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INTRODUCTION

Scholars have devoted a great deal of attention in recent years to the history of the American women's movement, from its inception in 1848 to the conclusion of the woman suffrage campaign in 1920.¹ Historians have generally neglected the period after 1920, however.² This neglect stems from their interpretation of the woman suffrage campaign as the crux of the women's movement and their conclusion that the movement therefore disintegrated after the suffrage victory.

This analysis reflects a flawed conceptualization of the nature of the women's movement. Some historians, for instance, refer to the women's movement in general and the suffrage campaign in particular as "feminist" movements, lumping all women activists together under the label of "feminists." By implication, therefore, they ascribe a shared ideology to the participants in the woman suffrage movement. Richard Evans does so, for instance, in _The Feminists: Women's Emancipation Movements in Europe, America, and Australasia, 1840-1920_. He criticizes the term "women's movement" when applied to the pre-1920 period because it was applied to almost every aspect of women's organized activities and therefore lacks the "clarity and precision" of the
term "feminism." In spite of this objection, he proceeds to use the term "feminist"--which he defines as those who believe in the "doctrine of equal rights for women, based on the theory of the equality of the sexes"--for all woman suffrage proponents, regardless of their ideological positions.\(^3\)

In *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869*, Ellen C. DuBois interprets the emergence of an organized suffrage campaign in 1869 as the beginning of the women's movement. She contends that this movement was a feminist movement. The basis for this contention is her belief that the demand for woman suffrage was inherently feminist because it challenged the traditional concept of the home as women's sphere. DuBois uses the label "feminist" for some woman suffrage proponents but not for others. She does not specifically explain, however, the reason for this restricted application of the label.\(^4\)

Other historians describe the advocates of woman suffrage as "suffragists," which merely signifies that they shared a common goal. This interpretation is found in Eleanor Flexner's *Century of Struggle: The Woman's Rights Movement in the United States*; in Aileen S. Kraditor's *The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890-1920*; and in Anne F. Scott's and Andrew M. Scott's *One Half the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage*. These historians avoid superimposing
a feminist ideology on all participants in the woman suffrage campaign. Indeed, they virtually ignore the existence of different ideological positions among suffragists. They use the labels "radical" and "conservative" or "militant" and "nonmilitant" to differentiate among suffragists, but these labels refer to tactical rather than ideological differences.

Historians' failure to define and clarify the nature of the pre-1920 women's movement has led to certain misconceptions about the post-suffrage era of the movement. If feminism is equated with suffragism, for instance, then the suffrage victory in 1920 destroyed the basis of feminism and led to its subsequent demise. This hypothesis is explicit in Richard Evans' The Feminists. Evans claims that the granting of woman suffrage was the cause of the decline of feminism and that 1920 therefore "marked the end of the era of feminism."^5

The same hypothesis is implicit in William O'Neill's Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America and J. Stanley Lemons' The Woman Citizen: Social Feminism in the 1920s. Both apply the term "feminist" to all suffragists and then attempt to account for the obvious ideological differences among women activists after the suffrage victory by differentiating the "hard-core" from the "social" feminists. O'Neill, who originated this distinction, defines the hard-core feminists as those who were chiefly interested in women's rights, whereas the social feminists, "while believing
in women's rights, generally subordinated them to broad
social reforms they thought more urgent. 6 O'Neill considers
the existence of these two factions of feminists in the
1920s ultimately irrelevant because he believes that fem-
inism had become so narrowly confined to woman suffrage that
it had no goal, no anchor and no vision after the suffrage
victory. He concludes, therefore, that feminism died in the
1920s.

Anne F. Scott and Andrew M. Scott, on the other hand,
do not equate feminism and suffrage in One Half the People,
their study of the woman suffrage movement. They argue that
feminism did not die in 1920, but concede that "the broader
movement we have described [the women's movement] lost
momentum." 7

These diverse interpretations of the nature of the
pre- and post-suffrage women's movement are the result of the
lack of a comprehensive study of the elements of change and
continuity in the movement. I propose partially to redress
this deficiency in this study by focusing on specific
changes and threads of continuity in the women's movement
from its beginning in 1848 to 1930, the end of the first
decade after women's enfranchisement. My thesis is that the
women's movement did not die after the suffrage victory. It
continued its overall character, an on-going collective
venture directed toward the advancement of women in American
society. This general movement had several phases, differentiated by the prominence of certain themes or goals.

The first phase of the movement was the "woman's rights" phase, roughly 1848 to 1869, during which activists campaigned for greater legal, economic, social and political rights for women. The "woman suffrage" phase was the period from 1869 to 1920, during which the focus of women's organized activity was the pursuit of political equality in the form of enfranchisement. The post-suffrage phase of the movement lasted from 1920 to the 1960s and, like the woman's rights phase, it encompassed a wide variety of issues, themes and goals.

The women's movement contained several threads of continuity which survived the change from one phase to another. Each phase of the movement was characterized by the existence of rival factions--moderates and radicals--who were differentiated by their ideological orientations. These factions persisted in each successive phase of the women's movement. The "moderates" embraced a humanitarian orientation which advocated changes in women's status as one plank in their platform of general social reform. The moderate faction included the American Woman Suffrage Association and later the National American Woman Suffrage Association in the woman suffrage phase, and the National League of Women Voters in the post-suffrage phase of the women's movement. The "radicals" represented the feminist orientation in their
dedication to the goal of equality for women in American society. The radical faction included the National Woman Suffrage Association and later the Congressional Union in the woman suffrage phase, and the National Woman's Party in the post-suffrage phase of the movement.

Chapter I of this study describes the elements of change and continuity in the national woman's rights and woman suffrage phases of the women's movement and Chapters III and IV are devoted to the post-suffrage phase.

To provide a microcosmic perspective on the phases of the movement, I have studied the parallel developments within one state—Ohio. Ohio provided a good case study because it had an early, identifiable woman's rights movement, a strong woman suffrage movement and a continuation of activism after the suffrage victory. A state perspective provided an opportunity to determine whether the existence of rival factions in the movement was a result of personal animosity between the national leaders or whether it was a result of deep ideological differences which animated women even on the more intimate state and local levels. The latter seems to be true in view of the many ways in which the Ohio movement paralleled the national movement in each of the phases. Chapter II describes the woman's rights and woman suffrage phases in Ohio, and Chapter V examines the post-suffrage phase of the women's movement in the state.
This study is not intended to be a comprehensive account of all of women's activities from 1848 to 1930. I have not attempted, for instance, to describe and analyze women's achievements in education, the professions, public office, the home and the work force except in so far as these were issues in the various phases of the women's movement. I also have not attempted to cover every aspect of the women's movement, particularly the specific campaigns, organized opposition and political conditions which affected the length and success of the woman suffrage movement.

What I have attempted to do is to suggest a new way of looking at the women's movement as a general movement characterized by multiplicity of goals, issues, ideologies and factions. I have concentrated on the post-suffrage phase of the movement which has been neglected in traditional histories of the women's movement. I found the issues, goals, ideologies and factionalism in the post-suffrage phase had direct counterparts in the two preceding phases of the women's movement.

In particular, the humanitarian and feminist orientations which motivated organized women in the post-suffrage era had been present in the women's movement continuously since 1848. The women's movement had never been, as some historians suggest, a feminist movement. Indeed, the feminist perspective was the minority viewpoint in all three phases. Neither the women's movement nor feminism "died"
in 1920. Both continued after the suffrage victory, although they altered in response to the new circumstances and opportunities. I have attempted in this and other examples of change and continuity to offer new insights into the nature of the American women's movement.
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The course of the woman's movement after the suffrage victory was determined, in part, by events and personalities of an earlier era. The woman suffrage movement, which had its roots in the nineteenth century woman's rights movement, was the immediate frame of reference for organized women after 1920; as such, it represented a point on a continuum. The purpose of this chapter is to examine the woman suffrage movement from the perspective of ideological, tactical and organizational change and continuity from 1848 to 1920.

The official beginning of the woman's rights movement in the United States was the Woman's Rights Convention at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848. The women and men who were present at this meeting surveyed the injustices against women found in society's laws and institutions and passed a series of resolutions which called for redress of these grievances. These resolutions, preceded by a statement of the essential equality of women and men, covered matters of religion, morality, economics, law, education and the elective franchise.  

All were adopted unanimously except the last; some of those present felt that the issue of enfranchisement was too controversial and ridiculous, but Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Frederick Douglass, "seeing that the power to choose rulers
and make laws was the right by which all others could be secured," finally obtained a majority vote in favor of the resolution.2

The meeting at Seneca Falls was followed by a series of similar gatherings--local, state and national--prior to the Civil War. Two historians of the woman suffrage movement contend that although there was no formal organization in this period (1848-1860), a "cohesive movement" existed with recognized leaders and a shared ideology.3 Among these recognized leaders, Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who had been responsible for that first meeting at Seneca Falls, and Lucy Stone and Susan B. Anthony were particularly well-known, respected and admired by women across the country. A generally feminist ideology, although not specifically articulated, was reflected in the proceedings at Seneca Falls and subsequent meetings.

These early woman's rights activities fell short of constituting a social movement, however, because they lacked two essential characteristics: the participation and/or support of large numbers of people and some form of organization or structure.4 The woman's rights meetings, which were the basis of the pre-Civil War activity, attracted a great deal of publicity because they were considered sensational, even scandalous, news but they did not attract a large number of women who consciously held and pursued a shared set of attitudes and actions.5 No formal organizational structure existed to supervise and direct activities toward a common set
of goals; the National Woman's Rights Association, established in 1849, was little more than a central steering committee which functioned between the annual national conventions. This lack of structure was apparently not accidental but by design. Ernestine Rose, an early suffragist and woman's rights advocate, reputedly advised her colleagues that "organizations were like the bandages used to restrict the natural growth of Chinese women's feet."7

Without structure and organization, the pre-Civil War movement was an example of collective behavior rather than a social movement. This distinction is an important element in the evaluation of the early woman's rights activities. Inez Haynes Irwin, in Angels and Amazons, describes the pre-Civil War conventions as "marching on with incredible momentum and inevitability."8 The evidence does not suggest, however, that either the conventions or individual actions produced more than scattered and insecure results. Agitation and meetings, an informal network of leaders and a shared sense of injustice were not sufficient to wage a methodical campaign to secure women's rights without the strength and consistency of large numbers, purpose and organization.

Ironically, the Civil War promoted the changes which eventually transformed the early woman's rights agitation into a social movement—although the initial impact appeared to produce just the opposite result. The annual national conventions, which had been the nucleus of the movement, were
discontinued after 1860 for the duration of the war. Most of
the women who had been active in the woman's rights movement
also embraced such reforms as abolition and temperance; when
the war began, many of the reformers dropped all other work
to support the Northern war effort in the name of abolition,
if not patriotism. Neither Susan B. Anthony nor Elizabeth
Cady Stanton, two of the most prominent national woman's
rights leaders, approved of this surcease of woman's rights
activities although they did help form the National Women's
Loyal League in 1863 to aid the emancipation of slaves.9

By the end of the Civil War, a significant shift of
focus had been generated in the woman's rights programme.
Woman suffrage, which had been but a "daring corollary" in the
1840s and a "final goal" in the 1850s, had become by 1866 an
immediate objective.10 This change stemmed from forces within
and outside the woman's rights movement. Within the movement,
for example, Stanton had continued to agitate for women's
enfranchisement as a fundamental first step toward equality;
she had addressed the New York State Legislature in 1854 in
support of her suffrage petition.11 Inez Haynes Irwin says of
the suffrage sentiment in the pre-Civil War period:

    One has a sense of a rising tide. One feels that the
    women of the United States would have been enfranchised
    long before that date of 1920 if the national life had
    run on its normal, peaceful channels.12

    This observation does not take into account the influence
    of forces outside the women's movement which were directly
    linked to the course of the Civil War. The most significant
developments, in this respect, were the proposed Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments to the Constitution. The Fourteenth Amendment was a guarantee of civil rights for all male citizens; the Fifteenth Amendment prohibited the denial of the franchise on the basis of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

The Fourteenth Amendment confirmed the worst fears of those like Stanton and Anthony who had opposed the hiatus of woman's rights activity during the war. Stanton and Anthony had been abolitionists before a woman's rights movement existed— but their first loyalty after 1848 was to women's issues. Other women's rights activists, such as Lucy Stone, Julia Ward Howe and Henry Blackwell, gave first priority to the fruition of their abolitionist work; they were willing therefore to hold woman's rights in abeyance until the rights of Negro men had been secured. At the first post-war woman's rights convention, an open split between these two factions was temporarily averted by the formation of the American Equal Rights Association, which was pledged to work for universal suffrage.13

This compromise pleased no one and collapsed after three years. One reason for its failure was that the "moderates" who put Negro male rights first and the "radicals" who opposed such a priority approach to equality continued to pursue separate goals. The differences between these two factions were deeper than a conflict over the Fourteenth Amendment.
The moderates disapproved of Stanton's public support of freer divorce laws and other controversial issues; they preferred a quiet campaign to remove the legal and political disabilities of women.14

The campaigns for Negro male and all-women suffrage in New York and Kansas in 1867 were a bitter experience for both factions—each blamed the other for the failures of its objectives.15 Stanton and Anthony believed that they had been betrayed by their former comrades; as a result, they accepted financial and oratorical support from a controversial eccentric named George Francis Train. Train's significance was twofold: he publicly espoused—while associated with Stanton and Anthony—controversial social and political issues, and he gave the two women enough money to establish a newspaper.16 This paper, The Revolution, published by Anthony and edited by Stanton, did much to increase hostility between the moderates and the radicals—hostility which had been sparked anew by Train's involvement. Stanton's articles in The Revolution covered such diverse topics as the injustices of the marriage relationship, the need for more coeducational schools and the necessity of economic independence for women—all controversial topics which, according to the moderates, hampered the women's cause by subjecting it to ridicule.17

When the American Equal Rights Association convened in 1869, the "topic of the hour" was the proposed Fifteenth Amendment. The radicals opposed the amendment; they had
become disillusioned with the AERA which they thought was too male-dominated to move far enough, and fast enough, on woman suffrage. The Stanton-Anthony forces subsequently withdrew from the meeting in protest and formed a separate organization specifically suited to their goal—the National Woman Suffrage Association. To counter the attraction of this organization, the moderates eventually formed the American Woman Suffrage Association.18

The schism which ensued between the two suffrage organizations lasted from 1869 until 1890; during its existence, the moderate and radical elements in the movement were separate and identifiable. The National, led by Stanton and Anthony, was the smaller organization but the stature, knowledge and skills of its leaders attracted nationwide publicity and converts. The National was a women's organization. Men were not barred from membership but they could neither vote nor speak at meetings. The major goal of the National was a federal woman suffrage amendment but in speeches and in print, Stanton and Anthony touched on all topics of concern to women, including contraception, divorce, property rights and employment opportunity.19 They did so, in the early years, as speakers on the Lyceum circuit—a practice which provided them with a nationwide audience and an independent income, both of which were necessary after The Revolution folded under the pressure of debts in 1870.20
The American was also led by skilled individuals: Lucy Stone, Henry Blackwell, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Henry Ward Beecher, Julia Ward Howe—all well-known and respected names in reform circles. They carried the stamp of the New England, evangelical aversion to evil and injustice. Their woman's rights program, pursued after ratification of the Fifteenth Amendment in 1870, was confined to legal and political issues, primarily enfranchisement. The American favored a state-by-state route to woman suffrage in contrast to its eager endorsement of the previous three amendments to the federal constitution. The Woman's Journal, its official publication, reflected this moderate orientation and its New England liberal, reform roots.

The impact of the National/American split on the course of the woman suffrage movement was mixed. As one recent study of the movement points out, divisions such as these tend to be self-perpetuating, as the lack of communication encourages mutual suspicion, bitterness feeds on itself and hostility is reinforced. The former close ties of the leaders of the two factions kept the rivalry from becoming a public vendetta. Much of the sparring took place on the pages of The Woman's Journal and The Revolution or in personal correspondence.

Some historians have contended that the rift delayed the suffrage victory, but it may actually have been a positive development. The existence of a radical element made the moderate group more palatable to the general public even though both were pursuing the same unorthodox goal—woman suffrage.
The existence of separate organizations gave the radicals unhindered opportunity to raise issues which might have been suppressed in a combined organization in which the moderates were a majority. Two organizations probably reached more people than either could have done alone. In their different ways, the American and the National breathed life into the movement for woman suffrage in the 1870s and 1880s: a suffrage amendment was introduced in Congress for the first time in 1878, state auxiliaries of both organizations were formed and two territories granted full suffrage to women during these years.24

By 1890, woman suffrage had become such a dominant theme that some suffragists, including Susan B. Anthony, began to evaluate issues solely in terms of their effect on the suffrage movement. Those which hindered the movement were expendable. The split between the American and the National was one such issue which, by the late 1880s, was considered in just these terms; to younger suffragists, in particular, the original causes of the conflict were unclear and even irrelevant.25 Alice Stone Blackwell therefore led an effort to affect a reconciliation between the two organizations which resulted in their merger in 1890. The new organization, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) was presided over by Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Stanton was a reluctant president. She had been chosen, at the request of Susan B. Anthony, because of her pioneering role in the suffrage movement but she
was the only national leader who believed that the concentration on the vote to the exclusion of all other issues was a mistake. She refused to subordinate the topics of greatest interest to her (marriage, divorce, religion, economics) to the suffrage issue. Her most scathing attacks on the clergy, her Woman's Bible, her relentless criticisms of the institution of marriage - all of these came after 1890 when suffragists considered such topics an embarrassment or a selfish diversion for the suffrage movement. Stanton was, according to one historian, the "enfant terrible" of the suffrage cause in this era.

Stanton's recalcitrance in this period, irritating as it was to suffragists, provided a certain continuity between the pre-Civil War woman's rights movement and the post-Civil War woman suffrage movement. Her scores of articles—many of them in the Woman's Journal, NAWSA's official publication—continued to reach a national audience at a time when most of her colleagues' skills were given over to suffrage arguments and agitation.

Neither the suffragists nor Stanton with her biting social commentaries represented the concerns of the majority of organized women at the close of the nineteenth century; both were still considered radical. Women in public roles, however, were no longer an oddity nor a scandal. They had become a fixture in American society, due to the proliferation of women's organizations, women's colleges and coeducational facilities and the increased number of women in the work force.
The women's organizations which suffused American society in the late nineteenth century were of a wide variety but can be generally classified as social/cultural or purposeful in nature. Organizations such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU), the National Consumers' League, the American Association of University Women (AAUW, formerly the Association of Collegiate Alumnae), the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) and the National Women's Trade Union League (NWTUL) had primary commitments to a specific reform or cause but they supported an array of general humanitarian endeavors. The WCTU program in the 1880s, for example, included child welfare, Christian citizenship, kindergartens, parliamentary rules, peace and international arbitration and penal and reformatory work in addition to the various temperance works. The YWCA, the NWTUL and the Consumers' League were concerned with the lives of working women but all branched into other related reform areas.\(^28\)

Two national umbrella organizations emerged in the last decade of the nineteenth century: the National Council of Women (1888) and the General Federation of Women's Clubs (1890). The National Council of Women was an association of women's clubs formed under the auspices of the National Woman Suffrage Association; it attracted a wide variety of organizations and by 1902 its membership was over one million.\(^29\) The close ties between the Council and the controversial woman suffrage movement led to the formation of the General Federation of Women's Clubs (GFWC) which drew together the scattered efforts
of hundreds of diverse clubs throughout the country and turned the conglomerate into the largest force of organized women in American history.\textsuperscript{30}

Many of the clubs which joined the GFWC in 1890 were of the social/cultural variety but a great number had more general goals and programs. Some were involved with a phenomenal range of projects such as trade schools for girls, libraries, university extension courses, schools for handicapped children, crime and justice and the plight of working women.\textsuperscript{31} The changing emphasis of the women's club movement was indicated by the words of Sarah Platt Decker, newly-elected president of the GFWC, in 1904: "I have an important piece of news to give you," she told the GFWC convention. "Dante is dead. He has been for several centuries and I think it is time we dropped the study of his Inferno and turned our attention to our own."\textsuperscript{32}

This trend among women's organizations toward humanitarian goals developed into a general characteristic by 1914. Humanitarian work enabled urban, middle-class, educated women to use their skills in a useful, interesting, "respectable" way without any apparent threat to the family structure.\textsuperscript{33} When the suffrage movement finally tapped these organizations in the twentieth century, it tapped into the mainstream of the humanitarian impulse; as these women were won to the suffrage cause, they brought with them a commitment to humanitarian reforms.
Before this happened, however, the suffrage movement experienced a decade of the "doldrums"—a period of declining vitality which some historians trace to the reunification of the two suffrage organizations in 1890. Before 1890, according to this interpretation, the tension, friction and competition between the two groups of suffragists—radicals and moderates—had kept the suffrage movement alive and lively. Without them, initiative died and rigor set in.34

The movement had suffered several losses after NAWSA was formed, as a result of the deaths of the pioneers: Lucy Stone in 1893, Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1902 and Susan B. Anthony in 1906.35 Costly as these losses were, they did not cause the doldrums. The "old guard," aware of their mortality, had prepared for the future of the movement and had groomed successors. Anthony had encouraged and aided Carrie Chapman Catt's advance within the suffrage ranks (as chairman of organization from 1895-1900 and as Anthony's successor as president of NAWSA in 1900); Lucy Stone's daughter, Alice Stone Blackwell, continued the successful publication of the Woman's Journal; Anna Howard Shaw was Stone's protege and "successor" in the American Woman Suffrage Association and later served as president of NAWSA from 1904-1915; and Elizabeth Cady Stanton's daughter, Harriot Stanton Blatch, kept alive the radical tradition within the suffrage movement.36 The pioneers had also bequeathed to the movement The History of Woman Suffrage, begun by Stanton and Anthony and completed by Francis Dana Gage and Ida Husted Harper. This record of the
early woman's rights and suffrage movements served as an inspiration and a valuable frame of reference for the new wave of suffragists.

If tension, friction and competition had kept the pre-NAWSA suffrage movement healthy, then the so-called "doldrum" period, extending roughly from 1900 to 1910, exhibited some strong vital signs. The militant suffragette movement in England was already notorious in the first decade of the twentieth century, and the half-century of campaigns, petitions and appeals--with paltry results--led many American suffragists to advocate the importation of the militant tactics.

Two prominent suffragists, Alva Belmont and Harriot Stanton Blatch, introduced these tactics into the American movement during the New York Suffrage campaign of 1910. Belmont was a wealthy woman with a reputation as a generous contributor to reform causes, including suffrage. She was originally associated with the mainstream of the suffrage movement and paid a large portion of NAWSA's expenses for several years.37 Mary G. Peck, biographer and friend of Carrie Chapman Catt, claimed that Belmont was, however, "militant by temperament" and that "as soon as militancy appeared in America, [she] transferred her allegiance and her financial support to the more congenial group."38 In 1910, Belmont formed the Political Equality Association which embraced the theory of militancy. One NAWSA leader credited
this Association with the "great awakening" in the New York campaign which rapidly spread over the country." 39

Harriot Stanton Blatch had lived in England and had first-hand knowledge of the British suffrage movement, which had a strong socialist affiliation prior to World War I. 40 Blatch was disappointed with what she interpreted as the conservative nature of the American movement. The Political Equality League of Self-Supporting Women, which she founded in 1910, was an attempt to translate the militant British theory and practice into an American form. This "Americanized" militancy, as exemplified in the New York Campaign of 1910, consisted of large-scale suffrage parades and public agitation. 41 The Stanton name, like the Belmont money, gave formidable potential to Blatch's efforts.

