keen gray eyes, flashily

dressed in a blue coat with brass buttons, white vest, black trousers,

patent-leather boots, and lavender kid gloves, he was a sight worth

driving miles to see, and he gave his audiences the best entertainment

they had had in many a day, shouting jingles at them in the midst of

his speeches and mercilessly ridiculing the Republicans. Here was none

of the boredom of most political speeches, none of the long sonorous

sentences with classical allusions which the big-name orators of the

day poured out. His bold statements, his clipped rapid-fire sentences

held the people's attention whether they agreed with him or not. When

he spoke in Leavenworth, the hall was packed with Irishmen who were

building the railroad to the West. They hissed when he mentioned woman

suffrage, but before long he had won them over and they cheered when

he shook his finger at them and shouted, "Every man in Kansas who

throws a vote for the Negro and not for women has insulted his mother,

his daughter, his sister, and his wife."[200]

[Illustration: George Francis Train]

At once the Republican press began a campaign of vilification, calling

Train a Copperhead and ridiculing his eccentricities and conceits; and

eastern Republicans, fearing they had harmed the Negro amendment in

Kansas by their opposition to woman suffrage, tried to make

last-minute amends by sending an appeal to Kansas voters to support

both amendments. Even Horace Greeley lamely supported them in a

\_Tribune\_ editorial which Susan read with disgust: "It is plain that

the experiment of Female Suffrage is to be tried; and, while we regard

it with distrust, we are quite willing to see it pioneered by Kansas.

She is a young State, and has a memorable history, wherein her women

have borne an honorable part.... If, then, a majority of them really

desire to vote, we, if we lived in Kansas, should vote to give them

the opportunity. Upon a full and fair trial, we believe they would

conclude that the right of suffrage for women was, on the whole,

rather a plague than a profit, and vote to resign it into the hands of

their husbands and fathers...."[201]

These halfhearted appeals were too late, for the political machine in

Kansas had already done its work; and Susan, turning her back on such

fair-weather friends, cultivated the Democrats even more sedulously.

When the Democrat who had promised to accompany George Francis Train

on a speaking tour failed him, she took his place. When Train demurred

at the strenuous task ahead, she announced she would undertake it

alone. Always the gallant gentleman, he accompanied her, and continued

with her through the long hard weeks of travel in mail and lumber

wagons over rough roads, through mud and rain, to the remotest

settlements, far from the railroads. Because it was a necessity,

traveling alone with a gentleman whom she hardly knew troubled her not

at all, unconventional though it was.

She took charge of the meetings, opening them herself with a short

sincere plea for both the woman and Negro suffrage amendments, and

then she introduced George Francis Train, who, no matter how late they

arrived or how tiring the day, had changed his wrinkled gray traveling

suit for his resplendent platform costume. The expectant crowd never

failed to respond with a gasp of surprise, and immediately the fun

began as Train with his wit and his mimicry entertained them, calling

for their support of woman suffrage and advocating as well some of his

own pet ideas, such as freeing Ireland from British oppression, paying

our national debt in greenbacks, establishing an eight-hour day in

industry, and even nominating himself for President.

Amused by his dramatics and often amazed at his conceit, Susan found

neither as objectionable as the outright falsehood circulated by

opponents of woman suffrage. As the days went by with their continued

hardships and increasing fatigue, she marveled at his unfailing

courteousness, his pluck, and good cheer, while he in turn admired her

courage, her endurance, and her zeal for her cause, and between them a

bond of respect and loyalty was built up which could not be destroyed

by the pressures of later years.

During the long hours on the road, he entertained her with the story

of his life and his travels, an adventure story of a poor boy who had

made good. Building clipper ships, introducing American goods in

Australia, traveling in India, China, and Russia, promoting street

railways in England, and now building the Union Pacific, he had a

wealth of information to impart.

Their views on the Negro differed sharply. Rating the whole race as

inferior and incapable of improvement, he naturally opposed

enfranchising Negroes before women. She, on the other hand, had always

regarded Negroes as her equals, and in campaigning with Train, she had

to make her choice between Negroes and women. She chose women, just as

her abolitionist friends in the East had chosen the Negro; and their

indifference and opposition to woman suffrage at this crucial time was

as unforgivable to her as was his valuation of the Negro to them. They

called him a Copperhead, remembering his southern wife and his hatred

of abolitionists, his vocal resistance to the draft, and his demands

for immediate unconditional peace. They ignored entirely his defense

of the Union in England during the Civil War when he publicly debated

with Englishmen who supported the Confederacy. They abused him in

their newspapers and he, not to be outdone, ridiculed them in his

speeches, shouting, "Where is Wendell Phillips, today? Lost caste

everywhere. Inconsistent in all things, cowardly in this. Where is

Horace Greeley in this Kansas war for liberty? Pitching the woman

suffrage idea out of the Convention and bailing out Jeff Davis. Where

is William Lloyd Garrison? Being patted on the shoulders by his

employers, our enemies abroad, for his faithful work in trying to

destroy our nation. Where is Henry Ward Beecher? Writing a story for

Bonner's Ledger...."[202]

They never forgave him this estimate of them, nor did they forgive

Susan for associating herself with him.

On one of the last days of the Kansas campaign, while she was driving

over the prairie with him, he suddenly asked her why the woman

suffrage people did not have a paper of their own. "Not lack of

brains, but lack of money," she tersely replied.[203]

They talked for a while about the good such a paper would do, about

the people who should edit and write for it, what name it should have.

Then he said simply, "I will give you the money."

Because a woman suffrage paper had been her cherished dream for so

many years, she did not dare regard this as more than a gallant

gesture soon to be forgotten; but to her amazement that very evening

she heard Train announce to his audience, "When Miss Anthony gets back

to New York, she is going to start a woman suffrage paper. Its name is

to be \_The Revolution\_: its motto, 'Men their rights, and nothing

more; women, their rights and nothing less.' This paper is to be a

weekly, price $2. per year; its editors, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and

Parker Pillsbury; its proprietor, Susan B. Anthony. Let everybody

subscribe for it!"

\* \* \* \* \*

Election day brought both Susan and Mrs. Stanton back to Leavenworth,

to Daniel's home, to learn the verdict of the people of Kansas. As the

returns came in, their hope of seeing Kansas become the first woman

suffrage state quickly faded. Neither their amendment nor the Negroes'

polled enough votes for adoption. Their woman suffrage amendment,

however, received only 1,773 votes less than the Republican-sponsored

Negro amendment, and to have accomplished this in a hard-fought bitter

campaign against powerful opponents gave them confidence in themselves

and in their judgment of men and events. No longer need they depend

upon Wendell Phillips or other abolitionist leaders for guidance. From

now on they would chart their own course. This led, they believed, to

Washington, where they must gain support among members of Congress for

a federal woman suffrage amendment. Few, if any, Republicans would

help them, but already one Democrat had come forward. George Francis

Train had offered to pay their expenses if they would join him on a

lecture tour on their way East. To Susan, who had to raise every penny

spent in her work, this seemed like an answer to prayer, as did his

proposal to finance a woman suffrage paper for them.

By this time their abolitionist friends in the East were writing them

indignant letters blaming the defeat of the Negro amendment on George

Francis Train and warning them not to link woman suffrage with an

unbalanced charlatan. Even their devoted friends in Kansas, including

Governor Robinson, advised them against further association with

Train.

They did not make their decision lightly, nor was it easy to go

against the judgment of respected friends, but of this they were

confident--that with or without Train, they would estrange most of

their old friends if they campaigned for woman suffrage now. Without

him, their work, limited by lack of funds, would be ineffectual. With

his financial backing, they not only had the opportunity of spreading

their message in all the principal cities on their way back to New

York, but had the promise of a paper, now so desperately needed when

other news channels were closed to them. That Train was eccentric they

agreed, and they also admitted that possibly some of his financial

theories were unsound. They believed he was ahead of his time when he

advocated the eight-hour day and the abolition of standing armies; but

at least he looked forward, not backward. Susan had found him to be a

man of high principles. She had heard him "make speeches on woman's

suffrage that could be equalled only by John B. Gough,"[204] the

well-known temperance crusader. Train's radical ideas did not disturb

her. Her association with antislavery extremists prior to the Civil

War had made her impervious to the criticism and accusations of

conservatives. She was aware that on this proposed lecture tour Train

probably wanted to make use of her executive ability and of Mrs.

Stanton's popularity as a speaker; but on the other hand, his

generosity to them was beyond anything they had ever experienced.

For Susan there was only one choice--to work for woman suffrage with

the financial backing of Train. Mrs. Stanton agreed, and as she

expressed it, "I have always found that when we see eye to eye, we are

sure to be right, and when we pull together we are strong.... I take

my beloved Susan's judgment against the world."[205]

\* \* \* \* \*

Traveling homeward with George Francis Train, Susan and Mrs. Stanton

spoke in Chicago, St. Louis, Louisville, Cincinnati, Cleveland,

Buffalo, Rochester, Boston, Hartford, and other important cities where

they drew large crowds, which had never before listened to a

discussion of woman suffrage. Most of their old friends among the

suffragists and abolitionists shunned them, for they had been warned

against this folly by their colleagues in the East. The lively

meetings rated plenty of publicity, complimentary in the Democratic

papers but sarcastic and hostile in the Republican press. Usually

"Woman Suffrage" got the headlines, but sometimes it was "Woman

Suffrage and Greenbacks" or "Train for President." Handbills, the

printing of which Susan supervised, scattered Train's rhymes and

epigrams far and wide and carried a notice that the proceeds of all

meetings would be turned over to the woman's rights cause. Susan also

arranged for the printing of Train's widely distributed pamphlet, \_The

Great Epigram Campaign of Kansas\_, with this jingle, so

uncomplimentary to the eastern abolitionists, on its cover:

The Garrisons, Phillipses, Greeleys, and Beechers,

False prophets, false guides, false teachers and preachers,

Left Mrs. Stanton, Miss Anthony, Brown, and Stone,

To fight the Kansas battle alone;

While your Rosses, Pomeroys, and your Clarkes

Stood on the fence, or basely fled,

While woman was saved by a Copperhead.

Even more unforgivable than this to the abolitionist suffragists were

the back-page advertisements of a new woman-suffrage paper, \_The

Revolution\_, and of woman's rights tracts which could be purchased

from Susan B. Anthony, Secretary of the American Equal Rights

Association. That Susan would presume to line up this organization in

any way with George Francis Train aroused the indignation of Lucy

Stone, who felt the cause was being trailed in the dust. While Susan

and Mrs. Stanton traveled homeward, enjoying the comfort of the best

hotels and the applause of enthusiastic audiences, a coalition against

them was being formed in the East.

"All the old friends with scarce an exception are sure we are wrong,"

Susan wrote in her diary, January 1, 1868. "Only time can tell, but I

believe we are right and hence bound to succeed."[206]
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THE ONE WORD OF THE HOUR

"If we women fail to speak the \_one word\_ of the hour," Susan wrote

Anna E. Dickinson, "who shall do it? No man is able, for no man sees

or feels as we do. To whom God gives the word, to him or her he says,

'Go preach it.'"[207]

This is just what Susan aimed to do in her new paper, \_The

Revolution\_. It's name, she believed, expressed exactly the stirring

up of thought necessary to establish justice for all--for women,

Negroes, workingmen and-women, and all who were oppressed. Her two

editors, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, reliable friends

as well as vivid forceful writers, were completely in sympathy with

her own liberal ideas and could be counted on to crusade fearlessly

for every righteous cause. What did it matter if George Francis Train

wanted space in the paper to publish his views and for a financial

column, edited by David M. Melliss of the New York \_World\_? Brought up

on the antislavery platform where free speech was the watchword and

where all, even long-winded cranks, were allowed to express their

opinions, Susan willingly opened the pages of \_The Revolution\_ to

Train and to Melliss in return for financial backing.

When on January 8, 1868, the first issue of her paper came off the

press, her heart swelled with pride and satisfaction as she turned

over its pages, read its good editorials, and under the frank of

Democratic Congressman James Brooks of New York, sent out ten thousand

copies to all parts of the country.

\_The Revolution\_ promised to discuss not only subjects which were of

particular concern to her and to Elizabeth Stanton, such as "educated

suffrage, irrespective of sex or color," equal pay for women for equal

work, and practical education for girls as well as boys, but also the

eight-hour day, labor problems, and a new financial policy for

America. This new financial policy, the dream of George Francis Train,

advocated the purchase of American goods only; the encouragement of

immigration to rebuild the South and to settle the country from ocean

to ocean; the establishment of the French financing systems, the

Crédit Foncier and Crédit Mobilier, to develop our mines and

railroads; the issuing of greenbacks; and penny ocean postage "to

strengthen the brotherhood of Labor."

All in all it was not a program with wide appeal. Dazzled by the

opportunities for making money in this new undeveloped country, people

were in no mood to analyze the social order, or to consider the needs

of women or labor or the living standards of the masses. Unfamiliar

with the New York Stock Exchange, they found little to interest them

in the paper's financial department, while speculators and promoters,

such as Jay Gould and Jim Fiske, wanted no advice from the lone eagle,

George Francis Train, and resented Melliss's columns of Wall Street

gossip which often portrayed them in an unfavorable light. Nor did a

public-affairs paper edited and published by women carry much weight.

None of this, however, mattered much to Susan, who did not aim for a

popular paper but "to make public sentiment." It was her hope that

just as the \_Liberator\_ under William Lloyd Garrison had been "the

pillar of light and of fire to the slave's emancipation," so \_The

Revolution\_ would become "the guiding star to the enfranchisement of

women."[208]

\* \* \* \* \*

Upon Susan fell the task of building up subscriptions, soliciting

advertisements, and getting copy to the printer. As her office in the

New York \_World\_ building, 37 Park Row, was on the fourth floor and

the printer was several blocks away on the fifth floor of a building

without an elevator, her job proved to be a test of physical

endurance. To this was added an ever-increasing financial burden, for

Train had sailed for England when the first number was issued, had

been arrested because of his Irish sympathies, and had spent months in

a Dublin jail, from which he sent them his thoughts on every

conceivable subject but no money for the paper. He had left $600 with

Susan and had instructed Melliss to make payments as needed, but this

soon became impossible, and she had to face the alarming fact that, if

the paper were to continue, she must raise the necessary money

herself. Because the circulation was small, it was hard to get

advertisers, particularly as she was firm in her determination to

accept only advertisements of products she could recommend. Patent

medicines and any questionable products were ruled out. Subscriptions

came in encouragingly but in no sense met the deficit which piled up

unrelentingly. Her goal was 100,000 subscribers.

She had gone to Washington at once to solicit subscriptions personally

from the President and members of Congress. Ben Wade of Ohio headed

the list of Senators who subscribed, and loyal as always to woman

suffrage, encouraged her to go ahead and push her cause. "It has got

to come," he added, "but Congress is too busy now to take it up."

Senator Henry Wilson of Massachusetts greeted her gruffly, telling her

that she and Mrs. Stanton had done more to block reconstruction in the

last two years than all others in the land, but he subscribed because

he wanted to know what they were up to. Although Senator Pomeroy was

"sore about Kansas" and her alliance with the Democrats, he

nevertheless subscribed, but Senator Sumner was not to be seen. The

first member of the House to put his name on her list was her

dependable understanding friend, George Julian of Indiana, and many

others followed his lead. For two hours she waited to see President

Johnson, in an anteroom "among the huge half-bushel-measure spittoons

and terrible filth ... where the smell of tobacco and whiskey was

powerful." When she finally reached him, he immediately refused her

request, explaining that he had a thousand such solicitations every

day. Not easily put off, she countered at once by remarking that he

had never before had such a request in his life. "You recognize, Mr.

Johnson," she continued, "that Mrs. Stanton and myself for two years

have boldly told the Republican party that they must give ballots to

women as well as to Negroes, and by means of \_The Revolution\_ we are

bound to drive the party to this logical conclusion or break it into a

thousand pieces as was the old Whig party, unless we get our rights."

This "brought him to his pocketbook," she triumphantly reported, and

in a bold hand he signed his name, Andrew Johnson, as much as to say,

"Anything to get rid of this woman and break the radical party."[209]

She was proud of her paper, proud of its typography which was far more

readable than the average news sheets of the day with their miserably

small print. The larger type and less crowded pages were inviting, the

articles stimulating.

Parker Pillsbury, covering Congressional and political developments

and the impeachment trial of President Johnson with which he was not

in sympathy, was fearless in his denunciations of politicians, their

ruthless intrigue and disregard of the public. During the turbulent

days when the impeachment trial was front-page news everywhere, \_The

Revolution\_ proclaimed it as a political maneuver of the Republicans

to confuse the people and divert their attention from more important

issues, such as corruption in government, high prices, taxation, and

the fabulous wealth being amassed by the few. This of course roused

the intense disapproval of Wendell Phillips, Theodore Tilton, and

Horace Greeley, all of whom regarded Johnson as a traitor and shouted

for impeachment. It ran counter to the views of Susan's brother

Daniel, who telegraphed Senator Ross of Kansas demanding his vote for

impeachment. Although no supporter of President Johnson, Susan was now

completely awake to the political manipulations of the radical

Republicans and what seemed to her their readiness to sacrifice the

good of the nation for the success of their party. She repudiated them

all--all but the rugged Ben Wade, always true to woman suffrage, and

the tall handsome Chief Justice, Salmon P. Chase, who, she believed,

stood for justice and equality.

Both of these men Susan regarded as far better qualified for the

Presidency than General Grant, who now was the obvious choice of the

Republicans for 1868. "Why go pell-mell for Grant," asked \_The

Revolution\_, "when all admit that he is unfit for the position? It is

not too late, if true men and women will do their duty, to make an

honest man like Ben Wade, President. Let us save the Nation. As to the

Republican party the sooner it is scattered to the four winds of

Heaven the better."[210] Later when Chase was out of the running among

Republicans and not averse to overtures from the Democrats, \_The

Revolution\_ urged him as the Democratic candidate with universal

suffrage as his slogan.

Susan demanded civil rights, suffrage, education, and farms for the

Negroes as did the Republicans, but she could not overlook the

political corruption which was flourishing under the military control

of the South, and she recognized that the Republicans' insistence on

Negro suffrage in the South did not stem solely from devotion to a

noble principle, but also from an overwhelming desire to insure

victory for their party in the coming election. These views were

reflected editorially in \_The Revolution\_, which, calling attention

to the fact that Connecticut, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, and

Pennsylvania had refused to enfranchise their Negroes, asked why Negro

suffrage should be forced on the South before it was accepted in the

North.

The Fourteenth Amendment was having hard sledding and \_The Revolution\_

repudiated it, calling instead for an amendment granting universal

suffrage, or in other words, suffrage for women and Negroes. \_The

Revolution\_ also discussed in editorials by Mrs. Stanton other

subjects of interest to women, such as marriage, divorce,

prostitution, and infanticide, all of which Susan agreed needed frank

thoughtful consideration, but which other papers handled with kid

gloves.

In still another unpopular field, that of labor and capital, \_The

Revolution\_ also pioneered fearlessly, asking for shorter hours and

lower wages for workers, as it pointed out labor's valuable

contribution to the development of the country. It also called

attention to the vicious contrasts in large cities, where many lived

in tumbledown tenements in abject poverty while the few, with more

wealth than they knew what to do with, spent lavishly and built

themselves palaces.

Sentiments such as these increased the indignation of Susan's critics,

but she gloried in the output of her two courageous editors just as

she had gloried in the evangelistic zeal of the antislavery crusaders.

Wisely, however, she added to her list of contributors some of the

popular women writers of the day, among them Alice and Phoebe Cary.

She ran a series of articles on women as farmers, machinists,

inventors, and dentists, secured news from foreign correspondents,

mostly from England, and published a Washington letter and woman's

rights news from the states. Believing that women should become

acquainted with the great women of the past, especially those who

fought for their freedom and advancement, she printed an article on

Frances Wright and serialized Mary Wollstonecraft's \_A Vindication of

the Rights of Women\_.

\* \* \* \* \*

Eagerly Susan looked for favorable notices of her new paper in the

press. Much to her sorrow, Horace Greeley's New York \_Tribune\_

completely ignored its existence, as did her old standby, the

\_Antislavery Standard\_. The New York \_Times\_ ridiculed as usual

anything connected with woman's rights or woman suffrage. The New York

\_Home Journal\_ called it "plucky, keen, and wide awake, although some

of its ways are not at all to our taste." Theodore Tilton in the

Congregationalist paper, \_The Independent\_, commented in his usual

facetious style, which pinned him down neither to praise nor

unfriendliness, but Susan was grateful to read, "\_The Revolution\_ from

the start will arouse, thrill, edify, amuse, vex, and non-plus its

friends. But it will command attention: it will conquer a hearing."

Newspapers were generally friendly. "Miss Anthony's woman's rights

paper," declared the Troy (New York) \_Times\_, "is a realistic,

well-edited, instructive journal ... and its beautiful mechanical

execution renders its appearance very attractive." The Chicago

\_Workingman's Advocate\_ observed, "We have no doubt it will prove an

able ally of the labor reform movement." Nellie Hutchinson of the

Cincinnati \_Commercial\_, one of the few women journalists, described

sympathetically for her readers the neat comfortable \_Revolution\_

office and Susan with her "rare" but "genial smile," Susan, "the

determined--the invincible ... destined to be Vice-President or

Secretary of State...," adding, "The world is better for thee,

Susan."[211]

While new friends praised, old friends pleaded unsuccessfully with

Mrs. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury to free themselves from Susan's

harmful influence. William Lloyd Garrison wrote Susan of his regret

and astonishment that she and Mrs. Stanton had so taken leave of their

senses as to be infatuated with the Democratic party and to be

associated with that "crack-brained harlequin and semi-lunatic,"

George Francis Train. She published his letter in \_The Revolution\_

with an answer by Mrs. Stanton which not only pointed out how often

the Republicans had failed women but reminded Garrison how he had

welcomed into his antislavery ranks anyone and everyone who believed

in his ideas, "a motley crew it was." She recalled the label of

fanatic which had been attached to him, how he had been threatened and

pelted with rotten eggs for expressing his unpopular ideas and for

burning the Constitution which he declared sanctioned slavery. With

such a background, she told him, he should be able to recognize her

right and Susan's to judge all parties and all men on what they did

for woman suffrage.[212]

None of these arguments made any impression upon Garrison, or upon

Lucy Stone, whose bitter criticism and distrust of Susan's motives

wounded Susan deeply. Only a few of her old friends seemed able to

understand what she was trying to do, among them Martha C. Wright,

who, at first critical of her association with Train, now wrote of

\_The Revolution\_, "Its vigorous pages are what we need. Count on me

now and ever as your true and unswerving friend."[213]

[Illustration: Anna E. Dickinson]

Another bright spot was Susan's friendship with Anna E. Dickinson,

with whom she carried on a lively correspondence, scratching oft

hurried notes to her on the backs of old envelopes or any odd scraps

of paper that came to hand. Whenever Anna was in New York, she usually

burst into the \_Revolution\_ office, showered Susan with kisses, and

carried on such an animated conversation about her experiences that

the whole office force was spellbound, admiring at the same time her

stylish costume and jaunty velvet cap with its white feather, very

becoming on her short black curls.

Repeatedly Susan urged Anna to stay with her in her "plain quarters"

at 44 Bond Street or in her "nice hall bedroom" at 116 East

Twenty-third Street. That Anna could have risen out of the hardships

of her girlhood to such popularity as a lecturer and to such

financial success was to Susan like a fairy tale come true. Scarcely

past twenty, Anna not only had moved vast audiences to tears, but was

sought after by the Republicans as one of their most popular campaign

speakers and had addressed Congress with President Lincoln in

attendance. Susan had been sadly disappointed that Anna had not seen

her way clear to speak a strong word for women in the Kansas campaign,

but she hoped that this vivid talented young woman would prove to be

"the evangel" who would lead women "into the kingdom of political and

civil rights." It never occurred to her that she herself might even

now be that "evangel."[214]

\* \* \* \* \*

By this time Susan had been called on the carpet by some of the

officers of the American Equal Rights Association because she had used

the Association's office as a base for business connected with the

Train lecture tour and the establishment of \_The Revolution\_. She was

also accused of spending the funds of the Association for her own

projects and to advertise Train. Lucy Stone, Henry Blackwell, and

Stephen Foster were particularly suspicious of her. Her accounts were

checked and rechecked by them and found in good order. However, at the

annual meeting of the Association in May 1868, Henry Blackwell again

brought the matter up. Deeply hurt by his public accusation, she once

more carefully explained that because there had been no funds except

those which came out of her own pocket or had been raised by her, she

had felt free to spend them as she thought best. This obviously

satisfied the majority, many of whom expressed appreciation of her

year of hard work for the cause. She later wrote Thomas Wentworth

Higginson, "Even if not one old friend had seemed to have remembered

the past and it had been swallowed up, overshadowed by the Train

cloud, I should still have rejoiced that I have done the work--for no

\_human\_ prejudice or power can rob me of the joy, the compensation, I

have stored up therefrom. That it is wholly spiritual, I need but tell

you that this day, I have not two hundred dollars more than I had the

day I entered upon the public work of woman's rights and

antislavery."[215]

What troubled her most at these meetings was not the animosity

directed against her by Henry Blackwell and Lucy Stone, but the

assertion, made by Frederick Douglass and agreed to by all the men

present, that Negro suffrage was more urgent than woman suffrage. When

Lucy Stone came to the defense of woman suffrage in a speech whose

content and eloquence Susan thought surpassed that of "any other

mortal woman speaker," she was willing to forgive Lucy anything, and

wrote Thomas Wentworth Higginson, "I want you to \_know\_ that it is

impossible for me to lay a straw in the way of anyone who \_personally

wrongs me\_, if only that one will work nobly in the \_cause\_ in their

own way and time. They may try to hinder my success but I \_never\_

theirs."

Realizing that it would be futile for her to spend any more time

trying to persuade the American Equal Rights Association to help her

with her woman suffrage campaign, she now formed a small committee of

her own, headed by Elizabeth Cady Stanton. It included Elizabeth Smith

Miller, the liberal wealthy daughter of Gerrit Smith, Abby Hopper

Gibbons, the Quaker philanthropist and social worker; and Mary Cheney

Greeley, the wife of Horace Greeley, who, in spite of the fact that

her husband now opposed woman suffrage, continued to take her stand

for it. This committee, with \_The Revolution\_ as its mouthpiece, was

soon acting as a clearing house for woman suffrage organizations

throughout the country and called itself the Woman's Suffrage

Association of America.

To the national Republican convention in Chicago which nominated

General Grant for President, these women sent a carefully worded

memorial asking that the rights of women be recognized in the

reconstruction. It was ignored. Thereupon Susan turned to the

Democrats, attending with Mrs. Stanton a preconvention rally in New

York, addressed by Governor Horatio Seymour. Given seats of honor on

the platform, they attracted considerable attention and the New York

\_Sun\_ commented editorially that this honor conferred upon them by the

Democrats not only committed Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton to Governor

Seymour's views but also committed the Democrats to incorporate a

woman suffrage plank in their platform.

This was too much for some of the officers of the American Equal

Rights Association, whose executive committee now adopted a sarcastic

resolution proposing that Susan attend the national Democratic

convention and prove her confidence in the Democrats by securing a

plank in their platform.

Ignoring the unfriendly implications of this resolution and the

ridicule heaped upon her by the New York City papers, Susan made plans

to attend the Democratic convention, which for the first time since

the war was bringing northern and southern Democrats together for the

dedication of their new, imposing headquarters, Tammany Hall, and

which was also attracting many liberals who, disgusted by the

corruption of the Republicans, were looking for a "new departure" from

the Democrats. To the amazement of the delegates, Susan with Mrs.

Stanton and several other women walked into the convention when it was

well under way and sent a memorial up to Governor Seymour who was

presiding. He received it graciously, announcing that he held in his

hand a memorial of the women of the United States signed by Susan B.

Anthony, and then turned it over to the secretary to be read while the

audience shouted and cheered. The sonorous passages demanding the

enfranchisement of women rang out through and above the bedlam: "We

appeal to you because ... you have been the party heretofore to extend

the suffrage. It was the Democratic party that fought most valiantly

for the removal of the 'property qualification' from all white men and

thereby placed the poorest ditch digger on a political level with the

proudest millionaire.... And now you have an opportunity to confer a

similar boon on the women of the country and thus ... perpetuate your

political power for decades to come...."[216]

To hear these words read in a national political convention was to

Susan worth any ridicule she might be forced to endure. She was not

allowed to speak to the convention as she had requested, and shouts

and jeers continued as her memorial was hurriedly referred to the

Resolutions committee where it could be conveniently overlooked.

The Republican press reported the incident with sarcasm and animosity,

the \_Tribune\_ deeply wounding her: "Miss Susan B. Anthony has our

sincere pity. She has been an ardent suitor of democracy, and they

rejected her overtures yesterday with screams of laughter."[217]

The Democrats' nomination of Horatio Seymour and Frank Blair was as

reactionary and unpromising of a "new departure" as was the choice of

General Grant and Schuyler Colfax by the Republicans. Thereupon \_The

Revolution\_ called for a new party, a people's party which would be

sincerely devoted to the welfare of all the people. So strongly did

Susan feel about this that in one of her few signed editorials she

declared, "Both the great political parties pretending to save the

country are only endeavoring to save themselves.... In their hands

humanity has no hope.... The sooner their power is broken as parties

the better.... \_The Revolution\_ calls for construction, not

reconstruction.... Who will aid us in our grand enterprise of a

nation's salvation?"[218]

To "darling Anna" she wrote more specifically, "Both parties are owned

body and soul by the \_Gold Gamblers\_ of the Nation--and so far as the

honest working men and women of the country are concerned, it matters

very little which succeeds. Oh that the Gods would inspire men of

influence and money to move for a third party--universal suffrage and

anti-monopolist of land and gold."[219]
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WORK, WAGES, AND THE BALLOT

In her zeal to promote the welfare of all the people, Susan now turned

her attention to the workingwomen of New York, whose low wages, long

hours, and unhealthy working and living conditions had troubled her

for a long time. Women were being forced out of the home into the

factory by a changing and expanding economy, and at last were being

paid for their work. However, the women she met on the streets of New

York, hurrying to work at dawn and returning late at night, weary,

pale, and shabbily dressed, had none of the confidence of the

economically independent. They had merely exchanged one form of

slavery for another. She saw the ballot as their most powerful ally,

and as she told the factory girls of Cohoes, New York, they could

compel their employers to grant them a ten-hour day, equal opportunity

for advancement, and equal pay, the moment they held the ballot in

their hands.[220]

As yet labor unions were few and short-lived. The women tailors of New

York had formed a union as early as 1825, but it had not survived, and

later attempts to form women's unions had rarely been successful. A

few men's unions had weathered the years, but they had not enrolled

women, fearing their competition. Women were welcomed only by the

National Labor Union, established in Baltimore in 1866 for the purpose

of federating all unions.

When the National Labor Union Congress met in New York in September

1868, Susan saw an opportunity for women to take part, and in

preparation she called a group of workingwomen together in \_The

Revolution\_ office to form a Workingwomen's Association which she

hoped would eventually represent all of the trades. At this meeting,

the majority were from the printing trade, typesetters operating the

newly invented typesetting machines, press feeders, bookbinders, and

clerks, in whom she had become interested through her venture in

publishing. She wanted them to call their organization the

Workingwomen's Suffrage Association, but they refused, because they

feared the public's disapproval of woman suffrage and were convinced

they should not seek political rights until they had improved their

working conditions. She could not make them see that they were

putting the cart before the horse. They did, however, form

Workingwomen's Association No. 1, electing her their delegate to the

National Labor Congress.

Next she called a meeting of the women in the sewing trades, and with

the help of men from the National Labor Union, persuaded a hundred of

them to form Workingwomen's Association No. 2. Most of these women

were seamstresses making men's shirts, women's coats, vests, lace

collars, hoop skirts, corsets, fur garments, and straw hats, but also

represented were women from the umbrella, parasol, and paper collar

industry, metal burnishers, and saleswomen. Most of them were young

girls who worked from ten to fourteen hours a day, from six in the

morning until eight at night, and earned from $4 to $8 a week.

"You must not work for these starving prices any longer ...," Susan

told them. "Have a spirit of independence among you, 'a wholesome

discontent,' as Ralph Waldo Emerson has said, and you will get better

wages for yourselves. Get together and discuss, and meet again and

again.... I will come and talk to you...."[221] They elected Mrs. Mary

Kellogg Putnam to represent them at the National Labor Congress.

With Mrs. Putnam and Kate Mullaney, the able president of the Collar

Laundry Union of Troy, New York, with Mary A. MacDonald of the Women's

Protective Labor Union of Mt. Vernon, New York, and Mrs. Stanton,

representing the Woman's Suffrage Association of America, Susan

knocked at the door of the National Labor Congress. All were welcomed

but Mrs. Stanton, who represented a woman suffrage organization and

whose acceptance the rank and file feared might indicate to the public

that the Labor Congress endorsed votes for women.

The women had a friend in William H. Sylvis of the Iron Molders'

Union, who was the driving force behind the National Labor Congress,

and he made it clear at once that he welcomed Mrs. Stanton and

everyone else who believed in his cause. So strong, however, was the

opposition to woman suffrage among union men that eighteen threatened

to resign if Mrs. Stanton were admitted as a delegate. The debate

continued, giving Susan an opportunity to explain why the ballot was

important to workingwomen. "It is the power of the ballot," she

declared, "that makes men successful in their strikes."[222] She

recommended that both men and women be enrolled in unions, pointing

out that had this been done, women typesetters would not have replaced

men at lower wages in the recent strike of printers on the New York

\_World\_. Finally a resolution was adopted, making it clear that Mrs.

Stanton's acceptance in no way committed the National Labor Congress

to her "peculiar ideas" or to "Female Suffrage."

A committee on female labor was then appointed with Susan as one of

its members. At once she tried to show the committee how the vote

would help women in their struggle for higher wages. She had at hand a

perfect example in the unsuccessful strike of Kate Mullaney's strong,

well-organized union of 500 collar laundry workers in Troy, New York.

Aware that Kate blamed their defeat on the ruthless newspaper

campaign, inspired and paid for by employers, Susan asked her, "If you

had been 500 carpenters or 500 masons, do you not think you would have

succeeded?"[223]

"Certainly," Kate Mullaney replied, adding that the striking

bricklayers had won everything they demanded. Susan then reminded her

that because the bricklayers were voters, newspapers respected them

and would hesitate to arouse their displeasure, realizing that in the

next election they would need the votes of all union men for their

candidates. "If you collar women had been voters," she told them, "you

too would have held the balance of political power in that little city

of Troy."

Susan convinced the committee on female labor, and in their strong

report to the convention they urged women "to secure the ballot" as

well as "to learn the trades, engage in business, join labor unions or

form protective unions of their own, ... and use every other honorable

means to persuade or force employers to do justice to women by paying

them equal wages for equal work." These women also called upon the

National Labor Congress to aid the organization of women's unions, to

demand the eight-hour day for women as well as men, and to ask

Congress and state legislatures to pass laws providing equal pay for

women in government employ. The phrase, "to secure the ballot," was

quickly challenged by some of the men and had to be deleted before the

report was accepted; but this setback was as nothing to Susan in

comparison with the friends she had made for woman suffrage among

prominent labor leaders and with the fact that a woman, Kate Mullaney

of Troy, had been chosen assistant secretary of the National Labor

Union and its national organizer of women.[224]

The National Labor Union Congress won high praise in \_The Revolution\_

as laying the foundation of the new political party of America which

would be triumphant in 1872. "The producers, the working-men, the

women, the Negroes," \_The Revolution\_ declared, "are destined to form

a triple power that shall speedily wrest the sceptre of government

from the non-producers, the land monopolists, the bondholders, and the

politicians."[225]

\* \* \* \* \*

One of the most encouraging signs at this time was the friendliness of

the New York \_World\_, whose reporters covered the meetings of the

Workingwomen's Association with sympathy, arousing much local

interest. Reprinting these reports and supplementing them, \_The

Revolution\_ carried their import farther afield, bringing to the

attention of many the wisdom and justice of equal pay for equal work,

and the need to organize workingwomen and to provide training and

trade schools for them. \_The Revolution\_ continually spurred women on

to improve themselves, to learn new skills, and actually to do equal

work if they expected equal pay.

When reports reached Susan that women in the printing trade were

afraid of manual labor, of getting their hands and fingers dirty, and

of lifting heavy galleys, she quickly let them know that she had no

patience with this. "Those who stay at home," she told them, "have to

wash kettles and lift wash tubs and black stoves until their hands are

blackened and hardened. In this spirit, you must go to work on your

cases of type. Are these cases heavier than a wash tub filled with

water and clothes, or the old cheese tubs?... The trouble is either

that girls are not educated to have physical strength or else they do

not like to use it. If a union of women is to succeed, it must be

composed of strength, nerve, courage, and persistence, with no fear of

dirtying their white fingers, but with a determination that when they

go into an office they would go through all that was required of them

and demand just as high wages as the men....

