Nationalism and Suffrage: Gender Struggle in Nation-Building America

Philip N. Cohen

THE DEVELOPMENT OF gender relations in the modern era is never free from the influence of nations and nationalism (McClintock 1993); nations reflect the impact of gender struggles as well. In this article I examine the white women's suffrage movement from 1848 to 1918 and conclude that a core within the suffrage leadership practiced a nationalism based on exclusive citizenship that was conditioned on whiteness. I see these politics as nationalist embedded within the women's experience and conceptions of America as well as "racist." This nationalism was realized through an alliance between white American women and men that subordinated gender conflict—even as suffrage leaders sought to improve their position as women. In the process, these leaders advanced the cause of women's suffrage while furthering the exclusion and oppression of nonwhite women and men. Aldon Morris observes that "social scientists have tended to underemphasize the political consciousness of dominant groups" (1992, 363). In this article I attempt to explain some of the unmarked political consciousness of the dominant American group—what I term its nationalism—and how gender struggles both affected and reflected that nationalism.

I begin with a brief review of literature on the relationships between white and nonwhite women, then offer a conception of national identity that undergirds the gender argument, before presenting a historical case. I focus on the mainstream of the suffrage movement and the leaders of its core organizations: the trend within the movement that was most successful in achieving the explicit political goals of suffrage.¹

Kathy Peiss and the editors and anonymous reviewers at *Signs* read drafts of this article and offered many useful comments. I wish to thank Mira Geffner, Caleb Southworth, and Susan Thistle. Suzanne Model's guidance and suggestions were invaluable. Judy Ruttenberg contributed vitally to the research and writing at all stages. I am grateful to those who helped me complete this project.

¹ Network analysis by Rosenthal et al. 1985 puts the women's rights and suffrage movements at the center of the larger network of women's reform movements from the mid-nineteenth century to World War I. Individuals and organizations with different

[Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 1996, vol. 21, no. 3]
© 1996 by The University of Chicago. All rights reserved. 0097-9740/96/2103-0006\$01.00

Although some historical accounts of the suffrage movement have acknowledged its "racist" aspects, there has been a tendency to explain these practices in ways that diminish the agency of the women who made the movement. If it is paternalist to attribute women's positive accomplishments to male influences, it is no less problematic to describe their faults as the result of such influence. William O'Neill (1971) criticized leading suffragists for their racist politics, but he argued it was their "emotional" rather than their "analytical" side that led them to "become so carried away by momentary passions" (75). Angela Davis (1981) exposed pervasive racism among suffrage leaders, but she saw it as a product of the ideological hegemony of capitalist- and planter-class white men. When leaders such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton made racist statements. they demonstrated, in Davis's words, "how defenseless they remained . . . to the pernicious ideological influence of racism" (76). Davis thus advanced a complicated story of white women's abolition and suffrage efforts, even as she reduced oppressors to rich white men, aided by a network of "naive" accomplices. Similarly, Nancy Cott argues the movement "caved in to the racism of the surrounding society" (1987, 68) rather than created racism itself.

In challenging "additive" models of "race" and gender relationships. Deborah King (1988) and Evelyn Nakano Glenn (1992) preserve the gender subordination of white women while implicating them more directly in "race" and class hierarchies. These descriptions avoid the paternalist tendencies apparent in previous work and attribute a greater measure of agency to white women. Aida Hurtado (1989) concurs, arguing that whereas nonwhite women are "rejected" by white men, "white women are persuaded to become the partners of white men and are seduced into accepting a subservient role that meets the material needs of white men" (845). The term seduction involves some degree of consent but implies white women do not instigate their complicity in white supremacy. A similar debate has taken place within histories of whiteness that focus primarily on men, where David Roediger (1991) and Alexander Saxton (1990) both make powerful cases for the agency of white workers and the white public in general in the construction of racism and racial ideology in the nineteenth century.

Feminists often have assumed that, by dividing women, white women's racism undermines their own interests and serves white men. Yet the leaders of the white women's suffrage movement were often quite explicit in their opposition to nonwhite (or foreign-born) women and men. Theirs was less an error in feminist analysis than a political strategy reflecting

perspectives and approaches—only some of which will be mentioned here—help define this core more than they challenge its usefulness as a unit of analysis.

and creating real privilege. The movement they led contributed to the subordination of nonwhite women and men by helping to solidify a system of domination by whites.

Roediger argues that the nineteenth-century white working class's attachment to whiteness hurt its long-term interests through "the wedding of labor to a debased republicanism" (1991, 55). Saxton, however, concludes that "racism sometimes worked to the advantage of the lower classes [of whites]," but that "does not mean that it ceased to work for upper classes" (1990, 388). White women suffrage leaders likewise benefited from their whites-only nationalism, even though they also helped strengthen male domination. Roediger (1991, 8) describes the creation of working-class and white identities as going "hand in hand" for U.S. white workers in the nineteenth century. White suffrage leaders similarly fostered an identity of "woman" that served their needs as opposed to the needs of nonwhite women (Mink 1990).² The alliance pursued by the suffragists between white women and men advanced the cause of suffrage, even as their strategy undermined a more egalitarian feminist vision.