The majority of New York suffragists, however, rejected militancy in the 1910 campaign. Carrie Chapman Catt, former president of NAWSA and a leader of the mainstream suffrage forces in New York, said of the British militants:

I glory in the fight and spunk of these women, but at the same time I think they will bring on a reaction that will last as long as the one against Home Rule. They remind me of the cow that kicks over her pail of milk. 42

Catt believed that the path to a suffrage victory lay, not in militancy, but in copying the organizational methods of the most successful political machine in the country--Tammany Hall. To that end, she created the Woman Suffrage Party of New York which was organized on a precinct and ward basis. The Party's role was educational rather than political; it sought to convert
individual voters instead of politicians to the woman suffrage cause. This effort was necessary, according to Catt, because a federal suffrage amendment could only come about through sufficient state victories which depended on the electorate.43

NAWSA loyalists described the New York campaign of 1910, unsuccessful though it was, as a turning point in the suffrage movement because of two results: the politicization of the suffrage cause and the rejection of militancy by the mainstream of American suffragists. "American women," according to Mary Peck, "went political and constitutional instead of militant in 1909."44 Suffragists who had not rejected militancy also considered 1910 a turning point in the suffrage movement because that was the year when a young woman named Alice Paul, recently returned to the United States from England where she had been immersed in militant suffragette activity, entered the American campaign. She found the American movement, according to one partisan, "confined in a narrow circle of routine propaganda," which had "many eloquent agitators with devoted followings, [but] lacked generalship."45 To her loyalists, Alice Paul was the general who revived the militant spirit and fundamental objective of Susan B. Anthony, "the first militant suffragist."46

Paul entered the American movement at the NAWSA convention of 1912 where her enthusiasm for a national suffrage amendment impressed many leaders, including Catt and Jane Addams. She was assigned to the practically dormant Congressional Committee of NAWSA and chose as her co-workers
Lucy Burns (who had also been active in the English movement), historian Mary Beard, journalist and lawyer Crystal Eastman, and Pennsylvania suffragist Dora Lewis. This committee breathed new life into the federal suffrage amendment idea. Even Mary Peck, no admirer of Alice Paul, conceded that the latter did "brilliant work" as head of the Congressional Committee in 1913. The Committee's report at the NAWSA convention in November, 1913, was reportedly received "with enthusiastic applause, [the members] giving three cheers and rising to its feet to show its approval." In spite of this reception, the Committee came under fire because of some of its unorthodox, independent actions. The Committee had a minimal budget and had formed an auxiliary, the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage (CU), through which to raise and channel funds. This action received the blessing of NAWSA president Anna Shaw, but was challenged by Carrie Chapman Catt who, although she appreciated the significance of Alice Paul's achievements, thought the Congressional Committee should work through the national association and the treasury, as she had done while chairman of organization for NAWSA.

The differences between Paul and Catt went beyond this question of accountability. The Congressional Committee and the Congressional Union were committed to a federal suffrage amendment, whereas NAWSA's main thrust was state-by-state enfranchisement, as a prelude to any federal action. Since women were not a political force without the vote, the Congressional Union adopted, in 1913, the policy of party accountability.
That is, the political party in control of Congress and the Presidency should be held responsible for the success or failure of woman suffrage by the women voters in the seven suffrage states. This "non-partisan" policy was heralded as part of the legacy of Susan B. Anthony. Doris Stevens, in Jailed for Freedom, quoted the following excerpt of a letter from Anthony to Lucy Stone as evidence of the precedent:

If all the suffragists of all the states could... stand shoulder to shoulder against every party and politician not fully and unequivocally committed to 'Equal Rights for Women,' we should become at once the moral balance of power which could not fail to compel the party of highest intelligence to proclaim woman suffrage the chief plank of its platform... Until that good day comes I shall continue to invoke the party in power... to pledge itself to the emancipation of our enslaved half of the people.

The executive board of NAWSA decided, after the 1913 convention, to separate the Congressional Committee and the Congressional Union—a move which Alice Paul and the other committee members refused to accept, and because of which all resigned from NAWSA to perpetuate their work through an independent Congressional Union. From 1914 to 1920, then, the suffrage forces were once again divided into radical and moderate branches.

The most obvious difference between the Congressional Union and NAWSA was their respective approaches to the suffrage campaign. NAWSA waged a two-pronged campaign until the suffrage victory in 1920: it chose target states in the East and conducted intensive, expensive campaigns to enfranchise the women of these states while concurrently lobbying Congress
and the President for a federal suffrage amendment. Until 1916, when Catt unveiled her secret "Winning Plan" which pledged NAWSA to a methodical campaign for a federal amendment, the state drives consumed the majority of the organization's funds and energy. Maud Wood Park, who became chairman of NAWSA's Congressional Committee in 1917, explained this strategy:

Mrs. Catt, who realized the waste of time and strength in the state-by-state way of getting votes for women, was determined that all of the Association's resources should be used to bring about the adoption of a federal amendment for woman suffrage. Yet she knew that Congress was not likely to submit such an amendment until women were able to vote at national elections in more than twelve states.54

The Congressional Union and its affiliate, the Woman's Party (an organization of women from the twelve suffrage states, organized in 1916), refused to accept the state-by-state approach. Kenyon Hayden Rector, a member of the CU from Ohio, denounced NAWSA's leaders, charging that they had "led suffragists to believe that there are two methods of gaining suffrage for the women of the country." This led to a mistaken belief, according to Rector, that the state-by-state and federal amendment routes "were two different methods for obtaining the same thing, and as if therefore one method or another might be chosen quite arbitrarily." Rector argued that it was "absolutely essential" that women be enfranchised by federal amendment because suffrage has never been a state issue for even one instant of time. If all forty-eight states amended their constitutions, (a task well-nigh impossible of accomplishment) to include women as voters, the disenfranchisement
clause would still remain in the Constitution of the United States to menace them as a class, and must sooner or later be removed. It can only be removed by amendment.55

The tactics with which the two organizations conducted their suffrage campaigns were a more divisive issue than the state versus federal argument. The CU, and later the National Woman's Party, were committed to the use of agitation to bring attention to the federal amendment campaign and to bring pressure to bear upon the politicians who were responsible for the fate of the amendment—a policy for which the CU and National Woman's Party members were labelled "militants."

The CU/WP militancy took a variety of forms, the first of which were the giant suffrage parades and demonstrations, arising from Alice Paul's "abiding instinct for pageantry and for the telling picturesqueness of demonstration."56 This "pageantry" was often used in conjunction with another militant policy—the active opposition to Woodrow Wilson and the Democratic Party which began in 1914. Doris Stevens, in her history of the National Woman's Party, contended that Alice Paul and Lucy Burns were approached in 1914 by Alva Belmont with a plan to campaign against the Democrats in the western woman suffrage states. Stevens claimed that Belmont was "practically the only leader formerly associated with the conservative forces who had the courage to extricate herself from the old routine propaganda and adventure into new paths."57

The formation of the Woman's Party in 1916 was another form of militancy, in that it was based on the concept of sex
solidarity as a political weapon. The women voters of the twelve suffrage states were asked to join this independent party and forsake the Republican and Democratic Parties, placing the cause of woman suffrage above party loyalty.58

NAWSA, on the other hand, believed that partisanship in any form was "like cutting off the nose to spite the face."59 Kenyon Rector quoted the following statement by Dr. Anna H. Shaw, made in 1915, to demonstrate the difference between NAWSA and the Woman's Party:

To assume that women will forsake their parties or the men of their own households... for any national issue, is to attribute to women super-human political virtue. There are other and better methods of arriving at results without estranging men and risking the loss of all political power and influence.60

Even when the Democrats and Wilson disappointed the suffragists with their suffrage plank in 1916, Carrie Chapman Catt refused to let NAWSA publicly remonstrate. "I will never consent to that," she said. "We have got them to give us a plank, even if it is rotten."61

The most public and controversial manifestation of the CU's militancy was the picketing of the White House beginning in January 1917. Woodrow Wilson had been re-elected in 1916, his candidacy apparently having suffered little as a result of the CU/WP opposition in the western states. After his election, according to Inez Haynes Irwin, CU/WP leaders realized that he was safe from political pressure for four years.62 A deputation to the President in January 1917 not only failed to win his endorsement of a federal suffrage amendment but his "patronizing"
attitude angered the visitors. Doris Stevens reported her reaction to this visit: "How little the President knew about women! How he underestimated their intelligence and penetration of things political!" At a spontaneous meeting held after the deputation, the women decided that more drastic measures were necessary; the next day the first pickets appeared in front of the White House. Shortly thereafter, a convention was held at which the CU and the Woman's Party merged into the National Woman's Party (NWP), whose sole purpose was to secure political liberty for women.

The event which brought all of the forms of militancy together and emphasized the differences between the militants and the moderates was American entry into World War I. NAWSA, under Catt's leadership, decided on a policy of "double duty": the organization pledged its loyalty and service to the Government and vowed to continue the campaign for woman suffrage. The NWP Convention in 1917 voted that the Party, as an organization, would continue to work solely for woman suffrage although individual members could give any service to the war effort they chose. The decision was made, also, that the Party would continue the peaceful picketing at the White House in an attempt to dramatize American women's fight for freedom while Wilson was so busy making the rest of the world "safe for democracy." Mary Peck, Catt's biographer, charged that the NWP's opposition to the war was therefore "not from pacifist scruples but because the Democratic Party was not supporting the Federal amendment."
The continuation of the pickets after the U.S. entered the war brought down a storm of criticism on the NWP. Doris Stevens reported that even "good 'suffrage-husbands' were now uncomfortable," and the Washington crowds, once friendly and/or curious, turned threatening and abusive. The Government maintained an air of indifference until June 22, 1917, when the first pickets were arrested on obscure charges.

The arrests, trials, prison sentences and hunger strikes endured by the members of the NWP placed NAWSA in an uncomfortable position. To have said nothing would have made NAWSA members appear callous and vindictive to the large number of Americans who were appalled by reports of abusive treatment received by the suffragists in prison. Doris Stevens, an NWP picket who was imprisoned, claimed that the imprisonments made many women who disapproved of the NWP's tactics sympathetic and "sex-conscious." NAWSA could not seem to endorse the actions of the suffragist prisoners, however, lest it further confuse the distinction between the two organizations to politicians and the public. Maud Wood Park recalled that NAWSA had always spent much time explaining "that we did not agree as to method with other women working for the same end"—a task which Park found "unpleasant."

In contrast to the militancy, pickets, banners and the hunger strikes of the NWP, NAWSA's activities during the war years consisted of quiet, persistent lobbying and organizing. Maud Park, who was in charge of the lobbying, insisted on certain cardinal rules for her co-workers which included:
"Don't nag;" "Don't threaten;" and "Don't lose your temper." In recording her lobbying experiences, Park related an incident in which she was so frustrated over a defeat in the Senate that she "broke down and cried like a baby" in front of a Senator. To her dismay, the man said, "Why now, it just shows that you're nothing but a woman after all." Park concluded that what she had done "was probably the most effective apology that I could have made, for from that time on the Senator was staunchly and consistently our friend." Inez Haynes Irwin said of NAWSA: "By all the subtleties passed down from Mother Eve they were nudging men along the path that they must eventually follow." The men in question, according to Irwin, were "captives of the 'silken skein.'"

The conflict which was generated as a result of the differences between these two organizations persisted throughout the remainder of the drive for passage and ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment. Each group charged that the other had—by action or inaction—obstructed the suffrage cause. Maude Wood Park related an incident which occurred right before the Senate vote in February 1919 in which the NWP attempted to burn President Wilson in effigy, an act which "was shocking to the President's opponents as well as friends," and led one friendly Senator to tell Park that suffragists had lost their last chance. But Irwin, in her history of the Woman's Party, claimed that the militant action "alienated some women [but] brought others into the organization; ... women who had
become impatient at the impasse to which the older generation of suffrage workers had brought the Suffrage Amendment."76

Just as each organization blamed the other for delays and setbacks, each took credit for the final suffrage victory. Maud Park gave the honors to Carrie Chapman Catt: "That women all over the United States were able to vote in 1920," she wrote, "is due . . . to the carrying out of the plan prepared and presented by an incomparable leader."77 Doris Stevens quoted a telegram to Alice Paul from Walter Clark, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of North Carolina, as evidence of the Woman's Party's contribution to the victory. "There were politicians and a large degree of public sentiment, which could only be won by the methods you adopted," he wrote. "It is certain that, but for you, success would have been delayed for many years to come."78

Charges and counter-charges such as these kept the rivalry between the radicals and the moderates alive, and the rivalry was, in some respects, constructive rather than destructive. Doris Stevens said that she found Theodore Roosevelt's attitude "delightful" and "sagacious" because he appreciated the "political and social value of a movement's having vitality enough to disagree on methods."79 In the same vein, Anne F. Scott and Andrew Scott concluded, in their history of the suffrage movement, that the existence of militant and conservative forces provided a "good one-two punch;" that is the Woman's Party tactics "provoked Congress and the
President to make concessions to conservative suffragists as less evil—without the division, the federal amendment might have been delayed for years."80

By 1920, the women's movement in the United States had passed through several phases since that first convention at Seneca Falls in 1848; issues and individuals had come and gone. One of the threads of continuity which was woven throughout the seventy-two years was the interplay of the radical minority and the moderate or conservative majority. The extent to which this continuity existed on the state level, where the suffrage movement was subject to local influences and conditions, is the subject of the next chapter which examines the woman suffrage movement in the state of Ohio.
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CHAPTER II. Woman's Rights and Woman Suffrage in Ohio, 1850-1920

News of the Woman's Rights Convention at Seneca Falls, New York, in 1848 was reported by newspapers throughout the country. Editorial comments tended to be scornful or jovial but the news struck a responsive chord in some quarters and similar meetings proliferated in the 1850s. One of the earliest of these meetings was held at Salem, Ohio, in April 1850, marking the beginning of the woman's rights movement in Ohio.

The woman's rights movement in Ohio had its roots in the state's strong reform traditions. Ohio was a center for abolitionist activities in the early nineteenth century and women figured prominently in abolitionist circles. Caroline Severance, Francis Dana Gage, Betsy Mix Cowles, Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown, for instance, were active abolitionists in Ohio in the 1840s who went on to gain national reputations. The prominence of such women activists in Ohio was due, in part, to the presence of Oberlin College, one of the earliest coeducational institutions in the United States. Woman students at Oberlin were immersed in an atmosphere of liberalism and activism which contrasted sharply with the traditional education for women in America.

That many of the women who attended Oberlin became leaders in the woman's rights movement was not a coincidence.
The degree of equality for women at Oberlin was limited. Women students had to take the "ladies course" which excluded the study of certain subjects reserved for men only. The existence of such separatism within the framework of a liberal educational institution led Oberlin women to develop a sense of sisterhood based on their status as an "out" group. These women also recognized the inconsistency between their expectations and their opportunities at Oberlin and in the rest of American society.

The Oberlin and abolitionist experiences created an informal network of activists composed of women from various parts of the country. Women in Ohio, for instance, were separated by great distances from women in New England but those who had been classmates and friends at Oberlin and comrades in the abolitionist movement continued to communicate with each other. When the woman's rights movement began, these connections provided the links between activities on the state and national level. Ohioan Betsy Mix Cowles, for instance, was an abolitionist and Oberlin graduate who attended the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 and then presided at the first such meeting in Ohio in 1850. Ohio in 1850 therefore had a general reform climate and a core of activist women, one of whom had already addressed the state legislature in behalf of women's property and earning rights. This situation led one writer to claim that in 1850, "agitation for the Woman Movement was more general in Ohio than in any other state in the country."
The immediate impetus for the Salem Woman's Rights Convention in April 1850 was the state Constitutional Convention scheduled for May which presented Ohio women, like other interest groups, with the rare opportunity to initiate desired changes in their condition. The Call to the Salem Convention, printed in the Salem Anti-Slavery Bugle, reflected a liberal, reformist orientation; it urged women to

Come in single-heartedness and with a personal self-devotion that will yield everything to Right, Truth and Reason, but not an iota to dogma or theoretical opinions, no matter how time-honored or by what precedent established.  

An editorial following the Call proclaimed: "Too long has Woman been a party to her own degradation in consenting to be the toy of the other sex, instead of asserting her equality." Women, it continued, "must take the lead" in this reform movement.

The women at the Salem Convention did just that; theirs was the first Woman's Rights Convention planned and run exclusively by women. Men were not permitted to speak or vote. The letters of greetings to the Convention from those unable to attend were specifically from women, to women, about women. Lucy Stone wrote from Massachusetts that her state ought to have taken the lead in this movement, "but if she chooses to linger, let her young sister of the West set her a worthy example." She closed her letter: "Yours for Justice and Equal Rights." Lucretia Mott's letter advised the gathering that in their petitions to the Constitutional Convention they must "not ask as favor, but demand as right, that every civil and
ecclesiastical obstacle be removed out of the way." She signed her letter, "Yours for woman's redemption and consequent elevation," and enclosed a copy of her "Discourse on Women" which was read to the Convention. Elizabeth Cady Stanton's letter offered more specific advice:

The question is for what shall you first petition? For the exercise of your right to the elective franchise—nothing short of this. The grant to you of this right will secure all others and the granting every other right, whilst this is denied, is a mockery.

The major address to the Convention, "The Wrongs of Woman," was delivered by J. Elizabeth Jones. Jones' speech, like the Declaration of Sentiments at Seneca Falls, covered a wide variety of injustices from which women suffered in American society. She reported that these wrongs had not, however, aroused the general sympathy, even among women, accorded to the plight of the Negro slaves because of the appearance of control exercised by women. "The fact that woman does not know that she is robbed of her rights," Jones declared, "shows the extent of her enslavement." She closed her address with an appeal to her listeners:

Let us not be like children that can be pacified with toys, or like silly girls whose heads can be turned by a compliment; but let us act like women, rational reflecting women, who know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain them.

The resolutions adopted at the Convention reflected these general sentiments and covered the gamut of woman's rights demands: that "all rights are human rights"; that "all distinctions between men and women in regard to social, literary,
pecuniary, religious or political customs and institutions, based on a distinction of sex, are contrary to the laws of Nature, are unjust and destructive"; that women should secure the elective franchise; that woman's "social condition, the regard in which she is held as a moral and intellectual being [is] the fundamental cause of [her] oppression"; and that one of the principal causes of her social condition is "woman's prohibition from all lucrative employment and enlarged spheres of labor."

These resolutions were not mere exercises in rhetoric; they were precludes to action. The Convention drew up a "Memorial to the State Constitutional Convention" which ended with a plea that in the new Ohio Constitution, "[w]omen shall be secured not only the Right of Suffrage, but all the political and legal rights that are guaranteed to men." To gather support for this petition and to stimulate further activity, the Convention prepared an "Address to the Women of Ohio." This Address called on "our sisters of Ohio" to arise from the lethargy of ages, to assert their rights as independent human beings . . . . We urge you . . . to arise and take possession of your birthright to freedom and equality. Take it not as the gracious boon tendered by the chivalry and gallantry of superiors, but as your right.

The response to the Salem Convention in Ohio newspapers was generally negative but the participants obtained over 8000 signatures for their Memorial to the Constitution Convention. This first effort by Ohio women to have the word "male" stricken from the state Constitution was defeated by a vote of 73-7.
Woman's rights activists were not devastated by this defeat; after all, theirs was one of the first organized attempts by American women to obtain equal political, legal and social rights for their sex. The participants at the Salem Convention, like those at Seneca Falls, had initiated a movement for the emancipation of women.19

After the Salem Convention, "like a snowball gathering snowflakes to itself," the movement in Ohio gained momentum as one convention followed another.20 On the heels of the Salem meeting, for instance, came a meeting in Morgan County, Ohio, called by a group of women led by Francis Dana Gage, a noted writer and abolitionist. Gage reported that she knew of only three women in the region "even favorable to a movement for the help of women," and of these only Gage asked for the ballot and equality before the law for all adults, regardless of sex or color.21 Gage drew up a Memorial to the Constitutional Convention, requesting that the words "white" and "male" be stricken from the Constitution. She also made a list of all the laws in Ohio which discriminated against women, which she presented at the meeting along with the Memorial. A total of seventy women attended the Morgan County meeting (men were not permitted to attend) and Gage was enormously surprised when forty of these women signed the Memorial.22 A second meeting in Morgan County, soon after the first, had to be held in a barn because of local opposition but still attracted three or four hundred people.23
From local meetings such as these, Ohio women gained the experience in public speaking and leadership which was vital to an independent woman's movement. Prior to 1850, even women who were active in reform causes such as abolition had seldom addressed public audiences or presided at meetings. Even Francis Dana Gage, who reported that people were used to her "craziness" because of her notoriety as an abolitionist, relied before 1850 on the press and her social circle as outlets for her opinions. When the Akron Woman's Rights Convention of 1851 elected her as president, Gage accepted reluctantly because of her lack of experience in this capacity.

The Akron Convention, which met under the slogan, "Women Unite," was the second state convention; it was followed by one in Massillon in 1852 and another in Ravenna in 1853. In addition, National Conventions met in the state in 1853 and 1855. By 1852, the movement in Ohio had gained enough momentum to warrant the formation of a state Woman's Rights Association, one of the earliest such organizations in the country. The vitality of the Ohio movement, which made it one of the most prominent in the country, was due, in part, to the close ties between Ohio leaders and the national movement. Among the Ohio women who were prominent in both the state and national woman's rights movements were Betsy Mix Cowles, Caroline Severance, J. Elizabeth Jones and Francis Dana Gage. Severance and Jones, for instance, were officers of the National Woman's Rights Convention at Syracuse in 1852. Gage and Jones lectured on the subject of woman's rights in New York state for six
months in 1860 at the request of Susan B. Anthony and Eliza­
beth Cady Stanton. Jones delivered one of the major addresses
at the Tenth Annual Convention in 1860 as did Gage at the
National Convention in 1866 and both were elected to offices
in the American Equal Rights Association in 1866.28

The woman's rights movement in Ohio had emphasized the
issue of woman suffrage from its inception and, like the
national movement, it always included the demand for enfran­
chisement in its pre-Civil War program. Ohio women continued
to petition the state legislature on the subject and as the
woman's rights movement attracted more adherents and attention
in the state, the request received more serious consideration
than it had in 1850. In 1858, a Select Committee of the Ohio
Senate recommended a woman suffrage resolution to the full
Senate. The Committee attributed its favorable attitude to
the evidence women had presented with regard to the abuses
suffered by married women, the unwarranted prejudices of men
and the principle of no taxation without representation. The
Senate defeated the measure but the vote of 44-44 indicated
the strides made by the woman's rights movement in Ohio since
the Salem Convention.29 Indeed, Florence Allen, a prominent
Cleveland jurist and suffragist, concluded many years later
that "surely the right to vote would in the normal course of
events have been granted to women [in Ohio] within a few
years."30

That women in Ohio and elsewhere did not get the vote
within a few years was due to the influence of the Civil War.
Many women's rights leaders in Ohio, like those on the national level, were also abolitionists and they ceased their activities in behalf of woman's rights to aid the Northern war effort in behalf of the slaves. From 1861, when Francis Dana Gage presented a woman suffrage petition to the Ohio legislature, until the end of the war, the woman's rights movement in the state lay dormant.\(^{31}\)

After the Civil War, woman's rights activities in Ohio focused increasingly on political rights. This was due to the emphasis on the suffrage issue in antebellum national politics. On the national level, woman's rights activists disagreed as to whether women should take advantage of the general reform climate of the Reconstruction period and press for the simultaneous enfranchisement of Negro men and all women or whether women should wait until the rights of Negro men were secured before pressing their claims. This disagreement, which was temporarily defused by formation of the American Equal Rights Association (AERA) in 1866, was not well-defined or understood on the state level.\(^{32}\) In 1869, Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, two AERA members who favored the immediate enfranchisement of women, embarked on a tour of the Midwest, hoping to organize women for a woman suffrage campaign. In Toledo, Ohio, their visit resulted in the formation of the Equal Suffrage Association of Lucas County, one of the earliest such organizations in the country.\(^{33}\)
The disagreements within the woman's rights ranks led to an open break in 1869 when Stanton and Anthony withdrew from the AERA and formed the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA). Margaret Longley of Dayton was present at the meeting at which the NWSA was formed and when she returned to Dayton she organized the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association, an affiliate of NWSA. In the same year, Julia Ward Howe, Lucy Stone and other national leaders who disagreed with Stanton and Anthony, met in Cleveland and formed the American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA) with chapters in Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) and Toledo.

The differences between the National and American Woman Suffrage Associations, which resulted in a strained relationship between their respective leaders, were less evident on the state level. Both organizations had affiliates in Ohio but these local chapters were seldom involved in the disputes between national leaders. The significant aspect of the formation of the NWSA and the AWSA for women on the state and local level was that they had inaugurated a movement whose primary goal was the enfranchisement of women. From 1869 onward, Ohio women, whether affiliated with NWSA or AWSA, directed their energies toward this goal.