"Make up your mind," she continued, "to take the 'lean' with the

'fat,' and be early and late at the case precisely as the men are. I

do not demand equal pay for any women save those who do equal work in

value. Scorn to be coddled by your employers; make them understand

that you are in their service as workers, not as women."[226]

Workingwomen's associations now existed in Boston, St. Louis, Chicago,

San Francisco and other cities, encouraged and aroused by the efforts

at organization in New York. These associations occasionally exchanged

ideas, and news of all of them was published in \_The Revolution\_. The

groups in Boston and in the outlying textile mills were particularly

active, and Susan brought to her next suffrage convention in

Washington in 1870 Jennie Collins of Lowell who was ably leading a

strike against a cut in wages. The newspapers, too, began to notice

workingwomen, publishing articles about their working and living

conditions.

Trying to amalgamate the various groups in New York, Susan now formed

a Workingwomen's Central Association, of which she was elected

president. To its meetings she brought interesting speakers and

practical reports on wages, hours, and working conditions. She herself

picked up a great deal of useful information in her daily round as she

talked with this one and that one. On her walks to and from work, in

all kinds of weather, she met poorly clad women carrying sacks and

baskets in which they collected rags, scraps of paper, bones, old

shoes, and anything worth rescuing from "garbage boxes." With

friendliness and good cheer, she greeted these ragpickers, sometimes

stopping to talk with them about their work, and through her interest

brought several into the Workingwomen's Association. Looking forward

to surveys on all women's occupations, she started out by appointing a

committee to investigate the ragpickers, many of whom lived in

tumbledown slab shanties on the rocky land which is now a part of

Central Park.

This investigation revealed that more than half of the 1200 ragpickers

were women and that it was the one occupation in which women had equal

opportunity with men and received equal compensation for their day's

work. Average earnings ranged from forty cents a day to ten dollars a

week. The report, highly sentimental in the light of today's

scientific approach, was a promising beginning, a survey made by women

themselves in their own interest--the forerunner of the reports of the

Labor Department's Women's Bureau.

Cooperatives appealed to Susan as they did to many labor leaders as

the best means of freeing labor. When the Sewing Machine Operators

Union tried to establish a shop where their members could share the

profits of their labor, she did her best to help them, hoping to see

them gain economic independence in a light airy clean shop where

wealthy women, eager to help their sisters, would patronize them.

However, the wealthy women to whom she appealed to finance this

project did not respond, looking upon a cooperative as a first step

toward socialism and a threat to their own profits. She was able,

however, to arouse a glimmer of interest among the members of the

newly formed literary club, Sorosis, in the problems of working women.

She had the satisfaction of seeing women typesetters form their own

union in 1869, and this was, according to the Albany \_Daily

Knickerbocker\_, "the first move of the kind ever made in the country

by any class of labor, to place woman on a par with man as regards

standing, intelligence, and manual ability."[227] \_The Revolution\_

encouraged this union by printing notices of its meetings and urging

all women compositors to join. In signed articles, Susan pointed out

how wages had improved since the union was organized. "A little more

Union, girls," she said, "and soon all employers will come up to 45

cents, the price paid men.... So join the Union, girls, and together

say \_Equal Pay for Equal Work\_."[228]

Eager to bring more women into the printing trade where wages were

higher, she tried in every possible way to establish trade schools for

them. She looked forward to a printing business run entirely by women,

giving employment to hundreds. So obsessed was she by the idea of a

trade school for women compositors that when printers in New York went

on a strike, she saw an opportunity for women to take their places and

appealed by letter and in person to a group of employers "to

contribute liberally for the purpose of enabling us to establish a

training school for girls in the art of typesetting." Explaining that

hundreds of young women, now stitching at starvation wages, were ready

and eager to learn the trade, she added, "Give us the means and we

will soon give you competent women compositors."[229] Having learned

by experience that men always kept women out of their field of labor

unless forced by circumstances to admit them, she also urged young

women to take the places of striking typesetters at whatever wage

they could get.

It never occurred to her in her eagerness to bring women into a new

occupation that she might be breaking the strike. She saw only women's

opportunity to prove to employers that they were able to do the work

and to show the Typographical Union that they should admit women as

members. Labor men, however, soon let her know how much they

disapproved of her strategy. She tried to explain her motives to them,

that she was trying to fit these women to earn equal wages with men.

She reminded these men of how hard it was for women to get into the

printing trade and how they had refused to admit women to their union;

and she called their attention to her whole-hearted support of the

lately formed Women's Typographical Union.

Some of the men were never convinced and never forgot this misstep,

bringing it up at the National Labor Union Congress in Philadelphia in

1869, which Susan attended as a delegate of the New York

Workingwomen's Association. Here she found herself facing an

unfriendly group without the support of William H. Sylvis, who had

recently died. For three days they debated her eligibility as a

delegate, first expressing fear that her admission would commit the

Labor Congress to woman suffrage. When she won 55 votes against 52 in

opposition, Typographical Union No. 6 of New York brought accusations

against her which aroused suspicion in the minds of many union

members. They pointed out that she belonged to no union, and they

called her an enemy of labor because she had encouraged women to take

men's jobs during the printers' strike. They could not or would not

understand that in urging women to take men's jobs, she had been

fighting for women just as they fought for their union, and they

completely overlooked how continuously and effectively she had

supported the Women's Typographical Union. Her \_Revolution\_, they

claimed, was printed at less than union rates in a "rat office" and

her explanation was not satisfactory. That it was printed on contract

outside her office was no answer to satisfy union men who could not

realize on what a scant margin her paper operated or how gladly she

would have set up a union shop had the funds been available.

Not only were these accusations repeated again and again, they were

also carried far and wide by the press, with the result that Susan was

not only kept out of the Labor Congress but was even sharply

criticized by some members of her Workingwomen's Association.

"As to the charges which were made by Typographical Union No. 6," she

reported to this Association, "no one believes them; and I don't think

they are worth answering. I admit that this Workingwomen's Association

is not a \_trade\_ organization; and while I join heart and hand with

the working people in their trades unions, and in everything else by

which they can protect themselves against the oppression of

capitalists and employers, I say that this organization of ours is

more upon the broad platform of philosophizing on the general

questions of labor, and to discuss what can be done to ameliorate the

condition of working people generally."[230]

She was not without friends in the ranks of labor, however, the New

England delegates giving her their support. The New York \_World\_, very

fair in its coverage of the heated debates, declared, "Of her devotion

to the cause of workingwomen, there can be no question."[231]

\* \* \* \* \*

The activities of the Workingwomen's Association had by this time

begun to irk employers, and some of them threatened instant dismissal

of any employee who reported her wages or hours to these meddling

women. Fear of losing their jobs now hung over many while others were

forbidden by their fathers, husbands, and brothers to have anything to

do with strong-minded Susan B. Anthony.

To counteract this disintegrating influence and to bring all classes

of women together in their fight for equal rights, Susan persuaded the

popular lecturer, Anna E. Dickinson, to speak for the Workingwomen's

Association at Cooper Union. This, however, only added fuel to the

flames, for Anna, in an emotional speech, "A Struggle for Life," told

the tragic story of Hester Vaughn, a workingwoman who had been accused

of murdering her illegitimate child. Found in a critical condition

with her dead baby beside her, Hester Vaughn had been charged with

infanticide, tried without proper defense, and convicted by a

prejudiced court, although there was no proof that she had

deliberately killed her child. At Susan's instigation, the

Workingwomen's Association sent a woman physician, Dr. Clemence

Lozier, and the well-known author, Eleanor Kirk, to Philadelphia to

investigate the case. Both were convinced of Hester Vaughn's

innocence.

With the aid of Elizabeth Cady Stanton's courageous editorials in \_The

Revolution\_, Susan made such an issue of the conviction of Hester

Vaughn that many newspapers accused her of obstructing justice and

advocating free love, and this provided a moral weapon for her critics

to use in their fight against the growing independence of women.

Eventually her efforts and those of her colleagues won a pardon for

Hester Vaughn. At the same time the publicity given this case served

to educate women on a subject heretofore taboo, showing them that

poverty and a double standard of morals made victims of young women

like Hester Vaughn. Susan also made use of this case to point out the

need for women jurors to insure an unprejudiced trial. She even

suggested that Columbia University Law School open its doors to women

so that a few of them might be able to understand their rights under

the law and bring aid to their less fortunate sisters.

\* \* \* \* \*

Under Susan's guidance, the Workingwomen's Association continued to

hold meetings as long as she remained in New York. In its limited way,

it carried on much-needed educational work, building up self-respect

and confidence among workingwomen, stirring up "a wholesome

discontent," and preparing the way for women's unions. The public

responded. At Cooper Union, telegraphy courses were opened to women;

the New York Business School, at Susan's instigation, offered young

women scholarships in bookkeeping; and there were repeated requests

for the enrollment of women in the College of New York.

Living in the heart of this rapidly growing, sprawling city, Susan saw

much to distress her and pondered over the disturbing social

conditions, looking for a way to relieve poverty and wipe out crime

and corruption. She saw luxury, extravagance, and success for the few,

while half of the population lived in the slums in dilapidated houses

and in damp cellars, often four or five to a room. Immigrants,

continually pouring in from Europe, overtaxed the already inadequate

housing, and unfamiliar with our language and customs, were the easy

prey of corrupt politicians. Many were homeless, sleeping in the

streets and parks until the rain or cold drove them into police

stations for warmth and shelter. Susan longed to bring order and

cleanliness, good homes and good government to this overcrowded city,

and again and again she came to the conclusion that votes for women,

which meant a voice in the government, would be the most potent factor

for reform.

Yet she did not close her mind to other avenues of reform. Seeing

reflected in the life of the city the excesses, the injustice, and the

unsoundness of laissez-faire capitalism, she spoke out fearlessly in

\_The Revolution\_ against its abuses, such as the fortunes made out of

the low wages and long hours of labor, or the Wall Street speculation

to corner the gold market, or the efforts to take over the public

lands of the West through grants to the transcontinental railroads.

Her active mind also sought a solution of the complicated currency

problem. In fact there was no public question which she hesitated to

approach, to think out or attempt to solve. She did not keep her

struggle for woman suffrage aloof from the pressing problems of the

day. Instead she kept it abreast of the times, keenly alive to social,

political, and economic issues, and involved in current public

affairs.
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THE INADEQUATE FIFTEENTH AMENDMENT

The Fourteenth Amendment had been ratified in July 1868, but

Republicans found it inadequate because it did not specifically

enfranchise Negroes. More than ever convinced that they needed the

Negro vote in order to continue in power, they prepared to supplement

it by a Fifteenth Amendment, which Susan hoped would be drafted to

enfranchise women as well as Negroes. Immediately through her Woman's

Suffrage Association of America, she petitioned Congress to make no

distinction between men and women in any amendment extending or

regulating suffrage.

She and Elizabeth Stanton also persuaded their good friends, Senator

Pomeroy of Kansas and Congressman Julian of Indiana, to introduce in

December 1868 resolutions providing that suffrage be based on

citizenship, be regulated by Congress, and that all citizens, native

or naturalized, enjoy this right without distinction of race, color,

or sex. Before the end of the month, Senator Wilson of Massachusetts

and Congressman Julian had introduced other resolutions to enfranchise

women in the District of Columbia and in the territories. Even the New

York \_Herald\_ could see no reason why "the experiment" of woman

suffrage should not be tried in the District of Columbia.[232]

To focus attention on woman suffrage at this crucial time, Susan, in

January 1869, called together the first woman suffrage convention ever

held in Washington. No only did it attract women from as far west as

Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, but Senator Pomeroy lent it importance

by his opening speech, and through the detailed and respectful

reporting of the New York \_World\_ and of Grace Greenwood of the

Philadelphia \_Press\_ it received nationwide notice.

Congress, however, gave little heed to women's demands. "The

experiment" of woman suffrage in the District of Columbia was not

tried and nothing came of the resolutions for universal suffrage

introduced by Pomeroy, Julian, and Wilson. In spite of all Susan's

efforts to have the word "sex" added to the Fifteenth Amendment, she

soon faced the bitter disappointment of seeing a version ignoring

women submitted to the states for ratification: "The right of citizens

of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the

United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous

condition of servitude."

The blatant omission of the word "sex" forced Susan and Mrs. Stanton

to initiate an amendment of their own, a Sixteenth Amendment, and

again Congressman Julian came to their aid, although he too regarded

Negro suffrage as more "immediately important and absorbing"[233] than

suffrage for women. On March 15, 1869, at one of the first sessions of

the newly elected Congress, he introduced an amendment to the

Constitution, providing that the right of suffrage be based on

citizenship without any distinction or discrimination because of sex.

This was the first federal woman suffrage amendment ever proposed in

Congress.

Opportunity to campaign for this amendment was now offered Susan and

Elizabeth Stanton as they addressed a series of conventions in Ohio,

Illinois, Wisconsin, and Missouri. Press notices were good, a

Milwaukee paper describing Susan as "an earnest enthusiastic, fiery

woman--ready, apt, witty and what a politician would call sharp ...

radical in the strongest sense," making "radical everything she

touches."[234] She found woman suffrage sentiment growing by leaps and

bounds in the West and western men ready to support a federal woman

suffrage amendment.

\* \* \* \* \*

With a lighter heart than she had had in many a day and with new

subscriptions to \_The Revolution\_, Susan returned to New York. She

moved the \_Revolution\_ office to the first floor of the Women's

Bureau, a large four-story brownstone house at 49 East Twenty-third

Street, near Fifth Avenue, which had been purchased by a wealthy New

Yorker, Mrs. Elizabeth Phelps, who looked forward to establishing a

center where women's organizations could meet and where any woman

interested in the advancement of her sex would find encouragement and

inspiration. Susan's hopes were high for the Women's Bureau, and in

this most respectable, fashionable, and even elegant setting, she

expected her \_Revolution\_, in spite of its inflammable name, to live

down its turbulent past and win new friends and subscribers.[235]

She made one last effort to resuscitate the American Equal Rights

Association, writing personal letters to old friends, urging that past

differences be forgotten and that all rededicate themselves to

establishing universal suffrage by means of the Sixteenth Amendment.

She was optimistic as she prepared for a convention in New York,

particularly as one obstacle to unity had been removed. George Francis

Train had voluntarily severed all connections with \_The Revolution\_ to

devote himself to freeing Ireland. She soon found, however, that the

misunderstandings between her and her old antislavery friends were far

deeper than George Francis Train, although he would for a long time be

blamed for them. The Fifteenth Amendment was still a bone of

contention and \_The Revolution's\_ continued editorials against it

widened the breach.

The fireworks were set off in the convention of the American Equal

Rights Association by Stephen S. Foster, who objected to the

nomination of Susan and Mrs. Stanton as officers of the Association

because they had in his opinion repudiated its principles. When asked

to explain further, he replied that not only had they published a

paper advocating educated suffrage while the Association stood for

universal suffrage but they had shown themselves unfit by

collaboration with George Francis Train who ridiculed Negroes and

opposed their enfranchisement.

Trying to pour oil on the troubled waters, Mary Livermore, the popular

new delegate from Chicago, asked whether it was quite fair to bring up

George Francis Train when he had retired from \_The Revolution\_.

To this Stephen Foster sternly replied, "If \_The Revolution\_ which has

so often endorsed George Francis Train will repudiate him because of

his course in respect to the Negro's rights, I have nothing further to

say. But they do not repudiate him. He goes out; but they do not cast

him out."[236]

"Of course we do not," Susan instantly protested.

Mr. Foster then objected to the way Susan had spent the funds of the

Association, accusing her of failing to keep adequate accounts.

This she emphatically denied, explaining that she had presented a full

accounting to the trust fund committee, that it had been audited, and

she had been voted $1,000 to repay her for the amount she had

personally advanced for the work.

Unwilling to accept her explanation and calling it unreliable, he

continued his complaints until interrupted by Henry Blackwell who

corroborated Susan's statement, adding that she had refused the $1,000

due her because of the dissatisfaction expressed over her management.

Declaring himself completely satisfied with the settlement and

confident of the purity of Susan's motives even if some of her

expenditures were unwise, Henry Blackwell continued, "I will agree

that many unwise things have been written in \_The Revolution\_ by a

gentleman who furnished part of the means by which the paper has been

carried on. But that gentleman has withdrawn, and you, who know the

real opinions of Miss Anthony and Mrs. Stanton on the question of

Negro suffrage, do not believe that they mean to create antagonism

between the Negro and woman question...."

To Susan's great relief Henry Blackwell's explanation satisfied the

delegates, who gave her and Mrs. Stanton a vote of confidence. Not so

easily healed, however, were the wounds left by the accusations of

mismanagement and dishonesty.

The atmosphere was still tense, for differences of opinion on policy

remained. Most of the old reliable workers stood unequivocally for the

Fifteenth Amendment, which they regarded as the crowning achievement

of the antislavery movement, and they heartily disapproved of forcing

the issue of woman suffrage on Congress and the people at this time.

Although they had been deeply moved by the suffering of Negro women

under slavery and had used this as a telling argument for

emancipation, they now gave no thought to Negro women, who, even more

than Negro men, needed the vote to safeguard their rights. Believing

with the Republicans that one reform at a time was all they could

expect, they did not want to hear one word about woman suffrage or a

Sixteenth Amendment until male Negroes were safely enfranchised by the

Fifteenth Amendment.

Offering a resolution endorsing the Fifteenth Amendment, Frederick

Douglass quoted Julia Ward Howe as saying, "I am willing that the

Negro shall get the ballot before me," and he added, "I cannot see how

anyone can pretend that there is the same urgency in giving the ballot

to women as to the Negro."

Quick as a flash, Susan was on her feet, challenging his statements,

and as the dauntless champion of women debated the question with the

dark-skinned fiery Negro, the friendship and warm affection built up

between them over the years occasionally shone through the sharp words

they spoke to each other.

"The old antislavery school says that women must stand back," declared

Susan, "that they must wait until male Negroes are voters. But we say,

if you will not give the whole loaf of justice to an entire people,

give it to the most intelligent first."

Here she was greeted with applause and continued, "If intelligence,

justice, and morality are to be placed in the government, then let the

question of woman be brought up first and that of the Negro last....

Mr. Douglass talks about the wrongs of the Negro, how he is hunted

down ..., but with all the wrongs and outrages that he today suffers,

he would not exchange his sex and take the place of Elizabeth Cady

Stanton."

"I want to know," shouted Frederick Douglass, "if granting you the

right of suffrage will change the nature of our sexes?"

"It will change the pecuniary position of woman," Susan retorted

before the shouts of laughter had died down. "She will not be

compelled to take hold of only such employments as man chooses for

her."

Lucy Stone, who so often in her youth had pleaded with Susan and

Frederick Douglass for both the Negro and women, now entered the

argument. She had matured, but her voice had lost none of its

conviction or its power to sway an audience. Disagreeing with

Douglass's assertion that Negro suffrage was more urgent than woman

suffrage, she pointed out that white women of the North were robbed of

their children by the law just as Negro women had been by slavery.

This was balm to Susan's soul, but with Lucy's next words she lost all

hope that her old friend would cast her lot wholeheartedly with women

at this time. "Woman has an ocean of wrongs too deep for any plummet,"

Lucy continued, "and the Negro too has an ocean of wrongs that cannot

be fathomed. But I thank God for the Fifteenth Amendment, and hope

that it will be adopted in every state. I will be thankful in my soul

if anybody can get out of the terrible pit....

"I believe," she admitted, "that the national safety of the government

would be more promoted by the admission of women as an element of

restoration and harmony than the other. I believe that the influence

of woman will save the country before every other influence. I see the

signs of the times pointing to this consummation. I believe that in

some parts of the country women will vote for the President of these

United States in 1872."

Susan grew impatient as Lucy shifted from one side to the other,

straddling the issue. Her own clear-cut approach, earning for her the

reputation of always hitting the nail on the head, made Lucy's seem

like temporizing.

The men now took control, criticizing the amount of time given to the

discussion of woman's rights, and voted endorsement of the Fifteenth

Amendment. Nevertheless, a small group of determined women continued

their fight, Susan declaring with spirit that she protested against

the Fifteenth Amendment because it was not Equal Rights and would put

2,000,000 more men in the position of tyrants over 2,000,000 women who

until now had been the equals of the Negro men at their side.[237]

\* \* \* \* \*

It was now clear to Susan and to the few women who worked closely with

her that they needed a strong organization of their own and that it

was folly to waste more time on the Equal Rights Association. Western

delegates, disappointed in the convention's lack of interest in woman

suffrage, expressed themselves freely. They had been sorely tried by

the many speeches on extraneous subjects which cluttered the meetings,

the heritage of a free-speech policy handed down by antislavery

societies.

"That Equal Rights Association is an awful humbug," exploded Mary

Livermore to Susan. "I would not have come on to the anniversary, nor

would any of us, if we had known what it was. We supposed we were

coming to a woman suffrage convention."[238]

At a reception for all the delegates held at the Women's Bureau at the

close of the convention, this dissatisfaction culminated in a

spontaneous demand for a new organization which would concentrate on

woman suffrage and the Sixteenth Amendment. Alert to the

possibilities, Susan directed this demand into concrete action by

turning the reception temporarily into a business meeting. The result

was the formation of the National Woman Suffrage Association by women

from nineteen states, with Mrs. Stanton as president and Susan as a

member of the executive committee. The younger women of the West,

trusting the judgment of Susan and Mrs. Stanton, looked to them for

leadership, as did a few of the old workers in the East--Ernestine

Rose, always in the vanguard, Paulina Wright Davis, Elizabeth Smith

Miller, Lucretia Mott, who although holding no office in the new

organization gave it her support, Martha C. Wright, and Matilda Joslyn

Gage who never wavered in her allegiance. Lucy Stone, who would have

found it hard even to step into the \_Revolution\_ office, did not

attend the reception at the Women's Bureau or take part in the

formation of the new woman suffrage organization.

[Illustration: Paulina Wright Davis]

Aided and abetted by her new National Woman Suffrage Association,

Susan continued her opposition in \_The Revolution\_ to the Fifteenth

Amendment until it was ratified in 1870.

So incensed was the Boston group by \_The Revolution's\_ opposition to

the Fifteenth Amendment, so displeased was Lucy Stone by the formation

of the National Woman Suffrage Association without consultation with

her, one of the oldest workers in the field, that they began to talk

of forming a national woman suffrage organization of their own. They

charged Susan with lust for power and autocratic control. Mrs. Stanton

they found equally objectionable because of her radical views on sex,

marriage, and divorce, expressed in \_The Revolution\_ in connection

with the Hester Vaughn case. They sincerely felt that the course of

woman suffrage would run more smoothly, arouse less antagonism, and

make more progress without these two militants who were forever

stirring things up and introducing extraneous subjects.

\* \* \* \* \*

During these trying days of accusations, animosity, and rival

factions, Mrs. Stanton's unwavering support was a great comfort to

Susan as was the joy of having a paper to carry her message.

In addition to all the responsibilities connected with publishing her

weekly paper, advertising, subscriptions, editorial policy, and

raising the money to pay the bills, Susan was also holding successful

conventions in Saratoga and Newport where men and women of wealth and

influence gathered for the summer; she was traveling out to St. Louis,

Chicago, and other western cities to speak on woman suffrage, making

trips to Washington to confer with Congressmen, getting petitions for

the Sixteenth Amendment circulated, and through all this, building up

the National Woman Suffrage Association.

The \_Revolution\_ office became the rallying point for a

forward-looking group of women, many of whom contributed to the

hard-hitting liberal sheet. Elizabeth Tilton, the lovely dark-haired

young wife of the popular lecturer and editor of the \_Independent\_,

selected the poetry. Alice and Phoebe Cary gladly offered poems and a

novel; and when Susan was away, Phoebe Cary often helped Mrs. Stanton

get out the paper. Elizabeth Smith Miller gave money, encouragement,

and invaluable aid with her translations of interesting letters which

\_The Revolution\_ received from France and Germany. Laura Curtis

Bullard, the heir to the Dr. Winslow-Soothing-Syrup fortune, who

traveled widely in Europe, sent letters from abroad and took a lively

interest in the paper. Another new recruit was Lillie Devereux Blake,

who was gaining a reputation as a writer and who soon proved to be a

brilliant orator and an invaluable worker in the New York City

suffrage group. Dr. Clemence S. Lozier, unfailingly gave her support,

and her calm assurance strengthened Susan. The wealthy Paulina Wright

Davis of Providence, Rhode Island, who followed Parker Pillsbury as

editor, when he felt obliged to resign for financial reasons, gave the

paper generous financial backing.

[Illustration: Isabella Beecher Hooker]

It was Mrs. Davis who brought into the fold the half sister of Henry

Ward Beecher, Isabella Beecher Hooker, a queenly woman, one of the

elect of Hartford, Connecticut. Hoping to break down Mrs. Hooker's

prejudice against Susan and Mrs. Stanton, which had been built up by

New England suffragists, Mrs. Davis invited the three women to spend a

few days with her. After this visit, Mrs. Hooker wrote to a friend in

Boston, "I have studied Miss Anthony day and night for nearly a

week.... She is a woman of incorruptible integrity and the thought of

guile has no place in her heart. In unselfishness and benevolence she

has scarcely an equal, and her energy and executive ability are

bounded only by her physical power, which is something immense.

Sometimes she fails in judgment, according to the standards of

others, but in right intentions never, nor in faithfulness to her

friends.... After attending a two days' convention in Newport,

engineered by her in her own fashion, I am obliged to accept the most

favorable interpretation of her which prevails generally, rather than

that of Boston. Mrs. Stanton too is a magnificent woman.... I hand in

my allegiance to both as leaders and representatives of the great

movement."[239]

From then on, Mrs. Hooker did her best to reconcile the Boston and New

York factions, hoping to avert the formation of a second national

woman suffrage organization.
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A HOUSE DIVIDED

"I think we need two national associations for woman suffrage so that

those who do not oppose the Fifteenth Amendment, nor take the tone of

\_The Revolution\_ may yet have an organization with which they can work

in harmony."[240] So wrote Lucy Stone to many of her friends during

the summer of 1869, and some of these letters fell into Susan's hands.

"The radical abolitionists and the Republicans could never have worked

together but in separate organizations both did good service," Lucy

further explained. "There are just as distinctly two parties to the

woman movement.... Each organization will attract those who naturally

belong to it--and there will be harmonious work."

When the ground had been prepared by these letters, Lucy asked old

friends and new to sign a call to a woman suffrage convention, to be

held in Cleveland, Ohio, in November 1869, "to unite those who cannot

use the methods which Mrs. Stanton and Susan use...."[241]

Those feeling as she did eagerly signed the call, while others who

knew little about the controversy in the East added their names

because they were glad to take part in a convention sponsored by such

prominent men and women as Julia Ward Howe, George William Curtis,

Henry Ward Beecher, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, and William Lloyd

Garrison. Still others who did not understand the insurmountable

differences in temperament and policy between the two groups hoped

that a new truly national organization would unite the two factions.

Even Mary Livermore, who had been active in the formation of the

National Woman Suffrage Association, was by this time responding to

overtures from the Boston group, writing William Lloyd Garrison, "I

have been repelled by some of the idiosyncrasies of our New York

friends, as have others. Their opposition to the Fifteenth Amendment,

the buffoonery of George F. Train, the loose utterances of the

\_Revolution\_ on the marriage and dress questions--and what is equally

potent hindrance to the cause, the fearful squandering of money at

the New York headquarters--all this has tended to keep me on my own

feet, apart from those to whom I was at first attracted.... I am glad

at the prospect of an association that will be truly national and

which promises so much of success and character."[242]

Neither Susan nor Mrs. Stanton received a notice of the Cleveland

convention, but Susan, scanning a copy of the call sent her by a

solicitous friend, was deeply disturbed when she saw the signatures of

Lydia Mott, Amelia Bloomer, Myra Bradwell, Gerrit Smith, and other

good friends.

The New York \_World\_, at once suspecting a feud, asked, "Where are

those well-known American names, Susan B. Anthony, Parker Pillsbury,

and Elizabeth Cady Stanton? It is clear that there is a division in

the ranks of the strong-minded and that an effort is being made to

ostracize \_The Revolution\_ which has so long upheld the cause of

Suffrage, through evil report and good...."[243]

The Rochester \_Democrat\_, loyal to Susan, put this question, "Can it

be possible that a National Woman's Suffrage Convention is called

without Susan's knowledge or consent?... A National Woman's Suffrage

Association without speeches from Susan B. Anthony and Mrs. Stanton

will be a new order of things. The idea seems absurd."[244]

To Susan it also seemed both absurd and unrealistic, for she

remembered how almost single-handed she had held together and built up

the woman suffrage movement during the years when her colleagues had

been busy with family duties. She was appalled at the prospect of a

division in the ranks at this time when she believed victory possible

through the action of a strong united front.

Confident that many who signed the call were ignorant of or blind to

the animus behind it, she did her best to bring the facts before them.

She put the blame for the rift entirely upon Lucy Stone, believing

that without Lucy's continual stirring up, past differences in policy

would soon have been forgotten. The antagonism between the two burned

fiercely at this time. Susan was determined to fight to the last ditch

for control of the movement, convinced that her policies and Mrs.

Stanton's were forward-looking, unafraid, and always put women first.

Susan now also had to face the humiliating possibility that she might

be forced to give up \_The Revolution\_. Not only was the operating

deficit piling up alarmingly, but there were persistent rumors of a

competitor, another woman suffrage paper to be edited by Lucy Stone

and Julia Ward Howe.

Susan had assumed full financial responsibility for \_The Revolution\_

because Mrs. Stanton and Parker Pillsbury, both with families to

consider, felt unable to share this burden. Mrs. Stanton had always

contributed her services and Parker Pillsbury had been sadly

underpaid, while Susan had drawn out for her salary only the most

meager sums for bare living expenses.

With a maximum of 3,000 subscribers, the paper could not hope to pay

its way even though she had secured a remarkably loyal group of

advertisers.[245] Reluctantly she raised the subscription price from

$2 to $3 a year. Her friends and family were generous with gifts and

loans, but these only met the pressing needs of the moment and in no

way solved the overall financial problem of the paper.

Appealing once again to her wealthy and generous Quaker cousin, Anson

Lapham, she wrote him in desperation, "My paper must not, shall not go

down. I am sure you believe in me, in my honesty of purpose, and also

in the grand work which \_The Revolution\_ seeks to do, and therefore

you will not allow me to ask you in vain to come to the rescue.

Yesterday's mail brought 43 subscribers from Illinois and 20 from

California. We only need time to win financial success. I know you

will save me from giving the world a chance to say, 'There is a

woman's rights failure; even the best of women can't manage business!'

If only I could die, and thereby fail honorably, I would say, 'Amen,'

but to live and fail--it would be too terrible to bear."[246] He came

to her aid as he always had in the past.

Susan's sister Mary not only lent her all her savings, but spent her

summer vacation in New York in 1869, working in \_The Revolution\_

office while Susan, busy with woman suffrage conventions in Newport,

Saratoga, Chicago, and Ohio, was building up good will and

subscriptions for her paper. Concerned for her welfare, Mary

repeatedly but unsuccessfully urged her to give up. Daniel added his

entreaties to Mary's, begging Susan not to go further into debt, but

to form a stock company if she were determined to continue her paper.

She considered his advice very seriously for he was a practical

businessman and yet appreciated what she was trying to do. For a time

the formation of a stock company seemed possible, for the project

appealed to three women of means, Paulina Wright Davis, Isabella

Beecher Hooker, and Laura Curtis Bullard, but it never materialized.

\* \* \* \* \*

With the financial problem of \_The Revolution\_ still unsolved, Susan

decided to make her appearance at Lucy Stone's convention in

Cleveland, Ohio, on November 24, 1869. Not only did she want to see

with her own eyes and hear with her own ears all that went on, but she

was determined to walk the second mile with Lucy and her supporters,

or even to turn the other cheek, if need be, for the sake of her

beloved cause.

Seeing her in the audience, Judge Bradwell of Chicago moved that she

be invited to sit on the platform, but Thomas Wentworth Higginson, who

was presiding, replied that he thought this unnecessary as a special

invitation had already been extended to all desiring to identify

themselves with the movement. Judge Bradwell would not be put off, his

motion was carried, and as Susan walked up to the platform to join the

other notables, she was greeted with hearty applause. Sitting there

among her critics, she wondered what she could possibly say to

persuade them to forget their differences for the sake of the cause.

After listening to Lucy Stone plead for renewed work for woman

suffrage and for petitions for a Sixteenth Amendment, she

spontaneously rose to her feet and asked permission to speak. "I

hope," she began, "that the work of this association, if it be

organized, will be to go in strong array up to the Capitol at

Washington to demand a Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution. The

question of the admission of women to the ballot would not then be

left to the mass of voters in every State, but would be submitted by

Congress to the several legislatures of the States for ratification,

and ... be decided by the most intelligent portion of the people. If

the question is left to the vote of the rank and file, it will be put

off for years.[247]

"So help me, Heaven!" she continued with emotion. "I care not what may

come out of this Convention, so that this great cause shall go

forward to its consummation! And though this Convention by its action

shall nullify the National Association of which I am a member, and

though it shall tread its heel upon \_The Revolution\_, to carry on

which I have struggled as never mortal woman or mortal man struggled

for any cause ... still, if you will do the work in Washington so that

this Amendment will be proposed, and will go with me to the several

Legislatures and \_compel\_ them to adopt it, I will thank God for this

Convention as long as I have the breath of life."

Loud and continuous applause greeted these earnest words. However,

instead of pledging themselves to work for a Sixteenth Amendment, the

newly formed American Woman Suffrage Association, blind to the

exceptional opportunity at this time for Congressional action on woman

suffrage, decided to concentrate on work in the states where suffrage

bills were pending. Instead of electing an outstanding woman as

president, they chose Henry Ward Beecher, boasting that this was proof

of their genuine belief in equal rights. Lucy Stone headed the

executive committee.

Divisions soon began developing among the suffragists in the field.

Many whose one thought previously had been the cause now spent time

weighing the differences between the two organizations and between

personalities, and antagonisms increased.

Hardest of all for Susan to bear was the definite announcement of a

rival paper, the \_Woman's Journal\_, to be issued in Boston in January

1870 under the editorship of Lucy Stone, Mary A. Livermore, and Julia

Ward Howe, with Henry Blackwell as business manager. Mary Livermore,

who previously had planned to merge her paper, the \_Agitator\_, with

\_The Revolution\_ now merged it with the \_Woman's Journal\_. Financed by

wealthy stockholders, all influential Republicans, the \_Journal\_,

Susan knew, would be spared the financial struggles of \_The

Revolution\_, but would be obliged to conform to Republican policy in

its support of woman's rights. Had not the \_Woman's Journal\_ been such

an obvious affront to the heroic efforts of \_The Revolution\_ and a

threat to its very existence, she could have rejoiced with Lucy over

one more paper carrying the message of woman suffrage.

More determined than ever to continue \_The Revolution\_, Susan

redoubled her efforts, announcing an imposing list of contributors

for 1870, including the British feminist, Lydia Becker, and as a

special attraction, a serial by Alice Cary. Through the efforts of

Mrs. Hooker, Harriet Beecher Stowe was persuaded to consider serving

as contributing editor provided the paper's name was changed to \_The

True Republic\_ or to some other name satisfactory to her.[248]

Having struggled against the odds for so long, Susan had no intention

of being stifled now by Mrs. Stowe's more conservative views, nor

would she give her crusading sheet an innocuous name. However, the

decision was taken out of her hands by \_The Revolution's\_ coverage of

the sensational McFarland-Richardson murder case, which so shocked

both Mrs. Hooker and Mrs. Stowe that they gave up all thought of being

associated in a publishing venture with Susan or Mrs. Stanton.

The whole country was stirred in December 1869 by the fatal shooting

in the \_Tribune\_ office of the well-known journalist, Albert D.

Richardson, by Daniel McFarland, to whose divorced wife Richardson had

been attentive. When just before his death, Richardson was married to

the divorced Mrs. McFarland by Henry Ward Beecher with Horace Greeley

as a witness, the press was agog. So strong was the feeling against a

divorced woman that Henry Ward Beecher was severely condemned for

officiating at the marriage, and Mrs. Richardson was played up in the

press and in court as the villain, although her divorce had been

granted because of the brutality and instability of McFarland.

Indignant at the sophistry of the press and the general acceptance of

a double standard of morals, \_The Revolution\_ not only spoke out

fearlessly in defense of Mrs. Richardson but in an editorial by Mrs.

Stanton frankly analyzed the tragic human relations so obvious in the

case. With Susan's full approval, Mrs. Stanton wrote, "I rejoice over

every slave that escapes from a discordant marriage. With the

education and elevation of women we shall have a mighty sundering of

the unholy ties that hold men and women together who loathe and

despise each other...."[249] When the court acquitted McFarland,

giving him the custody of his twelve-year-old son, Susan called a

protest meeting which attracted an audience of two thousand.

Such words and such activities disturbed many who sympathized with

Mrs. Richardson but saw no reason for flaunting exultant approval of

divorce in a woman suffrage paper, and they turned to the \_Woman's

Journal\_ as more to their taste.

Susan, however, reading the first number of the \_Woman's Journal\_,

found its editorials lacking fire. She rebelled at Julia Ward Howe's

counsel, "to lay down all partisan warfare and organize a peaceful

Grand Army of the Republic of Women ... not ... as against men, but as

against all that is pernicious to men and women."[250] Susan's fight

had never been against men but against man-made laws that held women

in bondage. There had always been men willing to help her. Experience

had taught her that the struggle for woman's rights was no peaceful

academic debate, but real warfare which demanded political strategy,

self-sacrifice, and unremitting labor. She was prouder than ever of

her \_Revolution\_ and its liberal hard-hitting policy.