White national identity

Historians treating "racial" or "racist" ideology have explained important aspects of dominant white politics and culture.³ But these histories also reveal that nonwhites were just as much excluded from the (political) nation as they were from the (ideological) race. George Frederickson (1971, 135) describes the nineteenth-century "rise of a new sense of American nationalism," with the "tendency to identify race and nationality." Reginald Horsman (1981) documents the ideological conversion of several "races," based on European nations, into a single American "race" and nation.⁴ Nineteenth-century language confusingly mixed the

² The promotion of *woman* as a symbol of the nation in Europe represented a form of social control by imposing a standard type; conforming to that standard served the interests of the nation, deviating undermined it (Mosse 1985, chap. 5). European and American women's movements in the latter part of the nineteenth century used that image to bolster their claim to serve the common good and distinguish between higher and lower orders of women.

³ Frederickson 1971; Horsman 1981; Fields 1982; Saxton 1990; Roediger 1991. Although many social scientists identify race as a social construction, too many continue to use "race" as an unchallenged descriptive term. To avoid this reification, I place quotation marks around the term and use it only when referring to others' applications. I similarly capitalize *Black* to signify its reference to a people rather than a color or a "race."

⁴ Consider the language of an 1862 House committee report: "The highest interests of the white race, whether Anglo-Saxon, Celt, or Scandinavian, require that the whole country should be held and occupied by these races alone.... The Anglo-American looks upon every acre of our present domain as intended for him and not for the negro" (Frederickson 1971, 146). Here, there are several "races" that are "white," even though there is

concepts of nation and race, but the concrete political struggles that this process comprised often took place on nationalist terrain—these are the questions of citizenship, suffrage, land conquests and wars, and the nature of republicanism. In the case of the suffrage movement in particular, the explicit object of struggle—voting, a central aspect of citizenship—seems logically connected to aspirations of nation.⁵

Like "race," considerable attention has been devoted to the ideological construction of nations (see, e.g., Hobsbawm 1990; Anderson 1991), but the ideology of a nation cannot take hold without a grounding in some combination of "objective" elements, such as land, language, economic bonds, and so on (Hroch 1993). If it is a cultural, political, or ideological project that trumpets the birth of a nationalist movement, it is nonetheless some objectively existing group of people who *make and are made* by such a project. The making of the nation and national identity spurs political struggles over who will vote, who will be a citizen, who and what will be conquered, and so on. Using nation as an analytic tool helps us understand these struggles.

From its inception, America was de jure or de facto a white nation, despite the proximity of millions of noncitizens. This nation, like any other, was permeable and flexible over time. Legally, with the formation of the United States certain of its white male citizens declared themselves a nation, inasmuch as membership in a nation may be formally achieved through citizenship. Besides nonwhites, white women and (in most states) propertyless white men were excluded from this formal membership at first. But from very early on, white women were granted marginal memberships in the nation, through their roles as mothers of the republic (Cott 1977, 199; Bloch 1978, 1987; Mink 1990, 97). The women's rights movement in the early nineteenth century challenged this marginalized inclusion and sought a formal political basis for participation (DuBois 1987).

Historians of American "race" and whiteness have touched on nation-

one "white race," and a group—presumably a nation—that is "Anglo-American." Ruth Frankenberg (1993, 1) defines whiteness as "a location of structural advantage," a "standpoint" or perspective, and "a set of cultural practices." By that point, however, maintaining the term race does more to confuse than to explain.

⁵ In 1910, Rheta Childe Dorr wrote that "although every one knows that women own property, pay taxes, successfully manage their own business affairs, and do an astonishing amount of community work as well, no one ever thinks of them as citizens" ([1910] 1971, 290).

⁶ Roediger 1991 and Saxton 1990 offer examples of restrictions to nonwhite citizenship that accompanied the extension of universal suffrage to white males. Frederickson (1971, 91), writes, "This conjuncture of Northern white egalitarianism and Negro proscription was more than rhetoric," as New York and Pennsylvania simultaneously extended white suffrage and restricted (or denied) Black suffrage in the early nineteenth century.

alism, especially as they have focused on how whiteness was embedded within concepts of citizenship, republicanism, patriotism, and nationality. Roediger (1991) cites a series of anti-Black attacks by white workers around patriotic events such as Independence Day rallies (e.g., Philadelphia in 1805 [35], and Columbia, Pennsylvania, in 1834 [58]). "That Blacks were largely noncitizens will surprise few," he writes, "but it is important to emphasize the extent to which they were seen as anticitizens" (57). Roediger's "racial" battles often are fought over questions of national identity. For example, as Irish-American workers "came to insist on their own whiteness and on white supremacy," they used a pamphlet that offered as evidence their loyalty as "CITIZENS of this great and glorious republic"—the equivalent to whiteness (136-37). Roediger and Saxton both draw from Pierre van den Berghe's (1978, 18) concept of herrenvolk democracy, for a regime that is "democratic for the master race but tyrannical for the subordinate groups," but Saxton extends this concept to describe that dominant group as keeper of the national identity. Saxton traces a continuum of thought from Jacksonian democracy, through the Free Soil movement, to Progressivism and Woodrow Wilson, that "defining nationality in terms of race, . . . extrudes, or marginalizes, racial minorities found inside national boundaries" (1990, 344).8 In this account, nineteenth-century egalitarianism for whites-in all but the most radical circles—is preconditioned on exclusive national identity and in opposition to nonwhites. In writing histories of racial ideology (largely neglecting women), these scholars have documented how whites of all classes used such ideology to restrict membership in the nation—formally through denying citizenship, informally through mob violence or cultural domination.9