Ohio suffragists adopted a variety of strategies in their quest for the vote, depending upon their affiliation. In general, NWSA affiliates campaigned for the federal suffrage amendment which had been introduced in Congress in 1878, whereas the AWSA affiliates worked for state and municipal
Ohio suffragists also made repeated attempts to vote in local, state and national elections. Women in South Newbury, Geauga County, and in Toledo were among the 150 women from across the country, including Susan B. Anthony, who tried to vote as early as 1871 and 1872.38

In 1874, the suffragists of South Newbury, who were active in the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the dress reform movement and woman's rights activities, formed the Newbury Woman's Political Suffrage Club. This club had a varied program which included, in addition to political education and activities, music, readings, essays, etc., designed to satisfy social yearnings and attract an audience. These Newbury suffragists kept in touch with developments in the national suffrage movement. They communicated with Anthony and Stone, sent delegates to the NWSA Convention in 1878 and sent petitions to Congress in support of the woman suffrage amendment.39

Toledo suffragists were also activists in this early period. Sarah Williams, for instance, owned and edited the National Citizen and Ballot Box, described by one historian as a major suffrage journal in the 1870s and 1880s.40 In 1876, suffragists in Toledo, like their counterparts on the national level, refused to participate in the local centennial celebration because they remained a disenfranchised class. These Toledo women were also responsible for the first victory of woman suffrage in Ohio when their campaign for the right to vote in school elections succeeded in 1894.41
Ohio women's activities in the post-Civil War period lacked one important element which had been prevalent in the pre-war era: conventions or state meetings which provided the forum for an exchange of ideas, progress reports, encouragement and exhortations to action—and led to cooperative endeavors rather than costly duplication of independent campaigns. This deficiency was remedied in 1884 when Rebecca Janney, wife of J. J. Janney, president of the state agricultural college (later Ohio State University), issued a call to a state woman suffrage convention in Columbus. The favorable publicity accorded this meeting reportedly led Ezra P. Taylor, Congressional Representative from Ohio, to approve a majority report from the House Judiciary Committee (which he chaired) in favor of a constitutional amendment to enfranchise women.42

The Columbus Convention led to the formation of the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association (OWSA) in 1885. The OWSA became the umbrella association for the various local suffrage organizations in the state. Until the suffrage victory in 1920, the OWSA held annual state suffrage conventions and sponsored women's days at colleges, camp meetings, state and county fairs to keep the issue of woman suffrage in the public spotlight. The formation of the OWSA gave permanence, direction and leadership to the Ohio suffrage movement and, when it affiliated with the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) after 1890, made the woman suffrage activities in Ohio part of the organized national suffrage movement.43
The women who led this phase of the suffrage movement in Ohio were a new generation of activists. They included Frances Casement of Painsville, who helped form the OWSA and served as its first president; Pauline Steinem of Toledo, also a founder of the OWSA; Rebecca Janney of Columbus; Elizabeth Coit of Columbus, first president of the Woman Suffrage Association in that city; and Harriet Taylor Upton of Warren, president of the OWSA from 1899 to 1908 and 1911 to 1920. Most of these women had been too young to participate in the abolition and woman's rights movements before the Civil War. They became activists when the focus of women's organized efforts was enfranchisement. Cleveland suffragist Florence Allen said of the post-Civil War milieu in which these new leaders emerged: "The great interest now was, not in the ills that women suffered, but in the value of political power and representation in government." Of these early leaders, Harriet Taylor Upton was one of the most prominent because of her leadership role in the national movement. Her father, Ezra P. Taylor, was chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and Upton served as his assistant from 1880 to 1893. She was originally a "rabid" anti-suffragist even though her father favored woman suffrage. When she met Susan B. Anthony in Washington, they became fast friends but only, according to Upton, on the condition that they never discuss the subject of suffrage. Upton was so opposed to suffrage that she began writing articles against it but in doing research on the question she converted herself.
When NAWSA was formed in 1890, Upton, because of her political connections and knowledge, served on the Congressional Committee and in 1894 she took on the extra duty of treasurer of the organization, serving in that capacity until 1910. When she returned to her hometown of Warren in 1903, the national headquarters of NAWSA was transferred there from New York City for her convenience. She served as president of the OWSA for over half the years of its existence, prompting Florence Allen's claim that "the growth and success of the movement in Ohio are due first of all to her lifelong devotion to the cause." 

Upton's second term as president of the OWSA, which began in 1911, coincided with a turning point in the Ohio suffrage movement. A state constitutional convention, scheduled for 1911, offered an opportunity for immediate action on the woman suffrage question. By 1910, the Ohio movement had a strong state organization and able leaders but it did not have the active support of large numbers of Ohio women. Only ten of the eighty-eight counties had suffrage organizations. The OWSA recognized the need for organization and recruitment; in 1908, its "plan of action" had included "special attention to agitation, education and organization" and admonished the local chapters that "the primary purpose of the suffrage club is to secure equality before the law, and not to provide entertainment for its members." 

The task of enrolling Ohio women in the suffrage cause was not easy. The fact that women could vote in school board
elections after 1894 gave them some political experience and even role models: Pauline Steinem, president of the OWSA in 1910, had been elected to the Toledo Board of Education in 1904 and served five years and attorney Dora Sandoe Bachman of Columbus was elected to the School Board in 1909 and served until 1917. Florence Allen, in her history of the Ohio suffrage movement, remarked that most Ohio suffragists, however, "had led very sheltered lives" and had to overcome their "shrinking feelings" to become public people.

In 1910, the OWSA chose Elizabeth Hauser of Girard to lead its organizing campaign. Hauser had edited a newspaper in Girard while still a very young woman and at the age of nineteen was elected corresponding secretary of the OWSA. Her youth and accomplishments caught the attention of Harriet Taylor Upton who appointed her assistant treasurer of NAWSA. Hauser went on to become press secretary and later executive secretary of NAWSA and became a close friend of such national leaders as Susan B. Anthony, Anna Howard Shaw and Carrie Chapman Catt.

Hauser went to Cuyahoga County (Cleveland) in 1910 to "revitalize" the county Woman Suffrage Association. The problem in Cleveland, according to one commentator, was that the suffrage movement had not been made fashionable or socially respectable. To remedy this, Hauser tried to recruit women from the city's "first families." One of her notable successes was the recruitment of Belle Sherwin, a member of a wealthy,
prominent Cleveland family, who reportedly had to be "dragged" into suffrage work because of her "natural shrinking from publicity."53

Hauser's organizing efforts in Cuyahoga County were aided by the earlier work of Inez Milholland and Maude Wood Park, two Vassar graduates who had organized a Cleveland chapter of the College Equal Suffrage League, and by an appearance and public address by Emmeline Pankhurst, the British militant suffrage leader who, to the surprise of Cleveland women, was a small, gracious, "feminine" woman whose words, "though defiant, were soft-spoken."54 These combined efforts won many converts to woman suffrage from among society leaders and intellectuals, increased the number of women voters registered for school board elections to a record high of 5,047, and contributed to the majority vote in favor of woman suffrage by the Cuyahoga County delegates to the Constitutional Convention in 1911.55

When the Constitutional Convention voted to submit the woman suffrage issue to a popular vote in 1912, Ohio suffragists leaped into action. One commentator said of the activity in Columbus: "Suddenly it seemed as though all the women in Columbus were in politics... Women prominent in the social life of the city gave up their summer vacations and all their social affairs to work for suffrage— or against it."56 The Columbus campaign concluded with a parade in late August 1912 in which 5,000 women from all over the country marched, resulting in many converts to the cause and high hopes for success.57
In Cleveland, the Cuyahoga County Woman Suffrage Association, following the example of New York suffragists, created the Woman Suffrage Party which canvassed Cleveland voters in behalf of the woman suffrage measure. Other suffragists set out on a series of trolley car excursions and open-air meetings, assisted by Maud Wood Park and Florence Allen of the College Equal Suffrage League. Since most women had little or no experience with such public appearances, suffragist leaders conducted a training class for speakers in the summer of 1912. The Cleveland campaign attracted national attention, and guest speakers that summer included Anna Howard Shaw, president of NAWSA, Jane Addams, Jeanette Rankin, and Rose Schneiderman of the National Women's Trade Union League who organized Cleveland's first noon-hour factory talks.58

In their effort to become respectable, leaders of the suffrage campaign in Ohio in 1912 were intolerant of unorthodox or militant behavior—a situation which characterized the remainder of the suffrage movement in Ohio. Virginia Abbott, in her history of the Cleveland movement, reported that even Mary Garrett Hay, close friend of Carrie Chapman Catt, embarrassed members of the local organization when she insisted on keeping a speaking engagement above a local saloon. Another incident related by Abbott concerned the equestriennes float which the Cleveland suffragists sent to the New York suffrage parade in 1912. A dispute arose as to whether the cavalry divisions would ride side-saddle or astride. A compromise was eventually worked out which left the choice to the individual
rider. To Abbott, this incident was an example of the differences between the militants who approved of British suffragette tactics and the non-militants who believed that the "gentle, more feminine approach was more suitable for this country." 59

In spite of all of this activity, the suffrage campaign of 1912 ended in failure. The woman suffrage measure was defeated by over 87,000 votes. 60 This was a bitter defeat for Ohio suffragists but they had gained a stronger organization, more converts and valuable political experience. They had also unearthed their most formidable opponent: the whiskey interests. 61

Ohio women got their next chance for enfranchisement in 1914 as a result of the passage of initiative and referendum measures in 1912. Once again, woman suffrage was submitted to a popular vote and once again Ohio suffragists mounted a vigorous campaign. They held street meetings, formed suffrage bands, sent suffrage valentines, planted suffrage gardens, and stamped "Votes for Women" on their checks in an effort to keep the issue constantly before the public and staged parades, pageants, teas and fairs to raise money. 62 In Cleveland, the Woman Suffrage Party adopted the slogan "a leader in every ward, a captain for every precinct" and set out to canvass every voter and enlist every woman in the campaign. 63 The women's efforts, however, were greatly hampered by the prohibition issue. Leading suffragists professed a neutral stand on the
prohibition issue but the "whiskey lobby" insisted that a vote for woman suffrage was a vote for prohibition. The whiskey interests cited the strength of the Women's Christian Temperance Union in Ohio as proof of their assertions, but Rose Morarity, a suffragist and political boss of Elyria, claimed that many women, especially rural women, "were not active prohibitionists but women who found that the gay social events of the W.C.T.U. offered a welcome relief from their straight-laced, church-going life."

The "antis"—whiskey interests and others—were much better organized in the 1914 campaign also but Cleveland suffragists met the challenge head-on. They chose Florence Allen, a former teacher and newspaper editor in Cleveland who had graduated from New York University Law School in 1913, to engage in a series of debates with the leaders of the "antis." These debates attracted a great deal of attention in the press and Allen's friends, aware of the stereotype of suffragists as "women of masculine stride, short hair and self-asserted manner," made an evening dress which they insisted she wear to the debates.

This attention to form as well as substance was a constant concern of Ohio suffragists who had to contend with rumors that their families lived on canned goods and crackers. Young working women, in particular, were reluctant to participate in suffrage activities because of these rumors and stereotypes. To attract these women, the Cleveland Woman Suffrage
Party formed the Wage-Earners' Suffrage League composed of business and professional women. Gertrude Foran Handrick, a lawyer, was the League's first president.68

In spite of the intense activity of Ohio suffragists, the woman suffrage measure was once again defeated. This result led many suffragists to question the wisdom of NAWSA's and OWSA's state-by-state approach to enfranchisement. This attitude was not confined to Ohio; suffragists across the country had experienced similar defeats and disappointments. To many of these women, certain new developments in the national suffrage movement after 1913 held great appeal, particularly the infusion of militant British tactics and a renewed emphasis on a federal suffrage amendment. Both courses of action were embodied in a new suffrage organization, the Congressional Union (CU).

Formerly an associate organization within NAWSA, the CU severed its ties in 1914 and embarked on an independent course. The leaders of the CU believed that the American suffrage movement had to become more aggressive and take bolder actions similar to those of the British movement. They contended that state enfranchisement campaigns were not only expensive and wasteful but were politically dangerous because only an amendment to the U. S. Constitution could enfranchise all women for all times.

Many Ohio suffragists were originally attracted to the CU's bold plans. Harriet Taylor Upton, for instance, had
favored the reinstatement of the Congressional Committee, CU's parent organization, when it broke with NAWSA in 1914. When Crystal Eastman, one of the original members of the CU, addressed a meeting of the Franklin County (Columbus) Woman Suffrage Association in 1913, she enlisted the support of some of Columbus' leading suffragists. A state branch of the CU was formed in 1915 and, until late 1916, prominent Ohio suffragists continued to join the CU and participate in its conventions and parades and contribute generously to its treasury. Many Ohio women were more comfortable, however, with the CU's endorsement of a federal amendment than with the militant tactics the group espoused. So long as its militancy was confined to bold speeches and parades, many women could subscribe to CU policies and still retain their affiliation with the more moderate OWSA and NAWSA. When the militancy turned to verbal attacks on public officials, pickets and confrontations with police, most Ohio suffragists denounced the CU.

In 1915, for example, Alice Paul, chairman and founder of the CU, was invited to Cleveland, with all expenses paid, to confer with Ohio suffragists on areas on cooperation. The Union had brought a fresh enthusiasm to the national campaign, according to one observer, and when Paul announced that all militant policies had been abandoned, the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association voted to cooperate with the CU. When militant practices resumed, the OWSA disavowed any connection with the
CU and its affiliate, the Woman's Party. A Cleveland woman reported that when Alva Belmont of the CU later attempted to organize in Ohio, she got a "frigid" Cleveland reception. Indeed, Cleveland suffragists were so aghast at the CU/Woman's Party campaign against the Democrats in 1916 that Florence Allen attempted to even the score by campaigning for Wilson and the Democrats out West.

In spite of these rejections, the CU/Women's Party did retain a following in Ohio and increased its membership from 95 in 1915 to 329 in 1917. Among the leaders of this small but active branch of the CU were Kate Hayden and her daughters, Gillette Hayden and Kenyon Hayden Rector, and Annie Maud Norton Battelle of Columbus and Helen C. Winters of Dayton—all prominent women of substantial means.

The rejection of the CU by most Ohio suffragists did not mean a rejection of the federal amendment. After 1916, NAWSA, under the leadership of Carrie Chapman Catt, gave more of its time and resources to the Anthony Amendment and NAWSA affiliates like the OWSA did likewise. In Ohio, however, the majority of suffragists also campaigned for limited enfranchisement in the form of municipal and presidential suffrage. The first victory for municipal suffrage in Ohio was the East Cleveland campaign of 1915-1916, spearheaded by Florence Allen. Following this victory, the OWSA decided to work for presidential suffrage by legislative enactment, a decision which reportedly pleased state president Harriet Taylor Upton who still believed that
state suffrage must come first. The CU, which reorganized as the National Woman's Party (NWP) in 1917, refused to participate in the campaigns for limited enfranchisement in the state because the Party was committed to work solely for full suffrage by federal amendment.

In the campaign for presidential suffrage, the OWSA activated a statewide organization which canvassed every voter. When this limited franchise was enacted by the state legislature in 1917, OWSA announced that it intended to press for full suffrage. American entry into World War I not only disrupted these plans, but put the scattered suffrage forces on the defensive just to protect their limited enfranchisement. Most Ohio suffragists followed the policy of NAWSA and offered their services to the war effort, which many believed was more important than their suffrage work. The militants, the members of the NWP, refused to cease their campaign for the Anthony Amendment and actually heightened their militant activity during the war. Ohio women were among those who participated in such activities, including the picketing of the White House. The NWP continued its recruiting and organizing in the state during the war, with state and national officers addressing college, social and labor audiences.

With the non-militants engaged in war service and the militants' attention focused on a federal amendment, the opponents of presidential suffrage managed to have the measure repealed by the end of 1917. This development made passage
of the federal suffrage amendment more urgent than ever and when the war ended, Ohio suffragists were unanimous on this objective.

When the U. S. Congress finally passed the Nineteenth Amendment in 1919, national and state suffrage leaders used their organizational and financial resources in the state campaigns for ratification. Ohio was the sixth state to ratify but the action was immediately challenged by the "antis" on constitutional grounds, leaving the state in the "questionable" category. The OWSA, led by Florence Allen, joined in the heated constitutional arguments and, in anticipation of a negative or delayed ruling, pressed for the reinstatement of the presidential suffrage bill to enable women to vote in the next presidential election. The presidential suffrage bill was passed in 1919 and in 1920 the United States Supreme Court upheld Ohio's ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, to the relief of Ohio and national suffrage leaders who were struggling to obtain the necessary thirty-six states.81

During the lapse between Ohio's ratification and the Supreme Court decision, Ohio suffragists also contributed their time and money to other state ratification campaigns. The Ohio Branch of the National Woman's Party raised $2,500 for the national organization's efforts and Ohio Party members participated in the attempts to get the Republican and Democratic Parties to hasten ratification of the Nineteenth
Amendment. The Ohio Woman Suffrage Association, led by Upton, was active in the ratification campaign in Tennessee, the pivotal thirty-sixth state. Upton, who had been appointed by the National Republican Executive Committee to direct the work of Republican women in the presidential campaign of 1920, became a vice president of the Committee and used her position to lobby within the Republican Party for the final victory for woman suffrage. When Tennessee ratified and the Nineteenth Amendment was added to the Constitution in August 1920, Ohio suffragists of both factions, like their counterparts on the national level, claimed a share in the victory.

The woman's rights and woman suffrage movements in Ohio were similar in many respects to the national movements. The woman's rights movement in the state, for instance, consisted of local and state conventions, petition drives and memorials to the state legislature, all loosely supervised by the Ohio Woman's Rights Association. The movement encompassed a wide variety of issues relating to women's legal, economic and social status but the issue of woman suffrage was always a central concern. The similarities between the movement in Ohio and the national movement were due, in part, to the close ties between state and national leaders, most of whom came to the woman's rights movement from a background in other reform efforts, particularly abolition.
In the aftermath of the Civil War, the issue of enfranchisement assumed first priority and the woman's rights movement gradually transformed into a woman suffrage movement on both the state and national levels. The national suffrage movement had, from its inception, more organizational structure, more clearly-defined objectives and more specific participatory events than had characterized the woman's rights movement. It also had more intra-movement conflict, in the rivalry between the NWSA and the AWSA. The Ohio woman suffrage movement, however, had no central organizational structure until the formation of the OWSA in 1885 and, consequently, the conflict which divided the national suffragist ranks did not produce significant factionalism among Ohio suffragists. The few local organizations in Ohio, whether affiliated with the NWSA or the AWSA, apparently welcomed correspondence with all national leaders.

The woman suffrage movement in Ohio grew steadily after the formation of the OWSA. This growth was aided by the formation of the NAWSA in 1890 which ended the split among the national suffrage forces. NAWSA provided the coordination and leadership which welded the scattered state suffrage efforts into a national movement. NAWSA's original strategy, which allowed the proposed federal suffrage amendment to lapse in favor of state campaigns for limited and full enfranchisement, received the hearty endorsement of the OWSA which campaigned for municipal, school board, state and presidential suffrage.
The advent of a second split in the suffrage ranks in 1914 between the Congressional Union and NAWSA found a limited expression in Ohio. The CU, and later the National Woman's Party, never attracted more than a small minority of Ohio suffragists and because the organization focused on the national rather than the state suffrage campaign, these women worked solely for the federal suffrage amendment, eschewing other reform movements, war work and limited enfranchisement campaigns. Their impact within the state was therefore a limited one. Even when the NAWSA and OWSA began their concerted efforts in behalf of the federal amendment, the rivalry between them and the CU/NWP persisted, although it was more of a publicity contest than an open confrontation.

The OWSA, as the umbrella organization for the majority of Ohio suffragists, represented women with a wide variety of political affiliations, goals and experiences. In addition to its campaigns for full and limited suffrage, the OWSA "never lost an opportunity to endorse a right cause," according to Florence Allen. The organization supported the war effort and endorsed legislative measures covering a variety of reforms. A resolution adopted at the 1908 OWSA Convention, for instance, declared that "sanitary conditions, the milk and food supply, village or city ordinances dealing with questions of health, education and morals, all intimately affect the home and are proper subjects for consideration."
The differences between these two factions of the suffrage movement in Ohio persisted until the movement came to an end in 1920. The goal which had monopolized women's activities in the state since 1850 had been realized but the machinery and motivation for activism remained intact. The question for Ohio suffragists of both factions, like their counterparts on the national level, was what form this activism would take in the future. The diverse answers to this question on the national level in the immediate post-suffrage period are the subject of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER III. After Suffrage: New Directions in the Women's Movement, 1920-1930

Ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment in August 1920 brought to a close a movement which had absorbed the time and attention of thousands of American women for seventy-two years. The woman suffrage movement had changed the lives of American women. It altered their political status and opened new vistas of opportunity and achievement. The suffrage victory therefore was not an occasion for nostalgia or retirement; it was, as one suffragist observed, "a day to begin with, not a day to end with."¹

This observation reflected the general consensus among suffragists by 1920 that the vote was not an end in itself. Maud Wood Park of the National League of Women Voters, for instance, described the vote as "a tool, the means to an end," and Mary Winsor of the National Woman's Party characterized it as "a broom to sweep away encumbrances."² The shared sense of anticipation embodied in these statements did not mean, however, that suffragists agreed on an agenda for the future. To the contrary, the variety of goals and activities proposed by former suffragists in the early 1920s revealed a distinct lack of consensus on the orientation of future endeavors.

Crystal Eastman, a close observer of the suffrage movement and its aftermath, distinguished two basic orientations
among organized women in the 1920s: the humanitarian and the feminist. Humanitarians, according to Eastman, were "those who devote themselves to securing those measures of general human betterment for which enlightened women have always stood," whereas feminists were those who "as long as any inequality exists between men and women, regard it as the chief objective of organized women to remove it."³

The term "humanitarian" is used in this study to designate those women who were not primarily interested in women's rights, but in human rights. They believed that enfranchisement was the capstone of women's rights; that it endowed women with the power to remove the remaining forms of sex discrimination in state and national laws, freeing women therefore to focus their attention on more general reforms. Humanitarians viewed the women's movement as the combined endeavors of women committed to the general improvement of American society, rather than as a selfish drive in the sole interest of women. The term "feminist" is applied only to those women who were primarily interested in women's rights. They believed, for instance, that the vote was but "a step on the road to equality,"⁴ and contended that women could not reform society as long as they remained an oppressed group, deprived of social, legal and economic equality. To the feminists, therefore, the women's movement was a movement of women, for women, whose sole objective was complete equality between the sexes in American Society.
The programs of two women's organizations—the National League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party—reflected the differences between these two orientations. Both organizations had their roots in the suffrage campaign and, as such, they provide a point of comparison between trends before and after 1920.

The National League of Women Voters, established in 1919 at the instigation of National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) president Carrie Chapman Catt, emerged in the 1920s as a representative humanitarian organization. Catt intended this new body to be the nucleus of a national post-suffrage movement to provide "non-partisan political education and leadership—a field unoccupied by any other group." Jane Addams, another NAWSA leader, lobbied from the League's inception, however, for a different role for the organization—that of social reconstruction. Since both women were prominent suffrage leaders and because both the political and social welfare programs had significant constituencies within NAWSA, the League adopted a compromise program of political/civic and social welfare education and leadership. President Maud Wood Park reflected this compromise in her description of the League as

an organization of women to help women make the best of themselves, both by intelligent participation in the responsibilities of voting citizens and by special attention to the human welfare side of government, in which women are particularly fit to be useful.
The League therefore was more than a disinterested political education body; it was also an interest group.

Of the two roles, education for citizenship assumed first priority in the early 1920s. League leaders realized that the right to vote did not grant women the knowledge of how to vote or necessarily instill a willingness to vote. In an attempt to remedy this situation, the National League, in cooperation with the state and local Leagues, inaugurated a series of citizenship schools across the country, conducted voter registration drives, sponsored community lectures on government and politics and provided a forum for discussion of issues and candidates prior to elections.

The informed exercise of the franchise was only one facet of citizenship. Another important function of the League, according to one member, was "to provide an opportunity for learning how to be a political being."\(^8\) This meant that League members had to become involved in the entire political process, including political parties, campaigns, public office and government positions. This particular aspect of the League's program was complicated by the organization's non-partisan policy which prevented the endorsement of any candidate, male or female. Catt explained the rationale for this policy on the occasion of the League's birth:

*In the League of Women Voters we have an anomaly; we are going to be a semi-political body. We want political things; we want legislation; we are going to educate for citizenship. In that body we have got to be non-partisan and all-partisan.*\(^9\)
This policy, however, applied to the organization, not to individual members; indeed, Catt advised women that "the only way to get things done is to get them done on the inside of the political party." League President Park echoed this belief in her address to the national convention in 1923 in which she urged each woman to become an active member of the political party which best represents her views; to attend its caucuses, meetings and conventions; and to vote in all primaries as well as in final elections. Particularly is she urged to take part in the political activity of her own election district.

Citizenship education and political training remained important League functions throughout the 1920s, but by 1923 the major emphasis of the organization was on the promotion of legislation in Congress, state legislatures and political party platforms. This was not a usurpation of one interest over another because the League considered its legislative goals an integral part of its educative process rather than a twin objective.

The choice of measures endorsed by the League was the result of careful deliberation. This policy, according to one analysis, stemmed from the suffrage experience of the pioneer League leaders which had instilled in them the habit of penetrating thought upon experience as a means of giving direction to social change and had put this thought to the test of experimental action. This slow, deliberative "study before action" policy became a marked characteristic of the League during the presidency of Belle Sherwin (1924-1934),
who believed that a program upon which a large membership agreed should be gradually developed.  