\* \* \* \* \*

Convinced that the National Woman Suffrage Association must publicize

its existence and its value, Susan began the year 1870 with a

convention in Washington which even Senator Sumner praised as

exceeding in interest anything he had ever witnessed there. Its

striking demonstration of the vitality and intelligence of the

National Association was the best answer she could possibly have given

to the accusations and criticism aimed at her and her organization.

Jessie Benton Frémont, watching the delegates enter the dining room of

the Arlington Hotel, called Susan over to her table and said with a

twinkle in her eyes, "Now, tell me, Miss Anthony, have you hunted the

country over and picked out and brought to Washington a score of the

most beautiful women you could find?"[251]

They were a fine-looking and intelligent lot--Paulina Wright Davis,

Isabella Beecher Hooker, Josephine Griffin of the Freedman's Bureau,

Charlotte Wilbour, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Martha C. Wright, and Olympia

Brown; Phoebe Couzins and Virginia Minor from Missouri, Madam Annekè

from Wisconsin, and best of all to Susan, Elizabeth Cady Stanton.

Their presence, their friendship and allegiance were a source of great

pride and joy. Elizabeth Stanton had come from St. Louis, interrupting

her successful lecture tour, when she much preferred to stay away from

all conventions. She had written Susan, "Of course, I stand by you to

the end. I would not see you crushed by rivals even if to prevent it

required my being cut into inch bits.... No power in heaven, hell or

earth can separate us, for our hearts are eternally wedded

together."[252]

Also at this convention to show his support of Susan and her program,

was her faithful friend of many years, the Rev. Samuel J. May of

Syracuse. Clara Barton, ill and unable to attend, sent a letter to be

read, an appeal to her soldier friends for woman suffrage.

Not only did the large and enthusiastic audiences show a growing

interest in votes for women, but two great victories for women in

1869, one in Great Britain and the other in the United States, brought

to the convention a feeling of confidence. Women taxpayers had been

granted the right to vote in municipal elections in England, Scotland,

and Wales, through the efforts of Jacob Bright. In the Territory of

Wyoming, during the first session of its legislature, women had been

granted the right to vote, to hold office, and serve on juries, and

married women had been given the right to their separate property and

their earnings. This progressive action by men of the West turned

Susan's thoughts hopefully to the western territories, and early in

1870 when the Territory of Utah enfranchised its women, she had

further cause for rejoicing.

To celebrate these victories for which her twenty years' work for

women had blazed the trail, some of her friends held a reception for

her in New York at the Women's Bureau on her fiftieth birthday. She

was amazed at the friendly attention her birthday received in the

press. "Susan's Half Century," read a headline in the \_Herald\_. The

\_World\_ called her the Moses of her sex. "A Brave Old Maid," commented

the \_Sun\_. But it was to the \_Tribune\_ that she turned with special

interest, always hoping for a word of approval from Horace Greeley and

finding at last this faint ray of praise: "Careful readers of the

\_Tribune\_ have probably succeeded in discovering that we have not

always been able to applaud the course of Miss Susan B. Anthony.

Indeed, we have often felt, and sometimes said that her methods were

as unwise as we thought her aims undesirable. But through these years

of disputation and struggling. Miss Anthony has thoroughly impressed

friends and enemies alike with the sincerity and earnestness of her

purpose...."[253]

To Anna E. Dickinson, far away lecturing, Susan confided, "Oh, Anna, I

am so glad of it all because it will teach the young girls that to be

true to principle--to live an idea, though an unpopular one--that to

live single--without any man's name--may be honorable."[254]

A few of Susan's younger colleagues still insisted that a merger of

the National and American Woman Suffrage Associations might be

possible. Again Theodore Tilton undertook the task of mediation and

Lucretia Mott, who had retired from active participation in the

woman's rights movement, tried to help work out a reconciliation.

Susan was skeptical but gave them her blessing. Representatives of the

American Association, however, again made it plain that they were

unwilling to work with Susan and Mrs. Stanton.[255]

By this time \_The Revolution\_ had become an overwhelming financial

burden. For some months Mrs. Stanton had been urging Susan to give it

up and turn to the lecture field, as she had done, to spread the

message of woman's rights. Susan hesitated, unwilling to give up \_The

Revolution\_ and not yet confident that she could hold the attention of

an audience for a whole evening. However, she found herself a great

success when pushed into several Lyceum lecture engagements in

Pennsylvania by Mrs. Stanton's sudden illness. "Miss Anthony evidently

lectures not for the purpose of receiving applause," commented the

Pittsburgh \_Commercial\_, "but for the purpose of making people

understand and be convinced. She takes her place on the stage in a

plain and unassuming manner and speaks extemporaneously and fluently,

too, reminding one of an old campaign speaker, who is accustomed to

talk simply for the purpose of converting his audience to his

political theories. She used plain English and plenty of it.... She

clearly evinced a quality that many politicians lack--sincerity."[256]

For each of these lectures on "Work, Wages, and the Ballot," she

received a fee of $75 and was able as well to get new subscribers for

\_The Revolution\_. She now saw the possibilities for herself and the

cause in a Lyceum tour, and when the Lyceum Bureau, pleased with her

reception in Pennsylvania wanted to book her for lectures in the West,

she accepted, calling Parker Pillsbury back to \_The\_ \_Revolution\_ to

take charge. All through Illinois she drew large audiences and her

fees increased to $95, $125, and $150. In two months she was able to

pay $1,300 of \_The Revolution's\_ debt.

When she returned to New York, she realized that she could not

continue to carry \_The Revolution\_ alone, in spite of increased

subscriptions. Its $10,000 debt weighed heavily upon her. Parker

Pillsbury's help could only be temporary; Mrs. Stanton's strenuous

lecture tour left her little time to give to the paper; and Susan's

own friends and family were unable to finance it further.

Fortunately the idea of editing a paper appealed strongly to the

wealthy Laura Curtis Bullard, who had the promise of editorial help

from Theodore Tilton. Susan now turned the paper over to them

completely, receiving nothing in return but shares of stock, while she

assumed the entire indebtedness.

Giving up the control of her beloved paper was one of the most

humiliating experiences and one of the deepest sorrows she ever faced.

\_The Revolution\_ had become to her the symbol of her crusade for

women. Overwhelmed by a sense of failure, she confided to her diary on

the date of the transfer, "It was like signing my own death warrant,"

and to a friend she wrote, "I feel a great, calm sadness like that of

a mother binding out a dear child that she could not support."[257]

She made a valiant announcement of the transfer in \_The Revolution\_ of

May 26, 1870, expressing her delight that the paper had at last found

financial backing and a new, enthusiastic editor. "In view of the

active demand for conventions, lectures, and discussions on Woman

Suffrage," she added, "I have concluded that so far as my own personal

efforts are concerned, I can be more useful on the platform than in a

newspaper. So, on the 1st of June next, I shall cease to be the \_sole\_

proprietor of \_The Revolution\_, and shall be free to attend public

meetings where ever so plain and matter of fact an old worker as I am

can secure a hearing."[258]

Financial backing, however, did not put \_The Revolution\_ on its feet,

although its forthright editorials and articles were replaced by spicy

and brilliant observations on pleasant topics which offended no one.

Before the year was up, Mrs. Bullard was making overtures to Susan to

take the paper back. Susan wanted desperately "to keep the Old Ship

Revolution's colors flying"[259] and to bring back Mrs. Stanton's

stinging editorials. She also feared that Mrs. Bullard on Theodore

Tilton's advice might turn the paper over to the Boston group to be

consolidated with the \_Woman's Journal\_. As no funds were available,

she had to turn her back on her beloved paper and hope for the best.

"I suppose there is a wise Providence in my being stripped of power to

go forward," she wrote at this time. "At any rate, I mean to try and

make good come out of it."[260]

For one more year, \_The Revolution\_ struggled on under the editorship

of Mrs. Bullard and Theodore Tilton and then was taken over by the

\_Christian Enquirer\_. The $10,000 debt, incurred under Susan's

management, she regarded as her responsibility, although her brother

Daniel and many of her friends urged bankruptcy proceedings. "My pride

for women, to say nothing of my conscience," she insisted, "says

no."[261]
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A NEW SLANT ON THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

While Susan was lecturing in the West, hoping to earn enough to pay

off \_The Revolution's\_ debt, she was pondering a new approach to the

enfranchisement of women which had been proposed by Francis Minor, a

St. Louis attorney and the husband of her friend, Virginia Minor.

Francis Minor contended that while the Constitution gave the states

the right to regulate suffrage, it nowhere gave them the power to

prohibit it, and he believed that this conclusion was strengthened by

the Fourteenth Amendment which provided that "no State shall make or

enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of

citizens of the United States."

To claim the right to vote under the Fourteenth Amendment made a great

appeal to both Susan and Elizabeth Stanton. Susan published Francis

Minor's arguments in \_The Revolution\_ and also his suggestion that

some woman test this interpretation of the Fourteenth Amendment by

attempting to vote at the next election; while Mrs. Stanton used this

new approach as the basis of her speech before a Congressional

committee in 1870.

With such a fresh and thrilling project to develop, Susan looked

forward to the annual woman suffrage convention to be held in

Washington in January 1871. So heavy was her lecture schedule that she

reluctantly left preparations for the convention in the willing hands

of Isabella Beecher Hooker, who was confident she could improve on

Susan's meetings and guide the woman's rights movement into more

ladylike and aristocratic channels, winning over scores of men and

women who hitherto had remained aloof. At the last moment, however,

she appealed in desperation to Susan for help, and Susan, canceling

important lecture engagements, hurried to Washington. Here she found

the newspapers full of Victoria C. Woodhull and her Memorial to

Congress on woman suffrage, which had been presented by Senator Harris

of Louisiana and Congressman Julian of Indiana. Capitalizing on the

new approach to woman suffrage, Mrs. Woodhull based her arguments on

the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, praying Congress to enact

legislation to enable women to exercise the right to vote vested in

them by these amendments. A hearing was scheduled before the House

judiciary committee the very morning the convention opened.

[Illustration: Victoria C. Woodhull]

Convinced that she and her colleagues must attend that hearing, Susan

consulted with her friends in Congress and overrode Mrs. Hooker's

hesitancy about associating their organization with so questionable a

woman as Victoria Woodhull. She engaged a constitutional lawyer,

Albert G. Riddle,[262] to represent the 30,000 women who had

petitioned Congress for the franchise. Then she and Mrs. Hooker

attended the hearing and asked for prompt action on woman suffrage.

This was the first Congressional hearing on federal enfranchisement.

Previous hearings had considered trying the experiment only in the

District of Columbia.

Susan had never before seen Victoria Woodhull. Early in 1870, however,

she had called at the brokerage office which Victoria and her sister,

Tennessee Claflin, had opened in New York on Broad Street. The press

had been full of amused comments regarding the lady bankers, and

Susan had wanted to see for herself what kind of women they were. Here

she met and talked with Tennessee Claflin, publishing their interview

in \_The Revolution\_, and also an advertisement of Woodhull, Claflin &

Co., Bankers and Brokers.[263]

About six weeks later, these prosperous "lady brokers" had established

their own paper, \_Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly\_, an "Organ of Social

Regeneration and Constructive Reform," but Susan had barely noticed

its existence, so burdened had she been by the impending loss of her

own paper and by pressing lecture engagements. She was therefore

unaware that this new weekly explored a field wider than finance,

advocating as well woman suffrage and women's advancement,

spiritualism, radical views on marriage, love, and sex, and the

nomination of Victoria C. Woodhull for President of the United States.

Now in a committee room of the House of Representatives, Susan

listened carefully as the dynamic beautiful Victoria Woodhull read her

Memorial and her arguments to support it, in a clear well-modulated

voice. Simply dressed in a dark blue gown, with a jaunty Alpine hat

perched on her curls, she gave the impression of innocent earnest

youth, and she captivated not only the members of the judiciary

committee, but the more critical suffragists as well. For the moment

at least she seemed an appropriate colleague of the forthright

crusader, Susan B. Anthony, and her fashionable friends, Isabella

Beecher Hooker and Paulina Wright Davis. They invited Victoria and her

sister, Tennessee Claflin, to their convention, and asked her to

repeat her speech for them.

At this convention Susan, encouraged by the favorable reception among

politicians of the Woodhull Memorial, mapped out a new and militant

campaign, based on her growing conviction that under the Fourteenth

Amendment women's rights as citizens were guaranteed. She urged women

to claim their rights as citizens and persons under the Fourteenth

Amendment, to register and prepare to vote at the next election, and

to bring suit in the courts if they were refused.

\* \* \* \* \*

So enthusiastic had been the reception of this new approach to woman

suffrage, so favorable had been the news from those close to leading

Republicans, that Susan was unprepared for the adverse report of the

judiciary committee on the Woodhull Memorial. She now studied the

favorable minority report issued by Benjamin Butler of Massachusetts

and William Loughridge of Iowa. Their arguments seemed to her

unanswerable; and hurriedly and impulsively in the midst of her

western lecture tour, she dashed off a few lines to Victoria Woodhull,

to whom she willingly gave credit for bringing out this report.

"Glorious old Ben!" she wrote. "He surely is going to pronounce the

word that will settle the woman question, just as he did the word

'contraband' that so summarily settled the Negro question....

Everybody here chimes in with the new conclusion that we are already

free."[264]

Far from New York where Victoria's activities were being aired by the

press, Susan thought of her at this time only in connection with the

Memorial and its impact on the judiciary committee. To be sure, she

heard stories crediting Benjamin Butler with the authorship of the

Woodhull Memorial, and rumors reached her of Victoria's unorthodox

views on love and marriage and of her girlhood as a fortune teller,

traveling about like a gypsy and living by her wits. Even so, Susan

was ready to give Victoria the benefit of the doubt until she herself

found her harmful to the cause, for long ago she had learned to

discount attacks on the reputations of progressive women. In fact,

Victoria Woodhull provided Susan and her associates with a spectacular

opportunity to prove the sincerity of their contention that there

should not be a double standard of morals--one for men and another for

women.

Returning to New York in May 1871, to a convention of the National

Woman Suffrage Association, Susan found that Mrs. Hooker, Mrs.

Stanton, and Mrs. Davis had invited Victoria Woodhull to address that

convention and to sit on the platform between Lucretia Mott and Mrs.

Stanton.

Through them and others more critical, Susan was brought up to date on

the sensational story of Victoria Woodhull, who had been drawing

record crowds to her lectures and whose unconventional life

continuously provided reporters with interesting copy. Victoria's home

at 15 East Thirty-eighth Street, resplendent and ornate with gilded

furniture and bric-a-brac, housed not only her husband, Colonel Blood,

and herself but her divorced husband and their children as well, and

also all of her quarrelsome relatives. Here many radicals, social

reformers, and spiritualists gathered, among them Stephen Pearl

Andrews, who soon made use of Victoria and her \_Weekly\_ to publicize

his dream of a new world order, the Pantarchy, as he called it.

Victoria, herself, was an ardent spiritualist, controlled by

Demosthenes of the spirit world to whom she believed she owed her most

brilliant utterances and by whom she was guided to announce herself as

a presidential candidate in 1872. Needless to say, with such a

background, Victoria Woodhull became a very controversial figure among

the suffragists.

In New York only a few days, it was hard for Susan to separate fact

from fiction, truth from rumor and animosity. Even Demosthenes did not

seem too ridiculous to her, for many of her most respected friends

were spiritualists. Nor did Victoria's presidential aspirations

trouble her greatly. Presidential candidates had been nothing to brag

of, and willingly would she support the right woman for President. If

Victoria lived up to the high standard of the Woodhull Memorial, then

even she might be that woman. After all, it was an era of radical

theories and Utopian dreams, of extravagances of every sort. Almost

anything could happen.

Whatever doubts the suffragists may have had when they saw Victoria

Woodhull on the platform at the New York meeting of the National

Association, she swept them all along with her when, as one inspired,

she made her "Great Secession" speech. "If the very next Congress

refuses women all the legitimate results of citizenship," she

declared, "we shall proceed to call another convention expressly to

frame a new constitution and to erect a new government.... We mean

treason; we mean secession, and on a thousand times grander scale than

was that of the South. We are plotting revolution; we will overthrow

this bogus Republic and plant a government of righteousness in its

stead...."[265]

Susan, who felt deeply her right to full citizenship, who herself had

talked revolution, and who had so often listened to the extravagant

antislavery declarations of William Lloyd Garrison, Wendell Phillips,

and Parker Pillsbury, was not offended by these statements. She was,

however, troubled by the attitude of the press, particularly of the

\_Tribune\_ which labeled this gathering the "Woodhull Convention" and

accused the suffragists of adopting Mrs. Woodhull's free-love

theories.

Having experienced so recently the animosity stirred up by her

alliance with George Francis Train, Susan resolved to be cautious

regarding Victoria Woodhull and was beginning to wonder if Victoria

was not using the suffragists to further her own ambitions. Yet many

trusted friends, who had talked with Mrs. Woodhull far more than she

had the opportunity to do, were convinced that she was a genius and a

prophet who had risen above the sordid environment of her youth to do

a great work for women and who had the courage to handle subjects

which others feared to touch.

Free love, for example, Susan well knew was an epithet hurled

indiscriminately at anyone indiscreet enough to argue for less

stringent divorce laws or for an intelligent frank appraisal of

marriage and sex. Was it for this reason, Susan asked herself, that

Mrs. Woodhull was called a "free-lover," or did she actually advocate

promiscuity?

With these questions puzzling her, she left for Rochester and the

West. Almost immediately the papers were full of Victoria Woodhull and

her family quarrels which brought her into court. This was a

disillusioning experience for the National Woman Suffrage Association

which had so recently featured Victoria Woodhull as a speaker, and

Susan began seriously to question the wisdom of further association

with this strange controversial character. Nevertheless, Victoria

still had her ardent defenders among the suffragists, particularly

Isabella Beecher Hooker and Paulina Wright Davis. Even the thoughtful

judicious Martha C. Wright wrote Mrs. Hooker at this time, "It is not

always 'the wise and prudent' to whom the truth is revealed; tho' far

be it from me to imply aught derogatory to Mrs. Woodhull. No one can

be with her, see her gentle and modest bearing and her spiritual face,

without feeling sure that she is a true woman, whatever unhappy

surroundings may have compromised her. I have never met a stranger

toward whom I felt more tenderly drawn, in sympathy and love."[266]

Elizabeth Cady Stanton spoke her mind in Theodore Tilton's new paper,

\_The Golden Age\_: "Victoria C. Woodhull stands before us today a

grand, brave woman, radical alike in political, religious and social

principles. Her face and form indicate the complete triumph in her

nature of the spiritual over the sensuous. The processes of her

education are little to us; the grand result everything."[267]

Victoria was in dire need of defenders, for the press was venomous,

goading her on to revenge. Susan, now traveling westward, lecturing in

one state after another, thinking of ways to interest the people in

woman suffrage, was too busy and too far away to follow Victoria

Woodhull's court battles.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mrs. Stanton met Susan in Chicago late in May 1871, to join her on a

lecture tour of the far West. Together they headed for Wyoming and

Utah, eager to set foot in the states which had been the first to

extend suffrage to women. The long leisurely days on the train gave

these two old friends, Susan now fifty-one and Mrs. Stanton,

fifty-six, ample time to talk and philosophize, to appraise their past

efforts for women, and plan their speeches for the days ahead. While

their main theme would always be votes for women, they decided that

from now on they must also arouse women to rebel against their legal

bondage under the "man marriage," as they called it, and to face

frankly the facts about sex, prostitution, and the double standard of

morals. In Utah, in the midst of polygamy fostered by the Mormon

Church, they would encounter still another sex problem.

After an enthusiastic welcome in Denver, they moved on to Laramie,

Wyoming, where one hundred women greeted them as the train pulled in.

From this first woman suffrage state, Susan exultingly wrote, "We have

been moving over the soil, that is really the land of the free and the

home of the brave.... Women here can say, 'What a magnificent country

is ours, where every class and caste, color and sex, may find

freedom....'"[268]

They reached Salt Lake City just after the Godbe secession by which a

group of liberal Mormons abandoned polygamy. As guests of the Godbes

for a week, they had every opportunity to become acquainted with the

Mormons, to observe women under polygamy, and to speak in long all-day

sessions to women alone.

Susan tried to show her audiences in Utah that her point of attack

under both monogamy and polygamy was the subjection of women, and that

to remedy this the self-support of women was essential. In Utah she

found little opportunity for women to earn a living for themselves and

their children, as there was no manufacturing and there were no free

schools in need of teachers. "Women here, as everywhere," she

declared, "must be able to live honestly and honorably without the aid

of men, before it can be possible to save the masses of them from

entering into polygamy or prostitution, legal or illegal."[269]

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony, 1871]

Some of Susan's' critics at home felt she was again besmirching the

suffrage cause by setting foot in polygamous Utah, but this was of no

moment to her, for she saw the crying need of the right kind of

missionary work among Mormon women, "no Phariseeism, no shudders of

Puritanic horror, ... but a simple, loving fraternal clasp of hands

with these struggling women" to encourage them and point the way.

Hearing that Susan and Mrs. Stanton were in the West en route to

California, Leland Stanford, Governor of California and president of

the recently completed Central Pacific Railway, sent them passes for

their journey. They reached San Francisco with high hopes that they

could win the support of western men for their demand for woman

suffrage under the Fourteenth Amendment. Their welcome was warm and

the press friendly. An audience of over 1,200 listened with real

interest to Mrs. Stanton. Then the two crusaders made a misstep. Eager

to learn the woman's side of the case in the recent widely publicized

murder of the wealthy attorney, Alexander P. Crittenden, by Laura

Fair, they visited Laura Fair in prison. Immediately the newspapers

reported this move in a most critical vein, with the result that an

uneasy audience crowded into the hall where Susan was to speak on "The

Power of the Ballot." As she proceeded to prove that women needed the

ballot to protect themselves and their work and could not count on the

support and protection of men, she cited case after case of men's

betrayal of women. Then bringing home her point, she declared with

vigor, "If all men had protected all women as they would have their

own wives and daughters protected, you would have no Laura Fair in

your jail tonight."[270]

Boos and hisses from every part of the hall greeted this statement;

but Susan, trained on the antislavery platform to hold her ground

whatever the tumult, waited patiently until this protest subsided,

standing before the defiant audience, poised and unafraid. Then, in a

clear steady voice, she repeated her challenging words. This time,

above the hisses, she heard a few cheers, and for the third time she

repeated, "If all men had protected all women as they would have their

own wives and daughters protected, you would have no Laura Fair in

your jail tonight."

Now the audience, admiring her courage, roared its applause. "I

declare to you," she concluded, "that woman must not depend upon the

protection of man, but must be taught to protect herself, and here I

take my stand."

Reading the newspapers the next morning, she found herself accused not

only of defending Laura Fair, but of condoning the murder of

Crittenden. This story was republished throughout the state and

eagerly picked up by New York newspapers.

As it was now impossible for her or for Mrs. Stanton to draw a

friendly audience anywhere in California, they took refuge in the

Yosemite Valley for the next few weeks. Susan was inconsolable. These

slanders on top of the loss of \_The Revolution\_ and the split in the

suffrage ranks seemed more than she could bear. "Never in all my hard

experience have I been under such fire," she confided to her diary.

"The clouds are so heavy over me.... I never before was so cut

down."[271]

Not until she had spent several days riding horseback in the Yosemite

Valley on "men's saddles" in "linen bloomers," over long perilous

exhausting trails, did the clouds begin to lift. Gradually the beauty

and grandeur of the mountains and the giant redwoods brought her peace

and refreshment, putting to flight "all the old six-days story and the

6,000 jeers."

Bearing the brunt of the censure in California, Susan expected Mrs.

Stanton to come to her defense in letters to the newspapers. When she

did not do so, Susan was deeply hurt, for in the past she had so many

times smoothed the way for her friend. Even now, on their return to

San Francisco, where she herself did not yet dare lecture, she did her

best to build up audiences for Mrs. Stanton and to get correct

transcripts of her lectures to the papers. Disillusioned and

heartsick, she was for the first time sadly disappointed in her

dearest friend.

Moving on to Oregon to lecture at the request of the pioneer

suffragist, Abigail Scott Duniway, she wrote Mrs. Stanton, who had

left for the East, "As I rolled on the ocean last week feeling that

the very next strain might swamp the ship, and thinking over all my

sins of omission and commission, there was nothing undone which

haunted me like the failure to speak the word at San Francisco again

and more fully. I would rather today have the satisfaction of having

said the true and needful thing on Laura Fair and the social evil,

with the hisses and hoots of San Francisco and the entire nation

around me, than all that you or I could possibly experience from their

united eulogies with that one word unsaid."[272]

\* \* \* \* \*

So far Susan's western trip had netted her only $350. This was

disappointing in so far as she had counted upon it to reduce

substantially her \_Revolution\_ debt. She now hoped to build her

earnings up to $1,000 in Oregon and Washington. Everywhere in these

two states people took her to their hearts and the press with a few

exceptions was complimentary. The beauty of the rugged mountainous

country compensated her somewhat for the long tiring stage rides over

rough roads and for the cold uncomfortable lonely nights in poor

hotels. Only occasionally did she enjoy the luxury of a good cup of

coffee or a clean bed in a warm friendly home.

At first in Oregon she was apprehensive about facing an audience

because of her San Francisco experience, and she wrote Mrs. Stanton,

"But to the rack I must go, though another San Francisco torture be in

store for me."[273] She spoke on "The Power of the Ballot," on women's

right to vote under the Fourteenth Amendment, on the need of women to

be self-supporting, and clearly and logically she marshaled her facts

and her arguments. Occasionally she obliged with a temperance speech,

or gathered women together to talk to them about the social evil,

relieved when they responded to this delicate subject with earnestness

and gratitude. Practice soon made her an easy, extemporaneous speaker.

Yet she was only now and then satisfied with her efforts, recording in

her diary, "Was happy in a real Patrick Henry speech."[274]

The proceeds from her lectures were disappointing, as money was scarce

in the West that winter, and she had just decided to return to the

East to spend Christmas with her mother and sisters when she was urged

to accept lecture engagements in California. Putting her own personal

longings behind her, she took the stage to California, sitting outside

with the driver so that she could better enjoy the scenery and learn

more about the people who had settled this new lonely overpowering

country. "Horrible indeed are the roads," she wrote her mother, "miles

and miles of corduroy and then twenty miles ... of black mud.... How

my thought does turn homeward, mother."[275]

This time she was warmly received in San Francisco. The prejudice, so

vocal six months before, had disappeared. "Made my Fourteenth

Amendment argument splendidly," she wrote in her diary. "All delighted

with it and me--and it is such a comfort to have the friends feel that

I help the good work on."[276]

She was gaining confidence in herself and wrote her family, "I miss

Mrs. Stanton. Still I can not but enjoy the feeling that the people

call on me, and the fact that I have an opportunity to sharpen my wits

a little by answering questions and doing the chatting, instead of

merely sitting a lay figure and listening to the brilliant

scintillations as they emanate from her never-exhausted magazine.

There is no alternative--whoever goes into a parlor or before an

audience with that woman does it at a cost of a fearful overshadowing,

a price which I have paid for the last ten years, and that cheerfully,

because I felt our cause was most profited by her being seen and

heard, and my best work was making the way clear for her."[277]

Starting homeward through Wyoming and Nevada where she also had

lecture engagements, she wrote in her diary on January 1, 1872, "6

months of constant travel, full 8000 miles, 108 lectures. The year's

work full 13,000 miles travel--170 meetings." On the train she met the

new California Senator, Aaron A. Sargent, his wife Ellen, and their

children. A warm friendship developed on this long journey during

which the train was stalled in deep snow drifts. "This is indeed a

fearful ordeal, fastened here ... midway of the continent at the top

of the Rocky mountains," she recorded. "The railroad has supplied the

passengers with soda crackers and dried fish.... Mrs. Sargent and I

have made tea and carried it throughout the train to the nursing

mothers."[278] The Sargents had brought their own food for the journey

and shared it with Susan. This and the good conversation lightened the

ordeal for her, especially as both Senator and Mrs. Sargent believed

heartily in woman's rights, and Senator Sargent in his campaign for

the Senate had boldly announced his endorsement of woman suffrage.

This friendly attitude among western men toward votes for women was

the most encouraging development in Susan's long uphill fight. These

men, looking upon women as partners who had shared with them the

dangers and hardships of the frontier, recognized at once the justice

of woman suffrage and its benefit to the country.

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan traveled directly from Nevada to Washington instead of breaking

her journey by a visit with her brothers in Kansas, as she had hoped

to do. She even omitted Rochester so that she might be in time for the

national woman suffrage convention in Washington in January 1872, for

which Mrs. Hooker, Mrs. Davis, and Mrs. Stanton were preparing. She

found Victoria Woodhull with them, her presence provoking criticism

and dissension.

Impulsively she came to Victoria's defense at the convention: "I have

been asked by many, 'Why did you drag Victoria Woodhull to the front?'

Now, bless your souls, she was not dragged to the front. She came to

Washington with a powerful argument. She presented her Memorial to

Congress and it was a power.... She had an interview with the

judiciary committee. We could never secure that privilege. She was

young, handsome, and rich. Now if it takes youth, beauty, and money to

capture Congress, Victoria is the woman we are after."[279]

"I was asked by an editor of a New York paper if I knew Mrs.

Woodhull's antecedents," she continued. "I said I didn't and that I

did not care any more for them than I do about those of the members of

Congress.... I have been asked along the Pacific coast, 'What about

Woodhull? You make her your leader?' Now we don't make leaders; they

make themselves."

Victoria, however, did not prove to be the leading light of this

convention, although she made one of her stirring fiery speeches

calling upon her audience to form an Equal Rights party and nominate

her for President of the United States. By this time, Susan had

concluded that Victoria Woodhull for President did not ring true and

she would have nothing to do with her self-inspired candidacy. Quickly

she steered the convention away from Victoria Woodhull for President

toward the consideration of the more practical matter of woman's right

to vote under the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments.

This time it was Susan, not Victoria, who was granted a hearing before

the Senate judiciary committee. "At the close of the war," Susan

reminded the Senators, "Congress lifted the question of suffrage for

men above State power, and by the amendments prohibited the

deprivation of suffrage to any citizen by any State. When the

Fourteenth Amendment was first proposed ... we rushed to you with

petitions praying you not to insert the word 'male' in the second

clause. Our best friends ... said to us: 'The insertion of that word

puts no new barrier against women; therefore do not embarrass us but

wait until we get the Negro question settled.' So the Fourteenth

Amendment with the word 'male' was adopted.[280]

"When the Fifteenth was presented without the word 'sex,'" she

continued, "we again petitioned and protested, and again our friends

declared that the absence of the word was no hindrance to us, and

again begged us to wait until they had finished the work of the war,

saying, 'After we have enfranchised the Negro, we will take up your

case.'

"Have they done as they promised?" she asked. "When we come asking

protection under the new guarantees of the Constitution, the same men

say to us ... to wait the action of Congress and State legislatures in

the adoption of a Sixteenth Amendment which shall make null and void

the word 'male' in the Fourteenth and supply the want of the word

'sex' in the Fifteenth. Such tantalizing treatment imposed upon

yourselves or any class of men would have caused rebellion and in the

end a bloody revolution...."

Unconvinced of the urgency or even the desirability of votes for

women, the Senate judiciary committee promptly issued an adverse

report, but Susan was assured that her cause had a few persistent

supporters in Congress when Benjamin Butler presented petitions to the

House for a declaratory act for the Fourteenth Amendment and

Congressman Parker of Missouri introduced a bill granting women the

right to vote and hold office in the territories.

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan now turned to the more sympathetic West to take her plea for

woman suffrage directly to the people. Speaking almost daily in

Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, and Illinois, she had little time to think of

the work in the East; the glamor of Victoria Woodhull faded, and she

realized that her own hard monotonous spade work would in the long run

do more for the cause than the meteoric rise of a vivid personality

who gave only part of herself to the task.

When letters came from Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Hooker showing plainly

that they were falling in with Victoria's plans to form a new

political party, Susan at once dashed off these lines of warning: "We

have no element out of which to make a political party, because there

is not a man who would vote a woman suffrage ticket if thereby he

endangered his Republican, Democratic, Workingmen's, or Temperance

party, and all our time and words in that direction are simply thrown

away. My name must not be used to call any such meeting."[281]

Then she added, "Mrs. Woodhull has the advantage of us because she has

the newspaper, and she persistently means to run our craft into her

port and none other. If she were influenced by women spirits ... I

might consent to be a mere sail-hoister for her; but as it is she is

wholly owned and dominated by \_men\_ spirits and I spurn the whole lot

of them...."

A few weeks later, as she looked over the latest copy of \_Woodhull &

Claflin's Weekly\_, she was horrified to find her name signed to a call

to a political convention sponsored by the National Woman Suffrage

Association. Immediately she telegraphed Mrs. Stanton to remove her

name and wrote stern indignant letters begging her and Mrs. Hooker not

to involve the National Association in Victoria Woodhull's

presidential campaign. Although she herself had often called for a new

political party while she was publishing \_The Revolution\_, she was

practical enough to recognize that a party formed under Victoria

Woodhull's banner was doomed to failure.

Returning to New York, she found both Mrs. Stanton and Mrs. Hooker

still completely absorbed in Victoria's plans. Bringing herself up to

date once more on the latest developments in the colorful life of

Victoria Woodhull, she found that she had been lecturing on "The

Impending Revolution" to large enthusiastic audiences and that she had

again been called into court by her family. Goaded to defiance by an

increasingly virulent press, Victoria had also begun to blackmail

suffragists who she thought were her enemies, among them Mrs. Bullard,

Mrs. Blake, and Mrs. Phelps. This made Susan take steps at once to

free the National Association of her influence.

When Victoria Woodhull, followed by a crowd of supporters, sailed into

the first business session of the National Woman Suffrage Association

in New York, announcing that the People's convention would hold a

joint meeting with the suffragists, Susan made it plain that they

would do nothing of the kind, as Steinway Hall had been engaged for a

woman suffrage convention. With relief, she watched Victoria and her

flock leave for a meeting place of their own. Disgruntled at what she

called Susan's intolerance, Mrs. Stanton then asked to be relieved of

the presidency. Elected to take her place, Susan was now free to cope

with Victoria, should this again become necessary.

Not to be outmaneuvered by Susan, Victoria made a surprise appearance

near the end of the evening session and moved that the convention

adjourn to meet the next morning in Apollo Hall with the people's

convention. Quickly one of her colleagues seconded the motion. Susan

refused to put this motion, standing quietly before the excited

audience, stern and somber in her steel-gray silk dress. Beside her on

the platform, Victoria, intense and vivid, put the motion herself, and

it was overwhelmingly carried by her friends scattered among the

suffragists. Declaring this out of order because neither Victoria nor

many of those voting were members of the National Association, Susan

in her most commanding voice adjourned the convention to meet in the

same place the next morning. Victoria, however, continued her demands

until Susan ordered the janitor to turn out the lights. Then the

audience dispersed in the darkness.

With these drastic measures, Susan rescued the National Woman Suffrage

Association from Victoria Woodhull, who had her own triumph later at

Apollo Hall, where, surrounded by wildly cheering admirers, she was

nominated for President of the United States by the newly formed Equal

Rights party.

Reading about Victoria's nomination in the morning papers, Susan

breathed a prayer of gratitude for a narrow escape, recording in her

diary, "There never was such a foolish muddle--all come of Mrs. S.

[Stanton] consulting and conceding to Woodhull & calling a People's

Con[vention].... All came near being lost.... I never was so hurt with

the folly of Stanton.... Our movement as such is so demoralized by

letting go the helm of ship to Woodhull--though we rescued it--it was

as by a hair breadth escape." She was surprised to find no

condemnation of her actions in \_Woodhull & Claflin's Weekly\_ but only

the implication that the suffragists were too slow for Victoria's

great work.[282]

The attitude of some of the leading suffragists toward Victoria

Woodhull remained a problem. Fortunately Mrs. Stanton came back into

line, but both Mrs. Hooker and Mrs. Davis seemed bound to drift under

Victoria's influence, and the promising young lawyer, Belva Lockwood,

campaigned for the Equal Rights party and its candidate Victoria

Woodhull.

\* \* \* \* \*

While Victoria Woodhull's fortunes were speedily dropping from the

sublime heights of a presidential nomination to the humiliation of

financial ruin, the loss of her home, and the suspended publication

of her \_Weekly\_, Susan was knocking at the doors of the Republican and

Democratic national conventions. She had previously appealed to the

liberal Republicans, among whose delegates were her old friends George

W. Julian, B. Gratz Brown, and Theodore Tilton, but they had ignored

woman suffrage and had nominated for President, Horace Greeley, now a

persistent opponent of votes for women. The Democrats did no better.

Faced with Grant as the strong Republican nominee, they too nominated

Horace Greeley with B. Gratz Brown as his running mate, hoping by this

coalition to achieve victory. The Republicans, still unwilling to go

the whole way for woman suffrage by giving it the recognition of a

plank in their platform, did, however, offer women a splinter at which

Susan grasped eagerly because it was the first time an important,

powerful political party had ever mentioned women in their platform.