The annual legislative program of the League consisted of federal measures endorsed by the national convention, from which the National Board chose one or two to be specially pressed.  The majority of both the general and the major measures in the 1920s were of a general humanitarian nature, reflecting the League's belief that women had "special responsibilities" for the welfare of children and working women, for health and sanitation and for the home.  A survey of legislation supported by the League from 1922 to 1923, for instance, listed six child welfare, one education, one women in industry, three social hygiene and seven living costs measures.

The major measures in the 1920s included the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act, the Child Labor Amendment and American membership in the World Court. The Sheppard-Towner Act was designed to provide federal matching funds to the states for the improvement of maternity and infancy health care. The measure was described by one historian as "the first major dividend of the full enfranchisement of women." League President Maud Wood Park played a major role in the Congressional lobbying effort for Sheppard-Towner, in recognition of which President Harding chose the League's national convention in 1921 as the occasion to announce his intention of signing the measure into law. The law was not universally popular,
even within the League. Some states' rights advocates at the 1921 convention refused to support the measure, prompting the convention to issue a vote of confidence in the "Leaders' Policy Report" which proposed that "a strong membership should be the first aim of the League, even at the expense of promoting new legislation."20 The League continued to support the measure throughout the 1920s, however, and periodically lobbied Congress for the renewal of adequate appropriations for its enforcement.21

The Child Labor Amendment, the League's major legislative measure in 1924-1925, did not register the same support or achieve the success of Sheppard-Towner. The amendment, pushed by the League and other humanitarian organizations, passed Congress and was approved by President Coolidge in 1924, but ran into a storm of opposition in the states.22 Many of the state Leagues participated in the ratification campaigns but the amendment remained unratified in the 1920s—a source of great frustration to many League members.23

World peace was also a major concern of the League in the 1920s, prompting one historian's claim that League meetings in the early years of the decade "were mostly anti-war rallies."24 The League's interest in world peace was influenced by the commitment to the cause of such prominent League members as Carrie Chapman Catt, Belle Sherwin, Jane Addams, Florence Kelley and Florence E. Allen.25 The organization's involvement in the peace movement was a limited one, however;
it neither wished nor attempted to lead a women's peace movement. Many of the national leaders, aware of the League's crowded program of civic and social welfare commitments, preferred to channel anti-war activities through organizations specifically devoted to the peace cause. Consequently, the League joined the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War founded in 1925 by Carrie Chapman Catt.\textsuperscript{26} Within the League, the national program of action in 1925 endorsed the campaign for American membership in the World Court. This campaign, like that for the Child Labor Amendment, ended in frustration when Congress adopted the measure in a watered down fashion in 1926.\textsuperscript{27}

In addition to these general humanitarian measures, the League program in the 1920s also included legislation designed to eliminate certain disabilities of women in American society. This goal had been enunciated by Carrie Chapman Catt in 1919 when she recommended that the newborn League should "work for freeing women from remaining legal disabilities . . . and aid the women of other countries to obtain equal rights."\textsuperscript{28} Maud Wood Park echoed this theme when she claimed that women had a special responsibility to insure fair opportunity for all women under the law.\textsuperscript{29} Among the efforts undertaken by the League for the benefit of women as women were support for the Cable Act of 1922, granting independent citizenship to married American women; state campaigns to insure women the right to hold public office and serve on juries; lobbying
within the two major political parties for the equal representation of women on the national executive committees; support of legislation for the protection of working women; endorsement of an adequately funded Women's Bureau within the Department of Labor; and support of a single standard of justice for male and female violators of the vice laws.\textsuperscript{30}

The League's legislative goals reflected its character as a cautious reform organization, preferring gradualism to revolutionary methods of bringing about social change. Reflecting this preference, the national convention motto in 1924 proclaimed: "The best guarantee against revolution is progress."\textsuperscript{31} The League's purpose, according to Maude Wood Park, was not "to lead a few women a long way quickly, but rather to lead many women a little way at a time."\textsuperscript{32} This proclivity for gradualism, coupled with a faith in "humanized scientific method,"\textsuperscript{33} marked the League as a liberal, middle-of-the-road organization. Park acknowledged this characterization when she described the League in 1924 as a "middle-of-the-road organization in which persons of widely different views might work out together a program of definite advance."\textsuperscript{34}

The League's humanitarian orientation reflected both its commitment to progressive social order and its interpretation of women's fundamental interests. League leaders subscribed to the general belief that humanitarian work was an extension of women's natural maternal inclination to aid the needy and unfortunate.\textsuperscript{35} In this respect, the League accepted the
traditional sphere of women—the home—as capable of a constructive influence in society. This was reflected in its leaders' promotion of the organization as an "all-woman, every woman" body in which the average member was the housewife "who fits the work of the League into the housewife's day." The image the League consciously projected therefore was not that of a group of radical women determined to challenge the social order nor that of "society" clubwomen dabbling in causes but, rather, that of a sober, dedicated organization of women using their votes for the good of their community and country.

This position was not just a matter of conviction; it was also a response to the political climate of the 1920s. The "Red Scare" of the early Twenties evolved into a general attack on "subversives" throughout the decade. To the ultrapatriots who led the search for elements of subversion in American society, all reforms and reformers were suspect. The League was not immune from such suspicion and attacks. An editorial in the New York Commercial, a conservative newsletter, in May, 1926, declared:

The League of Women Voters may have been organized for legitimate purposes, but the fact remains if so organized, it has degenerated into a propaganda movement for Socialists, Communists and others who are seeking to overthrow the government. We know nothing constructive urged by this organization in the past two years.

This and similar charges were levelled at the League because of its liberal, reformist orientation and its association with other women's organization whose programs were of a
similar nature. The Women's Joint Congressional Committee (WJCC), formed at the instigation of the League in 1920, was a special target for the "patriots." The WJCC, composed of representatives of several leading women's organizations, supported welfare legislation for women and minors.39 The original members of the WJCC, in addition to the League, were the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Parent-Teacher Association, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National Consumers' League, the American Association of University Women, the National Council of Jewish Women and the American Home Economics Association.40

The WJCC was an aggressive lobbying organization in the early 1920s, promoting such measures as the Sheppard-Towner Act, the Child Labor Amendment, the Women's and Children's Bureaus in the Department of Labor, the Cable Bill, civil service reform and compulsory school attendance.41 Its success in many of these endeavors focused national attention on the organization—some of which came from those who considered many of the WJCC's goals to be communistic.

The League was also involved in the international women's movement through its membership in the International Woman Suffrage Alliance (IWSA), formed by Carrie Chapman Catt in 1902. In the 1920s, the IWSA's program, as outlined by Catt, was directed toward greater political and legal rights for women in all countries.42 The international scope of the
IWSA, its support of an enhanced role for women in public life and the involvement of many members in the international peace movement led its critics on the right to denounce the organization as part of a Bolshevik plot.43

The League did not ignore these attacks, rather it refuted the charges and even counterattacked. To the charge in the New York Commercial that the League wanted to "overthrow the government," League spokeswoman Harriot T. Cooke replied:

The League is a very conservative organization, headed by such women as Belle Sherwin, whose income is drawn from the Sherwin-Williams Paint Company . . . and other women of independent means. . . . Do you believe that John D. Rockefeller, Jr., Edward Filene, Cyrus H. McCormack and others would give thousands to the League if it were striving to 'overthrow the government'? 44

Attacks on the WJCC and such prominent reformers as Jane Addams, Florence Kelley and Rose Schneiderman (of the National Women's Trade Union League) by the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), a former member of the WJCC, prompted Carrie Chapman Catt to issue an "Open Letter to the D.A.R." in the Woman Citizen in 1927. In this letter, Catt defended the women in question and called the DAR a "flagrant offender among the groups attacking women's organizations," charging it with "antifeminism."45

In addition to these criticisms from the right, the League also faced the general scrutiny of the public on the question of the impact of women's enfranchisement. Articles abounded on the subject throughout the 1920s, some favorable
and others critical. One of the most frequent criticisms of women voters was that they had not made significant inroads into the political party machinery or in elective offices. As the only national organization of women as voters, the League led the attempts to prove the success of woman suffrage. It did so by stressing women's use of the vote to improve society, rather than to improve individual women's political careers.

Ruth Fuller Stevens, a prominent Ohio League member, typified this defense in her response to a 1924 Century Magazine article on the failure of woman suffrage. Stevens charged that the critics of woman suffrage measured success—or failure—by the numbers of women in public office. This emphasis was unfair and misplaced, according to Stevens, because League leaders, "the real leaders of the women of the country," had spent their time on humanitarian measures which "seemed of more value than the mere holding of public office." Some League members did admit that they were disappointed with women's lack of success within the political party structure. According to one source, women resented their exclusion from the inner circle of political parties and, in some instances, even resigned from the parties in protest. One Ohio woman, for instance, resigned from her county Republican Committee because "the men in the inner circle don't care a nickel for us. They don't take us seriously . . . . There is not a bit of sense in our standing like beggars at the outer
The words of Agnes Bryant Dickinson, an Ohio lawyer and League member, summarized the frustrations of many League members in the 1920s. "We wanted to be citizens, voters, participants," she wrote in 1930. "We are being forced to be first of all, women." To a minority of organized women in the 1920s, this necessity of being women first and citizens second was not a liability, rather it was a positive objective. These women rejected the humanitarian impulse as their primary motivation and adopted, instead, a feminist program in the post-suffrage era. This feminist orientation, based on the principle of the equality of men and women, was represented by the National Woman's Party (NWP).

The NWP was formed in 1917 from the merger of two suffrage organizations, the Congressional Union and the Woman's Party. This new organization had one objective: passage of a federal suffrage amendment. When the Party's suffrage commitment was fulfilled by ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, it decided, at the 1921 convention, to continue its existence with the new objective of removing the remaining forms of the subjection of women. This objective stemmed from the belief that "while the great barricade of disenfranchisement has been levelled, women are still held as a subject group by a host of legal, economic, educational, professional and traditional discriminations."
The Party's goal, enunciated in its 1922 "Declaration of Principles," was that "women shall no longer be regarded and shall no longer regard themselves as inferior to men, but the equality of the sexes shall be recognized." In specific terms, the Declaration called for equality in government service, education, the professions, the labor force, the church, jury service, legal rights and moral standards.51

The NWP's first campaign, acting on the vote of the 1921 convention, was removal of the legal disabilities of women, after which it planned to proceed "as rapidly as possible" to the other disabilities.52 In preparation for this campaign, in November 1920 the Party's Legal Research Department, a group of women lawyers, had begun a survey of existing discriminatory laws in all states.53 On the basis of this survey and the suggestions from various state branches of the Party, the Legal Research Department proposed two categories of legislation for the campaign: specific equal rights bills addressing particular injustices and "blanket" equality measures to remove the legal disabilities of women in one motion.54 To aid the state branches of the Party in their legislative campaigns, the NWP prepared a digest of those laws of each state which violated the principle of equality and recommended specific legislative remedies.55 In 1924, NWP spokeswoman Ruby A. Black called this phase of the Party's legislative campaign a tremendous success, citing the 476 bills drafted for introduction in the states and passage of equal
rights legislation affecting over 25 million women in sixteen states.56

This piecemeal legislative approach was not the Party's preference, however. National leaders urged the state branches to introduce some version of the blanket equality bill prepared by the Party with the rest of their legislative packages.57 In December 1923, Congressman Daniel Anthony, nephew of Susan B. Anthony, introduced in Congress a federal version of the blanket equality bill, the Lucretia Mott Amendment—usually referred to as the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). This amendment, which read: "Men and women shall have equal rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction," became the NWP's major legislative effort throughout the decade.58

NWP leaders, committed to the general goal of equality for women in American society and to the specific objective of the ERA, realized that their organization could not remain aloof from the political party system. The Party's position, however, was to avoid identification with a particular party.59 This nonpartisan policy was a carryover from its strategy during the suffrage campaign of holding whichever party was in power responsible for the success or failure of the woman suffrage amendment. This strategy had been directed at the Democratic Party from necessity, according to the NWP, rather than from a spirit of partisan politics. As proof of its nonpartisan character, the NWP applied the same policy to the
Republican Party in the 1920s, holding it responsible for action or inaction on the ERA.60

The NWP's particular concept of nonpartisanship carried over into its campaign to place women in elective and appointive offices in government. The Party was always glad, according to one member, "to see every advance that women make in active political work, regardless of party affiliation."61 But the NWP was not primarily interested in women's gains within the traditional political party system because this would not necessarily further the Party's objectives. What the Party required, according to vice chairman Doris Stevens, was a women's "bloc" in Congress "composed of women who are loyal to women."62 In support of this objective, the Party inaugurated in 1924 a "Women for Congress" campaign which pledged the organization's resources to selected women candidates. The women who received this support were chosen on the basis of one issue: support for the ERA.63 The rationale for this basis of selection, explained one Party member, was that "the campaign for equality for women . . . will succeed only when backed by a body of women campaigning on that issue alone."64

The direct appeal to sex solidarity in the Women for Congress campaign drew criticism from other women and from male politicians. One woman, for instance, used the NWP's own principles as the basis for her charge that the campaign was actually "anti-feminist" because it used gender as the
determining factor in opportunity. An editorial in Equal Rights, the Party's official publication, responded to this charge by explaining that women had to "play catch-up in a male-dominated world." The Party urged the selection of qualified women, the editorial declared, "just because they are women . . . to offset latent dominant prejudice." An earlier editorial had employed a similar defense of the sex solidarity policy. It claimed that women had to support each for the simple reason that men would not give up their "centuries of control of politics, government and all forms of public activity without considerable pressure."

The Women for Congress campaign of 1924 also drew criticism from some politicians who saw it as in essence a form of partisan politics. These criticisms were based on the fact that the five NWP candidates in Pennsylvania were all on the Progressive Party ticket and on the NWP's open campaign against one Congressman who was running for re-election against one of its candidates. The Party justified both of these instances as nonpartisan on the grounds that the determining factor in each case was support of the ERA, rather than any partisan considerations. The Party explained that of the five women candidates in question, only one was a member of the Progressive Party; the others had different party affiliations but were endorsed by the Progressives. All five, however, were NWP members, "good feminists" and supported the ERA.
The Party claimed that its opposition to the Congressman in question was not because he was running against a NWP candidate, but because he was hostile to the ERA.68

The truth of this last assertion is questionable. The Party's 1924 political activity was generally devoted to the support of its own candidates rather than opposition to the hundreds of men (and women) running for office who opposed the ERA. In fact, only the Farm-Labor Party, out of all the political parties (including the Progressive Party), endorsed the ERA in 1924.69 If the NWP had campaigned against all candidates who were hostile to the ERA therefore its task would have been herculean. This was not the Party's strategy in 1924, however, which makes the Pennsylvania incident appear less justifiable as a nonpartisan contest.

The NWP's political activity in 1928 revealed a shift in strategy which required further justifications of the Party's definition of "nonpartisan." The Women for Congress campaign had generated much enthusiasm within the Party ranks in 1924 and 1926, but it had not accomplished its primary objective of creating a women's bloc in Congress. Only a handful of the Party's candidates had been elected. In 1928 therefore the NWP intensified its efforts to win an endorsement for the ERA from one of the major political parties. It had decided to judge the parties and their candidates in the 1928 presidential election solely on their attitude toward the ERA, "the one plank in the . . . Party platform"70 Neither of
the parties nor the two presidential hopefuls—Herbert Hoover and Alfred Smith—endorsed the ERA, however.71

The NWP chose to endorse Hoover, the Republican candidate, largely because of his running-mate, Senator Charles Curtis. The Party maintained that women should support Curtis, who was the Senate sponsor of the ERA, "to redeem a small fraction of the obligation that they ought to feel."72 As for Hoover, the Party emphasized that he was opposed to labor legislation which restricted the opportunity of any person and had declared that he would support the ERA if he found that it removed such restrictions.73

The NWP might have supported Hoover even without Curtis, in view of its adamant opposition to Governor Smith of New York, the Democratic candidate. Smith opposed the ERA and supported protective legislation for women—which was anathema to the NWP. In fact, the Party considered Smith "the most formidable enemy of Equal Rights in public life today."74

The Party campaigned actively for the Hoover-Curtis ticket, choosing "pivotal states" in the East in which to campaign and urging the women in these target states to use "the political power we worked so hard to gain."75 The Party's participation in such a partisan contest evoked criticism from Smith supporters such as Eleanor Roosevelt and Frances Perkins and provoked an attack on a group of Party speakers in New York by an allegedly pro-Smith mob.76 The NWP steadfastly
maintained, however, that its support for the Hoover-Curtis ticket was nonpartisan and reflected only the ticket's equal rights position.77

When Hoover and Curtis were elected, the Party claimed that its participation had been a factor of "major importance" and confidently predicted that in the future, candidates would never "speak, or even think, slightingly of the Feminist voter."78 The NWP apparently overestimated its impact and influence in view of the subsequent inaction on the ERA under the Hoover administration.

The National Woman's Party's legislative and political activities in the 1920s derived directly from its feminist principles. A 1923 Equal Rights editorial characterized the Party's equal rights campaign as "the only purely feminist movement in the world." The editorial acknowledged that movements "of women" abounded, but maintained that the NWP's program was unique as a movement "of women, by women, for women." The Party stood alone, the editorial concluded, in its "singleness of purpose."79 This singleness of purpose—working solely for equal rights for women—was the essential difference between the NWP and other contemporary women's organizations. It was the nucleus of the Party's feminist orientation, and also its strength, according to Party loyalists.80

This adherence to the single objective of equality reflected the Party's concept of its mission. NWP leaders believed that their equal rights campaign continued the program
established by the pioneers of the women's movement. Alice Paul, the founder of the Party, explained in 1922 that the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 outlined substantially the object which we have just undertaken; and . . . these early workers and their followers through the generations have been steadfastly working to 'remove the remaining forms of the subjection of women.'

Elsie Hill, chairman of the Party's National Council from 1921 to 1925, also saw a direct link between the NWP's post-suffrage program and the aims of the suffrage movement. The Nineteenth Amendment, she wrote, "became the rallying point for women who were conscious of their class discriminations." The vote itself, she said, "was not thrilling or interesting" but it did mean an increase of power for women. Hill recognized, however, that neither the psychology nor laws of the old society had been changed by the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, so "the same group of women should be class-conscious enough to eliminate the remaining forms of discrimination as a preliminary to their movement forward in constructive ways." As Hill's statement indicates, the NWP contended that women actually constituted a separate social class in the United States. "Social classes depend in the final analysis upon opportunity," Equal Rights proclaimed, and "lack of opportunity is what sets women, and not men, apart as a social class." Women's lack of opportunity, the editorial charged, was due to marriage: "marriage as an end in itself and not as an incident to living." This same general theme was
expounded by Party member Edith Houghton Hooker who wrote that "in ages gone, motherhood has been the chain that has bound woman to her subordination."\(^8\)

The Party did not repudiate marriage or motherhood; indeed, it did, on occasion, cite these facets of women's lives as justification for the equal rights movement. An editorial in *Equal Rights*, for example, declared that "women naturally uphold marriage as an institution, women naturally wish to educate their children and to prevent their exploitation. . . . It is in the very nature of womanhood and motherhood. . . . Hence the Feminist movement."\(^8\) The Party simply objected to the unequal relationship between men and women within marriage. This, in turn, stemmed from the belief that economic independence was the key to women's emancipation and that marriage mitigated against the economic independence of wives.\(^8\) The NWP wanted women to be free to choose careers outside the home, unfettered by restrictions, or have their services within the home recognized as valuable contributions to the family and the national economy.\(^8\) The NWP's allegiance to the single goal of equality for women therefore was based on an analysis of the nature and source of women's disabilities in American society.

The Party's nature as an organization was conducive to its pursuit of this single objective. The NWP's character, established during the suffrage campaign, was that of a small cadre of dedicated workers who formed the vanguard of the
women's movement. The Party realized that it was a numerical minority among organized women. The total NWP membership at the end of 1924, for instance, was only 9,469, whereas the League of Women Voters had about 100,000 members at the end of the decade.\textsuperscript{88} The NWP maintained that it nonetheless represented women of all walks of life; that it was, in fact, an "all-woman movement."\textsuperscript{89} An Equal Rights editorial explained: "The strength of the National Woman's Party has always been in its concentration on a definite purpose on which women of all shades of political, religious and social opinion can agree."\textsuperscript{90}

The NWP's allegiance to its equal rights program to the exclusion of all other reforms and side issues drew criticism from within and outside the organization. Sue White, a prominent Party member, chastised what she called the "simon-pure feminists" who would only support the actions of women who believed as the purists did. White feared that the Party's narrow program alienated women whose accomplishments and goals, although not within the NWP's guidelines, were nonetheless laudable and valuable. "If we are to stand for women," she wrote, "are we not to stand for all women?"\textsuperscript{91}

The policy also evoked criticism from certain special interest groups who felt that their objectives were directed toward greater freedom for women and therefore deserved the NWP's endorsement and support. Birth control advocates, for instance, had attempted since 1921 to persuade the Party to
include agitation for birth control among its objectives. The Party refused to do so, not because it disagreed with the birth control cause, but because it believed that its support of equality in the marriage relation connoted women's rights to determine the number of children they bore. "We believe that women cannot exercise the right to limit their families if they choose," Equal Rights explained, "unless they have Equal Rights in all the relations of life." Again, and ever, the NWP emphasized its equal rights campaign as its greatest possible contribution to American women.

The National League of Women Voters had an enormous impact on organized women in the 1920s. It was an experiment; no national women's organization before 1919 encompassed a program like that adopted by the League. This reflects the changed circumstances which confronted American women after enfranchisement. The possibilities of power and influence for women had been greatly enhanced by the Nineteenth Amendment and the League, as a new organization, capitalized on this potential in the design of its program. If this program had been confined to civic and political education, it would still have represented something novel to the tradition of women's organizations in the United States. That the League chose, however, to combine the technical and practical aspects of the franchise—how to vote as well as for what to vote—in its program, made it a new model for women's organizations in the post-suffrage era.
The National Woman's Party also represented something new in women's organizations in the 1920s. Its feminist program, however, rather than providing a model for other organized women, was repudiated by almost every major national organization of women in the country. In spite of this, the NWP refused to compromise its feminist principles and continued to pursue its single objective of equality between men and women throughout the 1920s. An Equal Rights editorial claimed that this persistence in the face of such overwhelming opposition did not mean that the leaders of the Party were Utopians. "They may be idealists," the editorial explained, "but they have their feet solidly on the ground." The NWP believed that its program would eventually be adopted by the other women's organizations and that, in the meantime, the Party carried the torch of freedom for all women.

The programs, policies and ideologies of these two organizations represented alternative courses of development for the post-suffrage women's movement in the United States. The extent to which the humanitarian and the feminist options were mutually exclusive, the possibility of consensus on specific issues and the nature of the conflicts between humanitarians and feminists are the subject of the next chapter.
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CHAPTER IV. Humanitarians versus Feminists: Issues and Conflicts in the Post-Suffrage Era

In the early 1920s, the nature and scope of the new women's movement had not yet been defined. Enfranchisement provided organized women an unprecedented opportunity to exercise direct influence in shaping public policy. Humanitarians and feminists disagreed on how and for what purpose women should use this new power but both groups of women wanted to avoid outright factionalism. As veterans of the suffrage movement, these women realized the costly and detrimental effect of intra-movement warfare. Carrie Chapman Catt, honorary chairman of the National League of Women Voters, expressed this attitude in 1921 when she said that "the fewer disagreements between women which are advertised the better."¹

Some women, in fact, initially viewed the diversity represented by the humanitarian and feminist perspectives as a potential source of strength within the women's movement. Eleanor Brannan, who was a member of the National Woman's Party and the League of Women Voters, thought that the two organizations had complementary programs. She explained this belief in a letter to League officer Belle Sherwin in 1922: "I think the League is doing a splendid work in rousing the women to their responsibilities and power, just as I think the Woman's Party is needed to make women realize that their
emancipation is not yet complete.² Katherine Ludington, a Regional Director of the League, expressed a similar view in a confidential letter to NWP founder Alice Paul in 1920. She believed, she wrote, that there was "a field for two organizations such as the League of Women Voters and the Woman's Party." The League program, she said, was a "liberal one, but we cannot, in the nature of the case, do pioneer work." The need existed, she explained,

for another body of women more compact and homogeneous to deal with another group of questions which should appeal particularly to women's consciences and which are in their nature controversial enough to limit the number of adherants [sic].³

These examples of friendly overtures between the two organizations were exceptions, however. The private correspondence of League and Woman's Party members revealed an undercurrent of hostility and mistrust which mitigated against a cooperative relationship. These sentiments were not created by particular post-suffrage developments; they were a legacy of the suffrage movement. The antagonism which had existed between NAWSA and the Congressional Union during the suffrage movement had been bequeathed to their respective successors, the League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party.