"The Republican party," read the splinter, "is mindful of its

obligations to the loyal women of America for their noble devotion to

the cause of freedom; their admission to wider fields of usefulness is

received with satisfaction; and the honest demands of any class of

citizens for equal rights should be treated with respectful

consideration."[283]

Thankful to have escaped involvement with Victoria Woodhull and her

Equal Rights party just at this time when the Republicans were ready

to smile upon women, Susan basked in an aura of respectability thrown

around her by her new political allies. She was even hopeful that the

two woman-suffrage factions could now forget their differences and

work together for "the living, vital issue of today--freedom to

women."

She at once began speaking for the Republican party, looking forward

to carrying the discussion of woman suffrage into every school

district and every ward meeting. In the beginning the Republicans were

generous with funds, giving her $1,000 for women's meetings in New

York, Philadelphia, Rochester, and other large cities. For speakers

she sought both Lucy Stone and Anna E. Dickinson, but Lucy made it

plain in letters to Mrs. Stanton that she would take no part in

Republican rallies conducted by Susan, and Anna responded with a

torrent of false accusations.[284] Only Mary Livermore of the American

Association consented to speak at Susan's Republican rallies; but with

Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Gage, and Olympia Brown to call upon, Susan did

not lack for effective orators.

In an \_Appeal to the Women of America\_, financed by the Republicans

and widely circulated, she urged the election of Grant and Wilson and

the defeat of Horace Greeley, whom she described as women's most

bitter opponent. "Both by tongue and pen," she declared, "he has

heaped abuse, ridicule, and misrepresentation upon our leading women,

while the whole power of the \_Tribune\_ had been used to crush our

great reform...."[285]

Beyond this she was unwilling to go in criticizing her one-time

friend. In fact her sense of fairness recoiled at the ridicule and

defamation heaped upon Horace Greeley in the campaign. "I shall not

join with the Republicans," she wrote Mrs. Stanton, "in hounding

Greeley and the Liberals with all the old war anathemas of the

Democracy.... My sense of justice and truth is outraged by the

Harper's cartoons of Greeley and the general falsifying tone of the

Republican press. It is not fair for us to join in the cry that

everybody who is opposed to the present administration is either a

Democrat or an apostate."[286]

Susan sensed a change in the Republicans' attitude toward women, as

they grew increasingly confident of victory. Not only did they refuse

further financial aid, but criticized Susan roundly because in her

speeches she emphasized woman suffrage rather than the virtues of the

Republican party. She ignored their complaints, and wrote Mrs.

Stanton, "If you are willing to go forth ... saying that you endorse

the party on any other point ... than that of its recognition of

woman's claim to vote, \_I\_ am not...."[287]
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TESTING THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

Susan preached militancy to women throughout the presidential campaign

of 1872, urging them to claim their rights under the Fourteenth and

Fifteenth Amendments by registering and voting in every state in the

Union.

Even before Francis Minor had called her attention to the

possibilities offered by these amendments, she had followed with great

interest a similar effort by Englishwomen who, in 1867 and 1868, had

attempted to prove that the "ancient legal rights of females" were

still valid and entitled women property holders to vote for

representatives in Parliament, and who claimed that the word "man" in

Parliamentary statutes should be interpreted to include women. In the

case of the 5,346 householders of Manchester, the court held that

"every woman is personally incapable" in a legal sense.[288] This

legal contest had been fully reported in \_The Revolution\_, and

disappointing as the verdict was, Susan looked upon this attempt to

establish justice as an indication of a great awakening and uprising

among women.

There had also been heartening signs in her own country, which she

hoped were the preparation for more successful militancy to come. She

had exulted in \_The Revolution\_ in 1868 over the attempt of women to

vote in Vineland, New Jersey. Encouraged by the enfranchisement of

women in Wyoming in 1869, Mary Olney Brown and Charlotte Olney French

had cast their votes in Washington Territory. A young widow, Marilla

Ricker, had registered and voted in New Hampshire in 1870, claiming

this right as a property holder, but her vote was refused. In 1871,

Nannette B. Gardner and Catherine Stebbins in Detroit, Catherine V.

White in Illinois, Ellen R. Van Valkenburg in Santa Cruz, California,

and Carrie S. Burnham in Philadelphia registered and attempted to

vote. Only Mrs. Gardner's vote was accepted. That same year, Sarah

Andrews Spencer, Sarah E. Webster, and seventy other women marched to

the polls to register and vote in the District of Columbia. Their

ballots refused, they brought suit against the Board of Election

Inspectors, carrying the case unsuccessfully to the Supreme Court of

the United States.[289] Another test case based on the Fourteenth

Amendment had also been carried to the Supreme Court by Myra Bradwell,

one of the first women lawyers, who had been denied admission to the

Illinois bar because she was a woman.

With the spotlight turned on the Fourteenth Amendment by these women,

lawyers here and there throughout the country were discussing the

legal points involved, many admitting that women had a good case. Even

the press was friendly.

Susan had looked forward to claiming her rights under the Fourteenth

and Fifteenth Amendments and was ready to act. She had spent the

thirty days required of voters in Rochester with her family and as she

glanced through the morning paper of November 1, 1872, she read these

challenging words, "Now Register!... If you were not permitted to vote

you would fight for the right, undergo all privations for it, face

death for it...."[290]

This was all the reminder she needed. She would fight for this right.

She put on her bonnet and coat, telling her three sisters what she

intended to do, asked them to join her, and with them walked briskly

to the barber shop where the voters of her ward were registering.

Boldly entering this stronghold of men, she asked to be registered.

The inspector in charge, Beverly W. Jones, tried to convince her that

this was impossible under the laws of New York. She told him she

claimed her right to vote not under the New York constitution but

under the Fourteenth Amendment, and she read him its pertinent lines.

Other election inspectors now joined in the argument, but she

persisted until two of them, Beverly W. Jones and Edwin F. Marsh, both

Republicans, finally consented to register the four women.

This mission accomplished, Susan rounded up twelve more women willing

to register. The evening papers spread the sensational news, and by

the end of the registration period, fifty Rochester women had joined

the ranks of the militants.

On election day, November 5, 1872, Susan gleefully wrote Elizabeth

Stanton, "Well, I have gone and done it!!--positively voted the

Republican ticket--Strait--this A.M. at 7 o'clock--& swore my vote in

at that.... All my three sisters voted--Rhoda deGarmo too--Amy Post

was rejected & she will immediately bring action against the

registrars.... Not a jeer not a word--not a look--disrespectful has

met a single woman.... I hope the mornings telegrams will tell of many

women all over the country trying to vote.... I hope you voted

too."[291]

\* \* \* \* \*

Election day did not bring the general uprising of women for which

Susan had hoped. In Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Connecticut, as in

Rochester, a few women tried to vote. In New York City, Lillie

Devereux Blake and in Fayetteville, New York, Matilda Joslyn Gage had

courageously gone to the polls only to be turned away. Elizabeth

Stanton did not vote on November 5, 1872, and her lack of enthusiasm

about a test case in the courts was very disappointing to Susan.

However, the fact that Susan B. Anthony had voted won immediate

response from the press in all parts of the country. Newspapers in

general were friendly, the New York \_Times\_ boldly declaring, "The act

of Susan B. Anthony should have a place in history," and the Chicago

\_Tribune\_ venturing to suggest that she ought to hold public office.

The cartoonists, however, reveling in a new and tempting subject,

caricatured her unmercifully, the New York Graphic setting the tone.

Some Democratic papers condemned her, following the line of the

Rochester \_Union and Advertiser\_ which flaunted the headline, "Female

Lawlessness," and declared that Miss Anthony's lawlessness had proved

women unfit for the ballot.

Before she voted, Susan had taken the precaution of consulting Judge

Henry R. Selden, a former judge of the Court of Appeals. After

listening with interest to her story and examining the arguments of

Benjamin Butler, Francis Minor, and Albert G. Riddle in support of the

claim that women had a right to vote under the Fourteenth and

Fifteenth Amendments, he was convinced that women had a good case and

consented to advise her and defend her if necessary. Judge Selden, now

retired from the bench because of ill health, was practicing law in

Rochester where he was highly respected. A Republican, he had served

as lieutenant governor, member of the Assembly, and state senator.

Susan had known him as one of the city's active abolitionists, a

friend of Frederick Douglass who had warned him to flee the country

after the raid on Harper's Ferry and the capture of John Brown. Such

a man she felt she could trust.

All was quiet for about two weeks after the election and it looked as

if the episode might be forgotten in the jubilation over Grant's

election. Then, on November 18, the United States deputy marshal rang

the doorbell at 7 Madison Street and asked for Miss Susan B. Anthony.

When she greeted him, he announced with embarrassment that he had come

to arrest her.

"Is this your usual manner of serving a warrant?" she asked in

surprise.[292]

He then handed her papers, charging that she had voted in violation of

Section 19 of an Act of Congress, which stipulated that anyone voting

knowingly without having the lawful right to vote was guilty of a

crime, and on conviction would be punished by a fine not exceeding

$500, or by imprisonment not exceeding three years.

This was a serious development. It had never occurred to Susan that

this law, passed in 1870 to halt the voting of southern rebels, could

actually be applicable to her. In fact, she had expected to bring suit

against election inspectors for refusing to accept the ballots of

women. Now charged with crime and arrested, she suddenly began to

sense the import of what was happening to her.

When the marshal suggested that she report alone to the United States

Commissioner, she emphatically refused to go of her own free will and

they left the house together, she extending her wrists for the

handcuffs and he ignoring her gesture. As they got on the streetcar

and the conductor asked for her fare, she further embarrassed the

marshal by loudly announcing, "I'm traveling at the expense of the

government. This gentleman is escorting me to jail. Ask him for my

fare." When they arrived at the commissioner's office, he was not

there, but a hearing was set for November 29.

On that day, in the office where a few years before fugitive slaves

had been returned to their masters, Susan was questioned and

cross-examined, and she felt akin to those slaves. Proudly she

admitted that she had voted, that she had conferred with Judge Selden,

that with or without his advice she would have attempted to vote to

test women's right to the franchise.[293]

"Did you have any doubt yourself of your right to vote?" asked the

commissioner.

"Not a particle," she replied.

On December 23, 1872, in Rochester's common council chamber, before a

large curious audience, Susan, the other women voters, and the

election inspectors were arraigned. People expecting to see bold

notoriety-seeking women were surprised by their seriousness and

dignity. "The majority of these law-breakers," reported the press,

"were elderly, matronly-looking women with thoughtful faces, just the

sort one would like to see in charge of one's sick-room, considerate,

patient, kindly."[294]

The United States Commissioner fixed their bail at $500 each. All

furnished bail but Susan, who through her counsel, Henry R. Selden,

applied for a writ of habeas corpus, demanding immediate release and

challenging the lawfulness of her arrest. When a writ of habeas corpus

was denied and her bail increased to $1,000 by United States District

Judge Nathan K. Hall, sitting in Albany, Susan was more than ever

determined to resist the interference of the courts in her

constitutional right as a citizen to vote. She refused to give bail,

emphatically stating that she preferred prison.

Seeing no heroism but only disgrace in a jail term for his client and

unwilling to let her bring this ignominy upon herself. Henry Selden

chivalrously assured her that this was a time when she must be guided

by her lawyer's advice, and he paid her bail. Ignorant of the

technicalities of the law, she did not realize the far-reaching

implications of this well-intentioned act until they left the

courtroom and in the hallway met tall vigorous John Van Voorhis of

Rochester who was working on the case with Judge Selden. With the

impatience of a younger man, eager to fight to the finish, he

exclaimed, "You have lost your chance to get your case before the

Supreme Court by writ of habeas corpus!"[295]

Aghast, Susan rushed back to the courtroom, hoping to cancel the bond,

but it was too late. Bitterly disappointed, she remonstrated with

Henry Selden, but he quietly replied, "I could not see a lady I

respected in jail." She never forgave him for this, in spite of her

continued appreciation of his keen legal mind, his unfailing kindness,

and his willingness to battle for women.

Within a few days she appeared before the Federal Grand Jury in

Albany and was indicted on the charge that she "did knowingly,

wrongfully and unlawfully vote for a Representative in the Congress of

the United States...."[296] Her trial was set for the term of the

United States District Court, beginning May 13, 1873, in Rochester,

New York.

[Illustration: Judge Henry R. Selden]

During these difficult days in Albany, Susan found comfort and

courage, as in the past, in the friendliness of Lydia Mott's home.

Here she planned the steps by which to win public approval and

financial aid for her test case. She addressed the commission which

was revising New York's constitution on woman's right to vote under

the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, pointing out that the law

limiting suffrage to males was nullified by this new interpretation.

Eager to spread the truth about her own legal contest, she distributed

printed copies of Judge Selden's argument. Then traveling to New York

and Washington, she personally presented copies to newspaper editors

and Congressmen. To one of these men she wrote, "It is not for

myself--but for all womanhood--yes and all manhood too--that I most

rejoice in the appeal to the legal mind of the Nation. It is no

longer whether women wish to vote, or men are willing, but it is

woman's Constitutional right."[297]

\* \* \* \* \*

In spite of the fact that Susan was technically in the custody of the

United States Marshal, who objected to her leaving Rochester, she

managed to carry out a full schedule of lectures in Ohio, Indiana, and

Illinois, and also the usual annual Washington and New York woman

suffrage conventions at which she told the story of her voting, her

arrest, and her pending trial, and where she received enthusiastic

support.

Because she wanted the people to understand the legal points on which

she based her right to vote, Susan spoke on "The Equal Right of All

Citizens to the Ballot" in every district in Monroe County. So

thorough and convincing was she that the district attorney asked for a

change of venue, fearing that any Monroe County jury, sitting in

Rochester, would be prejudiced in her favor. When her case was

transferred to the United States Circuit Court in Canandaigua, to be

heard a month later, she immediately descended upon Ontario County

with her speech, "Is It a Crime for a Citizen of the United States to

Vote?" and Matilda Joslyn Gage joined her, speaking on "The United

States on Trial, Not Susan B. Anthony."

On the lecture platform Susan wore a gray silk dress with a soft,

white lace collar. Her hair, now graying, was smoothed back and

twisted neatly into a tight knot. Everything about her indicated

refinement and sincerity, and most of her audiences felt this.

"Our democratic-republican government is based on the idea of the

natural right of every individual member thereof to a voice and vote

in making and executing the laws," she declared as she looked into the

faces of the men and women who had gathered to hear her, farmers,

storekeepers, lawyers, and housewives, rich and poor, a cross section

of America.

Repeating to them salient passages from the Declaration of

Independence and the Preamble to the Constitution, she added, "It was

we, the people, not we, the white male citizens, nor yet we, the male

citizens: but we the whole people, who formed this Union. And we

formed it, not to give the blessings of liberty, but to secure them;

not to the half of ourselves and the half of our posterity, but to the

whole people--women as well as men."[298]

She asked, "Is the right to vote one of the privileges or immunities

of citizens? I think the disfranchised ex-rebels, and the ex-state

prisoners will agree with me that it is not only one of them, but the

one without which all the others are nothing."[299]

Quoting for them the Fifteenth Amendment, she told them it had settled

forever the question of the citizen's right to vote. The Fifteenth

Amendment, she reasoned, applies to women, first because women are

citizens and secondly because of their "previous condition of

servitude." Defining a slave as a person robbed of the proceeds of his

labor and subject to the will of another, she showed how state laws

relating to married women had placed them in the position of slaves.

As she analyzed the Thirteenth, Fourteenth, and Fifteenth Amendments

and cited authorities for her conclusions, she left little doubt in

the minds of those who heard her that women were persons and citizens

whose privileges and immunities could not be abridged.

On this note she concluded: "We ask the juries to fail to return

verdicts of 'guilty' against honest, law-abiding, tax-paying United

States citizens for offering their votes at our elections ... We ask

the judges to render true and unprejudiced opinions of the law, and

wherever there is room for doubt to give its benefit on the side of

liberty and equal rights to women, remembering that 'the true rule of

interpretation under our national constitution, especially since its

amendments, is that anything for human rights is constitutional,

everything against human rights unconstitutional.' And it is on this

line that we propose to fight our battle for the ballot--all

peaceably, but nevertheless persistently through to complete triumph,

when all United States citizens shall be recognized as equals before

the law."

\* \* \* \* \*

Speaking twenty-one nights in succession was arduous. "So few see or

feel any special importance in the impending trial," she jotted down

in her diary. In towns, such as Geneva, where she had old friends,

like Elizabeth Smith Miller, she was assured of a friendly welcome and

a good audience.[300]

[Illustration: "The Woman Who Dared"]

As the collections, taken up after her lectures, were too small to pay

her expenses, her financial problems weighed heavily. The notes she

had signed for \_The Revolution\_ were in the main still unpaid, and

one of her creditors was growing impatient. She had recently paid her

counsel, Judge Selden, $200 and John Van Voorhis, $75, leaving only

$3.45 in her defense fund, but as usual a few of her loyal friends

came to her aid, and both Judge Selden and John Van Voorhis, deeply

interested in her courageous fight, gave most of their time without

charge.[301]

If this campaign was a problem financially, it was a success in the

matter of nation-wide publicity. The New York \_Herald\_ exulted in

hostile gibes at women suffrage and published fictitious interviews,

ridiculing Susan as a homely aggressive old maid, but the New York

\_Evening Post\_ prophesied that the court decision would likely be in

her favor. The Rochester \_Express\_ championed her warmly: "All

Rochester will assert--at least all of it worth heeding--that Miss

Anthony holds here the position of a refined and estimable woman,

thoroughly respected and beloved by the large circle of staunch

friends who swear by her common sense and loyalty, if not by her

peculiar views." In fact the consensus of opinion in Rochester was

much like that of the woman who remarked, "No, I am not converted to

what these women advocate. I am too cowardly for that; but I am

converted to Susan B. Anthony."[302]

This, however, was far from the attitude of Lucy Stone's \_Woman's

Journal\_, which had ignored Susan's voting in November 1872 because it

was out of sympathy with this militant move and with her

interpretation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. Later, as

her case progressed in the courts, the \_Journal\_ did give it brief

notice as a news item, but in 1873 when it listed as a mark of honor

the women who had worked wisely for the cause, Susan B. Anthony's name

was not among them, and this did not pass unnoticed by Susan; nor did

the fact that she was snubbed by the Congress of Women, meeting in New

York and sponsored by Mary A. Livermore, Julia Ward Howe, and Maria

Mitchell. This drawing away of women hurt her far more than newspaper

gibes. In fact she was sadly disappointed in women's response to the

herculean effort she was making for them.

Even more disconcerting was the adverse decision of the Supreme Court

on the Myra Bradwell case, which at once shattered the confidence of

most of her legal advisors. The court held that Illinois had violated

no provision of the federal Constitution in refusing to allow Myra

Bradwell to practice law because she was a woman and declared that the

right to practice law in state courts is not a privilege or an

immunity of a citizen of the United States, nor is the power of a

state to prescribe qualifications for admission to the bar affected by

the Fourteenth Amendment. Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase, filing a

dissenting opinion, lived up to Susan's faith in him, but Benjamin

Butler wrote her, "I do not believe anybody in Congress doubts that

the Constitution authorizes the right of women to vote, precisely as

it authorizes trial by jury and many other like rights guaranteed to

citizens. But the difficulty is, the courts long since decided that

the constitutional provisions do not act upon the citizens, except as

guarantees, ex proprio vigore, and in order to give force to them

there must be legislation.... Therefore, the point is for the friends

of woman suffrage to get congressional legislation."[303]

Susan, however, never wavered in her conviction that she as a citizen

had a constitutional right to vote and that it was her duty to test

this right in the courts.
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"IS IT A CRIME FOR A CITIZEN ... TO VOTE?"

Charged with the crime of voting illegally, Susan was brought to trial

on June 17, 1873, in the peaceful village of Canandaigua, New York.

Simply dressed and wearing her new bonnet faced with blue silk and

draped with a dotted veil,[304] she stoically climbed the court-house

steps, feeling as if on her shoulders she carried the political

destiny of American women. With her were her counsel, Henry R. Selden

and John Van Voorhis, her sister, Hannah Mosher, most of the women who

had voted with her in Rochester, and Matilda Joslyn Gage, whose

interest in this case was akin to her own.

In the courtroom on the second floor, seated behind the bar, Susan

watched the curious crowd gather and fill every available seat. She

wondered, as she calmly surveyed the all-male jury, whether they could

possibly understand the humiliation of a woman who had been arrested

for exercising the rights of a citizen. The judge, Ward Hunt, did not

promise well, for he had only recently been appointed to the bench

through the influence of his friend and townsman, Roscoe Conkling, the

undisputed leader of the Republican party in New York and a bitter

opponent of woman suffrage. She tried to fathom this small,

white-haired, colorless judge upon whose fairness so much depended.

Prim and stolid, he sat before her, faultlessly dressed in a suit of

black broadcloth, his neck wound with an immaculate white neckcloth.

He ruled against her at once, refusing to let her testify on her own

behalf.

She was completely satisfied, however, as she listened to Henry

Selden's presentation of her case. Tall and commanding, he stood

before the court with nobility and kindness in his face and eyes,

bringing to mind a handsome cultured Lincoln. So logical, so just was

his reasoning, so impressive were his citations of the law that it

seemed to her they must convince the jury and even the expressionless

judge on the bench.

Pointing out that the only alleged ground of the illegality of Miss

Anthony's vote was that she was a woman, Henry Selden declared, "If

the same act had been done by her brother under the same

circumstances, the act would have been not only innocent and laudable,

but honorable; but having been done by a woman it is said to be a

crime.... I believe this is the first instance in which a woman has

been arraigned in a criminal court, merely on account of her

sex."[305] He claimed that Miss Anthony had voted in good faith,

believing that the United States Constitution gave her the right to

vote, and he clearly outlined her interpretation of the Fourteenth and

Fifteenth Amendments, declaring that she stood arraigned as a criminal

simply because she took the only step possible to bring this great

constitutional question before the courts.

After he had finished, Susan followed closely for two long hours the

arguments of the district attorney, Richard Crowley, who contended

that whatever her intentions may have been, good or bad, she had by

her voting violated a law of the United States and was therefore

guilty of crime.

At the close of the district attorney's argument, Judge Hunt without

leaving the bench drew out a written document, and to her surprise,

read from it as he addressed the jury. "The right of voting or the

privilege of voting," he declared, "is a right or privilege arising

under the constitution of the State, not of the United States.[306]

"The Legislature of the State of New York," he continued, "has seen

fit to say, that the franchise of voting shall be limited to the male

sex.... If the Fifteenth Amendment had contained the word 'sex,' the

argument of the defendant would have been potent.... The Fourteenth

Amendment gives no right to a woman to vote, and the voting of Miss

Anthony was in violation of the law....

"There was no ignorance of any fact," he added, "but all the facts

being known, she undertook to settle a principle in her own person....

To constitute a crime, it is true, that there must be a criminal

intent, but it is equally true that knowledge of the facts of the case

is always held to supply this intent...."

Then hesitating a moment, he concluded, "Upon this evidence I suppose

there is no question for the jury and that the jury should be directed

to find a verdict of guilty."

Immediately Henry Selden was on his feet, addressing the judge,

requesting that the jury determine whether or not the defendant was

guilty of crime.

Judge Hunt, however, refused and firmly announced, "The question,

gentlemen of the jury, in the form it finally takes, is wholly a

question or questions of law, and I have decided as a question of law,

in the first place, that under the Fourteenth Amendment which Miss

Anthony claims protects her, she was not protected in a right to vote.

"And I have decided also," he continued, "that her belief and the

advice which she took does not protect her in the act which she

committed. If I am right in this, the result must be a verdict on your

part of guilty, and therefore I direct that you find a verdict of

guilty."

Again Henry Selden was on his feet. "That is a direction," he

declared, "that no court has power to make in a criminal case."

The courtroom was tense. Susan, watching the jury and wondering if

they would meekly submit to his will, heard the judge tersely order,

"Take the verdict, Mr. Clerk."

"Gentlemen of the jury," intoned the clerk, "hearken to your verdict

as the Court has recorded it. You say you find the defendant guilty of

the offense whereof she stands indicted, and so say you all."

Claiming exception to the direction of the Court that the jury find a

verdict of guilty in this a criminal case. Henry Selden asked that the

jury be polled.

To this, Judge Hunt abruptly replied, "No. Gentlemen of the jury, you

are discharged."

\* \* \* \* \*

That night Susan recorded her estimate of Judge Hunt's verdict in her

diary in one terse sentence, "The greatest outrage History ever

witnessed."[307]

The New York \_Sun\_, the Rochester \_Democrat and Chronicle\_, and the

Canandaigua \_Times\_ were indignant over Judge Hunt's failure to poll

the jury. "Judge Hunt," commented the \_Sun\_, "allowed the jury to be

impanelled and sworn, and to hear the evidence; but when the case had

reached the point of rendering the verdict, he directed a verdict of

guilty. He thus denied a trial by jury to an accused party in his

court; and either through malice, which we do not believe, or through

ignorance, which in such a flagrant degree is equally culpable in a

judge, he violated one of the most important provisions of the

Constitution of the United States.... The privilege of polling the

jury has been held to be an absolute right in this State and it is a

substantial right ..."[308]

Claiming that the defendant had been denied her right of trial by

jury. Henry Selden the next day moved for a new trial. Judge Hunt

denied the motion, and, ordering the defendant to stand up, asked her,

"Has the prisoner anything to say why sentence shall not be

pronounced."[309]

"Yes, your honor," Susan replied, "I have many things to say; for in

your ordered verdict of guilty, you have trampled underfoot every

vital principle of our government. My natural rights, my civil rights,

my political rights, my judicial rights, are all alike ignored...."

Impatiently Judge Hunt protested that he could not listen to a

rehearsal of arguments which her counsel had already presented.

"May it please your honor," she persisted, "I am not arguing the

question but simply stating the reasons why sentence cannot in justice

be pronounced against me. Your denial of my citizen's right to vote is

the denial of my right of consent as one of the governed, the denial

of my right of representation as one of the taxed, the denial of my

right to a trial by a jury of my peers ..."

"The Court cannot allow the prisoner to go on," interrupted Judge

Hunt; but Susan, ignoring his command to sit down, protested that her

prosecutors and the members of the jury were all her political

sovereigns.

Again Judge Hunt tried to stop her, but she was not to be put off. She

was pleading for all women and her voice rang out to every corner of

the courtroom.

"The Court must insist," declared Judge Hunt, "the prisoner has been

tried according to established forms of law."

"Yes, your honor," admitted Susan, "but by forms of law all made by

men, interpreted by men, administered by men, in favor of men, and

against women...."

"The Court orders the prisoner to sit down," shouted Judge Hunt. "It

will not allow another word."

Unheeding, Susan continued, "When I was brought before your honor for

trial, I hoped for a broad and liberal interpretation of the

Constitution and its recent amendments, that should declare all United

States citizens under its protecting aegis--that should declare

equality of rights the national guarantee to all persons born or

naturalized in the United States. But failing to get this

justice--failing, even, to get a trial by a jury \_not\_ of my peers--I

ask not leniency at your hands--but rather the full rigors of the

law."

Once more Judge Hunt tried to stop her, and acquiescing at last, she

sat down, only to be ordered by him to stand up as he pronounced her

sentence, a fine of $100 and the costs of prosecution.

"May it please your honor," she protested, "I shall never pay a dollar

of your unjust penalty. All the stock in trade I possess is a $10,000

debt, incurred by publishing my paper--\_The Revolution\_ ... the sole

object of which was to educate all women to do precisely as I have

done, rebel against your man-made, unjust, unconstitutional forms of

law, that tax, fine, imprison, and hang women, while they deny them

the right of representation in the government.... I shall earnestly

and persistently continue to urge all women to the practical

recognition of the old revolutionary maxim that 'Resistance to tyranny

is obedience to God.'"

Pouring cold water on this blaze of oratory. Judge Hunt tersely

remarked that the Court would not require her imprisonment pending the

payment of her fine.

This shrewd move, obviously planned in advance, made it impossible to

carry the case to the United States Supreme Court by writ of habeas

corpus.

\* \* \* \* \*

That same afternoon, Susan was on hand for the trial of the three

election inspectors. This time Judge Hunt submitted the case to the

jury but with explicit instructions that the defendants were guilty.

The jury returned a verdict of guilty, and the inspectors, denied a

new trial, were each fined $25 and costs. Two of them, Edwin F. Marsh

and William B. Hall, refused to pay their fines and were sent to jail.

Susan appealed on their behalf to Senator Sargent in Washington, who

eventually secured a pardon for them from President Grant. He also

presented a petition to the Senate, in January 1874, to remit Susan's

fine, as did William Loughridge of Iowa to the House, but the

judiciary committees reported adversely.

Because neither of these cases had been decided on the basis of

national citizenship and the right of a citizen to vote, Susan was

heartsick. To have them relegated to the category of election fraud

was as if her high purpose had been trailed in the dust. Wishing to

spread reliable information about her trial and the legal questions

involved, she had 3,000 copies of the court proceedings printed for

distribution.[310]

It was hard for her to concede that justice for women could not be

secured in the courts, but there seemed to be no way in the face of

the cold letter of the law to take her case to the Supreme Court of

the United States. This would have been possible on writ of habeas

corpus had Judge Hunt sentenced her to prison for failure to pay her

fine, but this he carefully avoided.

Even that intrepid fighter, John Van Voorhis, could find no loophole,

and another of her loyal friends in the legal profession, Albert G.

Riddle, wrote her, "There is not, I think, the slightest hope from the

courts and just as little from the politicians. They will never take

up this cause, never! Individuals will, parties never--till the thing

is done.... The trouble is that man can govern alone, and that, though

woman has the right, man wants to do it, and if she wait for him to

ask her, she will never vote.... Either man must be made to see and

feel ... the need of woman's help in the great field of human

government, and so demand it; or woman must arise and come forward as

she never has, and take her place."[311]

The case of Virginia Minor of St. Louis still held out a glimmer of

hope. She had brought suit against an election inspector for his

refusal to register her as a voter in the presidential election of

1872, and the case of Minor vs. Happersett reached the United States

Supreme Court in 1874. An adverse decision, on March 29, 1875,

delivered by Chief Justice Waite, a friend of woman suffrage, was a

bitter blow to Susan and to all those who had pinned their faith on a

more liberal interpretation of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth

Amendments.

Carefully studying the decision, Susan tried to fathom its reasoning,

so foreign to her own ideas of justice. "Sex," she read, "has never

been made of one of the elements of citizenship in the United

States.... The XIV Amendment did not affect the citizenship of women

any more than it did of men.... The direct question is, therefore,

presented whether all citizens are necessarily voters."[312]

She read on: "The Constitution does not define the privileges and

immunities of citizens.... In this case we need not determine what

they are, but only whether suffrage is necessarily one of them. It

certainly is nowhere made so in express terms....

"When the Constitution of the United States was adopted, all the

several States, with the exception of Rhode Island, had Constitutions

of their own.... We find in no State were all citizens permitted to

vote.... Women were excluded from suffrage in nearly all the States by

the express provision of their constitutions and laws ... No new State

has ever been admitted to the Union which has conferred the right of

suffrage upon women, and this has never been considered valid

objection to her admission. On the contrary ... the right of suffrage

was withdrawn from women as early as 1807 in the State of New Jersey,

without any attempt to obtain the interference of the United States to

prevent it. Since then the governments of the insurgent States have

been reorganized under a requirement that, before their

Representatives could be admitted to seats in Congress, they must have

adopted new Constitutions, republican in form. In no one of these

Constitutions was suffrage conferred upon women, and yet the States

have all been restored to their original position as States in the

Union ... Certainly if the courts can consider any question settled,

this is one....

"Our province," concluded Chief Justice Waite, "is to decide what the

law is, not to declare what it should be.... Being unanimously of the

opinion that the Constitution of the United States does not confer the

right of suffrage upon any one, and that the Constitutions and laws of

the several States which commit that important trust to men alone are

not necessarily void, we affirm the judgment of the Court below."

"A states-rights document," Susan called this decision and she scored

it as inconsistent with the policies of a Republican administration

which, through the Civil War amendments, had established federal

control over the rights and privileges of citizens. If the

Constitution does not confer the right of suffrage, she asked herself,

why does it define the qualifications of those voting for members of

the House of Representatives? How about the enfranchisement of Negroes

by federal amendment or the enfranchisement of foreigners? Why did

the federal government interfere in her case, instead of leaving it in

the hands of the state of New York?

Like most abolitionists, Susan had always regarded the principles of

the Declaration of Independence as underlying the Constitution and as

the essence of constitutional law. In her opinion, the interpretation

of the Constitution in the Virginia Minor case was not only out of

harmony with the spirit of the Declaration of Independence, but also

contrary to the wise counsel of the great English jurist, Sir Edward

Coke, who said, "Whenever the question of liberty runs doubtful, the

decision must be given in favor of liberty."[313]

In the face of such a ruling by the highest court in the land, she was

helpless. Women were shut out of the Constitution and denied its

protection. From here on there was only one course to follow, to press

again for a Sixteenth Amendment to enfranchise women.
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SOCIAL PURITY

Militancy among the suffragists continued to flare up here and there

in resistance to taxation without representation. Abby Kelley Foster's

home in Worcester was sold for taxes for a mere fraction of its worth,

while in Glastonbury, Connecticut, Abby and Julia Smith's cows and

personal property were seized for taxes. Both Dr. Harriot K. Hunt in

Boston and Mary Anthony in Rochester continued their tax protests.

Much as Susan admired this spirited rebellion, she recognized that

these militant gestures were but flames in the wind unless they had

behind them a well-organized, sustained campaign for a Sixteenth

Amendment, and this she could not undertake until \_The Revolution\_

debt was paid. Nor was there anyone to pinch-hit for her since

Ernestine Rose had returned to England and Mrs. Stanton gave all her

time to Lyceum lectures.

At the moment the prospect looked bleak for woman suffrage. In

Congress, there was not the slightest hope of the introduction of or

action on a Sixteenth Amendment. In the states, interest was kept

alive by woman suffrage bills before the legislatures, and year by

year, with more people recognizing the inherent justice of the demand,

the margin of defeat grew smaller. Whenever these state contests were

critical, Susan managed to be on hand, giving up profitable lecture

engagements to speak without fees; in Michigan in 1874 and in Iowa in

1875, she made new friends for the cause but was unable to stem the

tide of prejudice against granting women the vote. After the defeat in

Michigan, she wrote in her diary, "Every whisky maker, vendor,

drinker, gambler, every ignorant besotted man is against us, and then

the other extreme, every narrow, selfish religious bigot."[314]

A new militant movement swept the country in 1874, starting in small

Ohio towns among women who were so aroused over the evil influence of

liquor on husbands, sons, fathers, and brothers, that they gathered in

front of saloons to sing and pray, hoping to persuade drunkards to

reform and saloon keepers to close their doors. Out of this uprising,

the Women's Christian Temperance Union developed, and within the next

few years was organized into a powerful reform movement by a young

schoolteacher from Illinois, Frances E. Willard.

A lifelong advocate of temperance, Susan had long before reached the

conclusion that this reform could not be achieved by a strictly

temperance or religious movement, but only through the votes of women.

Nevertheless, she lent a helping hand to the Rochester women who

organized a branch of the W.C.T.U., but she told them just how she

felt: "The best thing this organization will do for you will be to

show you how utterly powerless you are to put down the liquor traffic.

You can never talk down or sing down or pray down an institution which

is voted into existence. You will never be able to lessen this evil

until you have votes."[315]

As she traveled through the West for the Lyceum Bureau, she did what

she could to stimulate interest in a federal woman suffrage amendment,

speaking out of a full heart and with sure knowledge on "Bread and the

Ballot" and "The Power of the Ballot," earning on the average $100 a

week, which she applied to the \_Revolution\_ debt.

Lyceum lecturers were now at the height of their

popularity,--particularly in the West, where in the little towns

scattered across the prairies there were few libraries and theaters,

and the distribution of books, magazines, and newspapers in no way met

the people's thirst for information or entertainment. Men, women, and

children rode miles on horseback or drove over rough roads in wagons

to see and hear a prominent lecturer. Susan was always a drawing card,

for a woman on the lecture platform still was a novelty and almost

everyone was curious about Susan B. Anthony. Many, to their surprise,

discovered she was not the caricature they had been led to believe.

She looked very ladylike and proper as she stood before them in her

dark silk platform dress, a little too stern and serious perhaps, but

frequently her face lighted up with a friendly smile. She spoke to

them as equals and they could follow her reasoning. Her simple

conversational manner was refreshing after the sonorous pretentious

oratory of other lecturers.

Continuous travel in all kinds of weather was difficult. Branch lines

were slow and connections poor. Often trains were delayed by

blizzards, and then to keep her engagements she was obliged to travel

by sleigh over the snowy prairies. There were long waits in dingy

dirty railroad stations late at night. Even there she was always busy,

reading her newspapers in the dim light or dashing off letters home on

any scrap of paper she had at hand, thinking gratefully of her sister

Mary who in addition to her work as superintendent of the neighborhood

public school, supervised the household at 7 Madison Street. Hotel

rooms were cold and drab, the food was uninviting, and only

occasionally did she find to her delight "a Christian cup of

coffee."[316] She often felt that the Lyceum Bureau drove her

unnecessarily hard, routed her inefficiently, and profited too

generously from her labors. Now and then she dispensed with their

services, sent out her own circulars soliciting engagements, and

arranged her own tours, proving to her satisfaction that a woman could

be as businesslike as a man and sometimes more so.[317]

Weighed down by worry over the illness of her sisters, Guelma and

Hannah, she felt a lack of fire and enthusiasm in her work. Anxiously

she waited for letters from home, and when none reached her she was in

despair. At such times, hotel rooms seemed doubly lonely and she

reproached herself for being away from home and for putting too heavy

a burden on her sister Mary. Yet there was nothing else to be done

until the \_Revolution\_ debt was paid, for some of her creditors were

becoming impatient.

\* \* \* \* \*

As often as possible Susan returned to Rochester to be with her

family, and was able to nurse Guelma through the last weeks of her

illness. Heartbroken when she died, in November 1873, she resolved to

take better care of Hannah, sending her out to Colorado and Kansas for

her health. She then tried to spend the summer months at home so that

Mary could visit Hannah in Colorado and Daniel and Merritt in Kansas.

These months at home with her mother whom she dearly loved were a

great comfort to them both. They enjoyed reading aloud, finding George

Eliot's \_Middlemarch\_ and Hawthorne's \_Scarlet Letter\_ of particular

interest as Susan was searching for the answers to many questions

which had been brought into sharp focus by the Beecher-Tilton case,

now filling the newspapers. Like everyone else, she read the latest

developments in this tragic involvement of three of her good friends.

She was especially concerned about Elizabeth and Theodore Tilton, in

whose home she had so often visited and toward whom she felt a warm

motherly affection. Her sympathy went out to Elizabeth Tilton, whose

help and loyalty during the difficult days of \_The Revolution\_ she

never forgot. Although she had often differed with Theodore, whose

quick changes of policy and temperament she could not understand, he

had won her gratitude many times by befriending the cause. The same

was true of Henry Ward Beecher, who had found time in his busy life to

say a good word for woman's rights.

Susan was close to the facts, for in desperation a few years before,

Elizabeth Tilton had confided in her. Unfortunately both Elizabeth and

Theodore had made confidants of others less wise than Susan. Mrs.

Stanton had passed the story along to Victoria Woodhull, who late in

1872 had revived her \_Weekly\_ for a crusade on what she called "the

social question" and had published her expose, "The Beecher-Tilton

Scandal Case." As a result the lives of all involved were being ruined

by merciless publicity.

The Beecher-Tilton story as it unfolded revealed three admirable

people caught in a tangled web of human relationships. Henry Ward

Beecher, for years a close friend and benefactor of his young

parishioners, Theodore and Elizabeth Tilton, had been accused by

Theodore of immoral relations with Elizabeth. Accusations and denials

continued while intrigue and negotiations deepened the confusion. The

whole matter burst into flame in 1874 in the trial of Henry Ward

Beecher before a committee of Plymouth Church, which exonerated him.

Reading Beecher's statement in her newspaper, Susan impulsively wrote

Isabella Beecher Hooker, "Wouldn't you think if God ever did strike

anyone dead for telling a lie, he would have struck then?"[318]

When early in 1875 the Beecher-Tilton case reached the courts in a

suit brought by Theodore Tilton against Henry Ward Beecher for the

alienation of his wife's affections, it became headline news

throughout the country. The press, greedy for sensation, published

anything and everything even remotely connected with the case.

Reporters hounded Susan, who by this time was again lecturing in the

West, and she seldom entered a train, bus, or hotel without finding

them at her heels, as if by their very persistence they meant to force

her to express her opinion regarding the guilt or innocence of Henry

Ward Beecher. They never caught her off guard and she steadfastly

refused to reveal to them, or to the lawyers of either side, who

astutely approached her, the story which Elizabeth Tilton had told her

in confidence. Yet in spite of her continued silence, she was twice

quoted by the press, once through the impulsiveness of Mrs. Stanton,

who expressed herself frankly at every opportunity, and again when the

New York \_Graphic\_ without Susan's consent published her letter to

Mrs. Hooker.

The sympathy of the public was generally with Henry Ward Beecher,

whose popularity and prestige were tremendous. A dynamic preacher,

whose sermons drew thousands to his church and whose written word

carried religion and comfort to every part of the country, he could

not suddenly be ruined by the circulation of a scandal or even by a

sensational trial. Behind him were all those who were convinced that

the future of the Church and Morality demanded his vindication. On his

side, also, as Susan well knew, was the powerful, behind-the-scenes

influence of the financial interests who profited from Plymouth Church

real estate, from the earnings of Beecher's paper, \_Christian Union\_,

and from his book the \_Life of Christ\_, now in preparation and for

which he had already been paid $20,000.

Susan and Mrs. Stanton paid the penalty of being on the unpopular

side. When Elizabeth Tilton was not allowed to testify in her own

defense, they accused Beecher and Tilton of ruthlessly sacrificing her

to save their own reputations. In fact, Susan and Mrs. Stanton knew

far too much about the case for the comfort of either Beecher or

Tilton, and to discredit them, a whispering campaign, and then a press

campaign was initiated against them. They and their National Woman

Suffrage Association were again accused of upholding free love. Their

previous association with Victoria Woodhull was held against them, as

were the frank discussions of marriage and divorce published in \_The

Revolution\_ six years before.

Actually Susan's views on marriage were idealistic. "I hate the whole

doctrine of 'variety' or 'promiscuity,'" she wrote John Hooker, the

husband of her friend Isabella. "I am not even a believer in second

marriages after one of the parties is dead, so sacred and binding do I

consider the marriage relation."[319]

Although in public Susan uttered not one word relating to the guilt or

innocence of Henry Ward Beecher, she did confide her real feelings to

her diary. She believed that to save himself Beecher was withholding

the explanation which the situation demanded. "It is almost an

impossibility," she wrote in her diary, "for a man and a woman to have

a close sympathetic friendship without the tendrils of one soul

becoming fastened around the other, with the result of infinite pain

and anguish." Then again she wrote, "There is nothing more

demoralizing than lying. The act itself is scarcely so base as the lie

which denies it."[320]

Susan's silence probably brought her more notoriety than anything she

could have said on this much discussed subject, and it heightened her

reputation for honesty and integrity. "Miss Anthony," commented the

New York \_Sun\_, "is a lady whose word will everywhere be believed by

those who know anything of her character." The Rochester \_Democrat and

Chronicle\_ had this to say: "Whether she will make any definite

revelations remains to be seen, but whatever she does say will be

received by the public with that credit which attaches to the evidence

of a truthful witness. Her own character, known and honored by the

country, will give importance to any utterances she may make."[321]

She was not called as a witness by either side during the 112 days of

trial which ended in July 1875 with the jury unable to agree on a

verdict.

\* \* \* \* \*

Realizing that many taboos were being broken down by the lurid

nation-wide publicity on the Beecher-Tilton case and that as a result

people were more willing to consider subjects which hitherto had not

been discussed in polite society, Susan began to plan a lecture on

"Social Purity."

She was familiar with the public protest Englishwomen under the

leadership of Josephine Butler were making against the state

regulation of vice. Following with interest and admiration their

courageous fight for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which

placed women suspected of prostitution under police power, Susan found

encouragement in the support these reformers had received from such

men as John Stuart Mill and Jacob Bright. Such legislation, she

resolved, must not gain a foothold in her country, because it not only

disregarded women's right to personal liberty but showed a dangerous

callousness toward men's share of responsibility for prostitution.

She was awake to the problems prostitution presented in cities like

New York and Washington, its prevalence, the police protection it

received, the political corruption it fostered and the reluctance of

the public to face the situation, the majority of men regarding it as

a necessity, and most women closing their eyes to its existence.

During the winter of 1875, while the Beecher-Tilton case was being

tried in Brooklyn, she delivered her speech on "Social Purity" at the

Chicago Grand Opera House, in the Sunday dime-lecture course, facing

with trepidation the immense crowd which gathered to hear her. Even

the daring Mrs. Stanton had warned her that she would never be asked

to speak in Chicago again, and with this the manager of the Slayton

Lecture Bureau agreed. But they were wrong. The people were hungry for

the truth and for a constructive policy. In the past they had heard

the "social evil" described and denounced in vivid thunderous words by

eloquent men and by the dramatic Anna E. Dickinson. Now an earnest

woman with graying hair, one of their own kind, talked to them without

mincing matters, calmly and logically, and offered them a remedy.

Calling their attention to the daily newspaper reports of divorce and

breach-of-promise suits, of wife murders and "paramour" shootings, of

abortions and infanticide, she told them that the prevalence of these

evils showed clearly that men were incapable of coping with them

successfully and needed the help of women. She cited statistics,

revealing 20,000 prostitutes in the city of New York, where a

foundling hospital during the first six months of its existence

rescued 1,300 waifs laid in baskets on its doorstep. She courageously

mentioned the prevalence of venereal disease and spoke out against

England's Contagious Diseases Acts which were repeatedly suggested for

New York and Washington and which she described as licensed

prostitution, men's futile and disastrous attempt to deal with social

corruption.

Declaring that the poverty and economic dependence of women as well as

the passions of men were the causes of prostitution, she quoted more

statistics which showed a great increase in the poverty of women. Work

formerly done in the household, she explained, was being gradually

taken over by factories, with the result that women in order to earn a

living had been forced to follow it out of the home and were

supporting themselves wholly or in part at a wage inadequate to meet

their needs. No wonder many were tempted by food, clothes, and

comfortable shelter into an immoral life.

Her solution was "to lift this vast army of poverty-stricken women who

now crowd our cities, above the temptation, the necessity, to sell

themselves in marriage or out, for bread and shelter." "Women," she

told them, "must be educated out of their unthinking acceptance of

financial dependence on man into mental and economic independence.

Girls like boys must be educated to some lucrative employment. Women

like men must have an equal chance to earn a living."[322]

"Whoever controls work and wages," she continued, "controls morals.

Therefore we must have women employers, superintendents, committees,

legislators; wherever girls go to seek the means of subsistence, there

must be some woman. Nay, more; we must have women preachers, lawyers,

doctors--that wherever women go to seek counsel--spiritual, legal,

physical--there, too, they will be sure to find the best and noblest

of their own sex to minister to them."

Then she added, "Marriage, to women as to men, must be a luxury, not a

necessity; an incident of life, not all of it.... Marriage never will

cease to be a wholly unequal partnership until the law recognizes the

equal ownership in the joint earnings and possessions."

She asked for the vote so that women would have the power to help make

the laws relating to marriage, divorce, adultery, breach of promise,

rape, bigamy, infanticide, and so on. These laws, she reminded them,

have not only been framed by men, but are administered by men. Judges,

jurors, lawyers, all are men, and no woman's voice is heard in our

courts except as accused or witness, and in many cases the married

woman is denied the right to testify as to her guilt or innocence.

Never before had the audience heard the case for social purity

presented in this way and they listened intently. When the applause

was subsiding, Susan saw Parker Pillsbury and Bronson Alcott,

fellow-lecturers on the Lyceum circuit, coming toward her, smiling

approval. They were generous in their praise, Bronson Alcott

declaring, "You have stated here this afternoon, in a fearless manner,

truths that I have hardly dared to think, much less to utter."[323]

She repeated this lecture in St. Louis, in Wisconsin, and in Kansas,

and while most city newspapers, acknowledging the need of facing the

issues, praised her courage, small-town papers were frankly disturbed

by a spinster's public discussion of the "social evil," one paper

observing, "The best lecture a woman can give the community ... on the

sad 'evil' ... is the sincerity of her profound ignorance on the

subject."[324]

\* \* \* \* \*

Having bravely done her bit for social purity, Susan with relief

turned again to her favorite lecture, "Bread and the Ballot." Her

message fell on fertile ground. These western men and women saw

justice in her reasoning. Having broken with tradition by leaving the

East for the frontier, they could more easily drop old ways for new.

Western men also recognized the influence for good that women had

brought to lonely bleak western towns--better homes, cleanliness,

comfort, then schools, churches, law and order--and many of them were

willing to give women the vote. All they needed was prodding to

translate that willingness into law.

As she continued her lecturing, she kept her watchful eye on her

family and the annual New York and Washington conventions, attending

to many of the routine details herself. Finally, on May 1, 1876, she

recorded in her diary, "The day of Jubilee for me has come. I have

paid the last dollar of the \_Revolution\_ debt."[325]

Even the press took notice, the Chicago \_Daily News\_ commenting, "By

working six years and devoting to the purpose all the money she could

earn, she has paid the debt and interest. And now, when the creditors

of that paper and others who really know her, hear the name of Susan

B. Anthony, they feel inclined to raise their hats in reverence."[326]
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A FEDERAL WOMAN SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

Like everyone else in the United States in 1876, Susan now turned her

attention to the Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, which was

proclaiming to the world the progress this new country had made. Susan

pointed out, however, that one hundred years after the signing of the

Declaration of Independence, women were still deprived of basic

citizenship rights.

As an afterthought, a Woman's Pavilion had been erected on the

exposition grounds and exhibited here she found only women's

contribution to the arts but nothing which would in any way show the

part women had played in building up the country or developing

industry. She longed to explain so that all could hear how the skilled

work of women had contributed to the prosperous textile and shoe

industries, to the manufacture of cartridges and Waltham watches, and

countless other products. Could she have had her way, she would have

made the Woman's Pavilion an eloquent appeal for equal rights, but

unable to do this, she established a center of rebellion for the

National Woman Suffrage Association at 1431 Chestnut Street, in

parlors on the first floor. Here she spent many happy hours directing

the work, often sleeping on the sofa so that she could work late and

save money for the cause.

Philadelphia had always been a friendly city because of Lucretia Mott.

Now Lucretia came almost daily to the women's headquarters, bringing a

comforting sense of support, approval, and friendship. When Mrs.

Stanton, free at last from her lecture engagements, joined them in

June, Susan's happiness was complete and she confided to her diary,

"Glad enough to see her and feel her strength come in."[327]

Susan and Mrs. Stanton now sent the Republican and Democratic national

conventions well-written memorials pointing out the appropriateness of

enfranchising women in this centennial year. But no woman suffrage

plank was adopted by either party. Susan put Mrs. Stanton and Mrs.

Gage to work on a Women's Declaration of 1876, and so "magnificent" a

document did they produce that she not only had many copies printed

for distribution but had one beautifully engrossed on parchment for

presentation to President Grant at the Fourth of July celebration in

Independence Square.

Unable to secure permission to present this declaration, she made

plans of her own. For herself, she managed to get a press card as

reporter for her brother's paper, the Leavenworth \_Times\_. Mrs.

Stanton and Lucretia Mott refused to attend the celebration, so

indignant were they over the snubs women had received from the

Centennial Commission, and they held a women's meeting at the First

Unitarian Church. When at the last minute four tickets were sent Susan

by the Centennial Commission, she gave them to the most militant of

her colleagues, Matilda Joslyn Gage, Lillie Devereux Blake, Sarah

Andrews Spencer, and Phoebe Couzins. With Susan in the lead, they

pushed through the jostling crowd to Independence Square on that

bright hot Fourth of July and were seated among the elect on the

platform.

By this time they had learned that Thomas W. Ferry of Michigan, Acting

Vice President, would substitute for President Grant at the ceremony.

Because he was a good friend of woman suffrage, Phoebe Couzins made

one more effort for orderly procedure, sending him a note asking for

permission to present the Women's Declaration. This failed, and rather

than take part in creating a disturbance, she withdrew, leaving her

four friends on the platform.

"We ... sat there waiting ..." reported Mrs. Blake. "The heat was

frightful.... Amid such a throng it was difficult to hear anything ...

We decided that our presentation should take place immediately after

Mr. Richard Lee of Virginia, grandson of the Signer, had read the

Declaration of Independence. He read it from the original document,

and it was an impressive moment when that time-honored parchment was

exposed to the view of the wildly cheering crowd.... Mr. Lee's voice

was inaudible, but at last I caught the words, 'our sacred honors,'

and cried, 'Now is the time.'

"We all four rose, Miss Anthony first, next Mrs. Gage, bearing our

engrossed Declaration, and Mrs. Spencer and myself following with

hundreds of printed copies in our hands. There was a stir in the

crowd just at the time, and General Hawley who had been keeping a wary

eye on us, had relaxed his vigilance for a moment, as he signed to the

band to resume playing. He did not see us advancing until we reached

the Vice President's dais. There Miss Anthony, taking the parchment

from Mrs. Gage, stepped forward and presented it to Mr. Ferry, saying,

'I present to you a Declaration of Rights from the women citizens of

the United States.'"[328]

Nonplussed, Mr. Ferry bowed low and received the Declaration without a

word. Then the four intrepid women filed out, distributing printed

copies of their declaration while General Hawley boomed out, "Order!

Order!"

Leaving the square and mounting a platform erected for musicians in

front of Independence Hall, they waited until a curious crowd had

gathered around them. Then while Mrs. Gage held an umbrella over Susan

to shield her from the hot sun, she read the Women's Declaration in a

loud clear voice that carried far.

"We do rejoice in the success, thus far, of our experiment of

self-government," she began. "Our faith is firm and unwavering in the

broad principles of human rights proclaimed in 1776, not only as

abstract truths, but as the cornerstones of a republic. Yet we cannot

forget, even in this glad hour, that while all men of every race, and

clime, and condition, have been invested with the full rights of

citizenship under our hospitable flag, all women still suffer the

degradation of disfranchisement."[329]

Then she enumerated women's grievances and the crowd applauded as she

drove home point after point.

"Woman," she continued, "has shown equal devotion with man to the

cause of freedom and has stood firmly by his side in its defense.

Together they have made this country what it is.... We ask our rulers,

at this hour, no special favors, no special privileges.... We ask

justice, we ask equality, we ask that all civil and political rights

that belong to the citizens of the United States be guaranteed to us

and our daughters forever."

Stepping down from the platform into the applauding crowd which

eagerly reached for printed copies of the declaration, she and her

four companions hurried to the First Unitarian Church where an eager

audience awaited their report and hailed their courage.

[Illustration: Aaron A. Sargent]

The New York \_Tribune\_, commenting on Susan's militancy, prophesied

that it foreshadowed "the new forms of violence and disregard of order

which may accompany the participation of women in active partisan

politics."[330]

\* \* \* \* \*

Nor was Congress impressed by Susan's centennial publicity demanding a

federal woman suffrage amendment. She had gathered petitions from

twenty-six states with 10,000 signatures which were presented to the

Senate in 1877. The majority of the Senators found these petitions

uproariously funny, and Susan in the visitors' gallery at the time of

their presentation was infuriated by the mirth and disrespect of these

men. "A few read the petitions as they would any other, with dignity

and without comment," reported the popular journalist, Mary Clemmer,

in her weekly Washington column, "but the majority seemed intensely

conscious of holding something unutterably funny in their hands....

The entire Senate presented the appearance of a laughing school

practicing sidesplitting and ear-extended grins." After a few humorous

and sarcastic remarks the petitions were referred to the Committee on

Public Lands. Only one Senator, Aaron A. Sargent of California, was

"man enough and gentleman enough to lift the petitions from this

insulting proposition.... He ... demanded for the petition of more

than 10,000 women at least the courtesy which would be given any

other."[331]

Although his words did not deter the Senators, Susan was proud of this

tall vigorous white-haired Californian and grateful for his

spontaneous support in this humiliating situation. He had been a

trusted friend and counselor ever since she had shared with him and

his family the long snowy journey from Nevada in 1872. She looked

forward to the time when woman suffrage would have more such advocates

in the Congress and when she would find there new faces and a more

liberal spirit.

Disappointment only drove Susan into more intensive activity. Between

lectures she now nursed her sister Hannah who was critically ill in

Daniel's home in Leavenworth. After Hannah's death in May 1877, Susan

worked off her grief in Colorado, where the question of votes for

women was being referred to the people of the state.

The suffragists in Colorado were headed by Dr. Alida Avery, who had

left her post as resident physician at the new woman's college,

Vassar, to practice medicine in Denver. Making Dr. Avery's home her

headquarters, Susan carried her plea for the ballot to settlements far

from the railroads, traveling by stagecoach over rough lonely roads

through magnificent scenery. Holding meetings wherever she could, she

spoke in schoolhouses, in hotel dining rooms, and even in saloons,

when no other place was available, and always she was treated with

respect and listened to with interest. Occasionally only a mere

handful gathered to hear her, but in Lake City she spoke to an

audience of a thousand or more from a dry-goods box on the court-house

steps. She was equal to anything, but the mining towns depressed her,

for they were swarming with foreigners who had been welcomed as

naturalized, enfranchised citizens and who almost to a man opposed

extending the vote to women. This precedence of foreign-born men over

American women was not only galling to her but menaced, she believed,

the growth of American democracy.

Woman suffrage was defeated in Colorado in 1877, two to one. With the

Chinese coming into the state in great numbers to work in the mines,

the specter that stalked through this campaign was the fear of putting

the ballot into the hands of Chinese women.

From Colorado, Susan moved on to Nebraska with a new lecture, "The

Homes of Single Women." Although she much preferred to speak on "Woman

and the Sixteenth Amendment" or "Bread and the Ballot," she realized

that, in order to be assured of return engagements, she must

occasionally vary her subjects, but she was unwilling to wander far

afield while women's needs still were so great. By means of this new

lecture she hoped to dispel the widespread, deeply ingrained fallacy

that single women were unwanted helpless creatures wholly dependent

upon some male relative for a home and support. Aware that this

mistaken estimate was slowly yielding in the face of a changing

economic order, she believed she could help lessen its hold by

presenting concrete examples of independent self-supporting single

women who had proved that marriage was not the only road to security

and a home. She told of Alice and Phoebe Cary, whose home in New York

City was a rendezvous for writers, artists, musicians, and reformers;

of Dr. Clemence Lozier, the friend of women medical students; of Mary

L. Booth, well established through her income as editor of \_Harper's

Bazaar\_; and of her beloved Lydia Mott, whose home had been a refuge

for fugitive slaves and reformers.[332]

In Nebraska, she made a valuable new friend for the cause, Clara

Bewick Colby, whose zeal and earnest, intelligent face at once

attracted her. Within a few years, Mrs. Colby established in Beatrice,

Nebraska, a magazine for women, the \_Woman's Tribune\_, which to

Susan's joy spoke out for a federal woman suffrage amendment.

Because Susan's contract with the Slayton Lecture Bureau allowed no

break in her engagements, she was obliged to leave the Washington

convention of the National Woman Suffrage Association in the hands of

others in 1878. It was much on her mind as she traveled through

Dakota, Minnesota, Missouri, and Kansas, and she sent a check for $100

to help with the expenses of the convention. Particularly on her mind

was a federal woman suffrage amendment, for since 1869 when a

Sixteenth Amendment enfranchising women had been introduced in

Congress and ignored, no further efforts along that line had been

made. Now good news came from Mrs. Stanton, who had attended the

convention. She had persuaded Senator Sargent to introduce in the

Senate, on January 10, 1878, a new draft of a Sixteenth Amendment,

following the wording of the Fifteenth. It read, "The right of

citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged

by the United States or by any State on account of sex."[333]

[Illustration: Clara Bewick Colby]

\* \* \* \* \*

During the next few years the Sixteenth Amendment made little headway,

although the complexion of Congress changed, the Democrats breaking

the Republicans' hold and winning a substantial majority. Encouraging

as was the more liberal spirit of the new Congress and the defeat of

several implacable enemies, Susan found California's failure to return

Senator Sargent an irreparable loss. In addition she now had to face a

newly formed group of anti-suffragists under the leadership of Mrs.

Dahlgren, Mrs. Sherman, and Almira Lincoln Phelps, who sang the

refrain which Congressmen loved to hear, that women did not want the

vote because it would wreck marriage and the home.

Hoping to counteract this adverse influence by increased pressure for

the Sixteenth Amendment, Susan once more appealed for help to the

American Woman Suffrage Association through her old friends, William

Lloyd Garrison and Wendell Phillips. Garrison replied that her efforts

for a federal amendment were premature and "would bring the movement

into needless contempt." This she found strange advice from the man

who had fearlessly defied public opinion to crusade against slavery.

Wendell Phillips did better, writing, "I think you are on the right

track--the best method to agitate the question, and I am with you,

though between you and me, I still think the individual States must

lead off, and that this reform must advance piecemeal, State by State.

But I mean always to help everywhere and everyone."[334]

The American Association continued to follow the state-by-state

method, and this holding back aroused Susan to the boiling point, for

experience had taught her that in state elections woman suffrage faced

the prejudiced opposition of an ever-increasing number of naturalized

immigrants, who had little understanding of democratic government or

sympathy with the rights of women. A federal amendment, on the other

hand, depending for its adoption upon Congress and ratifying

legislatures, was in the hands of a far more liberal, intelligent, and

preponderantly American group. "We have puttered with State rights for

thirty years," she sputtered, "without a foothold except in the

territories."[335]

Year by year she continued her Washington conventions, convinced that

these gatherings in the national capital could not fail to impress

Congressmen with the seriousness of their purpose. As women from many

states lobbied for the Sixteenth Amendment, reporting a growing

sentiment everywhere for woman suffrage, as they received in the press

respectful friendly publicity, Congressmen began to take notice. At

the large receptions held at the Riggs House, through the generosity

of the proprietors, Jane Spofford and her husband, Congressmen became

better acquainted with the suffragists, finding that they were not

cranks, as they had supposed, but intelligent women and socially

charming.

Mrs. Stanton's poise as presiding officer and the warmth of her

personality made her the natural choice for president of the National

Woman Suffrage Association through the years. Her popularity, now well

established throughout the country after her ten years of lecturing

on the Lyceum circuit, lent prestige to the cause. To Susan, her

presence brought strength and the assurance that "the brave and true

word" would be spoken.[336] A new office had been created for Susan,

that of vice-president at large, and in that capacity she guided,

steadied, and prodded her flock.

The subjects which the conventions discussed covered a wide field

going far beyond their persistent demands for a federal woman suffrage

amendment. Not only did they at this time urge an educational

qualification for voters to combat the argument that woman suffrage

would increase the ignorant vote, but they also protested the counting

of women in the basis of representation so long as they were

disfranchised. They criticized the church for barring women from the

ministry and from a share in church government. They took up the case

of Anna Ella Carroll,[337] who had been denied recognition and a

pension for her services to her country during the Civil War, and they

urged pensions for all women who had nursed soldiers during the war.

They welcomed to their conventions Mormon women from Utah who came to

Washington to protest efforts to disfranchise them as a means of

discouraging polygamy.

Susan injected international interest into these conventions by

reading Alexander Dumas's arguments for woman suffrage, letters from

Victor Hugo and English suffragists, and a report by Mrs. Stanton's

son, Theodore, now a journalist, of the International Congress in

Paris in 1878, which discussed the rights of women. Occasionally

foreign-born women, now making new homes for themselves in this

country, joined the ranks of the suffragists, and a few of them, like

Madam Anneké and Clara Heyman from Germany contributed a great deal

through their eloquence and wider perspective. These contacts with the

thoughts and aspirations of men and women of other countries led Susan

to dream of an international conference of women in the not too

distant future.[338]
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RECORDING WOMEN'S HISTORY

Recording women's history for future generations was a project that

had been in the minds of both Susan and Mrs. Stanton for a long time.

Both looked upon women's struggle for a share in government as a

potent force in strengthening democracy and one to be emphasized in

history. Men had always been the historians and had as a matter of

course extolled men's exploits, passing over women's record as

negligible. Susan intended to remedy this and she was convinced that

if women close to the facts did not record them now, they would be

forgotten or misinterpreted by future historians. Already many of the

old workers had died, Martha C. Wright, Lydia Mott, whom Susan had

nursed in her last illness, Lucretia Mott, and William Lloyd Garrison.

There was no time to be lost.[339]

In the spring of 1880, Susan's mother died, and it was no longer

necessary for her to fit into her schedule frequent visits in

Rochester. Her sister Mary, busy with her teaching, was sharing her

home with her two widowed brothers-in-law and two nieces whose

education she was supervising.[340] Mrs. Stanton had just given up the

strenuous life of a Lyceum lecturer and welcomed work that would keep

her at home. Susan, who had managed to save $4,500 out of her lecture

fees, felt she could afford to devote at least a year to the history.

She now shipped several boxes of letters, clippings, and documents to

the Stanton home in Tenafly, New Jersey.[341] As they planned their

book, it soon became obvious that the one volume which they had hoped

to finish in a few months would extend to two or three volumes and

take many years to write. They called in Matilda Joslyn Gage to help

them, and the three of them signed a contract to share the work and

the profits.

The history presented a publishing problem as well as a writing

ordeal, and Susan, interviewing New York publishers, found the subject

had little appeal. Finally, however, she signed a contract with Fowler

& Wells under which the authors agreed to pay the cost of composition,

stereotyping, and engravings; and as usual she raised the necessary

funds.[342]

[Illustration: Matilda Joslyn Gage]

Returning to Tenafly as to a second home, Susan usually found Mrs.

Stanton beaming a welcome from the piazza and Margaret and Harriot

running to the gate to meet her. The Stanton children were fond of

Susan. It was a comfortable happy household, and Susan, thoroughly

enjoying Mrs. Stanton's companionship, attacked the history with

vigor. Sitting opposite each other at a big table in the sunny tower

room, they spent long hours at work. Susan, thin and wiry, her graying

hair neatly smoothed back over her ears, sat up very straight as she

rapidly sorted old clippings and letters and outlined chapters, while

Mrs. Stanton, stout and placid, her white curls beautifully arranged,

wrote steadily and happily, transforming masses of notes into readable

easy prose.[343]

Having sent appeals for information to colleagues in all parts of the

country, Susan, as the contributions began to come in, struggled to

decipher the often almost illegible, handwritten manuscripts, many of

them careless and inexact about dates and facts. To their request for

data about her, Lucy Stone curtly replied, "I have never kept a diary

or any record of my work, and so am unable to furnish you the required

dates.... You say 'I' must be referred to in the history you are

writing.... I cannot furnish a biographical sketch and trust you will

not try to make one. Yours with ceaseless regret that any 'wing' of

suffragists should attempt to write the history of the other."[344]

The greater part of the writing fell upon Mrs. Stanton, but Matilda

Joslyn Gage contributed the chapters, "Preceding Causes," "Women in

Newspapers," and "Women, Church, and State." Susan carefully selected

the material and checked the facts. She helped with the copying of the

handwritten manuscript and with the proofreading. Believing that

pictures of the early workers were almost as important for the

\_History\_ as the subject matter itself, she tried to provide them, but

they presented a financial problem with which it was hard to cope, for

each engraving cost $100.[345]

When the first volume of the \_History of Woman Suffrage\_ came off the

press in May 1881, she proudly and lovingly scanned its 878 pages

which told the story of women's progress in the United States up to

the Civil War.

She was well aware that the \_History\_ was not a literary achievement,

but the facts were there, as accurate as humanly possible; all the

eloquent, stirring speeches were there, a proof of the caliber and

high intelligence of the pioneers; and out of the otherwise dull

record of meetings, conventions, and petitions, a spirit of

independence and zeal for freedom shone forth, highlighted

occasionally by dramatic episodes. As Mrs. Stanton so aptly expressed

it, "We have furnished the bricks and mortar for some future architect

to rear a beautiful edifice."[346]

The distribution of the book was very much on Susan's mind, for she

realized that it would not be in great demand because of its cost,

bulk, and subject matter. Nor could she at this time present it to

libraries, as she wished, for she had already spent her savings on the

illustrations. "It ought to be in every school library," she wrote

Amelia Bloomer, "where every boy and girl of the nation could see and

read and learn what women have done to secure equality of rights and

chances for girls and women...."[347]

So much material had been collected while Volume I was in preparation

that both Susan and Mrs. Stanton felt they should immediately

undertake Volume II. After a summer of lecturing to help finance its

publication, Susan returned to Tenafly to the monotonous work of

compilation. "I am just sick to death of it," she wrote her young

friend Rachel Foster. "I had rather wash or whitewash or do any

possible hard work than sit here and go there digging into the dusty

records of the past--that is, rather \_make\_ history than write

it."[348]

Yet she never entirely gave up making history, for she was always

planning for the future and Rachel Foster was now her able lieutenant,

relieving her of details, doing the spade work for the annual

Washington conventions, and arranging for an occasional lecture

engagement. Susan would not leave Tenafly for a lecture fee of less

than $50.

She took this intelligent young girl to her heart as she had Anna E.

Dickinson in the past. Rachel, however, had none of Anna's dramatic

temperament or love of the limelight, but in her orderly businesslike

way was eager to serve Susan, whom she had admired ever since as a

child she had heard her speak for woman suffrage in her mother's

drawing room.

While Susan was pondering the ways and means of financing another

volume of the \_History\_, the light broke through in a letter from

Wendell Phillips, announcing the astonishing news that she and Lucy

Stone had inherited approximately $25,000 each for "the woman's cause"

under the will of Eliza Eddy, the daughter of their former benefactor,

Francis Jackson. Although the legacy was not paid until 1885 because

of litigation, its promise lightened considerably Susan's financial

burden and she knew that Volumes II and III were assured. Her

gratitude to Eliza Eddy was unbounded, and better still, she read

between the lines the good will of Wendell Phillips who had been Eliza

Eddy's legal advisor. That he, whom she admired above all men, should

after their many differences still regard her as worthy of this trust,

meant as much to her as the legacy itself.

In May 1882 she had the satisfaction of seeing the second volume of

the \_History of Woman Suffrage\_ in print, carrying women's record

through 1875. Volume III was not completed until 1885.

Women's response to their own history was a disappointment. Only a few

realized its value for the future, among them Mary L. Booth, editor of

\_Harper's Bazaar\_. The majority were indifferent and some even

critical. When Mrs. Stanton offered the three volumes to the Vassar

College library, they were refused.[349] Nevertheless, every time

Susan looked at the three large volumes on her shelves, she was happy,

for now she was assured that women's struggle for citizenship and

freedom would live in print through the years. To libraries in the

United States and Europe, she presented well over a thousand copies,

grateful that the Eliza Eddy legacy now made this possible.

\* \* \* \* \*

In 1883, Susan surprised everyone by taking a vacation in Europe. Soon

after Volume II of the \_History\_ had been completed, Mrs. Stanton had

left for Europe with her daughter Harriot.[350] Her letters to Susan

reported not only Harriot's marriage to an Englishman, William Henry

Blatch, but also encouraging talks with the forward-looking women of

England and France whom she hoped to interest in an international

organization. Repeatedly she urged Susan to join her, to meet these

women, and to rest for a while from her strenuous labors. The

possibility of forming an international organization of women was a

greater attraction to Susan than Europe itself, and when Rachel Foster

suggested that she make the journey with her, she readily consented.

"She goes abroad a republican Queen," observed the Kansas City

\_Journal\_, "uncrowned to be sure, but none the less of the blood

royal, and we have faith that the noblest men and women of Europe will

at once recognize and welcome her as their equal."[351]

In London, Susan met Mrs. Stanton, "her face beaming and her white

curls as lovely as ever." Then after talking with English suffragists

and her two old friends, William Henry Channing and Ernestine Rose,

now living in England, Susan traveled with Rachel through Italy,

Switzerland, Germany, and France, where a whole new world opened

before her. She thoroughly enjoyed its beauty; yet there was much that

distressed her and she found herself far more interested in the

people, their customs and living conditions than in the treasures of

art. "It is good for our young civilization," she wrote Daniel, "to

see and study that of the old world and observe the hopelessness of

lifting the masses into freedom and freedom's industry, honesty and

integrity. How any American, any lover of our free institutions, based

on equality of rights for all, can settle down and live here is more

than I can comprehend. It will only be by overturning the powers that

education and equal chances ever can come to the rank and file. The

hope of the world is indeed our republic...." To a friend she

reported, "Amidst it all my head and heart turn to our battle for

women at home. Here in the old world, with ... its utter blotting out

of women as an equal, there is no hope, no possibility of changing her

condition; so I look to our own land of equality for men, and partial

equality for women, as the only one for hope or work."[352]

Back in London again, she allowed herself a few luxuries, such as an

expensive India shawl and more social life than she had had in many a

year, and she longed to have Mary enjoy it all with her. She visited

suffragists in Scotland and Ireland as well as in England and

occasionally spoke at their meetings.[353] Here as in America

suffragists differed over the best way to win the vote, and even the

most radical among them were more conservative and cautious than

American women, but she admired them all and tried to understand the

very different problems they faced. Gradually she interested a few of

them in an international conference of women, and before she sailed

back to America with Mrs. Stanton in November 1883, she had their

promise of cooperation.

The newspapers welcomed her home. "Susan B. Anthony is back from

Europe," announced the Cleveland \_Leader\_, "and is here for a winter's

fight on behalf of woman suffrage. She seems remarkably well, and has

gained fifteen pounds since she left last spring. She is sixty-three,

but looks just the same as twenty years ago. There is perhaps an extra

wrinkle in her face, a little more silver in her hair, but her blue

eyes are just as bright, her mouth as serious and her step as active

as when she was forty. She would attract attention in any crowd."[354]

Susan came back to an indifferent Congress. "All would fall flat and

dead if someone were not here to keep them in mind of their duty to

us," she wrote a friend at this time, and to her diary she confided,

"It is perfectly disheartening that no member feels any especial

interest or earnest determination in pushing this question of woman

suffrage, to all men only a side issue."[355]
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IMPETUS FROM THE WEST

"My heart almost stands still. I hope against hope, but still I hope,"

Susan wrote in her diary in 1885, as she waited for news from Oregon

Territory regarding the vote of the people on a woman suffrage

amendment.[356] Woman suffrage was defeated in Oregon; and in

Washington Territory, where in 1883 it had carried, a contest was

being waged in the courts to invalidate it. In Nebraska it had also

been defeated in 1882. Since the victories in Wyoming and Utah in 1869

and 1870, not another state or territory had written woman suffrage

into law.