NAWSA, for instance, refused to participate in a memorial to the suffrage pioneers in 1921 sponsored by the Woman's Party. NAWSA president Carrie Chapman Catt explained that the refusal stemmed from the fact that "at every step, [NAWSA] met misrepresentation and have abundant proof of much absolute
untruthfulness emanating from the [National Woman's Party].^ The remnants of suffrage rivalry were also apparent in Ida Husted Harper's reaction to Jailed for Freedom, an account of the suffrage movement written in 1920 by NWP member Doris Stevens. Harper, a NAWSA publicist, objected to Stevens' statement that it was Alice Paul's "brilliant and devoted leadership" as head of the Congressional Union which made the suffrage victory possible. "Could anything be more ridiculous?" she asked, adding: "It is such things as this that make me exceedingly tired when I contemplate the National Woman's Party."^ League member Mary McDowell reflected this attitude in 1921 when she recommended that the League should send a representative to the NWP's convention "to help them to go out of existence if possible."^ McDowell's suggestion had a more subtle counterpart in Carrie Chapman Catt's advice to League President Maud Wood Park: "I think you might very well invite the Woman's Party to disband and join with the League of Women Voters in carrying out [the League] program."^ Such sentiments were not confined to the League and NAWSA. Members of the National Woman's Party reciprocated the hostility and mistrust. Edith Houghton Hooker wrote in 1923 that the Congressional Union had been denounced by suffragists as well as anti-suffragists, and the same was true of the NWP in the post-suffrage period. The NWP, she claimed, was "attacked and vilified even by those who think they believe in the freedom of women."^ Another Party member wrote: "You and
I who have watched the career of the League of Women Voters know only too well how little we have to expect from their intelligence and their efforts."

This undercurrent of hostility surfaced in 1923 to form the basis of the relationship between humanitarians and feminists in the post-suffrage women's movement. The immediate impetus for the open conflict between the two orientations was the NWP's proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution, which the Party hoped would succeed the suffrage cause as a "rallying point" for organized women. Throughout 1921 and 1922, the leaders of the NWP conferred with leaders of various women's organizations on the wording and scope of the proposed amendment, submitting it to "as much friendly criticism as possible," according to Party Chairman Elsie Hill. These discussions did not initially indicate inflexible positions by either faction. Indeed, they appeared to be sincere negotiations based on the possibility of an eventual agreement.

This conciliatory posture was due to the focus of these discussions on the single issue of the impact of the ERA on protective legislation for working women. The organizations with whom the NWP most frequently conferred--the League of Women Voters, the National Consumers' League, the National Women's Trade Union League and the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor--cited their concern for protective legislation as the source of their reservations about the ERA. All of
these organizations had special commitments to laws which protected working women, such as the minimum wage, restrictions on the hours of labor, and prohibition of night work for women. The leaders of these organizations refused to endorse the ERA until they could be sure that it would not adversely affect this legislation.

This concern for special legislation by leading women's organizations presented a dilemma to the leaders of the NWP. The Party was dedicated to the principle of the equality of the sexes, but it wanted the support and cooperation of these organizations and leaders such as Florence Kelley, secretary of the National Consumers' League. Kelley had joined the NWP during the suffrage campaign and Party leaders were eager to retain her membership and support. Kelley's career as an industrial inspector, social worker and NCL officer, however, had been devoted to the improvement of working conditions for women in industry and she wanted assurances from the Party leadership that the proposed amendment would not destroy the protective legislation she had worked so hard to obtain.12

NWP leaders tried to assure Kelley and other humanitarians that the ERA would not undermine protective legislation. Elsie Hill informed Kelley in March 1921 that "without any question" the NWP's plan to remove women's legal disabilities "does not mean to touch at all the protective . . . legislation secured during recent years."13 Alice Paul asked a writer preparing an article about the Party for the Ladies
Home Journal in April 1921 to "state affirmatively that the new organization under the present leadership will not attack protective legislation for women." Anita Pollitzer, NWP secretary, claimed that the Party was not trying to remove the laws which protected working women because "while society is as it is at the present, we women need this protection." The Party's efforts in this regard were acknowledged by one League member who reported that during discussions about the proposed ERA, "the Woman's Party, of course, agreed to drop all pressure in relation to bills affecting women in industry."

Party leaders attempted to reconcile principles and expediency in 1921 by proposing a special exemption clause for protective legislation in its blanket equality bills, both state and federal. The Wisconsin Equal Rights Law of 1921, sponsored by the Wisconsin Branch of the NWP, was the model for this effort. The law contained a qualifying clause which stated that the construction of laws to include women would not "deny to females the specific protection and privilege they now enjoy for the general welfare."

These conciliatory efforts continued throughout 1921 but a meeting in December between three advocates of protective legislation (from the League of Women Voters, the National Consumers' League and the National Women's Trade Union League) and three representatives of the NWP ended in frustration since the participants were unable to agree on the wording of the proposed amendment. Mary Anderson, director
of the Women's Bureau, informed Alice Paul that the ERA could not be worded so as to safeguard labor legislation. Paul was reportedly so angry at this charge that she refused to speak to Anderson for a long time afterward.19

A 1922 study of the Wisconsin Equal Rights Law, sponsored by the Wisconsin Federation of Women's Clubs in cooperation with the Wisconsin branches of the American Association of University Women, the National Consumers' League, the League of Women Voters, the National Women's Trade Union League, the Women's Christian Temperance Union and the NWP, did not erase humanitarians' doubts about the possible impact of the ERA on protective legislation because it cautiously concluded that the law had not been in effect long enough for a final determination.20 A favorable article about the law in the Christian Science Monitor in 1922, which claimed that "there has been no intimation from any quarter that it has had the effect of nullifying any special legislation for women" still did not extinguish the doubts about the ERA.21

The concept of a special exemption clause in the amendment was not universally popular within the feminists' ranks. The most outspoken opponent of any compromise with protective legislation was Harriot Stanton Blatch, daughter of suffrage pioneer Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Blatch advised Elsie Hill in 1921 that "there is nothing more dangerous than blanket legislation with a clause thrown in excluding certain disabilities." She warned Hill that "there is an ever increasing body of
women who will not accept special sex legislation and . . . any organization will be opposed which by an implication supports such legislation." 22

The NWP finally abandoned the idea of a special exemption clause in the ERA. The "Declaration of Principles," issued in November 1922, insisted that men and women should be equal under the law and included a demand that "restrictions upon the hours, conditions and remuneration of labor shall apply alike to both sexes." 23 Emma Wold, the national legislative chairman in 1922, interpreted this to mean that the Party must change not only the laws which discriminated against women but also those which discriminated in their favor. 24 From this point onward, the NWP repudiated protective legislation which applied to women only.

For their part, the advocates of protective legislation adopted an uncompromising position against the ERA. The League of Women Voters submitted drafts of the amendment to a variety of legal experts who generally agreed that its effect on protective legislation was indeterminate, if not outright destructive. Several of these opinions were included in a pamphlet issued by a coalition of women's organizations explaining their opposition to the amendment. George Wharton Pepper, a United States Senator from Pennsylvania, characterized the ERA as "most hazardous" and explained that he believed that there were instances "in which it is economically and socially desirable that women should enjoy rights which
men do not share." Felix Frankfurter of the Harvard Law School also opposed the amendment on the grounds that only those who are ignorant of the nature of law . . . or indifferent to the exacting aspects of woman's life, can have the naivete, or the recklessness, to sum up woman's whole legal position in a meaningless and mischiefous phrase about 'equal rights.'

The League therefore discontinued its attempts to find common ground with the NWP. Katherine Edson, Executive Commissioner of the Industrial Welfare Commission of California, advised a League officer that it was "exceedingly necessary for the National League of Women Voters to start active publicity against the so-called equal rights amendment," and added, "this is the real fight at the present time." Another correspondent advised the League: "Since the National Woman's Party has seen fit to finally acknowledge the reason for its existence, I hope the League of Women Voters will spend some time in killing it off." Mary Anderson of the Women's Bureau summed up the extent of deterioration in the relationship between the NWP and the proponents of protective legislation when she said that by 1923, "the fat was really in the fire and the battle begun."

In the verbal "battle" over the ERA in the 1920s, the topic of protective legislation continued as a major point of contention between humanitarians and feminists. The concentration on this issue as the nexus of the controversy focused attention on certain differences between the humanitarian and feminist perspectives, but it obscured other, crucial, differences.
The arguments advanced about the relative merits of the ERA versus protective legislation revealed the disparate views of humanitarians and feminists on the basic nature of women. Humanitarians based their preference for protective legislation on the existence of immutable differences between men and women. Women were by nature, they insisted, the weaker sex and therefore possessed special handicaps not shared by men. This emphasis served as the basis of the so-called "Braudeis Brief," prepared by Louis Brandeis and Josephine Goldmark, which was used in several Supreme Court cases in the 1920s. This Brief, based on sociological and scientific evidence, interpreted protective legislation for women as justifiable on the grounds that it was a health measure--important to the well-being of the individual woman and of the community.29 One of the most important considerations in this regard was the reproductive role of women. Mary McDowell, Chairman of the League's Women in Industry Committee in 1921, based her committee's work on the premise that "the American standard of living demands a healthy, rested motherhood."30 Alice Henry, secretary of the NWTUL, favored protective legislation for all workers but believed that "the health and welfare of women as a class is of more importance to society than that of men inasmuch as the function of women as mothers ... is a more fundamental function than that of men as fathers."31

In contrast, the NWP believed "beyond any possibility of compromise that women are the equals of men" and repudiated
"both privileges and disabilities based on sex." The Party's fundamental principle, according to an editorial in *Equal Rights*, was that "the interests and welfare of men and women are identical, and that their rights and responsibilities should be equal." The NWP did not reject the concept of protective legislation; it merely insisted that such legislation should be equal for men and women. Preferential treatment for women was misguided, according to Harriot Stanton Blatch, because "an unhealthy process is unhealthy no matter who works at it and should be forbidden," and "a race is on a weak foundation that conserves health in one sex only."

Feminists considered arguments which emphasized women's weaker nature unconvincing, even insulting. Blatch, for example, found the "invalid theory" and the "prate about women's innate weakness" strange in view of the scrubbing, laundry and night nursing which women regularly performed in their homes. She also contended that women resented "the implications [in protective legislation] of linking adult women with the immature of the race in intelligence and working power." Party member Crystal Eastman echoed this belief when she wrote that the modern woman could have but one attitude to interference in her working life: "I am not a child. I will have none of your protection."

Another topic of disagreement between humanitarians and feminists in the ERA controversy was their assessment of the needs of working women. Humanitarians argued that women were
so severely handicapped as workers that they had to be protected by legislation or face the worst sort of exploitation in the labor force. The most common disabilities of women workers, according to this argument, were their greater youth and inexperience and the temporary nature of their employment because of marriage. These disabilities led to the over-representation of women in the low-wage, semi-skilled and unskilled jobs where few, if any, workers were organized into unions. The proponents of protective legislation considered this lack of unionization among women workers a key to their need for protection. Many women's organizations, including the League of Women Voters, advocated unionization as the ultimate goal for working women but, as Alice Henry of the NWTUL explained, "it would be inhuman to postpone the day of improvement until trade unionism among women becomes so general that they can act through the power of numbers."  

Humanitarians realized that men who worked in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs also were not unionized in the 1920s. That organized women did not campaign for protective legislation for all workers, regardless of sex, was due to the Supreme Court's tendency to regard laws which regulated the employment of men as a violation of the workers' "freedom of contract." Supporters of labor legislation for women therefore adopted the attitude that women workers should take whatever they could get. An editorial in the Ohio Council on Women in Industry Bulletin explained: "We cannot overcome
men's handicaps by taking away women's privileges."\(^{41}\)

Feminists offered a different interpretation of the needs of working women, emphasizing the competitive nature of the American labor market and the consequent need for equal opportunity for women within this market. Protective legislation, they argued, restricted the terms of women's employment and therefore limited their opportunities. Edith Houghton Hooker, an NWP officer, explained the discriminatory effects of protective legislation:

\[
\text{If a whole group is stigmatized by apparently needing special restrictive legislation, there must . . . be something the matter with that group to make such provisions necessary. . . . Under the present economic system, any individual or group of individuals in industry that has, or is alleged to have, anything the matter with it is worse treated, not better treated than those relatively normal.}^{42}\]

To single women out, according to the feminists, was to give a competitive edge to men. What the feminists wanted, according to Emily Newell Blair, was "a world in which men and women would work in competition with each other and the best individual win."\(^{43}\)

Feminists' arguments in favor of equal rights rather than protectionism stemmed from their belief in the primacy of economic rights. The NWP believed that women's earning power was "the very root of women's emancipation," and that industrial equality was the cornerstone of feminism.\(^{44}\) Elsie Hill expressed this conviction when she declared that "when we can get more done to improve the economic position of
women, women themselves will be more powerful to attack and finance the other changes that must come in our position."  

The NWP did not oppose legislation for the protection of children (such as mothers' pensions and the Sheppard-Towner Act) nor did it oppose improvements in the conditions under which American workers toiled. The problem with protective legislation for women only, according to Harriot Stanton Blatch, was that it "diverted public attention from the industrial needs of men," from abandoning unhealthy manufacturing processes . . . and [from] the prevention of child labor." The NWP argued, for instance, that if night work for women was undesirable because the streets were unsafe at night, then the solution was to make the streets safe instead of barring women from night occupations.

The gap between the humanitarian and feminist perspectives on the issue of protective legislation was substantial. In an attempt to explain the existence of such a gap, each faction questioned the other's motives, sensitivity and intelligence. Feminists contended that protective legislation for women was advocated by an alliance of "heartless clubwomen and interested (for themselves) labor men." They believed that women reformers who supported protective legislation were either misguided or ignorant. An Equal Rights editorial charged that "[l]eaders of the 'Reformer' type from outside the ranks of real working women . . . and women who do not believe in women, have virtually decided what women workers
want without consulting the women workers." Harriott Stanton Blatch claimed that women who supported protective legislation were "sadly lacking" in knowledge of economic law and "the real needs of women." Working women, she asserted, were ready for equality but the "welfare worker . . . was holding up to them the inferiority complex."51

Men supported protective legislation for women for more selfish reasons, according to the NWP. Edith Houghton Hooker claimed that labor men supported such legislation because "they are fully as sex arrogant as men in other circles and it is safe to say that a majority of them . . . believe that the sphere of women is in the home, if not the kitchen."52 The Women's Equality League of New York, an affiliate of the NWP, echoed this belief in its declaration that

the demand for labor legislation for women is founded on the theory that women's place is in the home. The custom that required that every woman be a home-keeper is a left-over from a past age. Today it is impossible for many women to have homes unless they themselves provide and maintain them.53

Feminists argued that this back-to-the home movement was based on certain economic developments in the 1920s. Burnita Shelton Matthews, a Womans Party lawyer, claimed that protective legislation for women was a response to the fact that women were seeking to enter new occupations in direct competition with men. Blatch saw it as a response to the post-World War I job situation. Men were eager, she said, "to see women go back into the home now that the war work was done!" Edith Houghton Hooker agreed. Citing the state of Ohio, where
twenty occupations were closed to women by law, she maintained that men naturally supported such legislation because "they wanted the jobs for themselves and it was an easy matter to reduce competition by statute."54

Humanitarians, in turn, claimed that the feminists, particularly those in the NWP, were either the dupes of employers or insensitive to the needs of women in industry. Mollie Carroll, chairman of the League's Women in Industry Committee, claimed that "the advocates of 'equal rights' come mainly from professional or business women's groups that have nothing personally to gain from protective legislation and nothing to lose, industrially, by the removal of such laws."55 Florence Kelley charged that the members of the NWP were "actually making common cause with, or allowing themselves to be used by, exploiting employers."56 Mary Anderson, a particular foe of the NWP, said that she was "convinced that in some cases the Woman's party [sic] was used as a front by the employers' associations that wanted to kill legislation for women."57

Both humanitarians and feminists believed that they represented the "true" interests of American working women and were therefore intolerant of opposing viewpoints. Their verbal assaults on each other, however, were based on insinuations and assumptions rather than absolute truths. Humanitarians, for instance, were neither "heartless" nor ignorant. They did not deliberately or maliciously neglect the needs of non-industrial women workers. They were aware that many
women in "white-collar" jobs opposed protective legislation.

In 1924, Katherine Edson of the California Welfare Commission advised League officer Edith Abbott that "[t]here are only certain types of women that we should try to protect and these are the women in occupations that attract the less efficient." Edson did not recommend, therefore, "whorescale" hours regulations because women in mercantile establishments, restaurants, etc., opposed it. "Business and professional women," she wrote, "resent any restriction of their right to work themselves to death if they so desire." A League member from Iowa reported in 1923 that the opposition of local business and professional women to an "hours bill" had caused the League to get "cold feet" and retreat from its support of the legislation. Humanitarians continued to support protective legislation, however, because of their sincere, long-standing commitment to the alleviation of the problems of women in industry. These problems were not imaginary; they were authentic, widely-recognized conditions. Humanitarians therefore believed that the needs of women industrial workers deserved priority over the needs of business and professional women.

Feminists, on the other hand, were not cruel and insensitive women. They were not the "dupes" or allies of employers seeking to exploit women industrial workers. A 1926 editorial in the National Association of Manufacturers' journal, the American Industries Pocket Bulletin, responded to a
charge that the NWP was an auxiliary of the Association with the quip: "This will no doubt be just as surprising to the ladies as it is to the members of the Association." In the same volume, an account of the Women's Bureau's Industrial Conference of 1926 substantiated this denial in its ridicule of the "Equal Righters" as well as the "welfare workers" and "clubwomen" in attendance. Alice Lee, the author of the article, reported that "[c]omedy features were provided by the Woman's Party, because they are so deadly serious."60 Feminists' opposition to protective legislation did favor the needs of business and professional women, but this was not its purpose. Feminists sincerely believed that equality of treatment would eventually benefit all women workers and was therefore preferable to protective legislation's short-term gains for some women workers.

The issue of protective legislation monopolized the debates about the merits of the ERA. The opponents of the amendment were responsible for this emphasis. In this regard, they seized the initiative from the NWP, forcing it to address peripheral aspects of the ERA instead of the general principles embodied in the amendment. Humanitarians' insistence on the centrality of the issue of protective legislation was not a deliberate attempt to avoid other issues, but it obscured some of the more fundamental differences between humanitarians and feminists which accounted for the persistent opposition throughout the 1920s to the ERA and the Woman's Party.
One such difference was the definition of "equality." Humanitarians did not believe that absolute equality between men and women was possible. Florence Kelley, for example, believed that women could not achieve "true equality" with men by securing identity of treatment under the law because women were different—they had different problems which required different legal remedies. Kelley was in favor of changes which would grant women access to jury duty, equal guardianship of children, divorce on equal terms and a fair share in family property but, she said, "to say Equality, Equality where there is no Equality, where Nature herself has decreed permanent physical inequality, can . . . be as stupid . . . as to cry Peace, Peace when there is no Peace."  

The position of the National League of Women Voters was similar to that expressed by Kelley. The League's Committee on the Legal Status of Women stated that it believed "in 'equal rights' so far as it is possible to define them." Katherine Ludington, treasurer of the League, testified against the ERA at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings in 1925 but explained that the League's opposition to the ERA did not mean that it opposed "removing legal disabilities and injustices, under the law, of our women." Speaking before the same committee in 1931, Mrs. William J. Carson, chairman of the Philadelphia League's Committee on the Legal Status of Women, gave a succinct statement of the humanitarian position. "[T]he end we are seeking," she said, "is not equality in the
sense of identity but justice and human happiness and opportunities for the most useful development of citizens of this country regardless of sex—an end to which equality is only a means."65

The feminists' position, incorporated in the ERA, was that women should have full equality with men in every respect. They objected to any proposal which sought to qualify or limit rights for women. An editorial in Equal Rights in 1925 criticized the women who had spoken against the amendment at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings. "The so-called opponents of Equal Rights—one by one—added their voices to the pleas for Equal Rights for men and women," the editorial claimed, "but specified that each group desired Equal Rights for some class or group of women—only not for all women."66

Another difference between humanitarians and feminists concerned the method by which the remaining disabilities of women should be removed. This issue recalled the historical roots of the two sides in the ERA controversy. Humanitarians were veterans of the NAWSA wing of the suffrage movement which had encouraged state and local campaigns for enfranchisement. In 1923, representatives of seven humanitarian women's organizations (including the League of Women Voters) sent a joint letter in opposition to the ERA to all members of Congress. The amendment, it charged, "because it is vague and general, will tend to defeat the purpose of real equality, and may inflict great hardships and inequality instead."67 These
organizations preferred state legislation, based on a policy of "specific bills to correct specific ills."

The League of Women Voters' Committee on the Legal Status of Women reflected this preference in its declaration that "'equal rights' can safely be sought only when the term is applied to some definite and specific inequality, with a definitely established standard." The Committee justified its position on the grounds that
to give all of these matters into the charge of the federal government would entail a centralization which even the staunchest Republican would hardly support.
... Especially is this true in view of the fact that the states have it within their power to pass legislation which will establish an actual equality with a minimum of interference with present laws and conditions.

Carrie Chapman Catt, who feared that "some of the Leagues in the states had been taken in by the Woman's Party appeal," recommended to League President Maud Wood Park that "the women in the states ought to hasten in their measures for the removal of discriminations against women." She suggested that the League even consider introducing a state blanket bill which would cover several disabilities. In the final analysis, however, she considered the ERA unnecessary because it required state ratification and "the women could get the same thing through in their respective states by state legislation if they go at it in the right way."

Humanitarians also objected to a federal amendment because it would have to be interpreted by the Supreme Court. Florence Kelley, for example, who believed that "every
amendment to the Constitution is a pig in a poke," maintained that "blanket measures in the hands of the courts are as dangerous as anything can possibly be." In addition to a reluctance to grant any more power to the Supreme Court, humanitarians also argued that the ERA would prompt an interminable series of court cases, thus clogging the judicial process. Florence Kelley concluded therefore that women as voters could "change statutes, both state and federal and state constitutions also, more quickly and far more safely than [the ERA] can be passed, ratified and judicially interpreted." The feminists of the National Woman's Party represented the Congressional Union faction of the suffrage movement which had steadfastly pursued enfranchisement by federal amendment. The NWP launched its campaign for equal rights in the state legislatures but it considered this state-by-state method wasteful and unnecessary. Emma Wold, the Party's legislative chairman, noted that the state method was "like a woman's work—it is never done." Alice Paul reflected this belief in her analysis of the Party's legislative record from 1921 to 1923. Some progress had been made, she said, but the complete achievement of equal rights is still to be won and the experience of the past two years with the state legislatures seems to have convinced the workers for equal rights of the wisdom of turning to Congress, just as they finally turned to Congress in the suffrage struggle.

The situation in the states had not improved by 1929. An editorial in Equal Rights in that year charged that the state legislatures had done "nothing of any consequence" for equal
rights which showed the failure of the "specific bills to correct specific ills" method. The NWP therefore insisted that an amendment to the Constitution was necessary because in no respect should the rights of women be left to the whims of individuals, legislatures or organizations, but, just as men are citizens of this land, knowing that all their rights, privileges and duties are guaranteed them by law, so we feel they should be established for women.

Party members believed that the ERA was neither vague nor harmful. The intent of the amendment, according to Equal Rights, was simply that in the wording of the Constitution, "generic terms such as 'person,' 'citizen,' and 'people' shall no longer signify exclusively men." Burnita Shelton Matthews explained that the amendment was not too vague since the Constitution "is supposed to establish principles." "It is not," she said, "supposed to go into great detail and into specifications." Party member Elinor Byrns summarized this perspective in her declaration that "what is right in principle must prove to be expedient in practice."

Finally, on the question of the long legal battles which might be initiated as a result of passage of the ERA, M. Carey Thomas, president of Bryn Mawr College, asserted that "the question of equality for women must be settled and got out of the way before women can begin to do their best work. To settle it is surely worth a little or a great deal of litigation."