In spite of these setbacks, Susan still saw great promise in the West

and resumed her lecturing there. She knew the rapidly growing young

western states and territories as few easterners did, and she

understood their people. Here women were making themselves

indispensable as teachers, and state universities, now open to them,

graduated over two thousand women a year. The Farmers' Alliance, the

Grange, and the Prohibition party, all distinctly western in origin,

admitted women to membership and were friendly to woman suffrage.

School suffrage had been won in twelve western states as against five

in the East, and Kansas women were now voting in municipal elections.

In a sense, woman suffrage was becoming respectable in the West, and a

woman was no longer ostracized by her friends for working with Susan

B. Anthony.

Still critical of her own speaking, Susan was often discouraged over

her lectures, but her vitality, her naturalness, and her flashes of

wit seldom failed to win over her audiences. Her nephew, Daniel Jr., a

student at the University of Michigan, hearing her speak, wrote his

parents, "At the beginning of her lecture, Aunt Susan does not do so

well; but when she is in the midst of her argument and all her

energies brought into play, I think she is a very powerful

speaker."[357]

On these trips through the West, she kept in close touch with her

brothers Daniel and Merritt in Kansas, frequently visiting in their

homes and taking her numerous nieces to Rochester. She valued

Daniel's judgment highly, and he, well-to-do and influential, was a

great help to her in many ways, investing her savings and furnishing

her with railroad passes which greatly reduced her ever-increasing

traveling expenses.

Everywhere she met active zealous members of the Women's Christian

Temperance Union. Since the Civil War, temperance had become a

vigorous movement in the Middle West, doing its utmost to counteract

the influence of the many large new breweries and saloons. Through the

Prohibition party, organized on a national basis in 1872, temperance

was now a political issue in Kansas, Iowa, and the Territory of

Dakota, and through the W.C.T.U. women waged an effective

total-abstinence campaign. Brought into the suffrage movement by

Frances Willard under the slogan, "For God and Home and Country,"

these women quickly sensed the value of their votes to the temperance

cause. Nor was Susan slow to recognize their importance to her and her

work, for they represented an entirely new group, churchwomen, who

heretofore had been suspicious of and hostile toward woman's rights.

Through them, she anticipated a powerful impetus for her cause.

With admiration she had watched Frances Willard's career.[358] This

vivid consecrated young woman was a born leader, quick to understand

woman's need of the vote and eager to lead women forward. It was a

disappointment, however, when she joined the American rather than the

National Woman Suffrage Association. The reasons for this, Susan

readily understood, were Frances Willard's warm friendship with Mary

Livermore and her own preference for the American's state-by-state

method, similar to that she had so successfully followed in her

W.C.T.U. Yet Frances Willard, whenever she could, cooperated with

Susan whom she admired and loved; and through the years these two

great leaders valued and respected each other, even though they

frequently differed over policy and method.

Susan, for example, was often troubled because women suffrage and

temperance were more and more linked together in the public mind, thus

confusing the issues and arousing the hostility of those who might

have been friendly toward woman suffrage had they not feared that

women's votes would bring in prohibition. She did her best to make it

clear to her audiences that she did not ask for the ballot in order

that women might vote against saloons and for prohibition. She

demanded only that women have the same right as men to express their

opinions at the polls. Such an attitude was hard for many temperance

women to understand and to forgive.

Over women's support of specific political parties, Susan and Frances

Willard were never able to agree. Susan had never been willing to ally

herself with a minority party. Therefore, to Frances Willard's

disappointment, she withheld her support from the Prohibition party in

1880, although their platform acknowledged woman's need of the ballot

and directed them to use it to settle the liquor question, and in 1884

when they recommended state suffrage for women. Finding women eager to

support the Prohibitionists in gratitude for these inadequate planks,

Susan even issued a statement urging them to support the Republicans,

who held out the most hope to them even if woman suffrage had not been

mentioned in their platform. Her experience in Washington had proved

to her the friendliness and loyalty of individual Republicans, and she

was unwilling to jeopardize their support.

Her judgment was confirmed during the next few years when friendly

Republicans spoke for woman suffrage in the Senate, and when in 1887

the woman suffrage amendment was debated and voted on in the Senate.

In the Senate gallery eagerly listening, Susan took notice that the

sixteen votes cast for the amendment were those of Republicans.[359]

Still hoping to win Susan's endorsement of the Prohibition party in

1888, Frances Willard asked her to outline what kind of plank would

satisfy her.

"Do you mean so satisfy me," Susan replied, "that I would work, and

recommend to all women to work ... for the success of the third party

ticket?... Not until a third party gets into power ... which promises

a larger per cent of representatives, on the floor of Congress, and in

the several State legislatures, who will speak and vote for women's

enfranchisement, than does the Republican, shall I work for it. You

see, as yet there is not a single Prohibitionist in Congress while

there are at least twenty Republicans on the floor of the United

States Senate, besides fully one-half of the members of the House of

Representatives who are in favor of woman suffrage.... I do not

propose to work for the defeat of the party which thus far has

furnished nearly every vote in that direction."[360]

Nor was she lured away when, in 1888, the Prohibition party endorsed

woman suffrage and granted Frances Willard the honor of addressing its

convention and serving on the resolutions committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

The temperance issue also cropped up in the annual Washington

conventions of the National Woman Suffrage Association, preparations

for which Susan now left to Rachel Foster, May Wright Sewall, a

capable young recruit from Indiana, and Jane Spofford. However, she

still supervised these conventions, prodding and interfering, in what

she called her most Andrew Jackson-like manner. She always returned to

Washington with excitement and pleasure, and with the hope of some

outstanding victory, and the suite at the Riggs House, given her by

generous Jane Spofford, was a delight after months of hard travel in

the West. "I shall come both ragged and dirty," she wrote Mrs.

Spofford in 1887. "Though the apparel will be tattered and torn, the

mind, the essence of me, is sound to the core. Please tell the little

milliner to have a bonnet picked out for me, and get a dressmaker who

will patch me together so that I shall be presentable."[361]

Open to all women irrespective of race or creed, the National Woman

Suffrage Association attracted fearless independent devoted members.

They welcomed Mormon women into the fold, and when the bill to

disfranchise Mormon women as a punishment for polygamy was before

Congress in 1887, they did their utmost to help Mormon women retain

the vote, but were defeated.

They welcomed as well many temperance advocates. A few delegates,

however, among them Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Gage, and Mrs. Colby, scorned

what they called the "singing and praying" temperance group and

protested that temperance and religion were getting too strong a hold

on the organization. Abigail Duniway from Oregon contended that

suffragists should not join forces with temperance groups and blamed

the defeat of woman suffrage in Oregon, Idaho, and Washington, in

1887, on men's fear that women would vote for prohibition.

Often Susan was obliged to act as arbiter between the temperance and

nontemperance groups. She did not underestimate the momentum which the

well-organized W.C.T.U. had already given the suffrage cause,

particularly in states where the National Association had only a few

and scattered workers. She needed and wanted the help of these

temperance women and of Frances Willard's forceful and winning

personality. She also saw the importance of breaking down with Frances

Willard's aid the slow-yielding opposition of the church.

Occasionally enthusiastic workers undertook projects which to her

seemed unwise. She told them frankly how she felt and left it at that,

but most of them had to learn by experience. When Belva Lockwood, one

of her most able colleagues in Washington, accepted the nomination for

President of the United States, offered her by the women of California

in 1884 and by the women of Iowa in 1888 through their Equal Rights

party, she did not lend her support or that of the National

Association, but followed her consistent policy of no alignment with a

minority party. Nevertheless, she heartily believed in women's right

and ability to hold the highest office in the land.

\* \* \* \* \*

Ever since her trip to Europe in 1883, Susan had been planning for an

international gathering of women. Interest in this project was kept

alive among European women by Mrs. Stanton during her frequent visits

with her daughter Harriot in England and her son Theodore in France.

It was Susan, however, who put the machinery in motion through the

National Woman Suffrage Association and issued a call for an

international conference in Washington, in March 1888, to commemorate

the fortieth anniversary of the first woman's rights convention. Ten

thousand invitations were sent out to organizations of women in all

parts of the world, to professional, business, and reform groups as

well as to those advocating political and civil rights for women, and

an ambitious program was prepared. Most of the work for the conference

and the raising of $13,000 to finance it fell upon the shoulders of

Susan, Rachel Foster, and May Wright Sewall, but they also had the

enthusiastic cooperation of Frances Willard, who, with her nation-wide

contacts, was of inestimable value in arousing interest among the many

and varied women's organizations and the labor groups. Another happy

development was Clara Colby's decision to publish her \_Woman's

Tribune\_ in Washington during the conference. Mrs. Colby's \_Tribune\_,

established in Beatrice, Nebraska, in 1883, had since then met in a

measure Susan's need for a paper for the National Association and she

welcomed its transfer to Washington.[362]

Women from all parts of the world assembled in Albaugh's Opera House

in Washington for the epoch-making international conference which

opened on Sunday, March 25, 1888, with religious services conducted

entirely by women, as if to prove to the world that women in the

pulpit were appropriate and adequate. Fifty-three national

organizations sent representatives, and delegates came from England,

France, Norway, Denmark, Finland, India, and Canada.

Presiding over all sixteen sessions, Susan rejoiced over a record

attendance. Her thoughts went back to the winter of 1854 when she and

Ernestine Rose had held their first woman's rights meetings in

Washington, finding only a handful ready to listen. The intervening

thirty-four years had worked wonders. Now women were willing to travel

not only across the continent but from Europe and Asia to discuss and

demand equal educational advantages, equal opportunities for training

in the professions and in business, equal pay for equal work, equal

suffrage, and the same standard of morals for all. Aware of their

responsibility to their countries, they asked for the tools, education

and the franchise, to help solve the world's problems. They were

listened to with interest and respect, and were received at the White

House by President and Mrs. Cleveland.

Through it all, a dynamic, gray-haired woman in a black silk dress

with a red shawl about her shoulders was without question the heroine

of the occasion. "This lady," observed the Baltimore \_Sun\_, "daily

grows upon all present; the woman suffragists love her for her good

works, the audience for her brightness and wit, and the multitude of

press representatives for her frank, plain, open, business-like way of

doing everything connected with the council.... Her word is the

parliamentary law of the meeting. Whatever she says is done without

murmur or dissent."[363]

A permanent International Council of Women to meet once every five

years was organized with Millicent Garrett Fawcett of England as

president, and a National Council to meet every three years was formed

as an affiliate with Frances Willard as president and Susan as

vice-president at large. Emphasizing education and social and moral

reform, the International Council did not rank suffrage first as

Susan had hoped. Nevertheless, she was happy that an international

movement of enterprising women was well on its way. They would learn

by experience.

Of all the favorable results of the International Council of Women,

two were of special importance to Susan, meeting Anna Howard Shaw and

overtures from Lucy Stone for a union of the National and American

Woman Suffrage Associations.

Prejudiced against Anna Howard Shaw, who had aligned herself with Mary

Livermore and Lucy Stone, and who she assumed, was a narrow Methodist

minister, Susan was unprepared to find that the pleasing young woman

in the pulpit on the first day of the conference, holding her audience

spellbound with her oratory, was Anna Howard Shaw. Here was a warm

personality, a crusader eager to right human wrongs, and above all a

matchless public speaker. Anna too had heard much criticism of Susan

and had formed a distorted opinion of her which was quickly dispelled

as she watched her preside. They liked each other the moment they met.

Anna Howard Shaw had grown up on the Michigan frontier, her

indomitable spirit and her eagerness for learning conquering the

hardships and the limitations of her surroundings. Encouraged by Mary

Livermore, who by chance lectured in her little town, she worked her

way through Albion College and Boston University Theological School,

from which she graduated in 1878. She then served as the pastor of two

Cape Cod churches, but was refused ordination by the Methodist

Episcopal church because of her sex. Eventually she was ordained by

the Methodist Protestant church. During her pastorate, she studied

medicine at Boston University, and because of her ability as a speaker

was in demand as a lecturer for temperance and woman suffrage groups.

Through the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, she met an

inspiring group of reformers, and their influence and that of Frances

Willard, in whose work she was intensely interested, led her to leave

the ministry for active work in the temperance and woman suffrage

movements. After several years as a lecturer and organizer for the

Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, she was placed at the head

of the franchise department of the W.C.T.U. This was her work when she

met Susan B. Anthony.

[Illustration: Anna Howard Shaw]

The more Susan talked with Anna, the better she liked her, and the

feeling was mutual. This wholesome woman of forty-one, with abundant

vitality, unmarried and without pressing family ties to divert her,

seemed particularly well fitted to assist Susan in the arduous

campaigns which lay ahead. A natural orator, she could in a measure

take the place of Mrs. Stanton, who could no longer undertake western

tours. Before the International Council adjourned, Susan had Anna's

promise that she would lecture for the National Association.

One of Susan's nieces, Lucy E. Anthony, also felt drawn to Anna after

meeting her at the International Council. A warm friendship quickly

developed and continued throughout their lives. Within a few years

they were living together, Lucy serving as Anna's secretary and

planning her lecture tours and campaign trips. Educated in Rochester

through the help of her aunts, Susan and Mary, living in their home

and loving them both, Lucy readily made their interests her own and

devoted her life to the suffrage movement. Neither a public speaker

nor a campaigner, she put her executive ability to work, and her

tasks, though less spectacular, were important and freed both Susan

and Anna from many details.

Just as the International Council of Women had broken down Anna Howard

Shaw's prejudice regarding Susan B. Anthony and her National Woman

Suffrage Association, just so it clarified the opinions of other young

women, now aligning themselves with the cause. Admiring the leaders of

both factions, these young women saw no reason why the two groups

should not work together in one large strong organization, and this

seemed increasingly important as they welcomed women from other

countries to this first international conference. Unfamiliar with the

personal antagonisms and the sincere differences in policy which had

caused the separation after the Civil War, they did not understand the

difficulties still in the way of union. So strongly, however, did they

press for a united front that the leaders of both groups felt

themselves swept along toward that goal. Susan herself had long looked

forward to the time when all suffragists would again work together,

but since the unsuccessful overtures of her group in 1870, she had

made no further efforts in that direction. She was completely taken by

surprise when in the fall of 1887 the American Association proposed

that she and Lucy Stone confer regarding union.

\* \* \* \* \*

The negotiations revived old arguments in the minds of zealous

partisans, and in the \_Woman's Journal\_, the \_Woman's Tribune\_, and

elsewhere, attempts were made to fasten the blame for the

twenty-year-old rift upon this one and that one; but so strong ran the

tide for union among the younger women that this excursion into the

past aroused little interest.

The election of the president of the merged organizations was the most

difficult hurdle. Lucy Stone suggested that neither she, Mrs. Stanton,

nor Susan allow their names to be proposed, since they had been blamed

for the division, but this was easier said than done. The clamor for

Susan and Mrs. Stanton was so strong and continuous among the younger

members that it soon became apparent that unless one or the other were

chosen, there would be no hope of union. The odds were in Susan's

favor. Her popularity in the National Association was tremendous.

Although Mrs. Stanton was revered as the mother of woman suffrage and

admired for her brilliant mind and her poise as presiding officer, she

now spent so much time in Europe with her daughter Harriot that many

who might otherwise have voted for her felt that the office should go

to Susan, who was always on the job.

[Illustration: Harriot Stanton Blatch]

Most of the American Association regarded Susan as safer and less

radical than Mrs. Stanton, less likely to stray from the straight path

of woman suffrage, and Henry Blackwell recommended her election.

Susan did not want the presidency. She wanted it for Mrs. Stanton, who

had headed the National Association so ably for so many years. She

pleaded earnestly with the delegates of the National Association: "I

will say to every woman who is a National and who has any love for the

old Association, or for Susan B. Anthony, that I hope you will not

vote for her for president.... Don't you vote for any human being but

Mrs. Stanton.... When the division was made 22 years ago it was

because our platform was too broad, because Mrs. Stanton was too

radical.... And now ... if Mrs. Stanton shall be deposed ... you

virtually degrade her.... I want our platform to be kept broad enough

for the infidel, the atheist, the Mohammedan, or the Christian....

These are the broad principles I want you to stand upon."[364]

When the two organizations met in February 1890 to effect formal union

as the National American Woman Suffrage Association, Elizabeth Cady

Stanton was elected president by a majority of 41 votes, while Susan

was the almost unanimous choice for vice-president at large. With Lucy

Stone chosen chairman of the executive committee, Jane Spofford

treasurer, and Rachel Foster and Alice Stone Blackwell

secretaries,[365] the new organization was well equipped with able

leaders for the work ahead. It was dedicated to work for both state

and federal woman suffrage amendments and its official organ would be

the \_Woman's Journal\_.

Susan now faced the future with gratitude that a strong unified

organization could be handed down to the younger women who would

gradually take over the work she had started, and her confidence in

these young women grew day by day. Working closely with Rachel Foster

and May Wright Sewall, she knew their caliber. Anna Howard Shaw and

Alice Stone Blackwell showed great promise, and Harriot Stanton Blatch

was living up to her expectations. In England where Harriot had made

her home since her marriage in 1882, she was active in the cause, and

on her visits to her mother in New York, she kept in touch with the

suffrage movement in the United States. She took part in the union

meeting, and in her diary, Susan recorded these words of commendation,

"Harriot said but a few words, yet showed herself worthy of her mother

and her mother's lifelong friend and co-worker. It was a proud moment

for me."[366]

To such she could entrust her beloved cause.
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VICTORIES IN THE WEST

New western states were coming into the Union, North and South Dakota,

Montana, Washington, Idaho, and Wyoming, and in Susan's opinion it was

highly important that they be admitted as woman suffrage states, for

she had not forgotten that disturbing line of the Supreme Court

decision in the Virginia Minor case which read, "No new State has ever

been admitted to the Union which has conferred the right of suffrage

on women, and this has never been considered a valid objection to her

admission."[367] Susan wanted to start a new trend.

Opposition to Wyoming's woman suffrage provision was strong in

Congress in spite of the fact that it had the unanimous approval of

Wyoming's constitutional convention. To Susan in the gallery of the

House of Representatives, listening anxiously to the debate on the

admission of Wyoming, defeat was unthinkable after women had voted in

the Territory of Wyoming for twenty years; but Democrats, wishing to

block the admission of a preponderantly Republican state, used woman

suffrage as an excuse. With a sinking heart, she heard an amendment

offered, limiting suffrage in Wyoming to males. At the crucial moment,

however, the tide was turned by a telegram from the Wyoming

legislature, the words of which rejoiced Susan, "We will remain out of

the Union a hundred years rather than come in without woman

suffrage."[368] After this, the House voted to admit Wyoming, 139 to

127, but the Senate delayed, renewing the attack on the woman suffrage

provision. Not until July 1890, while she was speaking to a large

audience in the opera house at Madison, South Dakota, did the good

news of the admission of Wyoming reach her. Jubilant as she commented

on this great victory, she spoke as one inspired, for she saw this as

the turning point in her forty long years of uphill work.

Neither North Dakota nor South Dakota had wanted to risk their

chances of statehood by incorporating woman suffrage in their

constitutions.[369] Yet public opinion in both states was friendly,

South Dakota directing its first legislature to submit the question to

the voters. It was this that brought Susan to South Dakota in 1890.

Sentiment for woman suffrage in South Dakota had previously been

created almost entirely by the W.C.T.U., and this had linked woman

suffrage and prohibition together. Now, the liquor interests made

prohibition an issue in this woman suffrage campaign, as they rallied

their forces for the repeal of prohibition which had been adopted when

South Dakota was admitted to statehood. Through the propaganda of the

liquor interests the 30,000 foreign-born voters became formidable

opponents, and newly naturalized Russians, Scandinavians, and Poles,

given the vote before American women, wore badges carrying the slogan,

"Against Woman Suffrage and Susan B. Anthony."[370] Both Republicans

and Democrats cultivated these foreign-born voters, turning a cold

shoulder to the woman suffrage amendment and refusing to endorse it in

their state conventions. Even the Farmers' Alliance and the Knights of

Labor, previously friendly to woman suffrage, now joined with the

Prohibitionists to form a third political party which also failed to

endorse the woman suffrage amendment. On top of all this,

anti-suffragists from Massachusetts, calling themselves Remonstrants,

flooded South Dakota with their leaflets.

It now seemed to Susan as if every clever politician had lined up

against women. During these trying days, Anna Howard Shaw joined her,

and together they covered the state, hoping by the truth and sincerity

of their statements to quash the propaganda against woman suffrage.

Often they traveled in freight cars, as transportation was limited, or

drove long distances in wagons over the sun-baked prairie. The heat

was intense and the hot winds, blowing incessantly, seared everything

they touched. After two years of drouth, the farmers were desperately

poor, and Susan, concerned over their plight, wondered why Congress

could not have appropriated the money for artesian wells to help these

honest earnest people, instead of voting $40,000 for an investigating

commission.[371]

Occasionally Susan and Anna spent the night in isolated sod houses

where ingenious pioneer women cooked their scant meals over burning

chips of buffalo bones gathered on the prairie. Glorying in the

valiant spirit of these women, who in loneliness and hardship played

an important but unheralded role in the conquest of this new country,

Susan was generous with her praise. To them her words of commendation

were like a benediction, and few of them ever forgot a visit from

Susan B. Anthony.

By this time life on the frontier was an old story to her, for she had

campaigned under similar conditions in Kansas and in the far West.

Nonetheless, the hardships were trying. Yet this plucky woman of

seventy wrote friends in the East, "Tell everybody that I am perfectly

well in body and in mind, never better, and never doing more work....

O, the lack of modern comforts and conveniences! But I can put up with

it better than any of the young folks.... I shall push ahead and do my

level best to carry this State, come weal or woe to me personally....

I never felt so buoyed up with the love and sympathy and confidence of

the good people everywhere...."[372]

Young vigorous Anna Howard Shaw proved to be a campaigner after

Susan's own heart, tireless, uncomplaining, and good-tempered, an

exceptional speaker, witty and quick to say the right word at the

right time. It was a joy to find in Anna the same devotion to the

cause that she herself felt, the same crusading fervor and

reliability. During the long drives over the prairie, she talked to

Anna of the work that must be done, of what it would mean to the women

of the future, and she fired Anna's soul "with the flame that burned

in her own."[373]

Another young western woman, Carrie Chapman Catt, also attracted

Susan's attention at this time. She had volunteered for the South

Dakota campaign, after attending her first national woman suffrage

convention; and Susan, meeting her in Huron, South Dakota, to map out

a speaking tour for her, found a tall handsome confident young woman

ready to attack the work and see it through, in spite of the hardships

which confronted her.

Carrie Lane, a graduate of Iowa State College, had briefly studied law

and taught school before her marriage to Lee Chapman. Now, four years

after his death, she had married George W. Catt of Seattle, a

promising young engineer and a former fellow-student at Iowa State

College. What particularly impressed Susan was that Carrie, in spite

of her marriage in June, had kept her pledge to come to South Dakota.

She was pleased with the way Carrie not only heroically filled every

difficult engagement, but sized up the campaign for herself and

planned for the future. In Carrie's report of her work there was a

ruthless practicality which was rare and which instantly won Susan's

approval. Here was a young woman to watch and to keep in the work.

[Illustration: The Anthony home, Rochester, New York]

The visible result of six months of campaigning was defeat, with the

vote 22,972 for woman suffrage and 45,632 opposed, and as Susan

remembered the maneuvers of the politicians, the trading of votes for

the location of the state capital, and the scheming of the liquor

interests, she felt she was championing a lonely cause.

\* \* \* \* \*

From now on Susan hoped to turn over to the younger women much of the

lecturing and organizing in the West, and she needed an anchorage, a

home of her own from which she could direct the work. Her mother had

willed 17 Madison Street to Mary, who had rented the first floor and

was living on the second where there was a room for Susan. Now that

Susan planned to spend more time at home and Mary had retired from

teaching, they decided to take over the whole house, modernize and

redecorate it, and enjoy it the rest of their lives. Mary as usual

took charge, but Susan had definite ideas about what should be done.

Mary, who had learned to be cautious and frugal, was more willing

than Susan to make old furnishings do, but their friends came to the

rescue, showering them with gifts.

Freshly painted and papered, with new rugs on the floor, lace curtains

at the windows, easy chairs and new furniture here and there, the

house was all Susan had wished for, and everywhere were familiar

touches, such as her mother's spinning wheel by the fireplace in the

back parlor.

She spent most of her time in her study on the second floor. Here she

hung her pictures of the reformers she admired and loved; and right

over her desk, looking down at her, was the comforting picture of her

dearest friend, Mrs. Stanton. Hour after hour, she sat at this desk,

writing letters, hurriedly dashing off one after another, writing just

as the thoughts came, as if she were talking, bothering little with

punctuation, using dashes instead, and vigorously underlining words

and phrases for emphasis. Instructions to workers in all parts of the

country, letters of friendship and sympathy, answers to the many

questions which came in every mail, these were signed and sealed one

after another, and slipped into the mail box when she took a brisk

walk before going to bed.

She started each day with the morning newspaper, stepping out on the

front veranda to pick it up, taking a deep breath of fresh air, and

enjoying the green grass and the tall graceful chestnut trees in front

of the house. Then sitting down in the back parlor beside the big

table covered with magazines and mail, she carefully read her paper

before beginning the work at her desk, for she must keep up-to-date on

the news.

Rochester was important to her. It was her city, and she was on hand

with her colleagues whenever there was an opportunity for women to

express interest in its government, progress, or welfare. Not only did

she encourage women to make use of their newly won right to vote in

school elections, she also urged municipal suffrage for women.

Appealing to the governor to appoint a woman to fill a vacancy on the

board of trustees of Rochester's State Industrial School, she herself

received the appointment which the \_Democrat and Chronicle\_ called "a

fitting recognition of one of the ablest and best women in the

commonwealth."[374]

One of her first acts as trustee was a practical one for the girls.

"Spent entire day at State Industrial School," she wrote in her diary,

"getting the laundry girls--who had always washed for the entire

institution by hand and ironed that old way--transferred to the boys'

laundry room to use its machinery--am sure it will work well--girls 12

of them delighted."[375] She also taught the boys to patch and darn,

and later asked for coeducation.

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony at her desk]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan looked forward to welcoming Mrs. Stanton at 17 Madison Street

when she returned to this country in 1891, particularly because she

had sold her home in Tenafly after her husband's death, in 1887, and

now had no home to go to. Susan hoped that as they again worked

together she could persuade Mrs. Stanton to concentrate on more

serious writing than the chatty reminiscences she had just published

and which Susan felt were "not the greatest" of herself.[376] When she

heard that Mrs. Stanton seriously contemplated living in New York with

two of her children, she begged her to reconsider, writing, "This is

the first time since 1850 that I have anchored myself to any

particular spot, and in doing it my constant thought was that you

would come here ... and stay for as long, at least, as we must be

together to put your writings into systematic shape to go down to

posterity. I have no writings to go down, so my ambition is not for

myself, but is for the one by the side of whom I have wrought these

forty years, and to get whose speeches before audiences ... has been

the delight of my life."[377]

Mrs. Stanton decided to make her home in New York, but first she

visited Susan who found her as stimulating as ever and brimful of

ideas. They plotted and planned as of old and managed to stir up

public opinion on the question of admitting women to the University of

Rochester. With women enrolled at the University of Michigan since

1870, and at Cornell since 1872, and with Columbia University yielding

at last to women's entreaties by establishing Barnard College in 1889,

they felt it their duty to awaken Rochester, and although their

agitation produced no immediate results, it did start other women

thinking and made news for the press. The cartoons on the subject

delighted them both.[378]

Susan soon realized that the writing she had planned for Mrs. Stanton

would never be done, for Mrs. Stanton had already made up her mind to

write for magazines and newspapers on new and controversial subjects,

feeling this was the best contribution she could make to the cause.

Susan also found it increasingly difficult to hold her old friend to

the straight path of woman suffrage, Mrs. Stanton insisting that too

much concentration on this one subject was narrowing and left women

unprepared for the intelligent use of the ballot. Women, Mrs. Stanton

argued, needed to be stirred up to think, and this they would not do

as long as their minds were dominated by the church, which, she

believed, had for generations hampered their development by

emphasizing their inferiority and subordination. She was determined to

analyze and rebel, and Susan could in no way divert her. Completely

absorbed in trying to prove that the Bible, accurately translated and

interpreted, did not teach the inferiority or the subordination of

women, she was writing a book which she called \_The Woman's Bible\_,

chapters of which were already appearing in the \_Woman's Tribune\_.

Susan was not unsympathetic to Mrs. Stanton's ideas, but she opposed

this excursion into religious controversy because she was sure it

would stir up futile wrangles among the suffragists and keep Mrs.

Stanton from giving her best to the cause. Her lack of interest then

and her frank disapproval as \_The Woman's Bible\_ progressed were a

great disappointment to Mrs. Stanton, and these two old friends began

to grow somewhat apart as they took different roads to reach their

goal, the one intent on freeing women's minds, the other determined to

establish their citizenship. Yet their friendship endured.
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In 1892 Susan reluctantly consented to Mrs. Stanton's retirement as

president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Mrs.

Stanton's request that she be followed by Susan won unanimous

approval, and Anna Howard Shaw was moved up to second place,

vice-president at large. For forty years, Susan had watched Mrs.

Stanton preside with a poise, warmth, and skill which few could equal.

She knew she would miss her dynamic reassuring presence at the

conventions. Yet she was obliged to admit to herself that it was more

than fitting that she should at last head the ever-growing

organization which she had built up. This was the last convention

which Mrs. Stanton attended, and it was the last for Lucy Stone who

died the next year. Susan appreciated the eager young women who now

took their places, but she did not yet feel completely at home with

them. "Only think," she wrote an old-time colleague, "I shall not have

a white-haired woman on the platform with me, and I shall be alone

there of all the pioneer workers. Always with the 'old guard' I had

perfect confidence that the wise and right thing would be said. What a

platform ours then was of self-reliant strong women! I felt sure of

you all.... I can not feel quite certain that our younger sisters will

be equal to the emergency, yet they are each and all valiant, earnest,

and talented, and will soon be left to manage the ship without even

me."[379]

In 1892, the year of the presidential election, Susan hopefully

attended the national political conventions. Again the Republicans

made their proverbial excuses, explaining that they not only faced a

formidable opponent in Grover Cleveland but also the threat of a new

People's party. The familiar ring of their alibis, which they had

repeated since Reconstruction days, made Susan wonder when and if ever

the Republicans would feel able to bear the strain of woman suffrage.

Their platform remembered the poor, the foreign-born, and male

Negroes, but it still ignored women. Yet hope for the future stirred

in her heart as she saw at the convention two women serving as

delegates from Wyoming. Here was the entering wedge.

The Democrats as usual were silent on woman suffrage, but undismayed

by them or by the Prohibitionists, who this year failed to endorse

votes for women, Susan moved on to Omaha with Anna Howard Shaw for the

first national convention of the new People's party. Here she met

representatives of the Farmers' Alliance and the Knights of Labor,

both friendly to woman suffrage, and men from other groups, critical

of the two major political parties for their failure to solve the

pressing economic problems confronting the nation. Susan was

sympathetic with many of the aims of the People's party, having seen

with her own eyes the plight of debt-burdened, hard-working farmers

and having crusaded in her own paper, \_The Revolution\_, for the rights

of labor and for the control of industrial monopoly. However, she

still viewed minor, reform parties with a highly critical eye. The

People's party gave her no woman suffrage plank and she found them

"quite as oblivious to the underlying principle of justice to women as

either of the old parties...."[380]

With the election of Grover Cleveland, whose opposition to woman

suffrage was well known, and with the Democrats in the saddle for

another four years, Congressional action on the woman suffrage

amendment was blocked. Nevertheless, the cause moved ahead in the

states; Colorado was to vote on the question in 1893 and Kansas in

1894, and New York was revising its constitution. In addition, the

World's Fair in Chicago in 1893 offered endless opportunities to bring

the subject before the people.

\* \* \* \* \*

As soon as plans for the World's Fair were under way, Susan began to

work indirectly through prominent women in Washington and Chicago for

the appointment of women to the board of management. "Lady Managers"

were appointed, 115 strong, who proved to be very much alive under the

leadership of Mrs. Bertha Honoré Palmer. Susan found Mrs. Palmer

almost as determined as she to secure equality of rights for women at

the World's Fair, and nothing that she herself might have planned

could have been more effective than the series of world congresses in

which both men and women took part, or than the World's Congress of

Representative Women.
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Two of Susan's "girls," as she liked to call them, Rachel Foster

Avery[381] and May Wright Sewall, were appointed by Mrs. Palmer to

take charge of the World's Congress of Representative Women, and they

arranged a meeting of the International Council of Women as a part of

this Congress.

Convening soon after the opening of the World's Fair, the Congress of

Representative Women drew record crowds at its eighty-one sessions.

Twenty-seven countries and 126 organizations were represented. Here

Susan, to her joy, heard Negroes, American Indians, and Mormons tell

of their progress and their problems, and saw them treated with as

much respect as American millionaires, English nobility, or the most

virtuous, conservative housewife. Watching these women assemble,

talking with them, and listening to their well-delivered speeches, she

felt richly rewarded for the lonely work she had undertaken forty

years before, when scarcely a woman could be coaxed to a meeting or be

persuaded to express her opinions in public. Although only one session

of the congress was devoted to the civil and political rights of

women, it was gratifying to her that women's need of the ballot was

spontaneously brought up in meeting after meeting, showing that

women, whatever their cause or whatever their organization, were

recognizing that only by means of the vote could their reforms be

achieved.

Speaking on the subject to which she had dedicated her life, Susan

gave credit to the pioneering suffragists for the change which had

taken place in public opinion regarding the position of women. She

urged women's organizations to give suffrage their wholehearted

support and pointed out the great power of some of the newer

organizations, such as the W.C.T.U. with its membership of half a

million and the young General Federation of Women's Clubs of 40,000

members. Confessing that her own National American Woman Suffrage

Association in comparison was poor in numbers and limited in funds,

she added, "I would philosophize on the reason why. It is because

women have been taught always to work for something else than their

own personal freedom; and the hardest thing in the world is to

organize women for the one purpose of securing their political liberty

and political equality."[382] Even so, the vital woman's rights

organizations, she concluded, drew the whole world to them in spirit

if not in person.

Her very presence among them without her words, in fact her very

presence on the fair grounds, advertised her cause, for in the mind of

the public she personified woman suffrage. This tall dignified woman

with smooth gray hair, abundant in energy and spontaneous

friendliness, was the center of attraction at the World's Congress of

Representative Women. In her new black dress of Chinese silk,

brightened with blue, and her small black bonnet, trimmed with lace

and blue forget-me-nots, she was the perfect picture of everyone's

grandmother, and the people took her to their hearts.[383] She was the

one woman all wanted to see. Curious crowds jammed the hall and

corridors when she was scheduled to speak, and often a policeman had

to clear the way for her. At whatever meeting she appeared, the

audience at once burst into applause and started calling for her,

interrupting the speakers, and were not satisfied until she had

mounted the platform so that all could see her and she had said a few

words. Then they cheered her. After years of ridicule and

unpopularity, she hardly knew what to make of all this, but she

accepted it with happiness as a tribute to her beloved cause. Many

who had been critical and wary of her newfangled notions began to

reverse their opinions after they saw her and heard her words of good

common sense. Even those who still opposed woman suffrage left the

World's Fair with a new respect for Susan B. Anthony.

She stayed on in Chicago for much of the summer and fall, for she was

in demand as a speaker at several of the world congresses and had five

speeches to read for Mrs. Stanton, who felt unable to brave the heat

and the crowds. She felt at home in this bustling, rapidly growing

city which for so many years had been the halfway station on her

lecture and campaign trips through the West. Here she had always found

a warm welcome, first from her cousins, the Dickinsons, then from the

ever-widening circle of friends she won for her cause. Now she was

literally swamped with hospitality.[384] She rejoiced that such great

numbers of everyday people were able to enjoy the beauty of the fair

grounds and the many interesting exhibits, and when a group of

clergymen urged Sunday closing, she took issue with them, declaring

that Sunday was the only day on which many were free to attend. Asked

by a disapproving clergyman if she would like to have a son of hers

attend Buffalo Bill's Wild West Show on Sunday, she promptly and

bluntly replied, "Of course I would, and I think he would learn far

more there than from the sermons in some churches!"[385]

Hearing of this, Buffalo Bill offered her a box at his popular Wild

West Show, and she appeared the next day with twelve of her "girls."

Dashing into the arena on his spirited horse while the band played and

the spotlight flashed on him, Buffalo Bill rode directly up to Susan's

box, reined his horse, and swept off his big western hat to salute

her. Quick to respond, she rose and bowed, and beaming with pleasure,

waved her handkerchief at him while the immense audience applauded and

cheered.

She returned home early in November 1893, with happy memories of the

World's Fair and to good news from Colorado. "Telegram ... from

Denver--said woman suffrage carried by 5000 majority," she recorded in

her diary.[386] This laconic comment in no way expressed the joy in

her heart.

Her diaries, written hurriedly in small fine script, year after year,

in black-covered notebooks about three inches by six, were a brief

terse record of her work and her travels. Only occasionally a line of

philosophizing shone out from the mass of routine detail, or an

illuminating comment on a friend or a difficult situation, but she

never failed to record a family anniversary, a birthday, or a death.

The Colorado victory, referred to so casually in her diary, was

actually of great importance to her and her cause, for it carried

forward the trend initiated by the admission of Wyoming as a woman

suffrage state in 1890. Colorado also proved to her that her "girls"

could take over her work. So busy had she been winning good will for

the cause at the World's Fair that she had left Colorado in the

capable hands of the women of the state and of young efficient Carrie

Chapman Catt, to whom she now turned over the supervision of all state

campaigns.

Encouragement also came from another part of the world, from New

Zealand, where the vote was extended to women. This confirmed her

growing conviction that equal citizenship was best understood on the

frontier and that in her own country victory would come from the West.
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LIQUOR INTERESTS ALERT FOREIGN-BORN VOTERS AGAINST WOMAN SUFFRAGE

"I am in the midst of as severe a treadmill as I ever experienced,

traveling from fifty to one hundred miles every day and speaking five

or six nights a week,"[387] Susan wrote a friend in 1894, during the

campaign to wrest woman suffrage from the New York constitutional

convention. She was now seventy-four years old. Political machines and

financial interests were deeply intrenched in New York, and although

two governors had recommended that women be represented in the

constitutional convention and a bill had been passed making women

eligible as delegates, neither Republicans nor Democrats had the

slightest intention of allowing women to slip into men's stronghold.

It was obvious to Susan that without representation at the convention

and without power to enforce their demands, women's only hope was an

intensive educational campaign which she now directed with vigor.

Whenever she could, she conferred with Mrs. Stanton, whose judgment

she valued, and there was zest in working together as they had during

the previous constitutional convention in 1867.

The women of New York were aroused as never before. Young able

speakers went through the state, piling up signatures on their

petitions, but they had few influential friends among the delegates.

Anti-suffragists were active, encouraged by Bishop Doane of the

Protestant Episcopal church and Mrs. Lyman Abbott, whose name carried

the prestige and influence of her husband's popular magazine, \_The

Outlook\_.

With the election of Joseph Choate of New York as president of the

convention, Susan knew that woman suffrage was doomed, for Choate had

political aspirations and was not likely to let his sympathies for an

unpopular cause jeopardize his chances of becoming governor. While he

gave women every opportunity to be heard, at the same time he arranged

for the defeat of woman suffrage by appointing men to consider the

subject who were definitely opposed, and they submitted an adverse

report. Here was a situation similar to that in 1867, when her

one-time friend, Horace Greeley, had deserted women for political

expediency.

"I am used to defeat every time and know how to pick up and push on

for another attack," she wrote as she now turned her attention to

Kansas.[388]

\* \* \* \* \*

The Republicans in Kansas had sponsored school and municipal suffrage

for women and had passed a woman suffrage amendment to be referred to

the people in 1894. Yet they proved to be as great a disappointment to

Susan as they were in 1867, when as a last resort she had been obliged

to campaign with the Democrats and George Francis Train.

The population of Kansas had changed with the years, as immigrants

from Europe had come into the state, and Susan was again confronted

with the powerful opposition of foreign-born voters for whose support

the political parties bargained. The liquor interests were also

active, and the Republicans, who had brought prohibition to Kansas,

now left the question discreetly alone, even making a deal with German

Democrats for their votes by promising to ignore in their platform

both prohibition and woman suffrage. Prohibition and woman suffrage

were synonymous in the minds of voters, because women had generally

voted for enforcement in municipal elections, and no matter how hard

Susan tried, she found it impossible to have woman suffrage considered

on its own merits.

Watching the straws in the wind, she saw Republican supremacy

seriously threatened by the new Populist party. Convinced that she

could no longer count on help from Kansas Republicans, she turned to

the Populist party, ignoring the pleas of Republican women who warned

her she would hurt the cause by association with such a radical group.

The Populists were generally regarded as the party of social unrest,

of a regulated economy, and unsound money, and they were looked upon

with suspicion. To many they represented a threat to the American

free-enterprise system, and they were blamed for the labor troubles

which had flared up in the bloody Homestead strike in the steel mills

of Pennsylvania and in the Pullman strike, defying the powerful

railroads. Susan was never afraid to side with the underdog, and she

could well understand why western farmers, in the hope of relief, were

eagerly flocking into the Populist party when their corn sold for ten

cents a bushel and the products they bought were high-priced and their

mortgage interest was never lower than 10 per cent.

To the Populist convention, she declared, "I have labored for women's

enfranchisement for forty years and I have always said that for the

party that endorsed it, whether Republican, Democratic, or Populist, I

would wave my handkerchief."[389]

"We want more than the waving of your handkerchief, Miss Anthony,"

interrupted a delegate, who then asked her, "If the People's party put

a woman suffrage plank in its platform, will you go before the voters

of this state and tell them that because the People's party has

espoused the cause of woman suffrage, it deserves the vote of every

one who is a supporter of that cause?"

"I most certainly will," she replied, adding as the audience cheered

her wildly, "for I would surely choose to ask votes for the party

which stood for the principle of justice to women, though wrong on

financial theories, rather than for the party which was sound on

questions of money and tariff, and silent on the pending amendment to

secure political equality to half of the people."

"I most certainly will" was the phrase which was remembered and was

flashed through the country, and as a result, the Republican press and

Susan's Republican friends harshly criticized her for taking her stand

with the radicals.

Like all political parties, the Populists found it hard to comprehend

justice for women, but after a four-hour debate, the convention

endorsed the woman suffrage amendment, absolving, however, members who

refused to support it. The rank and file rejoiced as if each and every

one of them were heart and soul for the cause. They cheered, they

waved their canes, they threw their hats high in the air, and then

swarmed around Susan and Anna Shaw to shake their hands and welcome

them into the Populist party.

With woman suffrage at last a political issue in Kansas, Susan left

the field to her "girls." Her homecoming brought reporters to 17

Madison Street for the details about her alignment with the Populist

party. "I didn't go over to the Populists," she told them. "I have

been like a drowning man for a long time, waiting for someone to throw

a plank in my direction. I didn't step on the whole platform, but just

on the woman suffrage plank.... Here is a party in power which is

likely to remain in power, and if it will give its endorsement to our

movement, we want it."[390]

This explanation, however, did not satisfy her critics, and as the

Republican press circulated false stories about her enthusiasm for the

Populist party, letters of protest poured in, among them one from

Henry Blackwell. To him, she replied, "I shall not praise the

Republicans of Kansas, or wish or work for their success, when I know

by their own confessions to me that the rights of the women of their

state have been traded by them in cold blood for the votes of the

lager beer foreigners and whisky Democrats.... I never, in my whole

forty years work, so utterly repudiated any set of politicians as I do

those Republicans of Kansas.... I never was surer of my position that

no self-respecting woman should wish or work for the success of a

party that ignores her political rights."[391]

The contest in Kansas was close and bitter. Kansas women carried on an

able campaign with the help of Anna Howard Shaw and Carrie Chapman

Catt. When Susan returned to the state in October, she not only found

that the Democrats had entered the fight with an anti-suffrage plank

but the Populists had noticeably lost ground since the Pullman strike

riots, the court injunction against the strikers, and the arrest of

Eugene V. Debs. Again this prairie state, from which she had hoped so

much, refused to extend suffrage to women. Impulsively she recommended

a little "Patrick Henryism" to the women of Kansas, suggesting that

they fold their hands and refuse to help men run the churches, the

charities, and the reform movements.[392]

\* \* \* \* \*

California was the next state to demand Susan's attention. A

Republican legislature had submitted a woman suffrage amendment to be

voted on by the people in 1896, and the women of California asked for

her help. She toured the state in the spring of 1895 with Anna Howard

Shaw, and everywhere she won friends. The continuous travel and

speaking, however, taxed her far more than she realized, and soon

after her return to the East, she collapsed. As this news flashed over

the wires, letters poured in from her friends, begging her to spare

herself. Two of these letters were especially precious. One in bold

vigorous script was from her good comrade, Parker Pillsbury, now

eighty-six, who had been an unfailing help during the most difficult

years of her career and whom she probably trusted more completely than

any other man. The other from her dearest friend, Elizabeth Stanton,

read, "I never realized how desolate the world would be to me without

you until I heard of your sudden illness. Let me urge you with all the

strength I have, and all the love I bear you, to stay at home and rest

and save your precious self."[393]

She now realized that rest was imperative for a time, but it troubled

her that people thought of her as old and ill, and she wrote Clara

Colby never to mention anyone's illness in her \_Woman's Tribune\_,

adding, "It is so dreadful to get public thought centered on one as

ill--as I have had it the last two months."[394]

She had no intention of retiring from the field. She knew her own

strength and that her life must be one of action. "I am able to endure

the strain of daily traveling and lecturing at over three-score and

ten," she observed, "mainly because I have always worked and loved

work.... As machinery in motion lasts longer than when lying idle, so

a body and soul in active exercise escapes the corroding rust of

physical and mental laziness, which prematurely cuts off the life of

so many women."[395]

Yet she did slow up a little, refusing an offer from the Slayton

Lecture Bureau for a series of lectures at $100 a night, and she

engaged a capable secretary, Emma B. Sweet, to help her with her

tremendous correspondence. "Dear Rachel" had given her a typewriter,

and now instead of dashing off letters at her desk late at night, she

learned to dictate them to Mrs. Sweet at regular hours. As requests

came in from newspapers and magazines for her comments on a wide

variety of subjects, she answered those that made possible a word on

the advancement of women.

Bicycling had come into vogue and women as well as men were taking it

up, some women even riding their bicycles in short skirts or bloomers.

What did she think of this? "If women ride the bicycle or climb

mountains," she replied, "they should don a costume which will permit

them the use of their legs." Of bicycling she said, "I think it has

done more to emancipate woman than any one thing in the world. I

rejoice every time I see a woman ride by on a wheel. It gives her a

feeling of self-reliance and independence the moment she takes her

seat; and away she goes, the picture of untrammeled womanhood."[396]

[Illustration: Ida Husted Harper]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan returned to California in February 1896. Through the generosity

and interest of two young Rochester friends, her Unitarian minister,

William C. Gannett, and his wife, Mary Gannett, she was able to take

her secretary with her. Making her home in San Francisco with her

devoted friend, Ellen Sargent, she at once began to plan speaking

tours for herself and her "girls," many of whom, including her niece

Lucy, had come West to help her. She appealed successfully to Frances

Willard to transfer the national W.C.T.U. convention to another state,

for she was determined to keep the issue of prohibition out of the

California campaign.

With the press more than friendly and several San Francisco dailies

running woman suffrage departments, she realized the importance of

keeping newspapers fed with readable factual material and enlisted the

aid of a young journalist, Ida Husted Harper, whom she had met in 1878

while lecturing in Terre Haute, Indiana, and who was in California

that winter. When the San Francisco \_Examiner\_, William Randolph

Hearst's powerful Democratic paper, offered Susan a column on the

editorial page if she would write it and sign it, she dictated her

thoughts to Mrs. Harper, who smoothed them out for the column, helping

her as Mrs. Stanton had in the past, for writing was still a great

hardship. Grateful to Mrs. Harper, she sang her praises: "The moment I

give the idea--the point--she formulates it into a good

sentence--while I should have to haggle over it half an hour."[397]

California women had won suffrage planks from Republicans, Populists,

and Prohibitionists, and the prospects looked bright. Rich women came

to their aid, Mrs. Leland Stanford, with her railroad fortune,

furnishing passes for all the speakers and organizers, and Mrs. Phoebe

Hearst contributing $1,000 to their campaign. What warmed Susan's

heart, however, was the spirit of the rank and file, the seamstresses

and washerwomen, paying their two-dollar pledges in twenty-five-cent

installments, the poorly clad women bringing in fifty cents or a

dollar which they had saved by going without tea, and the women who

had worked all day at their jobs, stopping at headquarters for a

package of circulars to fold and address at night. The working women

of California made it plain that they wanted to vote.

Susan insisted upon carrying out what she called her "wild goose

chase" over the state.[398] People crowded to hear her at farmers'

picnics in the mountains, in schoolhouses in small towns, and in

poolrooms where chalked up on the blackboard she often found "Welcome

Susan B. Anthony." She was at home everywhere and ready for anything.

The men liked her short matter-of-fact speeches and her flashes of

wit. Her hopes were high that the friendly people she met would not

fail to vote justice to women.

She grew apprehensive, however, when the newspapers, pressured by

their advertisers, one by one began to ignore woman suffrage. The

Liquor Dealers' League had been sending letters to hotel owners,

grocers, and druggists, as well as to saloons, warning that votes for

women would mean prohibition and would threaten their livelihood. Word

was spread that if women voted not one glass of beer would be sold in

San Francisco. As in Kansas, liquor interests had persuaded

naturalized Irish, Germans, and Swedes to oppose woman suffrage, so

now in California, they appealed to the Chinese.

On election day Susan was in San Francisco with Anna Howard Shaw and

Ellen Sargent, watching and anxiously waiting for the returns. Telling

the story of those last tense hours when women's fate hung in the

balance, Anna Howard Shaw reported, "I shall always remember the

picture of Miss Anthony and the wife of Senator Sargent wandering

around the polls arm in arm at eleven o'clock at night, their tired

faces taking on lines of deeper depression with every minute, for the

count was against us.... When the final counts came in, we found that

we had won the state from the north down to Oakland and from the south

up to San Francisco; but there was not sufficient majority to overcome

the adverse votes of San Francisco and Oakland. In San Francisco the

saloon element and the most aristocratic section ... made an equal

showing against us.... Every Chinese vote was against us."[399]

In spite of defeat in California, Susan had the joy of marking up two

more states for woman suffrage in 1896. Utah was granted statehood

with a woman suffrage provision in its constitution and Idaho's

favorable vote, though contested in the courts, was upheld by the

State Supreme Court. Now women in Wyoming, Colorado, Idaho, and Utah

were voters.
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AUNT SUSAN AND HER GIRLS

The future of the National American Woman Suffrage Association was

much on Susan's mind. This organization which she had conceived and

nursed through its struggling infancy had grown in numbers and

prestige, and she understood, as no one else could, the importance of

leaving it in the right hands so that it could function successfully

without her.

The young women now in the work, many of them just out of college,

were intelligent, efficient, and confident, and yet as she compared

them with the vivid consecrated women active in the early days of the

movement, she observed in her diary, "[Clarina] Nichols--Paulina

Davis--Lucy Stone--Frances D. Gage--Lucretia Mott & E. C.

Stanton--each without peer among any of our college graduates--young

women of today."[400]

Even so, she appreciated the "young women of today" whom she

affectionately called her girls or her adopted nieces, but she still

held the reins tightly, although they often champed at the bit.

Recognizing, however, that she must choose between personal power and

progress for her cause, she characteristically chose progress. Quick

to appreciate ability and zeal when she saw it, she seldom failed to

make use of it. When Carrie Chapman Catt presented a detailed plan for

a thorough overhauling of the mechanics of the organization, she gave

her approval, remarking drily, "There never yet was a young woman who

did not feel that if she had had the management of the work from the

beginning, the cause would have been carried long ago. I felt just

that way when I was young."[401]

On four of her adopted nieces, Rachel Foster Avery, Anna Howard Shaw,

Harriet Taylor Upton, and Carrie Chapman Catt, Susan felt that the

greater part of her work would fall and be "worthily done."[402] Yet

she feared that in their enthusiasm for efficient organization they

might lose the higher concepts of freedom and justice which had been

the driving force behind her work. Not having learned the lessons of

leadership when the cause was unpopular, they lacked the discipline of

adversity, which bred in the consecrated reformer the wisdom,

tolerance, and vision so necessary for the success of her task. What

they did understand far better than the highly individualistic

pioneers was the value of teamwork, which grew in importance as the

National American Association expanded far beyond the ability of one

person to cope with it.

[Illustration: Rachel Foster Avery]

Probably first in her affections was Rachel Foster Avery, who had been

like a daughter to her since their trip to Europe together in 1883.

The confidence she felt in their friendship was always a comfort.

Rachel's intelligent approach to problems made her an asset at every

meeting, and Susan relied much on her judgment.

In Anna Howard Shaw, ten years older than Rachel, Susan had found the

hardy campaigner and orator for whom she had longed. Anna expressed a

warmth and understanding that most of the younger women lacked, and

best of all she loved the cause as Susan herself loved it. Because of

her close friendship with Susan's niece Lucy, she was regarded as one

of the family, and whenever possible between lectures she stopped over

in Rochester for a good talk with "Aunt Susan."

Harriet Taylor Upton of Warren, Ohio, had enlisted in the ranks in

the 1880s when her father was a member of Congress. Because of her

influence in Washington and Ohio, Harriet was invaluable, and Susan

speedily brought her into the official circle of the National American

Association as treasurer, even thinking of her as a possible

president.[403] Harriet's jovial irrepressible personality readily won

friends, and Susan found her a refreshing and comfortable companion,

able to see a bit of humor in almost every situation. When differences

of opinion at meetings threatened to get out of hand, Harriet could

always be relied on to break the tension with a few witty remarks.

[Illustration: Harriet Taylor Upton]

Carrie Chapman Catt gave every indication of developing into an

outstanding executive. Not another one of Susan's "girls" could so

quickly or so intelligently size up a situation as Carrie, nor could

they so effectively put into action well-thought-out plans. Not as

popular a speaker as the more emotional Anna Howard Shaw, she held her

audiences by her appeal to their intelligence. Tall, handsome, and

well dressed, she never failed to leave a favorable impression. Only

her name irked Susan, and as Susan wrote Clara Colby, "If Catt it must

be then I insist, she should keep her own father's name--Lane--and

not her first husband's name--Chapman,"[404] but the three Cs

intrigued Carrie and she continued to be known as Carrie Chapman Catt.

Now living in the East because her husband's expanding business had

brought him to New York, she was easily accessible, and from her

beautiful new home at Bensonhurst, a suburb of Brooklyn, she carried

on the rapidly growing work of the organization committee until a New

York City office became imperative. In Carrie, Susan recognized

qualities demanded of a leader at this stage of the campaign when

suffragists must learn to be as keen as politicians and as well

organized.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Spring is not heralded in Washington by the arrival of the robin,"

commented a Washington newspaper, "but by the appearance of Miss

Anthony's red shawl." Susan was still the dominating figure at the

annual woman suffrage conventions. Everyone looked eagerly for the

tall lithe gray-haired woman with a red shawl on her arm or around her

shoulders. Once when Susan appeared on the platform with a new white

crepe shawl, the reporters immediately registered their displeasure by

putting down their pencils. This did not escape her, and always on

good terms with the newsmen and informal with her audiences, she

called out, "Boys, what is the matter?"[405]

"Where is the red shawl?" one of them asked. "No red shawl, no

report."

Enjoying this little by-play, she sent her niece Lucy back to the

hotel for the red shawl, and when Lucy brought it up to the platform

and put it about her shoulders, the audience burst into applause, for

the red shawl, like Susan herself, had become the well-loved symbol of

woman suffrage.

Susan was convinced that the annual national convention should always

be held in Washington, where Congress could see and feel the growing

strength and influence of the movement. Her "girls," on the other

hand, wanted to take their conventions to different parts of the

country to widen their influence. Not as certain as Susan that work

for a federal amendment must come first, many of them contended that a

few more states won for woman suffrage would best help the cause at

this time. The southern women, now active, were firm believers in

states' rights and supported state work.[406] Susan's experience had

taught her the impracticability of direct appeal to the voters in the

states, now that foreign-born men in increasing numbers were arrayed

against votes for women. In spite of her arguments and her pleas, the

National American Association voted in 1894 to hold conventions in

different parts of the country in alternate years. Disappointed, but

trying her best graciously to follow the will of the majority, she

traveled to Atlanta and to Des Moines for the conventions of 1895 and

1897.

Nor did the younger women welcome the messages which Mrs. Stanton, at

Susan's insistence, sent to every convention. Susan herself often

wished her good friend would stick more closely to woman suffrage

instead of introducing extraneous subjects, such as "Educated

Suffrage," "The Matriarchate," or "Women and the Church," but

nevertheless she proudly read her papers to successive conventions.

Insisting that the conventions were too academic, Mrs. Stanton urged

Susan to inject more vitality into them by broadening their platform.

Susan, however, had come to the conclusion that concentration on woman

suffrage was imperative in order to unite all women under one banner

and build up numbers which Congressmen were bound to respect. With

this her "girls" agreed 100 per cent. While all of them were convinced

suffragists, they were divided on other issues, and few of them were

wholehearted feminists, as were Susan and Mrs. Stanton.

\* \* \* \* \*

With the publication of \_The Woman's Bible\_ in 1895, Mrs. Stanton

almost upset the applecart, stirring up heated controversy in the

National American Woman Suffrage Association. \_The Woman's Bible\_ was

a keen and sometimes biting commentary on passages in the Bible

relating to women. It questioned the traditional interpretation which

for centuries has fastened the stigma of inferiority upon women, and

pointed out that the female as well as the male was created in the

image of God. To those who regarded every word of the Bible as

inspired by God, \_The Woman's Bible\_ was heresy, and both the clergy

and the press stirred up a storm of protest against it. Suffragists

were condemned for compiling a new Bible and were obliged to explain

again and again that \_The Woman's Bible\_ expressed Mrs. Stanton's

personal views and not those of the movement.

Susan regarded \_The Woman's Bible\_ as a futile, questionable

digression from the straight path of woman suffrage. To Clara Colby,

who praised it in her \_Woman's Tribune\_, she wrote, "Of all her great

speeches, I am always proud--but of her Bible commentaries, I am not

proud--either of their spirit or letter.... I could cry a heap--every

time I read or think--if it would undo them--or do anybody or myself

or the cause or Mrs. Stanton any good--they are so entirely unlike her

former self--so flippant and superficial. But she thinks I have gone

over to the enemy--so counts my judgment worth nothing more than that

of any other narrow-souled body.... But I shall love and honor her to

the end--whether her \_Bible\_ please me or not. So I hope she will do

for me."[407]

She was, however, wholly unprepared for the rebellion staged by her

"girls" at the Washington convention of 1896, when, led by Rachel

Foster Avery, they repudiated \_The Woman's Bible\_ and proposed a

resolution declaring that their organization had no connection with

it. This was clear proof to Susan that her "girls" lacked tolerance

and wisdom. Listening to the debate, she was heartsick. Anna Howard

Shaw and Mrs. Catt as well as Alice Stone Blackwell spoke for the

resolution. Only a few raised their voices against it, among them her

sister Mary, Clara Colby, Mrs. Blake, and a young woman new to the

ranks, Charlotte Perkins Stetson.

Susan was presiding, and leaving the chair to express her opinions,

she firmly declared, "To pass such a resolution is to set back the

hands on the dial of reform.... We have all sorts of people in the

Association and ... a Christian has no more right on our platform than

an atheist. When this platform is too narrow for all to stand on, I

shall not be on it.... Who is to set up a line? Neither you nor I can

tell but Mrs. Stanton will come out triumphant and that this will be

the great thing done in woman's cause. Lucretia Mott at first thought

Mrs. Stanton had injured the cause of woman's rights by insisting on

the demand for woman suffrage, but she had sense enough not to pass a

resolution about it....[408]

"Are you going to cater to the whims and prejudices of people?" she

asked them. "We draw out from other people our own thought. If, when

you go out to organize, you go with a broad spirit, you will create

and call out breadth and toleration. You had better organize one woman

on a broad platform than 10,000 on a narrow platform of intolerance

and bigotry."

Her voice tense with emotion, she concluded, "This resolution adopted

will be a vote of censure upon a woman who is without a peer in

intellectual and statesmanlike ability; one who has stood for half a

century the acknowledged leader of progressive thought and demand in

regard to all matters pertaining to the absolute freedom of

women."[409]

When the resolution was adopted 53 to 40, she was so disappointed in

her "girls" and so hurt by their defiance that she was tempted to

resign. Hurrying to New York after the convention to talk with Mrs.

Stanton, she found her highly indignant and insistent that they both

resign from the ungrateful organization which had repudiated the women

to whom it owed its existence. The longer Susan considered taking this

step, the less she felt able to make the break. She severely

reprimanded Mrs. Catt, Rachel, Harriet Upton, and Anna, telling them

they were setting up an inquisition.

Finally she wrote Mrs. Stanton, "No, my dear, instead of my resigning

and leaving those half-fledged chickens without any mother, I think it

my duty and the duty of yourself and all the liberals to be at the

next convention and try to reverse this miserable narrow action."[410]

To a reporter who wanted her views on \_The Woman's Bible\_, she made it

plain that she had no part in writing the book, but added, "I think

women have just as good a right to interpret and twist the Bible to

their own advantage as men have always twisted it and turned it to

theirs. It was written by men, and therefore its reference to women

reflects the light in which they were regarded in those days. In the

same way the history of our Revolutionary War was written, in which

very little is said of the noble deeds of women, though we know how

they stood by and helped the great work; it is so with history all

through."[411]

\* \* \* \* \*

For some years, Susan's girls had been urging her to write her

reminiscences, spurred on by the fact that Mrs. Stanton, Mary

Livermore, and Julia Ward Howe were writing theirs. There were also

other good reasons for putting her to work at this task. Writing would

keep her safely at home and away from the strenuous work in the field

which they feared was sapping her strength. It would keep her well

occupied so that they could develop the work and the conventions in

their own way.

Susan put off this task from month to month and from year to year,

torn between her desire to leave a true record of her work and her

longing to be always in the thick of the suffrage fight. Finally she

began looking about for a collaborator, convinced that she herself

could never write an interesting line. Ida Husted Harper, with her

newspaper experience and her interest in the cause, seemed the logical

choice, and in the spring of 1897, she came to 17 Madison Street to

work on the biography.[412]

The attic had been remodeled for workrooms and here Susan now spent

her days with Mrs. Harper, trying to reconstruct the past. She had

definite ideas about how the book should be written, holding up as a

model the biography of William Lloyd Garrison recently written by his

children. Mrs. Harper also had high standards, and influenced by

the formalities of the day, edited Susan's vivid brusque

letters--hurriedly written and punctuated with dashes--so that they

conformed with her own easy but more formal style. To this Susan

readily consented, for she always depreciated her own writing ability.

On one point, however, she was adamant, that her story be told without

dwelling upon the disagreements among the old workers.

The household was geared to the "bog," as they called the biography.

Mary, supervising as usual, watched over their meals and the housework

with the aid of a young rosy-cheeked Canadian girl, Anna Dann, who had

recently come to work for them and whom they at once took to their

hearts, making her one of the family. Soon another young girl,

Genevieve Hawley from Fort Scott, Kansas, was employed to help with

the endless copying, sorting of letters, and pasting of scrapbooks,

and with the current correspondence which piled up and diverted Susan

from the book.[413] Through 1897 and 1898, they worked at top speed.

\_The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony, A Story of the Evolution of

the Status of Women\_, in two volumes, by Ida Husted Harper, was

published by the Bowen Merrill Company of Indianapolis just before

Christmas 1898. Happy as a young girl out of school, Susan inscribed

copies for her many friends and eagerly watched for reviews, pleased

with the favorable comments in newspapers and magazines throughout

this country and Europe.[414]

\* \* \* \* \*

By this time the Cuban rebellion was crowding all other news out of

the papers, and Susan followed it closely, for this struggle for

freedom instantly won her sympathy. She hoped that Spain under

pressure from the United States might be persuaded to give Cuba her

independence, but the blowing up of the battleship \_Maine\_ and the war

cries of the press and of a faction in Congress led to armed

intervention in April 1898. Always opposed to war as a means of

settling disputes, she wrote Rachel, "To think of the mothers of this

nation sitting back in silence without even the power of a legal

protest--while their sons are taken without a by-your-leave! Well all

through--it is barbarous ... and I hope you and all our young women

will rouse to work as never before--and get the women of the Republic

clothed with the power of control of conditions in peace--or when it

shall come again--which Heaven forbid--in war."[415]

Not only did she express these sentiments in letters to her friends,

but in a public meeting, where only patriotic fervor and flag-waving

were welcome, she dared criticize the unsanitary army camps and the

greed and graft which deprived soldiers of wholesome food. "There

isn't a mother in the land," she declared, "who wouldn't know that a

shipload of typhoid stricken soldiers would need cots to lie on and

fuel to cook with, and that a swamp was not a desirable place in which

to pitch a camp.... What the government needs at such a time is not

alone bacteriologists and army officers but also women who know how to

take care of sick boys and have the common sense to surround them with

sanitary conditions."[416] At this her audience, at first hostile,

burst into applause.

More and more disturbed by the inefficient care of the wounded and the

feeding of enlisted men, she wrote Rachel, "Every day's reports and

comments about the war only show the need of women at the front--not

as employees permitted to be there because they begged to be--but

there by right--as managers and dictators in all departments in which

women have been trained--those of feeding and caring for in health and

nursing the sick."[417]

The war over, the problem of governing the Philippines, Puerto Rico,

and Hawaii was of great interest to her, and she at once asked for the

enfranchisement of the women of these newly won island possessions.

She regarded it as an outrage for the most democratic nation in the

world to foist upon them an exclusively masculine government, a "male

oligarchy," as she called it. "I really believe I shall explode," she

wrote Clara Colby, "if some of you young women don't wake up and raise

your voice in protest.... I wonder if when I am under the sod--or

cremated and floating in the air--I shall have to stir you and others

up. How can you not be all on fire?"[418]

The unwillingness of her "girls" to relate woman suffrage to

contemporary public affairs such as this, repeatedly disappointed her.

Yet she was well aware that the younger generation would never see the

work through her eyes, or exactly follow her pattern.

\* \* \* \* \*

Disappointed that her National American Woman Suffrage Association did

not attract members as did the W.C.T.U. or the General Federation of

Women's Clubs, she confessed to Clara Colby, "It is the disheartening

part of my life that so very few women will work for the emancipation

of their own half of the race."[419] Watching women flock into these

other organizations and contributing to all sorts of charities, she

was obliged to admit that "very few are capable of seeing that the

cause of nine-tenths of all the misfortunes which come to women, and

to men also, lies in the subjection of women, and therefore the

important thing is to lay the ax at the root."[420]

She also discovered that it was one thing to build up a large

organization and another to keep women so busy with pressing work for

the cause that they did not find time to expend their energies on the

mechanics of organization. Not only did she chafe at the red tape most

of them spun, but she often felt that they were too prone to linger in

academic by-ways, listening to speeches and holding pleasant

conventions. Since the California campaign of 1896, only one state,

Washington, had been roused to vote on a woman suffrage amendment,

which was defeated and only one more state Delaware had granted women

the right to vote for members of school boards.

Again and again she warned her "girls" that some kind of action on

woman suffrage by Congress every year was important. A hearing, a

committee report, a debate, or even an unfavorable vote would, she was

convinced, do more to stir up the whole nation than all the speakers

and organizers that could be sent through the country.

Such thoughts as these, relative to the work which was always on her

mind, she dashed off to one after another of her young colleagues.

"Your letters sound like a trumpet blast," wrote Anna Howard Shaw,

grateful for her counsel. "They read like St. Paul's Epistles to the

Romans, so strong, so clear, so full of courage."[421]

At seventy-eight, Susan realized that the time was approaching when

she must make up her mind to turn over to a younger woman the

presidency of the National American Association, and during the summer

of 1898 she announced to her executive committee that she would retire

on her eightieth birthday in 1900.

FOOTNOTES:

[400] Ms., Diary, Nov. 7, 1895

[401] Mary Gray Peck, \_Carrie Chapman Catt\_ (New York, 1944), p. 84.

[402] Ms., Diary, Nov. 27, 1895.

[403] To Mrs. Upton, Sept. 5, 1890, University of Rochester Library,

Rochester, New York.

[404] Feb. 10, 1894, Anthony Collection, Henry E. Huntington Library.

[405] Harper, \_Anthony\_, III, p. 1113.

[406] Miss Anthony's first attempt to win Southern women to suffrage

was at the time of the New Orleans Exposition in 1885. Because of her

reputation as an abolitionist, she had much resistance to overcome in

the South.

[407] Dec. 18, 1895, Anthony Collection, Henry E. Huntington Library.

[408] \_Woman's Tribune\_, Feb. 1, 1896.

[409] \_History of Woman Suffrage\_, IV, p. 264.

[410] Harper, \_Anthony\_, II, p. 855. The action of the National

American Woman Suffrage Association on the Woman's Bible was never

reversed.

[411] \_Ibid.\_, p. 856.

[412] Susan thought seriously of Clara Colby as a collaborator but

concluded she was too involved with the \_Woman's Tribune\_. Susan

agreed to share royalties with Mrs. Harper on the biography and any

other work on which they might collaborate. On her 75th birthday

Susan's girls had presented her with an annuity of $800 a year. This

made it possible for her to give up lecturing and concentrate on her

book.

[413] Genevieve Hawley left an interesting record of these years in

letters to her aunt, many of which are preserved in the Susan B.

Anthony Memorial Collection in Rochester, New York.

[414] Both the New York \_Herald\_ and Chicago \_Inter-Ocean\_ gave the

book full-page reviews. A third volume was published in 1908.

[415] Aug. 10, 1898, Susan B. Anthony Papers, Library of Congress.

[416] Harper, \_Anthony\_, III, p. 1121.

[417] Aug. 10, 1898, Susan B. Anthony Papers, Library of Congress.

[418] Dec. 17, 1898, Anthony Collection, Henry E. Huntington Library.

Clara Colby, making her headquarters in Washington, kept Susan

informed on developments and they carried on an animated, voluminous

correspondence during these years.

[419] March 12, 1894, Anthony Collection, Henry E. Huntington Library.

[420] Harper, \_Anthony\_, II, p. 920.

[421] Harper, \_Anthony\_, II, p. 924.

PASSING ON THE TORCH

The last year of Susan's presidency was particularly precious to her.

In a sense it represented her farewell to the work she had carried on

most of her life, and at the same time it was also the hopeful

beginning of the period leading to victory. Yet she had no illusion of

speedy or easy success for her "girls" and she did her best to prepare

them for the obstacles they would inevitably meet. She warned them not

to expect their cause to triumph merely because it was just.

"Governments," she told them, "never do any great good things from

mere principle, from mere love of justice.... You expect too much of

human nature when you expect that."[422]

The movement had reached an impasse. The temper of Congress, as shown

by the admission of Hawaii as a territory without woman suffrage, was

both indifferent and hostile. That this attitude did not express the

will of the American people, she was firmly convinced. It was due, she

believed, to the political influence of powerful groups opposed to

woman suffrage--the liquor interests controlling the votes of

increasing numbers of immigrants, machine politicians fearful of

losing their power, and financial interests whose conservatism

resisted any measure which might upset the status quo. How to

undermine this opposition was now her main problem, and she saw no

other way but persistent agitation through a more active, more

effective, ever-growing woman suffrage organization, reaching a wider

cross section of the people. She herself had established a press

bureau which was feeding interesting factual articles on woman

suffrage to newspapers throughout the country, for as she wrote Mrs.

Colby, the suffrage cause "needs to picture its demands in the daily

papers where the unconverted can see them rather than in special

papers where only those already converted can see them."[423]

Of greatest importance to her was winning the support of organized

labor. Samuel Gompers, the president of the American Federation of

Labor, had already shown his friendliness toward equal pay and votes

for women and was putting women organizers in the field to speed the

unionization of women. Even so she was surprised at the enthusiasm

with which she was received at the American Federation of Labor

convention in 1899, when the four hundred delegates by a rising vote

adopted a strong resolution urging favorable action on a federal woman

suffrage amendment.

So far as possible she had always established friendly relations with

labor organizations, first in 1869 with William H. Sylvis's National

Labor Union and then with the Knights of Labor and their leader,

Terrence V. Powderly.[424] When Eugene V. Debs, president of the

American Railway Union, was arrested during the Pullman strike in 1894

for defying a court injunction, she did not rate him, as so many did,

a dangerous radical, but as an earnest reformer, crusading for an

unpopular cause. They had met years before in Terre Haute, where at

his request she had lectured on woman suffrage, and immediately they

had won each other's sympathy and respect. She did not see indications

of anarchy in the Pullman and Homestead strikes or in the Haymarket

riot, but regarded them as an unfortunate phase of an industrial

revolution which in time would improve the relations of labor and

capital.

That women would be effected by this industrial revolution was obvious

to her, and she wanted them to understand it and play their part in

it. For this reason she saw the importance of keeping the National

American Woman Suffrage Association informed on all developments

affecting wage-earning women and to her delight she found three young

suffragists wide awake on this subject. One of them, Florence Kelley,

had joined forces with that remarkable young woman, Jane Addams, in

her valuable social experiment, Hull House, in the slums of Chicago,

and was now devoting herself to improving the working conditions of

women and children. She represented a new trend in thought and

work--social service--which made a great appeal to college women and

set in motion labor legislation designed to protect women and

children. Another young woman of promise, Gail Laughlin, pioneering as

a lawyer, approached the subject from the feminist viewpoint, seeking

protection for women not through labor legislation based on sex, but

through trade unions, the vote, equal pay, and a wider recognition of

women's right to contract for their labor on the same terms as men.