The controversy over the ERA was one element in the general struggle between humanitarians and feminists concerning
leadership of the post-suffrage women's movement. The NWP and the League of Women Voters were the principle adversaries in this conflict. In the 1920s, both sought the support of other women's organizations and of the general public for their respective claims to speak for American women. The League had a distinct advantage in this respect because of its formal alliance with other women's organizations in the Women's Joint Congressional Committee and its informal ties, through overlapping memberships, with the National Consumers' League, the National Women's Trade Union League and the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The NWP had no such ties with any of the major women's organizations, but it claimed that its minority position was not really a handicap because its feminist program would ultimately prevail. A Party representative asserted that the NWP was "undaunted by mere numbers" because it was "in the vanguard of a world-wide movement for the complete emancipation of women." Another member depicted the opposition to the organization's program as a positive sign, in that "you can judge of the magnitude of a cause by the number of its enemies." Equal Rights applied this same judgment to the ERA, contending that lack of support for the measure was not a valid argument against it because lack of support had traditionally characterized the demands of the woman movement. The Party optimistically predicted in 1924 that "in a few years" the NWP would "belong with the commonplace majority" in
support of equal rights.\textsuperscript{84}

In spite of such pronouncements, NWP leaders were pragmatists. They realized that the Party's feminist platform, especially the ERA, needed the support of other organized women to bolster its chances of success in the state and national legislatures. The NWP therefore waged a concerted effort among women's organizations to win converts to the feminist cause. NWP President Alva Belmont declared this effort a success in an address to the national convention in 1926. She asserted that after the introduction of the ERA in 1923, "individual women promptly joined the Party in large numbers." She also claimed that "the opposition of organizations is being gradually withdrawn through the insistence of their own members."\textsuperscript{85}

Belmont's analysis was overly-optimistic; the record of the Party's success in winning converts was less than dramatic. In 1924, for example, the ERA was endorsed by the Farmers' Union of Iowa, the Railroad Brotherhoods of Minnesota and the Farmer-Labor Party.\textsuperscript{86} One women's organization, the American Association of University Women (AAUW); withdrew its formal opposition to the amendment that year and voted to study the subject for one year, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom decided to work for equal rights as one of its objectives but refused to endorse the ERA.\textsuperscript{87} In the same year, \textit{Equal Rights} pessimistically reported that "practically every organization of women in the country is
opposed to us," and singled out the League, the Consumers' League, the Women's Trade Union League and the Federation of Women's Clubs.®®

The NWP claimed that this opposition was not consistent. An article in Equal Rights in 1925 described a meeting of the New York City Women's Press Club at which members of the League and the NWP spoke. The League speakers stressed the removal of all discriminations and urged women to support the endeavors of other women in all fields. From this, the article concluded that whereas the NWP once "stood alone in their demand for equal rights for women," now the League was making the same demand.®® The Party saw a possible wedge in such developments, and in 1925 decided that an educational campaign was necessary to explain its program. The Party leadership instructed the Extension Committee to communicate with the AAUW, the League and the Council of Jewish Women "in an effort to have members of these organizations appointed to the regional councils" of the Party.®®

The NWP considered the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs (BPW) one of the more promising candidates among the women's organizations to endorse its program. Here again, however, the Party's efforts were unsuccessful in the 1920s. In 1926, Equal Rights criticized the BPW for failing to endorse the ERA, implying that these successful women had not attempted to help other women remove the obstacles which all had to overcome.®® In spite of this
criticism, the BPW convention in 1926 refused to endorse the amendment and opted instead to study the question of equal rights for another year. The Party was disappointed therefore when the 1927 convention decided to leave the question of endorsement up to the state federations. Another possible "convert," the AAUW, again refused to endorse the ERA in 1927 and decided to continue to study the question.

The League of Women Voters did not ignore the NWP's campaign. Ethel Smith of the National Women's Trade Union League warned League officer Minnie Fisher Cunningham in 1924 that women had to take an "emphatic stand" against the ERA so Congress would understand that the majority of American women did not support the amendment. The League's position was indeed emphatic; it played an active role in countering the Party's efforts to win support from among organized women. It intervened in numerous instances to ward off endorsement of the ERA.

The NWP's success in getting the AAUW to withdraw its formal opposition to the ERA in 1924 alarmed the League and its allies. Fearing that a similar effort by the Woman's Party might succeed at the 1924 General Federation of Women's Clubs convention, national League officers appealed to state members for help in influencing GFWC delegates. When the GFWC convention refused to endorse the ERA, a League officer attributed the action to the help of "many of our state chairmen who were also closely allied with the Federation."
League undertook a similar campaign in 1927 with the BPW. Belle Sherwin, League president, urged the BPW convention in 1927 not to endorse the ERA, charging that it would eliminate protective legislation. Sherwin argued that it was "imperative that the Federation extend understanding that the case of business and professional women is different from that of women in industry for whom the field of work is not fair without special legislation."96

When the NWP's feminist program was so persistently opposed by the majority of organized women in the United States, Party leaders turned their attention increasingly to the international women's movement. President Alva Belmont resided most of the time in France during the 1920s and was on intimate terms with the developments in European feminism.97 Belmont favored a strong international perspective for the NWP and was responsible for the formation of the Party's International Council which by 1927 included representatives from twenty-two countries.98 As part of this international program, the Party made a formal request for membership in the International Woman Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) in 1925.

Once again, the League openly campaigned against the NWP's efforts. IWSA President Margery Corbett Ashby informed Alice Paul of the NWP that the Board of Directors had "reluctantly decided" not to recommend the NWP for membership. This action was taken, she explained, because the League had made a "formal objection" to the Party's admission and the IWSA's
policy was that a second society from any country had to be approved by the existing member society from that country. The League, she said, "being a direct outcome of the former National American Woman Suffrage Association, has a history of long association with the Alliance [and] is the society of our beloved founder and honorable president, Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt." Ashby informed Paul that the Party could "of course" bring its petition before the Alliance Congress but added that she hoped the NWP would "prefer to withdraw in these circumstances."99 Paul's response to Ashby indicated that the NWP would not have applied for membership "if we had understood that our entrance ... depended upon the approval of the League of Women Voters, as their hostility to the Woman's Party's campaign for equality between men and women is well known."100 She informed Ashby that the NWP would take the matter to the Alliance Congress so that all the members could vote on the decision.

After the NWP announced its intentions, the League, at Catt's request, prepared a portfolio on the NWP describing the Party's "objectionable" behavior. The League hoped that this information would convince the other member societies of the IWSA of the undesirability of the NWP's application. The portfolio consisted of excerpts of letters from members of the state Leagues which recounted numerous instances of the Party's alleged interference with the League's work.
The letters from the state Leagues revealed a great deal about the relationship between the League and the Woman's Party, but they did not support one member's contention that the NWP "always did make a lot of trouble." Letters from California, New York, and Massachusetts, for instance, indicated the existence of cooperation, mutual goals, and the absence of rivalry between the two organizations. The correspondence from Iowa, Illinois, New Jersey, and Maryland indicated a less harmonious relationship, referring to instances wherein the League "routed" or "outwitted" the NWP, but only the Maryland League reported specific details of actual clashes between the two organizations. The excerpted material in the portfolio stressed the different methods of the League and the Woman's Party instead of their ideological differences. The League emphasized its "specific bills for specific ills," state-by-state method of eliminating discriminations against women, comparing this with the NWP's ruthless pursuit of the ERA.

The League's efforts were successful. The IWSA Congress, by a vote of 48-123, sustained the Board of Directors' decision to reject the NWP's application for membership. NWP leaders, however, asserted that they were undaunted by the IWSA's rejection. Mabel Vernon, for instance, told the Alliance Congress that "regardless of your action here today, we of the National Woman's Party are in the International Woman's Movement."
The NWP scored one victory in the international movement: it was instrumental in the creation of an International Commission of Women by the Pan-American Conference in 1928. Doris Stevens, a vice-chairman of the Party, was appointed chairman of the Commission, whose purpose was to study the question of the legal status of women in the Western Hemisphere.

The IWSA incident, however, was a turning point for the NWP. From 1926 until the end of the decade, the Party reverted to its earlier claims that its minority position was a strength, not a weakness, and emphasized its role as the vanguard of the women's movement. After the IWSA decision, Equal Rights maintained that the "sharp differences" between the NWP and other women's organizations were due to the Party's "attitude toward women and toward the work for their emancipation that has no counterpart among the other organizations." Sophie G. Meredith, chairman of the Virginia Branch of the Party, wrote in 1927: "We all know that it is not easy to be pioneers, and the Feminist movement is entirely different from the Reformers' movement. The latter works for reforms in many ways, the Feminist movement works for one principle, the emancipation of woman."

The League acknowledged its opposition to the NWP but denied that it was based on deep ideological differences. Belle Sherwin, for example, told the IWSA Congress in 1926 that the League would not oppose the admission of another
society "if we did not think it necessary." "It is not so much a question of principle between us, nor of legislative differences," she said. "It is because we are convinced of the impracticability of a working alliance between the National Woman's Party and this body." Reiterating the theme of the portfolio, the League maintained that a working alliance with the NWP was impossible because of the methods of the Woman's Party. The League's influence can be detected in one of the IWSA's formal reasons for the rejection of the NWP's application. The IWSA charged that the Woman's Party's press campaign during the convention had been "conducted on lines dictated solely by the interests of their own group and to the detriment of the interests of the Alliance."

The National Woman's Party was aware that its deliberate attraction of publicity—a tradition since the suffrage campaign—irritated the League. At a luncheon in Paris following the IWSA decision, British feminist Lady Rhondda told the assembled Party members that their chief sin was a good press. The real reason for the Party's rejection by the IWSA, according to Lady Rhondda, was that the NWP members were feminists, whereas the majority of women in the women's movement were reformers "who are not in the least Feminists."

NWP leaders agreed with this analysis, arguing that the League of Women Voters was typical of the "Reformer" type of organization whose program was sharply different from that of the Party. Jane Norman Smith, chairman of the New York
Branch of the Party, compared the different purposes of the two organizations in an article in *Equal Rights* in 1927. She contrasted the NWP's "one object of securing Equal Rights for men and women before the law and in every pursuit of life," with the NLWV's "diverse legislative interests" which grouped the legal status of women with such subjects as education, public welfare, living costs and international peace.112

The issues and conflicts which divided humanitarians and feminists in the 1920s were unresolved by the end of the decade. The NWP remained committed to passage of the ERA and the League continued to endorse social welfare measures, including protective legislation for women. The League's program placed it within the mainstream of the humanitarian current of organized women, whereas the NWP's program had widened the gulf between itself and the majority of organized women. This was confirmed at the Senate Judiciary Committee hearings on the ERA in 1929 at which Maud Wood Park of the League coordinated an opposition including representatives from the NCL, GFWC, NWTL, YWCA, National Council of Jewish Women, National Council of Catholic Women, American Home Economics Association, American Federation of Teachers and the Women's Bureau.113

The National Woman's Party and the League of Women Voters were national organizations and their leaders were concerned with problems and programs which were national, even international, in scope. Both, however, had state affiliates
whose role was to adapt the national policy to the needs and interests of local women. These state branches of the League and the Woman's Party were immersed therefore in a different milieu in which priorities, goals, ideologies and relationships were subject to different influences from those of the national organizations. The extent to which the situation at the state level in the post-suffrage era differed from that on the national is the subject of the next chapter which focuses on the experiences of the League and the Woman's Party in the state of Ohio.
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CHAPTER V. The Women's Movement After Suffrage: An Ohio Perspective

Delle Sherwin, a prominent Ohio suffragist, reflected the general sentiment of suffragists in 1920 when she described the suffrage victory as "women's commencement day." Sherwin, like many other Ohio women, had gained more than the right to vote as a result of the suffrage movement. She had also acquired organizational skills, political experience and a commitment to activity in the public sphere. The manner in which these acquisitions would be utilized—and to what end—was an immediate concern of many Ohio women in the post-suffrage era. New priorities and new goals had to be established, a task which was particularly urgent for members of the two organizations which had been committed to woman suffrage as their primary or sole objective: the Ohio Woman Suffrage Association and the Ohio Branch of the National Woman's Party.

The Ohio Woman Suffrage Association, like other affiliates of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, re-organized in 1920 as the Ohio League of Women Voters, with the same civic/humanitarian program adopted by the National League of Women Voters in 1919. The Ohio League, following the example of its national counterpart, gave first priority in the early 1920s to the education of the new women voters because,
as one member declared, "the right to vote did not innoculate women with the knowledge of how to vote intelligently [nor] how to become independent thinkers." At the suggestion of the National League, the state and local Leagues in Ohio sponsored citizenship schools for League members and other interested women. Maud Wood Park, president of the National League, conducted the first such school at the state convention in 1920. Within a few months the Franklin County (Columbus) League, with the financial support of the local Chamber of Commerce, operated the first of the local schools.

Other educational activities sponsored by Ohio Leagues included the operation of model voting booths for women (an original idea of the Cleveland League which was adopted by other Leagues), house-to-house voter registration drives, "Get Out the Vote" campaigns, and forums in which candidates for public office discussed their platforms or debated their opponents.

Ohio League leaders realized, however, that the role of voter was only one aspect of women's citizenship responsibilities. Women would also, according to Cleveland League President Belle Sherwin, have to "get into politics." Many Ohio women responded promptly and enthusiastically to the call but many others were more reluctant due to their timidity and lack of experience and the bad reputation of politics. This situation led a National League officer to urge a group of Cleveland women to "hold your noses if necessary, but get into politics!"
This advice was complicated, however, by the fact that the League, as an organization, was officially nonpartisan; it neither supported nor opposed particular candidates for public office. A 1926 article in the Ohio Woman Voter, the League's official publication, explained that the League's work was "absolutely nonpolitical in the sense that measures and not men were our issue." As a result of this policy, the state and local Leagues in Ohio encouraged women to stand for elective office and lobbied for the appointment of women to government positions on the basis of the principle instead of the person. Violations of this standard did sometimes occur, however, as when the Columbus League "pushed" the campaign of fellow member Dora Sandoe Bachman in her unsuccessful bid for the office of Judge of the Court of Common Pleas in 1920. A similar situation occurred in Cleveland in the same year when the local League endorsed the candidacy of member Florence Allen for Judge of the Court of Common Pleas on the grounds that it was a nonpartisan office. Belle Sherwin, president of the Cleveland League, had been absent when the decision was made and was furious when she learned of it. In the future, she insisted, the League would give no such endorsements and League officers who ran for public office had to take a leave of absence.

Even the principle of women's participation in politics was sometimes a source of confusion and debate. League members disagreed on which women should hold public office and
why. The debate centered on the question of women's qualifications for office as women opposed to their qualifications as citizens. A symposium in the Ohio Woman Voter in 1924, entitled "Are Women Fitted for Public Office," contained the opinions of a variety of Ohio women office holders. Most of the participants emphasized certain special qualities unique to women: Ohio Supreme Court Justice Florence Allen stated that women brought a "high degree of conscientiousness" to their work; Justice of the Peace Della Hilbert claimed that women were "more inclined to look after the small details that a man often overlooks;" State Senator Maude Waitt believed that men viewed legislation in terms of its effect on business whereas women thought first of the effects on home and community; and Sheriff Frankie Freese declared that women "can raise the moral tone of public affairs and their presence has an elevating influence upon the men." Others stressed the qualities which men and women shared as a justification for women's a participation in public office: Municipal Court Judge Mary Grossman, who viewed "common sense, social vision and a working knowledge of the particular office" as the principle requirements for public office, stated that these were not exclusively masculine virtues; and Probate and Juvenile Court Judge Addie Nye Norton declared that even though women "are liable to the same faults and failures as men, under similar conditions, they are also liable to have at least equal ability and dependability."
In the same vein, an editorial in the *Cleveland Voter* on the subject of women who ran for office to represent the "woman's point of view" asked:

"What is this woman's point of view? Did you ever know two women who thought alike? . . . Women are individuals . . . and they think individually, not collectively . . . . An appeal to this woman's point of view is a direct appeal to sex antagonism."12

The confusion persisted, however, and an article in the *Ohio Woman Voter* in 1927 hailed Senator Maude Waitt's bill requiring equal representation of men and women on state political party committees as important because "woman's point of view will play an important part in the direction of the presidential and state campaigns of 1928."13

Regardless of the justification, Ohio women did "get into politics." By late 1923, 348 women held elective offices in the state.14 Ruth Fuller Stevens, a prominent Ohio League member, said of this number: "We are surprised not that there are so few but that there are so many!"15 Stevens' remarks were made in response to an article in *Century Magazine* which claimed that the small number of women in public office was one proof that woman suffrage was a failure. In defense of women voters, Stevens asserted that the concentration on women in public office was not a fair test for suffrage because "unless a woman is outstandingly able to do a job better than any available man, it has been tacitly agreed that she should not do it." The League, in particular took this position, she claimed, because the public subjected
women office holders to tougher scrutiny than men just because they were women.16

The state League's legislative goals in the 1920s were as important as these civic/political education responsibilities. The National League recommended several major legislative issues each year for state and local consideration but local leaders were free to develop other legislative goals which reflected the interests and problems of local women.17 The degree of freedom exercised by state and local Leagues was limited, however, by certain restrictions imposed by the National League. State League President Sybil Burton reminded the state convention in 1928 that "we are bound not to include in state or local programs measures in opposition to any portion of the program adopted by vote of the National Convention."18 The local Leagues were further restricted, in the late twenties, by the guidelines of the state League's Legislative Conference. An editorial in the Ohio Woman Voter in 1926 cautioned:

Local Leagues as Leagues are not expected to work for any legislation which has not been approved by the Conference. Individual members may work for other legislation in other organizations or as individuals but not as members of the League.19

These guidelines were prompted, in part, by a situation which developed in Cleveland in the early 1920s. The National League had included a plea for world peace in its program since 1920. This plea had special appeal to a group of Cleveland women led by Judge Florence Allen who had proposed
a plan to outlaw war-- the "Cleveland Peace Plan." The Cleveland and Ohio Leagues endorsed this plan but it failed to win the endorsement of the National League conventions in 1922 and 1923. The National League's action was a great disappointment to Cleveland League members such as Allen, but Belle Sherwin, president of the Cleveland League and vice-president of the National, approved the National's decision. Sherwin believed that the League could not afford to become too closely identified with any special interest group. As an alternative, Cleveland League members who were committed to the peace movement joined with representatives of other local women's organizations to form an independent council in which to pursue their goal of world peace. This alternative won the hearty approval and endorsement of the National League which recommended this course to other special interest groups within the organization.20

In most of its legislative proposals, the Ohio League followed the National League's commitment to humanitarian measures such as child welfare, education and protective labor legislation as they related to particular needs and conditions in Ohio. At the 1922 state convention, for instance, legislative topics which the League endorsed included the Bing Law (an Ohio law regulating child labor and school attendance); state appropriations for the enforcement of the federal Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act; protection and support for illegitimate children; equal guardianship
rights for the parents of minor children; improvement of the conditions of state schools; and the proposed minimum wage for women.21

Many of these humanitarian measures became special Ohio League commitments in the 1920s and League members often led state efforts in their behalf. The Bing Law, which Grace Abbott of the Children's Bureau considered "the most progressive child labor and school attendance law in the country,"22 was the special project of the state League's Child Welfare Committee which protected the measure against repeated repeal efforts in the 1920s. Year after year, the Ohio League lobbied in the state legislature for adequate appropriations for the enforcement of the Sheppard-Towner Act. The League had a special interest in this measure because its first president, Amy Maher, had assisted National League President Maud Wood Park in the Congressional lobbying for the bill. The proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution was the Ohio League's first priority in 1924 and 1925. Juliette Sessions, the state League's president at the time, was also chairman of the Ohio Joint Council for Ratification of the Child Labor Amendment, which was composed of representatives of several social welfare organizations. The ratification effort failed in Ohio in 1925 but the Ohio League continued its campaign until the state ratified in 1933.23
The protection of working women was another humanitarian measure which consumed much of the Ohio League's time and effort in the 1920s. One reason for this interest can be found in the League's response to a study of women in Ohio industries by the Women's Bureau of the U. S. Department of Labor. According to this study, Ohio had 409,970 wage-earning women in 1920—fifth in rank among all states in the number of women employed—and 50 percent of these women were over the age of twenty-five. In response to these statistics, one League member said: "The question of the possible voting force of these women in a matter of vital interest." To arouse interest in the issues concerning working women among League members, the Ohio Woman Voter in 1923 and 1924 published a series of articles, contributed by the Ohio Council on Women and Children in Industry, on the subject, "Why Labor Legislation."

The labor legislation of the most interest to the state and local Leagues in Ohio in the 1920s was the proposed minimum wage for women workers. The state League convention in 1922 voted to work for minimum wage legislation and submitted planks to the two political party platform committees. In 1923, the League endorsed the proposed Burke Minimum Wage Bill and supported the work of the Consumers' League and the Ohio Council on Women in Industry (which had dropped the word "Children" from its title) for the establishment of a minimum wage commission. This effort was strengthened by a
1923 Women's Bureau survey of women's earnings in Ohio, requested by the Ohio Department of Industrial Relations, which reported that the median wage of women industrial workers, who were representative of the entire group of gainfully employed women in the state, was $13.80 per week. This statistic was of particular significance in view of the report's conclusion that "80% of women in gainful occupations work not for 'pin money' but to support themselves and others."26

The U. S. Supreme Court decision in 1923 (Adkins v. Children's Hospital) that the minimum wage law in Washington, D. C. was unconstitutional mitigated against Ohio's minimum wage proposal, as did the strong local opposition from employers' associations. When the Burke Minimum Wage Bill was defeated, the Ohio Woman Voter published, under the heading, "we print--the reader may interpret," a copy of a form letter received by a member of the Retail Merchants Association in which the names of state senators who voted against the Burke Bill were to be publicized in recognition of their loyalty to business "in the face of strong opposition and the many requests from women [sic] organizations."27

In the legislative program for 1925, the state League endorsed the principle of a minimum wage and encouraged local Leagues to study women's wages and the cost of living in Ohio but it introduced no bill. This was, in part, a reflection of the National League's new policy of "study before action,"
introduced by the new president, Belle Sherwin, but it was also an indication of the declining faith in labor legislation on the national and state levels after a series of reverses at the hands of the courts. In response to a questionnaire from the National League's Committee on Women in Industry, the Ohio committee reported that it had not been an active one during the year, although it claimed that this was due to lack of time, not lack of interest. By 1927, the president of the Columbus League reported that the National League had decided not to have a committee on women in industry that year and she reassigned the local committee chairman to other duties.

The National League, with its headquarters in Washington, D.C., was too far removed from the lives of women in Cleveland, Columbus, Toledo or Dayton to address their special interests and problems. National leaders tended to think in terms of national or international issues, whereas the "average woman's concerns," according to one League theorist, were "more heterogeneous, closer to the commonplace things in life." For this reason, the National League considered the state and local Leagues to be the "crux" of the organization. The Ohio Leagues, through their involvement in activities such as citizenship schools, school bond drives, and campaigns for juvenile court and school attendance laws, followed the principles and practices established by the National League but did so in the context of particular
Ohio women's concerns. In this respect, the Ohio Leagues were model Leagues.

The Ohio Branch of the National Woman's Party reorganized after the suffrage victory with the new objective agreed upon at the Party's national convention in 1921: the removal of the remaining forms of the subjection of women. The Party's Declaration of Principles (1922) asserted the essential equality of men and women and pledged the organization's resources to the realization of that equality in American society. In Ohio, the Party viewed this feminist program as a continuation of the equal rights movement inaugurated at the Salem Woman's Rights Convention of 1850, which had called on the women of Ohio to assert their rights as independent human beings. 32

The activities of the Ohio Party in the first decade after suffrage were greatly influenced by the National Party's principles and by the particular nature of the organization. The National Woman's Party (NWP) was not like other contemporary women's organizations. The NWP did not aspire to great numbers, keeping its membership count low by design. The state and local branches of the Party did not recruit new members just for the sake of numerical strength. They sought women with a "natural bent" for the Party's feminist program or those who emerged as leaders of groups in which the Party was interested. This policy was illustrated in an
account by a former Ohio member of her attempt to recruit 1200 teachers for the Party during a sex discrimination controversy, only to have the offer rejected by the national officers.33

This selectivity was sometimes at variance with the Party's need for funds. The NWP had relied on individual contributions during the suffrage campaign, but when it switched to a dues-paying basis in 1921, a certain level of membership was vital. When the membership in Ohio dropped from 477 in November 1920 to 52 in March 1922, the state chairman, Dr. Gillette Hayden, wrote to a national officer: "We have such a paltry handful of members that it is imperative that we have some organizing work done in the state."34 This organizing work was undertaken by state and national Party members and combined a number of strategies. One Cincinnati organizer, for instance, suggested to Dr. Hayden in 1923: "If we could just make the present program of the National Woman's Party the fashion here we could get the women without any difficulty."35 Another Cincinnati member suggested that the Party make a special appeal to the working women because "if only one million gave one dollar each year it would help pay expenses."36 Martha Souder, the National's secretary, recommended that the Ohio Branch form branches at all the state colleges as a good source of new members. College students, she said, would be valuable Party additions because they could look into discriminations against women in
the field of education. Of more immediate aid, the National office sent organizers to assist in the state work. One such organizer, who reported that Ohio had "wonderful possibilities," gained new members and new chapters of the Party throughout the state in 1924 and 1925. This organizational drive in the early twenties pushed the membership to 250 by April 1923 and up to 408 by November 1924.

The NWP also differed from many other women's organizations, particularly the League of Women Voters, in that it was relatively uninterested in women's citizenship roles, civic responsibilities, voting behavior or political affiliation. This attitude angered some former suffragists. An editorial in the Ohio Woman Voter in 1927 quoted Alva Belmont, president of the NWP, as saying: "I have never voted ... nor will I cast a ballot until the Woman's Party can place in the field a candidate for president." This confession, according to the editorial, was based "either on the idea of getting publicity or on narrow-minded, prejudiced views." The Party, however, was interested in equal opportunity for women within the political parties and in the greater representation of women in public office and government positions. In contrast to the League, however, the Party believed that women should support the election or appointment of women to office because of their sex—a direct appeal to sex solidarity. A member of the Cleveland Branch, for instance, claimed that since the number of women and men voters was
almost equal, then women should have a "50-50" right to all
government positions. The Ohio Party waged a campaign to
have one of its members, Lucille Atcherson, appointed to a
position in the diplomatic service. Atcherson was finally
assigned to the American Legation in Switzerland in 1925, the
first such assignment for an American woman.

In another deviation from the practices of other
women's organizations, the Ohio Party did not have regular
meetings but relied, instead, on state and local officers to
carry out the program of work which was decided upon at the
annual state conventions. These yearly programs were
heavily influenced by the platforms and principles estab­
lished by the national executive committee under the unoffi­
cial leadership of the Party's founder, Alice Paul. A former
Ohio member said of this relationship: "She gave the [state]
chairmen all deference. But if you were a wise chairman, you
did what Alice Paul wanted, because she knew what was
needed."

The major thrust of the NWP's yearly program was its
legislative campaign. Because so many of the discriminations
against women were a result of legal restrictions and omis­
sions, the legislative campaigns of the 1920s centered on the
removal of the legal disabilities of women. To help the
state branches prepare their legislative proposals, the
national Legal Research Department prepared in 1922 a digest
of the discriminatory laws in each state and suggested
remedial legislation consisting of "blanket" equality measures and specific equal rights bills which would amend, repeal or add to existing statutes concerning women. In addition to these state measures, the state branches also supported the National's campaign in behalf of the Lucretia Mott or Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the Constitution.

The Ohio campaign was one of the earliest trials for the Party's legislative program. The preparations for the Ohio campaign reflected the close ties between the national and state branches. Emma Wold, chairman of the national Legislative Committee, explained the Party's plans to Dr. Hayden in January 1923: "We shall take the laws as they stand which violate our principle of equality between men and women before the law, and [show] what amendments can be made to your law . . . or what law can take its place." She sent the Ohio Party a digest of the state's discriminatory laws and copies of what Headquarters regarded as the most important bills that were required to remove these discriminations.

The legislative package submitted by the Ohio Party in February 1923 consisted of bills on the subjects of equal guardianship rights for both parents of minor children; equal responsibility of both parents for illegitimate children; extension of the contract rights of husband and wife; a re-definition of the term "head of household"; a wife's right of consortium; a wife's right to be the authorized agent of her husband; a married woman's right to her own labor; that
a married woman's domicile for voting purposes should be determined on the same basis as for a single woman; equalization of the age of majority for both sexes; and equalization of the age of marriage for boys and girls and the consent of both parents to the marriage of minors. 47

These proposals were not comprehensive. Both state and national leaders of the Party contemplated other changes in Ohio laws. Dr. Hayden suggested the possibility of a community property bill for Ohio, similar to the proposal in California. Martha Souder, national headquarters secretary, discouraged this proposal on the advice of Alice Paul who thought the matter needed "most careful consideration" before any action was taken. "From [Paul's] point of view," Souder explained, "it is wiser to confine our efforts at the present time to removing the existing discriminations against women under the present law rather than try to change the property system of any state." 48

The National Party was particularly interested in alterations to the state's labor and welfare laws. Emma Wold had informed Dr. Hayden in December 1922 that the Legal Research Department was working on proposed changes in these areas, particularly minimum wage and hours of labor laws for women, "so that they will apply equally to men and women." 49 The specific measures to be introduced in Ohio were left to Hayden's discretion, but Wold reminded her that, for the sake of consistency, "we should amend certain statutes which
now discriminate in favor of women."  

When no new bills had been introduced by the Ohio Party by the end of February 1923, Alice Paul wrote a reminder to Hayden:

Please let me know whether you have introduced a bill to repeal the restrictions upon women's work in Ohio. . . . This is about the most extreme law on this subject that has been enacted and it seems to me it should not be allowed to stand . . . as a precedent for other states. 

The letter concluded with an appeal for a "special effort" in this regard by the Ohio Party.

The inclusion of industrial laws was important enough to prompt Paul to repeat the appeal in a letter two days later in which she asked Hayden:

Do you not think that it would be well to introduce the other bills immediately? Even though you feel that they cannot pass it seems to me it would be well to have the whole program before the legislature and thus make our demand that all disabilities be removed. 

In compliance, the Ohio Party introduced four more bills, one of which proposed equal pay for men and women teachers and one of which prohibited discrimination between men and women in public employment. 

The Ohio Party's 1923 legislative campaign was a vigorous, ambitious effort. Dr. Hayden, a member of a prominent Columbus family, led the well-organized lobbying campaign in support of the Party's legislative package, assisted by Helen C. Winters, a prominent Party member from Dayton. Winters assumed responsibility for winning support from members of
the Ohio House of Representatives and Hayden concentrated on the Senate.

Hayden's notes on her lobbying activities in the Ohio Senate indicate a thorough grasp of the political situation in the Ohio legislature. She insisted that Party representatives visit every member of every committee considering Party measures. She assessed the influence of various Senators and sought out those considered the most powerful. One key Democratic Senator (McCoy) interviewed by Hayden initially refused to take a position on the Party's proposed bills although he conceded that he was "sympathetic with the spirit" of the measures. In this instance, Hayden's efforts were successful; Senator McCoy sponsored two of the Party's measures in the General Assembly.54

A spirit of optimism characterized this first endeavor. Anita Pollitzer, a national officer who assisted in the Ohio campaign, claimed that "in Ohio, perhaps more than any other state in the country, political leaders realize the need of giving women Equal Rights, which is the next step in their emancipation."55 Pollitzer's optimism was based on the growth in Party membership in Ohio and the bipartisan support of the Party's program in the General Assembly and among Ohio's political leaders. Of the original ten bills sponsored by the Party, for instance, eight were introduced by Democrats and two by a Republican and Republican Simeon D. Fess, United States Senator from Ohio, was the Senate sponsor of the Equal Rights Amendment.56
The success of the Party's legislative program partially justified Pollitzer's optimism. The Ohio legislature passed six laws for women in 1923. These laws equalized women's inheritance rights; provided for equal guardianship of minor children; required the consent of both parents for the marriage of girls under the age of sixteen and boys under the age of eighteen; raised the age of majority for females to twenty-one (the same as males); made the father of an illegitimate child equally responsible for its support; and equalized the method of determining a married woman's domicile for voting purposes.57

After the 1923 state legislative session, the Ohio Party turned its attention to the national program, particularly the ERA. The state executive committee under the leadership of the new chairman, Mrs. Ivor Hughes, decided in January 1924 to circularize the membership, urging them to write to their representatives in Congress in support of the ERA. The Party had secured the endorsement of the governor, the secretary of state and Senator Fess. Olive Paulson, the first vice chairman of the Ohio Party, had served on the ERA lobbying committee in Washington and had secured pledges of support from several members of the Ohio Congressional delegation.58 To gain public attention and support, the state branch sponsored a series of informational gatherings in several Ohio cities in the spring of 1924 in which state and national leaders discussed the NWP's program, including the ERA.59
Several Ohio members played prominent roles in the NWP's effort to win endorsement of the ERA from the political parties at the conventions in 1924. Helen C. Winters, the legislative chairman of the Ohio Party who described herself as an "ardent Republican woman," told the Republican Platform Committee: "It is inevitable that the Amendment will finally be adopted and I would like the Republican Party to have the credit of having stood for it." Mary Brite, a Party member from Cincinnati, made a similar appeal to the Farm-Labor Party Convention, to which she was an elected delegate. She asked the Party to include a pro-ERA plank in its platform, "for the sake of the reputation of our Party as a progressive political group." The Ohio Party also led the "intensive lobbying campaign" for the ERA at the convention of the Committee for Progressive Political Action which met in Cleveland in July 1924 to nominate Robert LaFollette for President.

The vigor and scope of the Ohio Party's activities in the early 1920s were not matched in the remainder of the decade. When the 1925 legislative session convened, the Ohio Party again submitted a package of proposals. This time, the emphasis was clearly on economic injustices in Ohio laws. This emphasis was a result of the success of the family and property measures in 1923 and the influence of the national protective legislation/ERA controversy. The four measures proposed were equal pay for men and women
teachers, a bill to prohibit discrimination between men and women in public employment, a bill to prohibit the denial of reappointment of a woman teacher upon her marriage and a bill to repeal the statute which excluded women from nineteen different occupations. All four measures were rejected by the Ohio legislature.63

When Emma Wold, chairman of the NWP's Legislative Committee, reviewed the legislative gains by 1927, she recorded only the six measures passed in 1923 to the Ohio Party's credit.64 In some respects, the discriminations against women in Ohio had increased in the 1920s, a situation which did not escape the attention of the National Party. The statute which excluded women from working as express drivers, bell hops, taxi drivers, and gas or electric meter readers, remained in force during the 1920s although the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas found the prohibition against women as taxi drivers "not a valid exercise of the police power" of the state.65 The National Party continued to find the Ohio law offensive. An October 1927 editorial in Equal Rights, the Party's official publication, commented on the situation wherein women students at Ohio State University were allowed to study meter reading in spite of the fact that this was one of the forbidden occupations. "They are learning meter-reading as a part of a 'household mechanics' course," the editorial explained. "But [if] it does not injure the woman's health and morals to do such things without pay, why
should it injure them to do the same work for pay?" 66

The restrictions upon women's work even increased in the state in the 1920s as city after city enacted laws which forbade the employment of married women as regular teachers. An editorial in *Equal Rights* interpreted a Columbus law to this effect as a refusal "to recognize a woman as a human being, free to choose her own occupation," and asked: "Will imbecilities such as this never cease?" 67 The attitude underlying such retrogressive measures was the subject of another editorial which praised the action of Juliette Sessions, "an unmarried woman member of the Board of Education of Columbus," who protested this exclusion of married women teachers but was overruled by the majority who believed, as the Superintendent of Schools claimed, that "there should be but one head of the home as far as breadwinning goes." 68

A statement by state Party chairman Helen C. Winters to the Republican Platform Committee in 1928 reflected the Party's frustration:

To try to secure equality by changing laws, one by one, in every state, is a difficult and endless task. I speak out of the experience of many years of work in my own state to remove discriminations against women. . . . I ask the Republican Party to use all of its great power on behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment. 69

In the reorganization period following the suffrage victory, the Ohio League of Women Voters and the Ohio Branch of the National Woman's Party established alternative programs of action for organized women in the state: a civic/
humanitarian orientation for the League and a feminist orientation for the Woman's Party. These divergent orientations did not automatically preclude the existence of coinciding interests or cooperative endeavors between the two organizations. In the more intimate environment of the state and local level, the possibility of cooperation was enhanced by the likelihood that League and Party members knew each other, that they worked in the same offices or professions, had attended the same schools, belonged to the same political parties, churches and clubs, and attended the same social events. A former Ohio Party member described the Woman's Party members as women of "education, means and established families" who formed an interlocking web of "very intellectual women." This description was just as applicable to the members of the Ohio League. A survey of the prominent women in the League and the Woman's Party in the 1920s reveals many of these shared characteristics.

Both organizations included women from prominent and/or wealthy families. Belle Sherwin, Harriet Taylor Upton and Belle Coit Kelton of the Ohio League and Helen C. Winters, Gillette Hayden, Kenyon Hayden Rector and Mary Brandon of the Woman's Party were all members of "established families" of wealth. The majority of leaders in both organizations were professional women with successful careers. In the Woman's Party, Gillette Hayden was a dentist of international repute; her sister, Kenyon Hayden Rector, was an architect who had
designed the Women's Building at the Chicago World's Fair; Mary Brandon was a Columbus school teacher; Mrs. Ivor Hughes was an insurance saleswoman; Marjorie Meeker was a poet; and Dr. Sophie Rogers was a professor of psychology at Ohio State University. Among League members, Juliette Sessions was a Columbus teacher; Florence Allen had been a teacher and journalist in Cleveland before she became a lawyer and judge and finally an Ohio Supreme Court Justice; Belle Sherwin had taught in the Cleveland schools and worked as a social worker; Agnes Bryant Dickinson and Dora Sandoe Bachman were lawyers; Maude C. Waitt was a politician and Lucia Johnson Bing and Amy Maher were social workers.

Many of the women in the League and the Woman's Party were Ohio natives who had graduated from Ohio State University, many as contemporaries. The list included Juliette Sessions, Dora Sandoe Bachman, Belle Coit Kelton, Agnes Bryant Dickinson and Olga Anna Jones of the League and Gillette Hayden, Kenyon Haden Rector and Mary Brandon of the Woman's Party. In terms of political affiliation, Harriet Taylor Upton of the League and Helen C. Winters of the Woman's Party were both prominent leaders within the Republican Party in Ohio in the 1920s. Finally, and significantly, many leaders of the League had sympathized with or belonged to the Congressional Union, predecessor of the National Woman's Party, during the suffrage campaign. In the Franklin County (Columbus) League, for instance, Dr. Caroline Breyfogle,
Belle Coit Kelton, Dora Sandoe Bachman, Harriett Bradbury, Dr. Alice Johnston and Mrs. Julius Stone, most of whom were officers of the League in the 1920s, had been CU members prior to 1915 and Harriet Taylor Upton, a state officer, had supported the early efforts of the CU while it was still affiliated with the National American Woman Suffrage Association. Katherine Aman Seibert, who was an honored member of the Ohio League, was also a founder of the National Woman's Party in 1921 and was still a member of the Ohio Party in 1945.71

In addition to these similarities in personal characteristics, League and Party members in Ohio had certain coinciding interests. The League's humanitarian program included the extension of women's legal and economic rights. This feminist strain was reflected in numerous articles and editorials in the Ohio Woman Voter during the 1920s. The property rights of married women was a feminist concern which was reflected in Ohio Woman Voter articles such as "The Widow's Share," "The Present Property Rights of Married Women in Ohio," and "Should Husbands and Wives Own Property in Common?"72 The last article, written by Dora Sandoe Bachman, contained a feminist analysis of the worth of the homemaker's contribution to the family income and her right to a share of that income. "Why should a woman," Bachman wrote, "ask for that which she has helped to earn any more than a business partner should have to ask for a share of profits from any
other business?" In a related article, "Most Every Man Thinks That His Wife Has Nothing To Do," Grace Berger described the average man's lack of comprehension of the burdens of housework.74

Another feminist issue with which the Ohio League dealt was the single moral standard for men and women. In an article in the Ohio Woman Voter, Olive Colton, chairman of the Toledo League's Social Hygiene Committee, described local efforts to stop police persecution of prostitutes. She recommended that the women of Ohio "visit the courts in little groups and learn for themselves . . . the age long injustice to their misguided sisters." "The first step to bring the single standard of morals," she wrote, "is to stop the discrimination against women." Colton concluded with the observation that "injustice even to the prostitute is the concern of other women."75

Finally, a poem which was printed in the Ohio Woman Voter in 1922 rejected the concept of a separate woman's sphere—a feminist theme which underlay many of the Woman's Party principles:

They talk about a woman's sphere,
As if it had a limit;
There's not a place on earth or Heav'n
There's not a task to mankind given;
There's not a joy or woe;
There's not a whispered 'yes' or 'no';
There's not a life or death or birth,
That has a feather's weight of worth
Without a woman in it.76

The coinciding interests of the League and the Woman's Party also had a more pragmatic manifestation in support of
the same legislative measures. In 1922, both organizations supported the Cable Bill which provided for the independent citizenship of married women. In 1923, both proposed measures designed to give parents equal guardianship rights to minor children, to equalize the age of majority for males and females, to raise the age of marriage to eighteen for both sexes, to determine a married woman's domicile for voting purposes on the same basis as that of single women, and to provide for the support and protection of illegitimate children by both parents.

In spite of these similarities and coinciding interests, the relationship which developed between the League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party in Ohio was an adversary relationship. Indeed, many of the shared characteristics and common interests contained within them the seeds of dissension. Although many League and Woman's Party members were professional women, for instance, and even graduates of the same colleges, the League women more often had strong humanitarian affiliations in their professional roles than did Woman's Party members. Belle Sherwin, Florence Allen, Harriet Taylor Upton, Elizabeth Hauser, Lucia Johnson Bing, Olive Colton, Amy Maher—all of these League members were professional women by training who devoted their careers or volunteered their services to humanitarian organizations and endeavors such as the YWCA, the Red Cross, the Consumers' League, the peace movement, the Ohio Conference of Social Work, Child Welfare
societies and various charities. These involvements influenced the issues which Ohio League leaders chose for consideration, the legislative measures which they endorsed, and the content and extent of their contacts with other organized women. Since the Woman's Party eschewed peripheral issues, including world peace, child welfare, and charities, the professional links between Party members and League members were limited.

The involvement of League and Party members in the Republican Party in Ohio was another context in which a superficial connection masked a reality of separate interests and expectations. This had been true during the suffrage campaign when the League and the Woman's Party competed for influence. Annie Norton Battelle, president of the Columbus Republican Women's Club and a member of the Ohio Woman's Party, picketed the Republican National Convention in 1920 in an effort to force the Republican leaders to use their political pressure on the unratified states—a tactic with which the National League of Women Voters and NAWSA disagreed. Both the Woman's Party and the NAWSA sent deputations to the Republican and Democratic presidential candidates in 1920. The Woman's Party delegation included Ohio Party members Gillette Hayden, Kenyon Hayden Rector, Mary Brandon and Annie Norton Battelle, and the NAWSA delegation was led by Ohio League/NAWSA member Harriet Taylor Upton. Each side claimed that the subsequent pressure for ratification from candidates Harding
and Cox was due solely to their efforts. After suffrage, the division persisted. Ohio Woman's Party members who were affiliated with the Republican Party lobbied for a pro-ERA plank in 1924 and 1928 whereas Harriet Taylor Upton was part of the Republican hierarchy which rejected the plank.

Even the examples of feminist themes in the Ohio Woman Voter were hedged with non-feminist interpretations and recommendations. Mary Vashti Jones' article on married women's property rights, for instance, was prefaced with an explanation that her study was undertaken to correct the "mistaken idea" held by a great many people that married women in Ohio had no property rights. Jones concluded that "with two or three exceptions, the property rights of men and women are identical and in the exceptions, the woman is given a measure of protection." To the Woman's Party, any exception was unacceptable. Another article related the experience of the Toledo League of Women Voters in its effort to help "alien wives" become citizens. The rationale in this case, however, was not based on feminist principles but on the belief that the foreign-born wife needed American citizenship "to help hold the respect of her children" and to "help her hold her rightful place in the home."

The common legislative goals also were not a bridge between the two organizations. Each side ignored the contributions of the other and claimed credit for successful measures. This was true, for instance, in the case of the Cable Bill. A
report of the passage of this bill in the Ohio Woman Voter in 1922 mentioned the endorsement of several women's organizations but completely ignored the support of the National Woman's Party. Of the equal guardianship bill which passed in 1923, with the support of the League and the Woman's Party, an article in the Ohio Woman Voter said: "We secured the introduction of the Bill and saw it pass." (emphasis mine) An article in Equal Rights, the NWP's publication, quoted an account in the Ohio State Journal of April 1923 which said that the equal guardianship bill was "started by the National Woman's Party and since promoted by other women's organizations as well."

The shared membership of League and Party members in the Congressional Union during the suffrage campaign also mitigated against a warm relationship after 1920. Most of the Ohio League members who had belonged to the CU had severed their ties with the organization as it grew increasingly militant in 1916 and their former allegiance changed to opposition. When Mary Brandon of the Ohio Woman's Party addressed the Columbus League in April 1920, for instance, Belle Coit Kelton, a former CU member, responded with a defense of the work done by NAWSA and said that no one organization (i.e., the NWP) should try to claim credit for the suffrage victory.

These latent sources of conflict were exacerbated by instances of direct confrontation between the Ohio League and the Woman's Party, confrontations which stemmed from their
different orientations. League members evaluated issues and actions in terms of humanitarian principles whereas the Party members judged from the perspective of feminist standards. Open conflicts occurred when issues arose over which the two sets of principles collided. A case in point in Ohio, as elsewhere, was the dispute between the League and the Woman's Party over the relative merits of protective legislation for women versus absolute equality of treatment for men and women.

The League endorsed various protective measures for women on the humanitarian grounds that women—as the weaker sex, the mothers of the race, and non-unionized members of the work force—had to be protected by the state for the good of the whole community. The Woman's Party opposed the concept of legislation based on gender; it advocated the elimination of the words "male" and "female" from all laws, even if this meant the loss of so-called privileges for women.

In Ohio, the immediate stimulus for this dispute was a proposed minimum wage for women bill—the Burke Bill. Introduced in 1922, the Burke Bill had the support of a number of humanitarian groups, including the Ohio League of Women Voters. A variety of groups, led by employers' associations, opposed the measure on the grounds that it was unconstitutional, a violation of freedom of contract. The Ohio Woman's Party also opposed the measure, but on the grounds that it violated the Party's feminist principles. Party member Kenyon Hayden Rector explained this opposition in a newspaper
interview in 1923: "A minimum wage bill for women," she said, "actually limits the working hours and deprives the worker of the extra pay that she would get under existing conditions or under a law similar to that now in effect for men." Legislation such as this, she claimed, "is either discrimination against the male workers, by offering women such advantages as men do not have, or else they handicap the women as in the case of the [Burke] bill." 87

Proponents severely criticized this attitude toward the Burke Bill. The Ohio Council on Women in Industry—of which the Ohio League was a member—accused the "equalitarian feminists" of setting up a "straw woman." An editorial in the Council's Bulletin quoted a British suffragette's claim that "it is not possible for human beings . . . to single out any one principle and pursue it to the disregard of every other consideration, without the danger that the principle may become an 'arid, barren, obsessing idea.'" 88 The Council claimed to be interested not only in the rights of women as individuals "and keenly interested in these rights," but also in the rights of the community or social group to protect itself from conditions which it has found harmful. 89

This disagreement over protective legislation was partially responsible for the humanitarians' opposition to the NWP's proposed Equal Rights Amendment. The Ohio League had gone on record as early as 1921 against the Woman's Party's proposal of a blanket equality bill for Ohio. 90 One Ohio
League member reported that "year after year the League of Women Voters if forced to call its members into action to defeat this greatly-misunderstood issue [the ERA]."91

The adversary relationship between the League and the Woman's Party in Ohio was also affected by the milieu in which they existed. The League's humanitarian orientation in the 1920s placed it in the mainstream of organized women's activity in Ohio. Women's organizations frequently cooperated on specific projects or banded together to form permanent coalitions dedicated to the pursuit of common goals. Ad hoc cooperation was quite common on the local level, as illustrated by the experiences of the Columbus League. In 1920, the League endorsed the Housewives' League's protest of high bread prices; in 1921, it joined the Parent-Teacher Association in a successful bond issue drive for Columbus schools and participated with the Columbus Federation of Women's Clubs, the YWCA, the PTA, the Chamber of Commerce, the Federation of Labor and the Farm Bureau in a Disarmament meeting; in 1922, it co-hosted a dinner for Judge Florence Allen with the American Association of University Women, the College Women's Club and the Columbus Women's Association of Commerce; and in 1925, it met with the AAUW to discuss the question of teachers' salary raises.92

The state League also joined in ad hoc cooperative endeavors. In 1923, a League representative expressed appreciation for the "interest and helpfulness" in its legislative
efforts given by the Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, the Women's Christian Temperance Union, the Council of Jewish Women, the PTA, the AAUW and the YWCA.\textsuperscript{93} In 1926, the League's Legislative Conference received representatives from the YWCA, the Ohio Consumers' League and the Child Conservation League.\textsuperscript{94} State and local Leagues also developed more permanent relationships with other women's organizations. In 1923, for instance, the Toledo League joined with twenty-five other organizations to form the Women's Joint Legislative Committee which was instrumental in the establishment of a court of domestic relations, in spite of charges that the women involved were "meddlesome old maids and wealthy society women looking for something to reform."\textsuperscript{95} The Cleveland League joined a Women's Joint Legislative Committee composed of the Council of Jewish Women, YWCA, Women's City Club, Democratic Women's League, Junior League and others which "worked to keep the women of Cleveland better informed concerning national and state legislation."\textsuperscript{96} The state League belonged to the Ohio Council on Women and Children in Industry (which later split into two separate councils) whose membership composed a veritable "who's who" of humanitarian organizations: the American Association of University Women, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Consumers' League, Daughters of the American Revolution, Council of Jewish Women, Young Women's Christian Association, Ohio Federation of Women's Clubs, Ohio Federation of Labor, Ohio State Teachers' Association, Parent-Teacher
Association, the Colored Urban League, and the Women's Trade Union League. This Council was particularly active in the campaign for protective legislation for working women.97

The Ohio Woman's Party, in contrast, was relatively isolated from the community of women's organizations in Ohio. The instances of cooperation between the Party and other organizations were few in number. This was, in part, a result of the Party's singleness of purpose; it did not form ad hoc relationships with other organizations in pursuit of non-feminist goals, no matter how laudable these goals might be. Cooperative endeavors had to be directed toward the Party's goal of equality for men and women in American society and few women's organizations interpreted this goal in the same manner as the Woman's Party in the 1920s.