Her survey of women's working conditions, presented at a convention of

the National American Association was so valuable and attracted so

much attention that she was appointed to the United States Labor

Commission. Harriot Stanton Blatch also understood the significance of

the industrial revolution and woman's part in it, and she too opposed

labor legislation based on sex. Coming from England occasionally to

visit her mother in New York, she brought her liberal viewpoint into

woman suffrage conventions with a flare of oratory matching that of

her gifted parents. "The more I see of her," Susan remarked to a

friend, "the more I feel the greatness of her character."[425]

\* \* \* \* \*

Although it was Susan's intention to hew to the line of woman suffrage

and not to comment publicly on controversial issues, she could not

keep silent when confronted with injustice. Religious intolerance,

bigotry, and racial discrimination always forced her to take a stand,

regardless of the criticism she might bring on herself.

The treatment of the Negro in both the North and the South was always

of great concern to her, and during the 1890s, when a veritable

epidemic of lynchings and race riots broke out, she expressed herself

freely in Rochester newspapers. She noted the dangerous trend as

indicated by new anti-Negro societies and the limitation of membership

to white Americans in the Spanish-American War veterans' organization.

Whenever the opportunity presented itself, she put into practice her

own sincere belief in race equality. During every Washington

convention, she arranged to have one of her good speakers occupy the

pulpit of a Negro church, and in the South she made it a point to

speak herself in Negro churches and schools and before their

organizations, even though this might prejudice southerners. In her

own home, she gladly welcomed the Negro lecturers and educators who

came to Rochester. This seeking out of the Negro in friendliness was a

religious duty to her and a pleasure. She demanded of everyone

employed in her household, respectful treatment of Negro guests. She

rejoiced when she saw Negroes in the audience at woman suffrage

conventions in Washington, and it gave her great satisfaction to hear

Mary Church Terrell, a beautiful intelligent Negro who had been

educated at Oberlin and in Europe, making speeches which equaled and

even surpassed those of the most eloquent white suffragists.

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan did not fail to keep in touch with the international feminist

movement, and in the summer of 1899, when she was seventy-nine years

old, she headed the United States delegation to the International

Council of Women, meeting in London. Visiting Harriot Stanton Blatch

at her home in Basingstoke, she first conferred with the leading

British feminists, bringing herself up to date on the progress of

their cause. In England as in the United States, the burden of the

suffrage campaign had shifted from the shoulders of the pioneers to

their daughters, and they were carrying on with vigor, pressing for

the passage of a franchise bill in the House of Commons.

Moving on to London, she was acclaimed as she had been at the World's

Fair in Chicago. "The papers here have been going wild over Miss

Anthony, declaring her to be the most unaggressive woman suffragist

ever seen," reported a journalist to his newspaper in the United

States.

From China, India, New Zealand, and Australia, from South Africa,

Palestine, Persia, and the Argentine, as well as from Europe and the

United States, women had come to London to discuss their progress and

their problems, and Susan, pointing out to them the goal toward which

they must head, declared with confidence, "The day will come when man

will recognize woman as his peer, not only at the fireside but in the

councils of the nation. Then, and not until then, will there be the

perfect comradeship ... between the sexes that shall result in the

highest development of the race."[426]

She had hoped that Queen Victoria would receive the delegates at

Windsor Castle, thus indicating her approval of the International

Council. She longed to talk with this woman who had ruled so long and

so well. That a queen sat on the throne of England, this in itself was

important to her and she wanted to express her gratitude, although she

was well aware that the Queen had never used her influence for the

improvement of laws relating to women. She had hoped to convince her

of the need of votes for women, but Queen Victoria never gave her the

opportunity. All that influential Englishwomen were able to arrange

was the admission of the delegates to the courtyard of Windsor Castle

to watch the Queen start on her drive and to tea in the banquet room

without the Queen.

[Illustration: Carrie Chapman Catt]

\* \* \* \* \*

Returning home late in August 1899, Susan began at once to make

definite plans to turn over the presidency of the National American

Woman Suffrage Association to a younger woman. Although she well knew

that the choice of her successor was actually in the hands of the

membership, it was her intention to do what she could within the

bounds of democratic procedure to insure the best possible leadership.

To fill the office, she turned instinctively to Anna Howard Shaw whom

she loved more dearly as the years went by and whose selfless devotion

to the cause she trusted implicitly. Yet Anna, in spite of her many

qualifications, lacked a few which were exceptional in Carrie Chapman

Catt--creative executive ability, diplomacy, a talent for working with

people, directing them, and winning their devotion. With growing

admiration, Susan had been watching Mrs. Catt's indefatigable work in

the states where she had been building up active branches. Her flare

for raising money was outstanding, and Susan realized, as few others

did, the crying need of funds for the campaigns ahead. In addition

Mrs. Catt had no personal financial worries, for her husband,

successful in business, was sympathetic to her work. Anna, on the

other hand, would have to support herself by lecturing and carry as

well the burden of the presidency of a rapidly growing organization.

Anna made the decision for Susan. She urged the candidacy of Mrs.

Catt, although her highest ambition had always been to succeed her

beloved Aunt Susan. As she later confessed to Susan, this was a

personal sacrifice which cost her many a heartache, but she "honestly

felt that Mrs. Catt was better fitted ... as well as freer to go into

an unpaid field."[427] Susan therefore approached Mrs. Catt through

Rachel and Harriet Upton, and was relieved when she consented to stand

for election.

Rumors of Susan's retirement aroused ambitions in Lillie Devereux

Blake, who from the point of seniority and devoted work in New York

was regarded as being next in line for the presidency by Mrs. Stanton

and Mrs. Colby. Unable to visualize Mrs. Blake as the leader of this

large organization with its diverse strong personalities, Susan

nevertheless conceded her right to compete for the office. Although

she appreciated Mrs. Blake's valuable work for the cause, there never

had been understanding or sympathy between them. Temperamentally the

blunt stern New Englander with untiring drive had little in common

with the southern beauty turned reformer.

A change in the presidency needed wise and patient handling as

personal ambitions, prejudices, and misunderstandings reared their

heads. When there were murmurings of secession among a small group if

Mrs. Catt were elected, Susan wrote Mrs. Colby that such talk was

"very immature, very despotic, very undemocratic," and she hoped she

was not one of the malcontents.[428]

Another problem was the future of the organization committee which

under Mrs. Catt's chairmanship had carried on a large part of the

work. Its influence was considerable and could readily develop so as

to conflict with that of the officers, thus threatening the unity of

the whole organization. To dissolve the committee seemed to Susan and

her closest advisors the wisest procedure. Mary Garrett Hay, who had

worked closely with Mrs. Catt on the organization committee, opposed

this plan, but after earnest discussion the officers, including Mrs.

Catt, agreed to dissolve the organization committee.

\* \* \* \* \*

As Susan appeared on the platform at the opening session of the

Washington convention in February 1900, there was thunderous applause

from an audience tense with emotion at the thought of losing the

leader who had guided them for so many years. The tall gray-haired

woman in black satin, with soft rich lace at her throat and the

proverbial red shawl about her shoulders, had become the symbol of

their cause. Now, as she looked down upon them with a friendly smile

and motherly tenderness, tears came to their eyes, and they wanted to

remember always just how she looked at that moment. Then she broke the

tension with a call to duty, a summons to press for the federal

amendment, and one more plea that they always hold their annual

conventions in the national capital.

Difficult and sad as this official leave-taking was, she had made up

her mind to carry if through with good cheer. Tirelessly she presided

at three sessions daily. With the pride of a mother, she listened to

the many reports and with particular satisfaction to that of the

treasurer which showed all debts paid and pledges amounting to $10,000

to start the new year. Susan herself had made this possible, raising

enough to pay past debts and securing pledges so that the new

administration could start its work free from financial worries.

"I have fully determined to retire from the active presidency of the

Association," she announced when the reports and speeches were over.

"I am not retiring now because I feel unable, mentally or physically,

to do the necessary work, but because I wish to see the organization

in the hands of those who are to have its management in the future. I

want to see you all at work, while I am alive, so I can scold if you

do not do it well. Give the matter of selecting your officers serious

thought. Consider who will do the best work for the political

enfranchisement of women, and let no personal feelings enter into the

question."[429]

Watching developments with the keen eye of a politician, she was

confident that Mrs. Catt would be elected to succeed her, although

Mrs. Blake's candidacy was still being assiduously pressed and

circulars recommending her, signed by Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Russell Sage

and Dr. Mary Putnam Jacobi, were being widely distributed. Just before

the balloting, however, Mrs. Blake withdrew her name in the interest

of harmony. This left the field to Mrs. Catt, who received 254 votes

of the 278 cast.

A burst of applause greeted the announcement of Mrs. Catt's election.

Then abruptly it stopped, as the realization swept over the delegates

that Aunt Susan was no longer their president. Walking to the front of

the platform, Susan took Mrs. Catt by the hand, and while the

delegates applauded, the two women stood before them, the one showing

in her kind face the experience and wisdom of years, the other young,

intelligent, and beautiful, her life still before her. There were

tears in Susan's eyes and her voice was unsteady as she said, "I am

sure you have made a wise choice.... 'New conditions bring new

duties.' These new duties, these changed conditions, demand stronger

hands, younger heads, and fresher hearts. In Mrs. Catt, you have my

ideal leader. I present to you my successor."[430]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan's joyous confidence in the new administration was rudely jolted

as controversy over the future of the organization committee flared up

during the last days of the convention. Under strong pressure from

Mary Garrett Hay, Mrs. Catt had counseled with Henry Blackwell, and at

one of the last sessions he had slipped in a motion authorizing the

continuance of the organization committee.[431]

Stunned by this development and looking upon it as a threat to the

harmony of the new administration, Susan, supported by Harriet Upton

and Rachel, prepared to take action, and the next morning, at the

first post-convention executive committee meeting at which Mrs. Catt

presided, Susan proposed that the national officers, headed by Mrs.

Catt, take over the duties of the organization committee. This

precipitated a heated debate, during which Henry Blackwell and his

daughter, Alice, called such procedure unconstitutional, and Mary Hay

resigned. As the discussion became too acrimonious, Mrs. Catt put an

end to it by calling up unfinished business, and thus managed to

steer the remainder of the session into less troubled waters. The next

day, however, Susan brought the matter up again, and on her motion the

organization committee was voted out of existence with praise for its

admirable record of service.

Here were all the makings of a factional feud which, if fanned into

flame, could well have split the National American Association. Not

only had the old organization interfered with the new, indirectly

reprimanding Mrs. Catt, but Susan, by her own personal influence and

determination, had reversed the action of the convention. As a result,

Mrs. Catt was indignant, hurt, and sorely tempted to resign, but after

sending a highly critical letter to every member of the business

committee, she took up her work with vigor.

Disappointed and heartsick over the turn of events, Susan searched for

a way to re-establish harmony and her own faith in her successor.

Realizing that a mother's cool counsel and guiding hand were needed to

heal the misunderstandings, and convinced that unity and trust could

be restored only by frank discussion of the problem by those involved,

she asked for a meeting of the business committee at her home. "What

can we do to get back into trust in each other?" she wrote Laura Clay.

"That is the thing we must do--somehow--and it cannot be done by

letter. We must hold a meeting--and we must have you--and every single

one of our members at it."[432]

Impatient at what to her seemed unnecessary delay, she kept prodding

Mrs. Catt to call this meeting. Fortunately both Susan and Mrs. Catt

were genuinely fond of each other and placed the welfare of the cause

above personal differences. Both were tolerant and steady and

understood the pressures put on the leader of a great organization.

Anxious and troubled as she waited for this meeting, Susan appreciated

Anna Shaw's visits as never before, marking them as red-letter days on

her calender.

Late in August 1900, all the officers finally gathered at 17 Madison

Street, and Susan listened to their discussions with deep concern. She

was confident she could rely completely on Harriet Upton, Rachel, and

Anna and could count on Laura Clay's "level head and good common

sense."[433] She never felt sure of Alice Stone Blackwell and knew

there was great sympathy and often a working alliance between her, her

father, and Mrs. Catt. Of the latest member of the official family,

Catharine Waugh McCulloch, she had little first-hand knowledge. Mrs.

Catt, whom she longed to fathom and trust, was still an enigma. During

those hot humid August days, misunderstandings were healed, unity was

restored, and Susan was reassured that not a single one of her "girls"

desired "other than was good for the work."[434]

\* \* \* \* \*

Susan had always been a champion of coeducation, speaking for it as

early as the 1850s at state teachers' meetings and proposing it for

Columbia University in her \_Revolution\_. In 1891, she and Mrs. Stanton

had agitated for the admission of women to the University of

Rochester. Seven years later the trustees consented to admit women

provided $100,000 could be raised in a year, and Susan served on the

fund-raising committee with her friend, Helen Barrett Montgomery.

Because the alumni of the University of Rochester opposed coeducation

and the city's wealthiest men were indifferent, progress was slow, but

the trustees were persuaded to extend the time and to reduce by one

half the amount to be raised.

With so much else on her mind in 1900, including the sudden death of

her brother Merritt, she had given the fund little thought until the

committee appealed to her in desperation when only one day remained in

which to raise the last $8,000. Immediately she went into action.

Remembering that Mary had talked of willing the University $2,000 if

it became coeducational, she persuaded her to pledge that amount now.

Then setting out in a carriage on a very hot September morning, she

slowly collected pledges for all but $2,000. As the trustees were in

session and likely to adjourn any minute, she appealed to Samuel

Wilder, one of Rochester's prominent elder citizens who had already

contributed, to guarantee that amount until she could raise it. To

this he gladly agreed. Reaching the trustees' meeting with Mrs.

Montgomery just in time, with pledges assuring the payment of the full

$50,000, she was amazed at their reception. Instead of rejoicing with

them, the trustees began to quibble over Samuel Wilder's guarantee of

the last $2,000 because of the state of his health. When she offered

her life insurance as security, they still put her off, telling her

to come back in a few days. Even then they continued to quibble, but

finally admitted that the women had won. Disillusioned, she wrote in

her diary, "Not a trustee has given anything although there are

several millionaires among them."[435] Only her life insurance policy

and her dogged persistence had saved the day.

This effort to open Rochester University to women, on top of a very

full and worrisome year, was so taxing and so disillusioning that she

became seriously ill. When she recovered sufficiently for a drive, she

asked to be taken to the university campus and afterward wrote in her

diary, "As I drove over the campus, I felt 'these are not forbidden

grounds to the girls of the city any longer.' It is good to feel that

the old doors sway on their hinges--to women! Will the vows be kept to

them--will the girls have equal chances with the boys? They promised

well--the fulfilment will be seen--whether there shall not be some

hitch from the proposed to a separate school."[436]

\* \* \* \* \*

Still keeping her watchful eye on the National American Association,

Susan traveled to Minneapolis in the spring of 1901 for the first

annual convention under the new administration. There was talk of an

"entire new deal," the retirement of all who had served under Miss

Anthony, and the election of a "new cabinet of officers," and Susan

was so concerned that there might also be a change in the presidency

that she felt she must be on hand to guide and steady the

proceedings.[437]

Mrs. Catt was re-elected and Susan returned to Rochester well

satisfied and ready to devote herself to completing the fourth volume

of the \_History of Woman Suffrage\_ on which she and Mrs. Harper had

been working intermittently for the past year. It was published late

in 1902. While working on the History, Susan, although more than

satisfied with Mrs. Harper's work, often thought nostalgically of her

happy stimulating years of collaboration with Mrs. Stanton. She seldom

saw Mrs. Stanton now, but they kept in touch with each other by

letter.

In the spring of 1902, she visited Mrs. Stanton twice in New York, and

planned to return in November to celebrate Mrs. Stanton's

eighty-seventh birthday. In anticipation, she wrote Mrs. Stanton, "It

is fifty-one years since we first met and we have been busy through

every one of them, stirring up the world to recognize the rights of

women.... We little dreamed when we began this contest ... that half a

century later we would be compelled to leave the finish of the battle

to another generation of women. But our hearts are filled with joy to

know that they enter upon this task equipped with a college education,

with business experience, with the freely admitted right to speak in

public--all of which were denied to women fifty years ago.... These

strong, courageous, capable, young women will take our place and

complete our work. There is an army of them where we were but a

handful...."[438]

Two weeks before Mrs. Stanton's birthday, Susan was stunned by a

telegram announcing that her old comrade had passed away in her chair.

Bewildered and desolate, she sat alone in her study for several hours,

trying bravely to endure her grief. Then came the reporters for copy

which only this heartbroken woman could give. "I cannot express myself

at all as I feel," she haltingly told them. "I am too crushed to

speak. If I had died first, she would have found beautiful phrases to

describe our friendship, but I cannot put it into words."[439]

From New York, where she had gone for the funeral, she wrote in

anguish to Mrs. Harper, "Oh, the voice is stilled which I have loved

to hear for fifty years. Always I have felt that I must have Mrs.

Stanton's opinion of things before I knew where I stood myself. I am

all at sea--but the Laws of Nature are still going on--with no shadow

or turning--what a wonder it is--it goes right on and on--no matter

who lives or who dies."[440]

\* \* \* \* \*

National woman suffrage conventions were still red-letter events to

Susan and she attended them no matter how great the physical effort,

traveling to New Orleans in 1903. Of particular concern was the 1904

convention because of Mrs. Catt's decision at the very last moment not

to stand for re-election on account of her health. Looking over the

field, Susan saw no one capable of taking her place but Anna Howard

Shaw. Not to be able to turn to Mrs. Stanton's capable daughter,

Harriot Stanton Blatch, at this time was disappointing, but Harriot's

long absence in England had made her more or less of a stranger to the

membership of the National American Association, and for some reason

she did not seem to fit in, lacking her mother's warmth and

appeal.[441]

[Illustration: Quotation in the handwriting of Susan B. Anthony]

"I don't see anybody in the whole rank of our suffrage movement to

take her [Mrs. Catt's] place but you," Susan now wrote Anna Howard

Shaw. "If you will take it with a salary of say, $2,000, I will go

ahead and try to see what I can do. We must not let the society down

into \_feeble\_ hands.... Don't say \_no\_, for the \_life\_ of \_you\_, for

if Mrs. Catt \_persists\_ in going out, we shall simply \_have\_ to

\_accept it\_ and we must \_tide over\_ with the \_best material\_ that we

have, and \_you are the best\_, and would you have taken office \_four

years ago\_, you would have been elected over-whelmingly."[442]

Anna could not refuse Aunt Susan, and when she was elected with Mrs.

Catt as vice-president, Susan breathed freely again.

It warmed Susan's heart to enter the convention on her eighty-fourth

birthday to a thundering welcome, to banter with Mrs. Upton who called

her to the platform, and to stop the applause with a smile and "There

now, girls, that's enough."[443] Nothing could have been more

appropriate for her birthday than the Colorado jubilee over which she

presided and which gave irrefutable evidence of the success of woman

suffrage in that state. There was rejoicing too over Australia, where

women had been voting since 1902 and over the new hope in Europe, in

Denmark, where women had chosen her birthday to stage a demonstration

in favor of the pending franchise bill.

For the last time, she spoke to a Senate committee on the woman

suffrage amendment. Standing before these indifferent men, a tired

warrior at the end of a long hard campaign, she reminded them that she

alone remained of those who thirty-five years before, in 1869, had

appealed to Congress for justice. "And I," she added, "shall not be

able to come much longer.

"We have waited," she told them. "We stood aside for the Negro; we

waited for the millions of immigrants; now we must wait till the

Hawaiians, the Filipinos, and the Puerto Ricans are enfranchised; then

no doubt the Cubans will have their turn. For all these ignorant,

alien peoples, educated women have been compelled to stand aside and

wait!" Then with mounting impatience, she asked them, "How long will

this injustice, this outrage continue?"[444]

Their answer to her was silence. They sent no report to the Senate on

the woman suffrage amendment. Yet she was able to say to a reporter of

the New York \_Sun\_, "I have never lost my faith, not for a moment in

fifty years."[445]
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SUSAN B. ANTHONY OF THE WORLD

Susan was on the ocean in May 1904 with her sister Mary and a group of

good friends, headed for a meeting of the International Council of

Women in Berlin. What drew her to Berlin was the plan initiated by

Carrie Chapman Catt to form an International Woman Suffrage Alliance

prior to the meetings of the International Council. This had been

Susan's dream and Mrs. Stanton's in 1883, when they first conferred

with women of other countries regarding an international woman

suffrage organization and found only the women of England ready to

unite on such a radical program. Now that women had worked together

successfully in the International Council for sixteen years on other

less controversial matters relating to women, she and Mrs. Catt were

confident that a few of them at least were willing to unite to demand

the vote.

Chosen as a matter of course to preside over this gathering of

suffragists in Berlin, Susan received an enthusiastic welcome. For her

it was a momentous occasion, and eager to spread news of the meeting

far and wide, she could not understand the objections of many of the

delegates to the presence of reporters who they feared might send out

sensational copy.

"My friends, what are we here for?" she asked her more timid

colleagues. "We have come from many countries, travelled thousands of

miles to form an organization for a great international work, and do

we want to keep it a secret from the public? No; welcome all reporters

who want to come, the more, the better. Let all we say and do here be

told far and wide. Let the people everywhere know that in Berlin women

from all parts of the world have banded themselves together to demand

political freedom. I rejoice in the presence of these reporters, and

instead of excluding them from our meetings let us help them to all

the information we can and ask them to give it the widest

publicity."[446]

This won the battle for the reporters, who gave her rousing applause,

and the news flashed over the wires was sympathetic, dignified, and

abundant. It told the world of the formation of the International

Woman Suffrage Alliance by women from the United States, Great

Britain, Germany, The Netherlands, Sweden, Australia, Norway, and

Denmark, "to secure the enfranchisement of women of all nations." It

praised the honorary president, Susan B. Anthony, and the American

women who took over the leadership of this international venture,

Carrie Chapman Catt, the president, and Rachel Foster Avery,

corresponding secretary.

To celebrate the occasion, German suffragists called a public mass

meeting, and Susan, eager to rejoice with them, was surprised to find

members of the International Council disgruntled and accusing the

International Woman Suffrage Alliance of stealing their thunder and

casting the dark shadow of woman suffrage over their conference. To

placate them and restore harmony, she stayed away from this public

meeting, but she could not control the demand for her presence.

"Where is Susan B. Anthony?" were the first words spoken as the mass

meeting opened. Then immediately the audience rose and burst into

cheers which continued without a break for ten minutes. Anna Howard

Shaw there on the platform and deeply moved by this tribute to Aunt

Susan, later described how she felt: "Every second of that time I

seemed to see Miss Anthony alone in her hotel room, longing with all

her big heart to be with us, as we longed to have her.... Afterwards,

when we burst in upon her and told her of the great demonstration, the

mere mention of her name had caused, her lips quivered and her brave

old eyes filled with tears."[447]

The next morning her "girls" brought her the Berlin newspapers,

translating for her the report of the meeting and these heart-warming

lines, "The Americans call her 'Aunt Susan.' She is our 'Aunt Susan'

too."

This was but a foretaste of her reception throughout her stay in

Berlin. To the International Council, she was "Susan B. Anthony of the

World," the woman of the hour, whom all wanted to meet. Every time she

entered the conference hall, the audience rose and remained standing

until she was seated. Every mention of her name brought forth cheers.

The many young women, acting as ushers, were devoted to her and eager

to serve her. They greeted her by kissing her hand. Embarrassed at

first by such homage, she soon responded by kissing them on the

cheek.

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony at the age of eighty-five]

The Empress Victoria Augusta, receiving the delegates in the Royal

Palace, singled out Susan, and instead of following the custom of

kissing the Empress's hand, Susan bowed as she would to any

distinguished American, explaining that she was a Quaker and did not

understand the etiquette of the court. The Empress praised Susan's

great work, and unwilling to let such an opportunity slip by, Susan

offered the suggestion that Emperor William who had done so much to

build up his country might now wish to raise the status of German

women. To this the Empress replied with a smile, "The gentlemen are

very slow to comprehend this great movement."[448]

When the talented Negro, Mary Church Terrell, addressing the

International Council in both German and French, received an ovation,

Susan's cup of joy was filled to the brim, for she glimpsed the bright

promise of a world without barriers of sex or race.

\* \* \* \* \*

The newspapers welcomed her home, and in her own comfortable sitting

room she read Rochester's greeting in the \_Democrat and Chronicle\_,

"There are woman suffragists and anti-suffragists, but all Rochester

people, irrespective of opinion ... are Anthony men and women. We

admire and esteem one so single-minded, earnest and unselfish, who,

with eighty-four years to her credit, is still too busy and useful to

think of growing old."[449]

Her happiness over this welcome was clouded, however, by the serious

illness of her brother Daniel, and she and Mary hurried to Kansas to

see him. Two months later he passed away. Now only she and Mary were

left of all the large Anthony family. Without Daniel, the world seemed

empty. His strength of character, independence, and sympathy with her

work had comforted and encouraged her all through her life. A fearless

editor, a successful businessman, a politician with principles, he had

played an important role in Kansas, and proud of him, she cherished

the many tributes published throughout the country.

Courageously she now picked up the threads of her life. Her precious

National American Woman Suffrage Association was out of her hands, but

she still had the \_History of Woman Suffrage\_ to distribute, and it

gave her a great sense of accomplishment to hand on to future

generations this record of women's struggle for freedom.[450]

Missing the stimulous of work with her "girls," she took more and more

pleasure in the company of William and Mary Gannett of the First

Unitarian Church, whose liberal views appealed to her strongly. She

liked to have young people about her and followed the lives of all her

nieces and nephews with the greatest interest, spurring on their

ambitions and helping finance their education. The frequent visits of

"Niece Lucy" were a great joy during these years, as was the nearness

of "Niece Anna O,"[451] who married and settled in Rochester. The

young Canadian girl, Anna Dann, had become almost indispensable to her

and to Mary, as companion, secretary, and nurse, and her marriage left

a void in the household. Anna Dann was married at 17 Madison Street by

Anna Howard Shaw with Susan beaming upon her like a proud grandmother.

\* \* \* \* \*

Longing to see one more state won for suffrage, Susan carefully

followed the news from the field, looking hopefully to California and

urging her "girls" to keep hammering away there in spite of defeats.

Her eyes were also on the Territory of Oklahoma, where a constitution

was being drafted preparatory to statehood. "The present bill for the

new state," she wrote Anna Howard Shaw, in December 1904, "is an

insult to women of Oklahoma, such as has never been perpetrated

before. We have always known that women were in reality ranked with

idiots and criminals, but it has never been said in words that the

state should ... restrict or abridge the suffrage ... on account of

illiteracy, minority, \_sex\_, conviction of felony, mental condition,

etc.... We must fight this bill to the utmost...."[452]

The brightest spot in the West was Oregon, where suffrage had been

defeated in 1900 by only 2,000 votes. In June 1905, when the National

American Association held its first far western convention in Portland

during the Lewis and Clark Exposition, Susan could not keep away,

although she had never expected to go over the mountains again. As she

traveled to Portland with Mary and a hundred or more delegates in

special cars, she recalled her many long tiring trips through the West

to carry the message of woman suffrage to the frontier. In

comparison, this was a triumphal journey, showing her, as nothing else

could, what her work had accomplished. Greeted at railroad stations

along the way by enthusiastic crowds, showered with flowers and gifts,

she stood on the back platform of the train with her "girls," shaking

hands, waving her handkerchief, and making an occasional speech.

Presiding over the opening session of the Portland convention,

standing in a veritable garden of flowers which had been presented to

her, she remarked with a droll smile, "This is rather different from

the receptions I used to get fifty years ago.... I am thankful for

this change of spirit which has come over the American people."[453]

On Woman's Day, she was chosen to speak at the unveiling of the statue

of Sacajawea, the Indian woman who had led Lewis and Clark through the

dangerous mountain passes to the Pacific, winning their gratitude and

their praise. In the story of Sacajawea who had been overlooked by the

government when every man in the Lewis and Clark expedition had been

rewarded with a large tract of land, Susan saw the perfect example of

man's thoughtless oversight of the valuable services of women. Looking

up at the bronze statue of the Indian woman, her papoose on her back

and her arm outstretched to the Pacific, Susan said simply, "This is

the first statue erected to a woman because of deeds of daring....

This recognition of the assistance rendered by a woman in the

discovery of this great section of the country is but the beginning of

what is due." Then, with the sunlight playing on her hair and lighting

up her face, she appealed to the men of Oregon for the vote. "Next

year," she reminded them, "the men of this proud state, made possible

by a woman, will decide whether women shall at last have the rights in

it which have been denied them so many years. Let men remember the

part women have played in its settlement and progress and vote to give

them these rights which belong to every citizen."[454]

\* \* \* \* \*

Reporters were at Susan's door, when she returned to Rochester, for

comments on ex-President Cleveland's tirade against clubwomen and

woman suffrage in the popular \_Ladies' Home Journal\_. "Pure

fol-de-rol," she told them, adding testily, "I would think that Grover

Cleveland was about the last person to talk about the sanctity of the

home and woman's sphere." This was good copy for Republican newspapers

and they made the most of it, as women throughout the country added

their protests to Susan's. A popular jingle of the day ran, "Susan B.

Anthony, she took quite a fall out of Grover C."[455]

Susan, however, had something far more important on her mind than

fencing with Grover Cleveland--an interview with President Theodore

Roosevelt. Here was a man eager to right wrongs, to break monopolies,

to see justice done to the Negro, a man who talked of a "square deal"

for all, and yet woman suffrage aroused no response in him.

In November 1905, she undertook a trip to Washington for the express

purpose of talking with him. The year before, at a White House

reception, he had singled her out to stand at his side in the

receiving line. She looked for the same friendliness now. Memorandum

in hand, she plied him with questions which he carefully evaded, but

she would not give up.

"Mr. Roosevelt," she earnestly pleaded, "this is my principle request.

It is almost the last request I shall ever make of anybody. Before you

leave the Presidential chair recommend to Congress to submit to the

Legislatures a Constitutional Amendment which will enfranchise women,

and thus take your place in history with Lincoln, the great

emancipator. I beg of you not to close your term of office without

doing this."[456]

To this he made no response, and trying once more to wring from him

some slight indication of sympathy for her cause, she added, "Mr.

President, your influence is so great that just one word from you in

favor of woman suffrage would give our cause a tremendous impetus."

"The public knows my attitude," he tersely replied. "I recommended it

when Governor of New York."

"True," she acknowledged, "but that was a long time ago. Our enemies

say that was the opinion of your younger years and that since you have

been President you have never uttered one word that could be construed

as an endorsement."

"They have no cause to think I have changed my mind," he suavely

replied as he bade her good-bye. In the months that followed he gave

her no sign that her interview had made the slightest impression.

One of the most satisfying honors bestowed on Susan during these last

years was the invitation to be present at Bryn Mawr College in 1902

for the unveiling of a bronze portrait medallion of herself. Bryn

Mawr, under its brilliant young president, M. Carey Thomas, herself a

pioneer in establishing the highest standards for women's education,

showed no such timidity as Vassar where neither Susan nor Elizabeth

Cady Stanton had been welcome as speakers. At Bryn Mawr, Susan talked

freely and frankly with the students, and best of all, became better

acquainted with M. Carey Thomas and her enterprising friend, Mary

Garrett of Baltimore, who was using her great wealth for the

advancement of women. She longed to channel their abilities to woman

suffrage and a few years later arranged for a national convention in

their home city, Baltimore, appealing to them to make it an

outstanding success.[457]

Arriving in Baltimore in January 1906 for this convention, Susan was

the honored guest in Mary Garrett's luxurious home. Frail and ill, she

was unable to attend all the sessions, as in the past, but she was

present at the highlight of this very successful convention, the

College Evening arranged by M. Carey Thomas. With women's colleges

still resisting the discussion of woman suffrage and the Association

of Collegiate Alumnae refusing to support it, the College Evening

marked the first public endorsement of this controversial subject by

college women. Up to this time the only encouraging sign had been the

formation in 1900 of the College Equal Suffrage League by two young

Radcliffe alumnae, Maud Wood Park and Inez Haynes Irwin. Now here, in

conservative Baltimore, college presidents and college faculty gave

woman suffrage their blessing, and Susan listened happily as

distinguished women, one after another, allied themselves to the

cause: Dr. Mary E. Woolley, who as president of Mt. Holyoke was

developing Mary Lyons' pioneer seminary into a high ranking college;

Lucy Salmon, Mary A. Jordan, and Mary W. Calkins of the faculties of

Vassar, Smith, and Wellesley; Eva Perry Moore, a trustee of Vassar and

president of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, with whom she

dared differ on this subject; Maud Wood Park, representing the younger

generation in the College Equal Suffrage League; and last of all, the

president of Bryn Mawr, M. Carey Thomas. After expressing her

gratitude to the pioneers of this great movement, Miss Thomas turned

to Susan and said, "To you, Miss Anthony, belongs by right, as to no

other woman in the world's history, the love and gratitude of all

women in every country of the civilized globe. We your daughters in

spirit, rise up today and call you blessed.... Of such as you were the

lines of the poet Yeats written:

'They shall be remembered forever,

They shall be alive forever,

They shall be speaking forever,

The people shall hear them forever.'"[458]

During the thundering applause, Susan came forward to respond, her

face alight, and the audience rose. "If any proof were needed of the

progress of the cause for which I have worked, it is here tonight,"

she said simply. "The presence on the stage of these college women,

and in the audience of all those college girls who will someday be the

nation's greatest strength, tell their story to the world. They give

the highest joy and encouragement to me...."[459]

During her visit at the home of Mary Garrett, Susan spoke freely with

her and with M. Carey Thomas of the needs of the National American

Association, particularly of the Standing Fund of $100,000 of which

she had dreamed and which she had started to raise. Now, like an

answer to prayer, Mary Garrett and President Thomas, fresh from their

successful money-raising campaigns for Johns Hopkins and Bryn Mawr,

offered to undertake a similar project for woman suffrage, proposing

to raise $60,000--$12,000 a year for the next five years.

"As we sat at her feet day after day between sessions of the

convention, listening to what she wanted us to do to help women and

asking her questions," recalled M. Carey Thomas in later years, "I

realized that she was the greatest person I had ever met. She seemed

to me everything that a human being could be--a leader to die for or

to live for and follow wherever she led."[460]

Immediately after the convention, Susan went to Washington with the

women who were scheduled to speak at the Congressional hearing on

woman suffrage. In her room at the Shoreham Hotel, a room with a view

of the Washington Monument which the manager always saved for her, she

stood at the window looking out over the city as if saying farewell.

Then turning to Anna Shaw, she said with emotion, "I think it is the

most beautiful monument in the whole world."[461]

That evening she sat quietly through the many tributes offered to her

on her eighty-sixth birthday, longing to tell all her friends the

gratitude and hope that welled up in her heart. Finally she rose, and

standing by Anna Howard Shaw who was presiding, she impulsively put

her hand on her shoulder and praised her for her loyal support. Then

turning to the other officers, she thanked them for all they had done.

"There are others also," she added, "just as true and devoted to the

cause--I wish I could name everyone--but with such women consecrating

their lives--" She hesitated a moment, and then in her clear rich

voice, added with emphasis, "Failure is impossible."[462]

\* \* \* \* \*

In Rochester, in the home she so dearly loved, she spent her last

weeks, thinking of the cause and the women who would carry it on.

Longing to talk with Anna Shaw, she sent for her, but Anna, feeling

she was needed, came even before a letter could reach her. With Anna

at her bedside, Susan was content.

"I want you to give me a promise," she pleaded, reaching for Anna's

hand. "Promise me you will keep the presidency of the association as

long as you are well enough to do the work."[463]

Deeply moved, Anna replied, "But how can I promise that? I can keep it

only as long as others wish me to keep it."

"Promise to make them wish you to keep it," Susan urged. "Just as I

wish you to keep it...."

After a moment, she continued, "I do not know anything about what

comes to us after this life ends, but ... if I have any conscious

knowledge of this world and of what you are doing, I shall not be far

away from you; and in times of need I will help you all I can. Who

knows? Perhaps I may be able to do more for the Cause after I am gone

than while I am here."

A few days later, on March 13, 1906, she passed away, her hand in

Anna's.

\* \* \* \* \*

Asked, a few years before, if she believed that all women in the

United States would ever be given the vote, she had replied with

assurance, "It will come, but I shall not see it.... It is inevitable.

We can no more deny forever the right of self-government to one-half

our people than we could keep the Negro forever in bondage. It will

not be wrought by the same disrupting forces that freed the slave, but

come it will, and I believe within a generation."[464]

[Illustration: Susan B. Anthony, 1905]

She had so longed to see women voting throughout the United States, to

see them elected to legislatures and Congress, but for her there had

only been the promise of fulfillment in Wyoming, Utah, Colorado, and

Idaho, and far away in New Zealand and Australia.

"Failure is impossible" was the rallying cry she left with her "girls"

to spur them on in the long discouraging struggle ahead, fourteen more

years of campaigning until on August 26, 1920, women were enfranchised

throughout the United States by the Nineteenth Amendment.

Even then their work was not finished, for she had looked farther

ahead to the time when men and women everywhere, regardless of race,

religion, or sex, would enjoy equal rights. Her challenging words,

"Failure is impossible," still echo and re-echo through the years, as

the crusade for human rights goes forward and men and women together

strive to build and preserve a free world.
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[Transcriber's Note: All footnotes for the book were located here, on
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