Ohio Party members did sometimes participate in the meetings of other organizations for the purpose of promoting a particular legislative measure such as the ERA. A member of the Cincinnati Branch, for instance, addressed a group of women at the University of Cincinnati in 1923 on the subject of the ERA, and Florence Bayard Hilles and Mabel Vernon, two national officers of the Party, addressed various women's groups in Ohio in March 1924 on the same topic. A Party representative participated in a debate of the ERA at a special meeting of the Dayton League of Women Voters in April 1928.98

Altrusa, a national organization of business and professional women in which the members either owned their own
business, held "important" executive positions or were "worthy" representatives of a profession, was the only women's organization in Ohio in the 1920s in general sympathy with the Woman's Party's goals. This was due, in part, to the influence of Gillette Hayden, who served as president of the Ohio Association of Altrusa Clubs in 1921-1922 and of the national association in 1924-1925. The alliance, however, was one of spirit rather than action. Altrusa did not lobby for the ERA or other Party measures, although it did refuse to participate in activities sponsored by the League of Women Voters.

The rivalry between the League and the Woman's Party in Ohio was acknowledged publicly and privately. Ohio newspapers frequently juxtaposed the positions of the two organizations in accounts of various activities. An article in the *Columbus Citizen* in 1923, for instance, reviewed the "equal rights" measures before the state legislature and explained that some were backed by the National Woman's Party "which wants every right enjoyed by man shared with the other sex and every burden endured by him a part of woman's hardship" whereas other measures were backed by the Ohio League of Women Voters, "a constructive and instructional nonpartisan organization which seeks political equality and education." An article on the same subject in the *Ohio State Journal* listed the measures proposed by the Woman's Party and added: "The Ohio League of Women Voters is said to be opposed to the methods pursued by
the National Woman's Party and are expected to oppose all bills."103

The press also criticized the actions and/or orientation of each organization, which further emphasized their differences. An article in the Ohio State Journal in 1923 criticized the Ohio League's support of minimum wage legislation. These women voters, according to the article, had allowed "their advocacy of or opposition to some specific measure to blind their eyes entirely to the principles underlying such measures." The article conceded that the Ohio League had "the best intentions in the world" but argued that someday they or their daughters might appreciate the preservation of the right of contract, "one of our hard-won liberties that might so easily be swept away on some passing current of special interest."104 An earlier article in the same publication, which had so gently chided the League, referred to the members of the Woman's Party as "extreme feminists" who "make a fetish of literal equality" which was both "silly" and "harmful."105

In their private correspondence, League and Woman's Party members acknowledged the animosity between the two groups. Amy Maher, a League member who was chairman of the Ohio Council on Women in Industry, suggested to Edith Abbott, chairman of the NLWV's Women in Industry Committee, that the League should emphasize the NWP's opposition to all protective legislation "in the form of showing why we do not wish to do away with it."106 Gillette Hayden, chairman of the Ohio Party,
indicated her own awareness of the situation in a response to a suggestion from Headquarters that a former Ohio resident be sent to Ohio as an organizer. "I don't know whether she would be interested in coming to Ohio," she wrote, "where she was active in the League of Women Voters work for a year." A comment from a former member of the Ohio Party described this attitude in its most extreme manifestation. She claimed that when she told a Woman's Party officer that she thought Carrie Chapman Catt, founder of the League, was a marvelous person, the woman cried.

The post-suffrage development of the League of Women Voters and the Woman's Party in Ohio were remarkably similar to that of their respective parent organizations. The Ohio League was a leader among Ohio women's organizations in its capacity as an organization of women voters dedicated to the informed use of the ballot for the good of the community and the individual. The state League's yearly programs reflected the National League's civic/political/humanitarian principles. In this respect, the national and state components of the League blended together in Ohio to form a unity of purpose without sacrifice of local initiative. The Ohio Woman's Party, on the other hand, occupied a minority position among organized women in the state. After 1923, its' program had a built-in national bias because of the emphasis on the ERA. The Woman's Party did introduce state legislation but the ERA represented the Party's attempt to avoid the kind of expensive
and time-consuming state campaigns which had characterized the suffrage movement. The fact that the ERA, and feminist issues in general, were not popular with most women detracted from the Party's influence among Ohio women.

The Ohio League and Woman's Party also mirrored the national trends in their acrimonious relationship. The effects of this relationship were detrimental for both organizations and for the future of the women's movement in Ohio. The failure of the League and the Woman's Party to cooperate resulted in duplication of time, money and effort, which neither organization had in great abundance. This was particularly true with regard to the legislative proposals of each organization. The legislative package of the Ohio Woman's Party in 1923, for instance, contained only one measure (general equal rights for women) which could not have been submitted, with no infringement of principles, by the Ohio League. The League had even indicated to the Woman's Party, according to Gillette Hayden, "a desire to find out if they and we are not planning legislative work of common interest." The same principles applied to the Woman's Party's attitude toward League-sponsored legislation. The Burke Minimum Wage Bill was unacceptable to the Party because it violated the principle of equal treatment, but it could have supported measures such as the Bing School Bill and the Child Labor Amendment, for the sake of harmony and cooperation, without any loss of principle. The two organizations chose,
however, to wage separate legislative campaigns even on those measures which both endorsed.

The rivalry between the League and the Woman's Party limited the accomplishments of both. The "enemy" was too often another group of women rather than a particular condition or event in society. As a result, the post-suffrage women's movement in Ohio was fragmented into a humanitarian wing, led by the League, and a feminist wing, represented by the Woman's Party. The failure of these two factions to compromise or cooperate in the 1920s established a precedent of distrust and combativeness which prevented the development of a social movement built around a common goal to succeed the suffrage movement.
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CHAPTER VI. Summary and Conclusions

Before the inauguration of the woman's rights movement in 1848, attempts to address and redress the disabilities of women in American society were scattered, infrequent, individual endeavors which attracted little public attention and even less response. Once a movement developed, however, with forceful leadership and public, collective behavior, the attempts to alter women's status never ceased. The leadership, organizations, goals, participants, and milieu of the movement changed, but the drive for the general advancement of women has continued to the present.

Recognition of this continuity is essential to an understanding of women's organized activities after passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. The prevalent interpretation of the suffrage victory as the death of the general women's movement until its rebirth as the women's liberation movement in the 1960s is a result of historians' failure to comprehend the historical origins of the post-1920 developments. The different programs, policies, ideologies, even the factionalism among former suffragists in the post-1920 era had counterparts in the woman's rights and woman suffrage phases of the women's movement.
Women activists in the period from 1848 to 1920 had seldom concurred on their fundamental values or the exact nature of their goals and expectations. In both the woman's rights and woman suffrage phases of the women's movement, a minority of the participants insisted on sweeping changes in women's status whereas the majority favored cautious, selective changes.

In the woman's rights phase of the movement (1848-1869), some women on both the state and national levels argued for parity for women; they wanted women to receive all the rights and opportunities accorded to men. They wanted women to have the right to control their own lives and destinies in such matters as property, family size, marriage and divorce, education, earnings and voting. This stance, reflected in the resolutions of the early woman's rights conventions, was predicated on the theory of the sameness of men and women—their common humanity.¹

Not all activists subscribed to this vision, however. Indeed, most were uncomfortable with public discussion of topics such as divorce and contraception. They believed in equal rights for women in some areas (such as property, education and voting), but maintained that because men's and women's roles and needs were not identical, their status could never be equal.

This diversity among woman's rights activists did not originally cause friction because of the loose structure of
the movement. No central, coordinating structure existed on the national level to define goals and direct activities. The national, state and local conventions, which were the nexus of the movement, provided a valuable forum for the exchange of ideas and declarations of intentions, but did not provide an agenda for action or articulate a comprehensive ideology. An informal network of state and national leaders comprised the movement's only semblance of centralization and coordination. The early period of the woman's rights phase of the women's movement therefore was characterized by diversity without factionalism.

The Civil War interrupted the momentum of the woman's rights movement because so many of the activists, who also were abolitionists, devoted their time and attention to the war effort. When the war ended and the movement resumed, it underwent significant changes. The issue of woman suffrage, always one of the demands of the woman's rights movement, began to monopolize the attention of most woman's rights advocates. This was due to the general emphasis on civil and political rights in antebellum politics and to the activists' conclusion that women could not effect changes in their status until they represented a political constituency.

The adoption by many activists of a central objective in the post-war period transformed the focus of the women's movement, ushering in the woman suffrage phase which dominated the movement until 1920. This new phase had central
organization and leadership and specific recommendations for action. These characteristics conformed to the necessary requisites of a social movement to such a degree that historians generally refer to this phase as the woman suffrage movement. The changes which ushered in the woman suffrage phase also initiated factionalism among activists. Whereas the pre-Civil War women's movement had been able to encompass diverse ideologies, goals and expectations without developing significant factionalism, the woman suffrage movement, from its inception until 1890, was characterized by a rift among the national leaders. Two historians of the suffrage movement contend that when such factions developed, they separated the radical from the conservative and the venturesome from the cautious. Such factionalism, they claim, was a result of differences in strategy and tactics. This was true, to an extent, of the two rival suffrage organizations which emerged in 1869: the National and the American Woman Suffrage Associations. The National Association—the radical component—favored the immediate enfranchisement of women by a Constitutional amendment. The American Association—the moderate or cautious component—advocated the gradual enfranchisement of women by the state legislatures.

If the differences between these two organizations had been confined to these questions of strategy and tactics, then the use of the labels "radical" and "moderate" would be an exaggerated distinction. Their differences, however, were
more substantial, involving basic ideological variations. The radical National Association, led by Elizabeth Cady Stanton (described in one history as a "consistent theoretical radical") and Susan B. Anthony, was not a typical contemporary reform organization; it was a women's organization—led by women, funded by women and concerned only with women's issues. It concentrated on a wide variety of such issues, only one of which was woman suffrage. The Revolution, the National's short-lived publication, was replete with articles about the legal disabilities of women, the necessity of economic independence for women and a host of other social, domestic, political and religious discriminations against women.

The American Association was a reformist organization in which men and women worked together for woman suffrage and other worthy causes. In the early years of the organization's existence, for instance, the American, which opposed a federal woman suffrage amendment, campaigned vigorously for passage of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, calling for the enfranchisement of Negro males. The American did not branch out into other issues concerning women's status in society, preferring to confine its campaign to legal and political rights. Julia Ward Howe, described by one historian as the "epitome" of the American's attitudes, was concerned about the image of the woman suffrage movement and sought to make it a respectable endeavor by eschewing controversial side issues (such as divorce and trade unionism) which might
alienate influential sections of the community. American founders Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell, although they had been leaders in the woman's rights movement, accepted the wisdom of Howe's attitude.

In spite of these differences, similarities did exist between the National and the American. The women leaders of both shared a middle-class background, although they were not typical women of their class or any other class because they were activist, public women. The National might consider the American a conservative body, but society perceived both as radical. The issue of woman suffrage was still an unorthodox cause in the late nineteenth century and the general public, and even suffragists on the local level, did not always perceive the differences between the two factions of suffragists. Indeed, the common goal of enfranchisement was a bridge between the National and the American and accounted for their merger in 1890, creating the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA).

From the beginning, the orientation of the moderate faction dominated within NAWSA, but the radical perspective was never completely eliminated due to the influence of Elizabeth Cady Stanton. Unlike Susan B. Anthony, who perceived enfranchisement as the key to women's emancipation and was therefore willing by 1890 to subordinate other issues temporarily, Stanton insisted that women's disabilities had multiple sources and required multiple remedies; the vote, she
contended, was only one, and not necessarily the most important, objective.

Even though Stanton's attitude had limited support within NAWSA, it served as a crucial link between the woman's rights and woman suffrage phases of the women's movement. The persistence of the radical perspective after 1890 kept alive certain elements of ideology from the woman's rights phase: that men and women were essentially alike and should therefore have equal rights and opportunities and that the vote, in particular, was a right to which women were entitled as a matter of justice. Neither of these ideas was dominant within the mainstream of the post-1890 suffrage movement as represented by NAWSA. American society had changed by 1890. The influx of immigrants and the rise of trade unionism and class strife caused many Americans in the "ruling class" to abandon the eighteenth century theory of natural rights and equality of all men. The suffrage movement reflected these changes in part because most suffragists were from the ruling class, although as women they did not share in the ruling. After 1890, therefore, most suffragists shifted their justification for enfranchisement from natural rights or justice to "expediency."5

These expediency arguments, which dominated the remainder of the suffrage movement, emphasized the ways in which women would use the vote for self-protection or for the general welfare of the community. In both cases, the underlying assumption was that men and women were quite different; that they
had dissimilar needs, characteristics and perspectives. Women deserved the vote therefore, not as a matter of justice, but because they would use it in a socially responsible manner.\(^6\)

The shift to expediency arguments after 1890 is a critical connection between the mainstream of the suffrage phase and the mainstream of the post-1920 phase of the women's movement. Expediency arguments characterized women as more moral, temperate, law-abiding, literate, humane, etc., than men. Once enfranchised, women would exert a constructive influence on society. Expediency justifications therefore portrayed women as reformers, an idea that appealed to the new generation of suffragists in NAWSA. Many of the leading suffragists after 1890 were college-educated women committed to socially useful careers in teaching, medicine, social work, etc.\(^7\) Even middle- and upper-class suffragists without career aspirations subscribed to the general belief that women, with their uniquely humane perspective, should have socially responsible roles.

Some historians have attributed this reformist trend to the influence of the Progressive movement. In fact, one historian views the suffrage movement as but one of the movements within Progressivism.\(^8\) This analysis is reflected in another historian's claim that "feminism" (which he equates with suffragism) was "about status equality, not about sex equality," and another's claim that the suffrage movement was reformist rather than revolutionary.\(^9\)
These assertions are inaccurate and misleading. Equating the two movements obscures the historical origins and nature of the woman suffrage movement. Some men and women did become involved in the suffrage campaign as a result of their identification with the Progressive movement, but the suffrage movement antedated by many years the Progressive movement. It was one phase of a women's movement which had always contained a faction committed to a wide range of societal reforms. Moreover, the implication that the woman suffrage movement was a part of the Progressive movement deprives the suffrage campaign of its uniqueness and independence as a movement initiated by women in response to their second-class citizenship.

The national suffrage movement languished temporarily after the formation of NAWSA, due in part to the organization's preference for state enfranchisement campaigns rather than the federal amendment route. In some states, however, the movement was still in its infancy, just beginning to organize and recruit and develop strategies. In Ohio, an organized movement did not actually emerge until 1885 and the leaders of the movement had to instill an interest in and commitment to the suffrage cause in a significant number of women before any progress could be expected. This process consumed much of the leaders' energy, but it was necessary on the grass-roots level where women were so far-removed from the deliberations in New York or Washington. The first
decade of the twentieth century therefore was devoted to growth—to building a constituency for woman suffrage.

After 1910, the suffrage movement in Ohio and on the national level gathered momentum, as the years of organizing, educating and agitating began to show results. Another factor in the movement's renewed vitality was the re-emergence of a prominent radical faction within the suffrage movement, the so-called "militant" suffragists. The earliest spokeswomen of the militant faction, such as Alva Belmont and Harriot Stanton Blatch, attributed their militancy to the example of the British suffragette movement and to what they perceived as the staid, conservative nature of the American movement. But Blatch, the daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, had been immersed in the radical tradition of the women's movement from birth and had inherited her mother's catholic vision of the movement's scope. This vision was shared by Alice Paul, the central figure in the radical faction which arose after 1910 to challenge NAWSA's leadership of the suffrage movement.

Paul's organization, the Congressional Union (CU), was originally an auxiliary of NAWSA, but became an independent suffrage organization in 1914. Its major objective was passage of a woman suffrage amendment to the Constitution. The differences between the CU and NAWSA, however, were not confined to the question of strategy. Like the earlier split between the National and American Woman Suffrage Associations, the CU/NAWSA rift derived from divergent policies, attitudes
and ideology. Indeed, some of the women in the new factions had been involved in the earlier rift. Former AWSA members Anna Howard Shaw and Antoinette Stone Blackwell belonged to NAWSA and Blatch served as liaison between the NWSA and the new generation of radicals.

NAWSA represented the moderate faction of the woman suffrage movement. It had a large membership, much of which was interested in a wide array of humanitarian reforms. One historian refers to these women as "Genteel Reformers," to whom the vote was "socially expedient."10 As one mark of their genteelness, NAWSA leaders, especially Carrie Chapman Catt, believed in nonpartisan, nonthreatening, indirect influence as the best way to bring about social change, including woman suffrage. NAWSA did not want women to beg for the vote, but it did not countenance aggressive behavior and confrontations. It preferred, instead, quiet, orderly, well-organized state, and later national, enfranchisement campaigns. This emphasis on a "ladylike" demeanor and achievement of humanitarian reforms also characterized the NAWSA-connected suffrage movement in Ohio.

The radical wing of the suffrage movement, the CU and its affiliate the Woman's Party (WP), differed from the moderates in several ways. CU/WP members insisted on a federal woman suffrage amendment, refusing to participate in the numerous state campaigns for limited enfranchisement, such as those in Ohio. They advocated militant pressure tactics, confrontations, disruptive behavior, etc., to force politicians
to recognize, and then act on, the suffrage amendment. They called on the enfranchised women in the West to hold the Democratic Party, as the party in power, accountable for passage or failure of the amendment.

The radicals also eschewed commitments to other reforms. To the CU/WP members, the vote was politically rather than socially expedient. They regarded women's enfranchisement as one step toward the emancipation of women in American society. They believed, as had their predecessors in the NWSA, that the vote was women's right, emphasizing the essential equality of men and women.

The differences between these two factions, and the hostility they generated on both state and national levels, were a factor in developments after the suffrage victory. The suffrage movement had not obscured the differences between these two factions, as one historian claims,11 except to the general public. The suffragists themselves were aware of their differences and privately acknowledged their mutual hostility. The Nineteenth Amendment did not eliminate their basic ideological differences, which became important ingredients in their new roles after the suffrage victory.

The two factions which emerged in the post-suffrage phase of the women's movement were the direct descendants of the suffrage factions. The humanitarians of the 1920s had belonged to the moderate faction of the suffrage movement which had embraced a number of humanitarian causes in addition to
their advocacy of woman suffrage and had emphasized the reform potential of women's enfranchisement. They turned their attention after 1920 to the fulfillment of these objectives. The feminists in the new women's movement had belonged to the militant or radical faction of the suffrage movement which had emphasized the vote as one ingredient in women's emancipation. They shifted their emphasis after 1920 to other elements of discrimination against women in American society.

The two leading representatives of these orientations, on both the national and state levels, in the post-suffrage women's movement were the National League of Women Voters and the National Woman's Party (NWP). The League, a descendant of NAWSA, adopted a program of civic/political and social welfare leadership which contrasted sharply with the program adopted by the NWP, the descendant of the CU, of removing the remaining forms of the subjection of women in American society. In spite of some isolated overtures by members of each organization, an acrimonious relationship developed in the 1920s between the League and the NWP.

The controversy surrounding the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) and protective legislation for women was a symptom of this relationship, rather than its cause. It heightened the awareness of the different perspectives between humanitarians and feminists on such basic issues as the nature of women, the meaning of progress for women, and the definition of equality. A League theorist, for instance, described the League's program as part of the process of change of emphasis in the
women's movement from feminism to social service. The old "individualistic feminism," with its emphasis on women's rights, was modified, she claimed, and developed into an organized social force--what she labeled as "voting feminists." 12

An Equal Rights editorial in 1926, on the other hand, quoted a speech by Lady Rhondda, a British feminist, in which she defined a "Feminist" as "an emancipator, one who believes in liberty, rather than protection, as a solvent of human ills." She explained that, contrary to popular belief, Feminists did not disagree on their program. This mistaken impression, she claimed, was a result of the tendency to mistake reformers (humanitarians), "who are not in the least Feminists . . . for Feminists." Lady Rhondda concluded that it was "idle for those who desire to achieve opposite ends to travel the path together." 13

Lady Rhondda's statement was accurate; the League and the NWP certainly did not travel together. The League, which represented the orientation of the majority of organized women in the post-suffrage era, actively opposed the NWP and the ERA. It repudiated the existence of a special women's platform, preferring instead to stress that women's issues could not be separated from men's because the problems of the post-World War I era were humanity's, rather than the individual's. The League subscribed to the general humanitarian impulse of the 1920s which sought to make people more
comfortable within American society, rather than challenging the nature of society. The NWP, on the other hand, because it pursued a strictly feminist program and rejected the humanitarian orientation, sought substantial changes in the structure of American society. The NWP leadership may have been, as one historian claims, politically conservative in their desire for a share of the fruits of the existing system, but their feminist demands for absolute equality between the sexes implied a basic reorientation of American society away from its patriarchal foundation.

With such different perspectives, the League and the NWP found peaceful coexistence impossible. Even on the state level, where League and Party members were more likely to have common backgrounds and concerns, the gap between the two perspectives was difficult to span. In Ohio, the relationship between the League and the NWP reflected the overt hostility evident on the national level. On both levels, the two factions refused to cooperate or acknowledge each other's positive contributions and accomplishments. This was true in spite of the fact that some common ground existed between the two organizations. Both were part of the general women's movement after 1920, their members maintaining public roles and activism while the majority of former suffragists retired from such activity. The NWP best reflected the general aims of the earlier women's movement, but because the League continued to embrace at least the general objective of the
advancement of women in the 1920s, it preserved a fragment of the old woman's rights platform within the mainstream of organized women. This common ground between the League and the NWP was significant in view of their post-1920s fortunes.

The League created a permanent role for itself as a political or civic education body and a supporter of liberal causes such as the anti-poverty program and civil rights legislation in the 1960s. Although the League refused to take a stand on the Vietnam War, its long-standing commitment to international peace has frequently led to charges that the organization is communistic.

In contrast, the NWP remained a tiny, and not very influential, minority of organized women. The Party was almost destroyed by internal dissension in the 1940s, but never abandoned its perception of its role as the vanguard of the women's movement. This perception was valid in the sense that the presence of a feminist minority in the women's movement after 1920 served the same purpose as its predecessors in the woman's rights and woman suffrage phases of the movement. It advocated major alterations in the status of women, thereby making the moderate changes recommended by the humanitarians more palatable to the public.

The NWP also steadfastly pursued passage of the ERA after the 1920s, keeping the amendment alive through years of Congressional inaction. When Congress finally passed the amendment, however, the action was a private victory for the NWP.
By the 1960s, the Party's leadership of the feminist movement and its responsibility for the ERA had been coopted by the new phase of the women's movement—the women's liberation movement.

Two historians of the women's movement contend that the women's liberation movement has a broad basis of concern which they characterize as a return to the Seneca Falls (woman's rights) tradition. When the League of Women Voters voted in 1972 to support the ERA, a League publication echoed this analysis in its claim that with this action, "the League, as a lineal descendant of the original women's movement, came full circle to give priority support to equal rights for men and women."

These remarks indicate a crucial aspect of the history of the American women's movement: from 1848 to the present, it has contained several threads of continuity which have survived the changes in leadership, personnel and goals. Each phase of the women's movement has been characterized by the existence of rival factions, differentiated by ideological orientations. The moderate faction—the AWSA, NAWSA and the League of Women Voters—has advocated changes in women's status as one plank in its platform of general humanitarian reforms. The radical faction—the NWSA, the CU/WP, and the National Woman's Party—has dedicated its entire program to the pursuit of equality for women in American society.
The women's liberation movement differs from the earlier phases of the women's movement in that the feminist perspective, formerly associated with the radical minority, is the compelling force of the movement. This new movement does have moderate and radical wings, but these have not yet caused a schism. The moderate faction, composed of organizations such as the National Organization for Women and the National Women's Political Caucus, emphasizes the numerous instances of sex discrimination in American society and seeks to alter these practices. The radical faction, the socialist feminists and the "radical feminists," advocates basic changes in the existing social order as a precondition to equality between men and women. This division indicates that the twin themes of change and continuity remain operative in the American women's movement.
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