National consciousness thrives when subordinate groups can incorporate their class and gender identities into a national framework. Class and gender identities always threaten to cross national boundaries, and often do. Thus, gender alliances—subordinating gender conflict within a national effort—are necessary to co-opt into the national movement those gender struggles that might otherwise undermine national unity. When Stanton staked her claim for formal citizenship in opposition to Black suffrage, she did so by pledging her allegiance to white American men, and in strong nationalist language: "I protest against the enfranchisement of another man of any race or clime until the daughters of Jefferson, Han-

⁷ Translations of Volk itself often include people, nation, and race.

⁸ DuBois 1987 traces the intellectual roots of nineteenth-century women's rights to Jacksonian Frances Wright and establishes a later connection to the Free Soil movement. Links to Wilson are discussed below.

⁹ "Is not America for the Whites?" asked Walt Whitman. "And is it not better so?" (Saxton 1990, 154).

cock, and Adams are crowned with their rights." 10 Carrie Chapman Catt's approach was similar to Stanton's. As Catt requested recognition for contributions to the nation, she used a language that at once glorified the national past and made the white woman its quintessential woman, in opposition to all nonwhites:

We appeal [for suffrage] in the name of our foremothers who, side by side with our forefathers, and with equal courage, faced death on the ocean, and death in the wilderness, to carve new homes for the oppressed of the old world; in the name of those women who unmurmuringly bore the hardships of colonial life, who kept their high courage despite the wild beast and the savage lurking ever near their door, and planted the noble American ideal deep in the hearts of their children; in the name of those women of revolutionary days who kept the fire of freedom burning in their breasts, who fed, clothed, nursed, and inspired the men who won liberty for our country.11

From equality to essentialism

The white women's suffrage movement underwent a shift in its core logic after the 1860s.¹² Women's rights emerged from white women's work in abolitionism, where the principles of natural and equal rights spurred a rejection of women's political marginalization.¹³ Under this influence, women's rights activists collected signatures for the Thirteenth Amendment to abolish chattel slavery. Their Enlightenment language stressed the inherent equality of men and women and challenged the prevailing idea of separate gender spheres (DuBois 1987; Landsman 1992,

¹⁰ Elizabeth Cady Stanton to F. P. Blair, October 1, 1868, Stanton Papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress. For the Blairs, a prominent antislavery family who proposed the colonization of African slaves, "the mere presence of the Negro constituted a threat to American nationality" (Frederickson 1971, 148-49). For the role of the Blairs and colonization plans in antislavery politics, see Foner 1970, 267-80. To describe Stanton's comment as "racial" (Hurtado 1989, 840) is to impose a contemporary ideological view. Nations were racialized before "races" were widely considered multinational. Horsman (1981) gives examples of the racialization of national identity. In contrast to Stanton, Angelina Grimké, as an abolitionist, had explicitly tried to put Black women in the American nation: "They are our country women—they are our sisters" (Lerner 1967, 161). Grimké's argument, which appeared early (and in opposition to the marginalization of women through separate spheres), was rare by the late nineteenth century.

 [&]quot;An Appeal for Liberty," 1915, Catt Papers, Library of Congress.
 See Kraditor 1965, 1968; Cott 1987; DuBois 1987; Buechler 1987, 1990; and Landsman 1992.

¹³ Cott 1977 and Bloch 1987 describe the development of separate spheres ideology within American republicanism and suggest that the early women's rights movement developed out of, and away from, that conception.

254). Sarah Grimké wrote in 1838: "I ask no favors for my sex. I surrender not to our claim to equality" ([1838] 1970, 10). 14 The 1848 Seneca Falls declaration was modeled after the Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal" (Buhle and Buhle 1978, 94–98). These were the operative principles behind the initial demand for women's suffrage.

This conception, "based on a premise of sameness," lost its hegemony within the suffrage movement after the late 1860s, and by the end of the 1880s it was "displaced by an ideology stressing women's distinctive nature and special role in social reform based on a premise of difference," later known as "essentialism" (Buechler 1990, 97). The latter tendency was typified by such statements as, "It is woman's womanhood, her instinctive femininity, her highest morality that society now needs to counter-act the excess of masculinity that is everywhere to be found in our unjust and unequal laws" (Cott 1987, 19). The two trends, which Aileen Kraditor (1965, 1968) termed justice and expediency, propelled two different approaches to citizenship and the relationship between white women and nonwhites. Natural rights or "justice" identified more closely with abolitionism and more frequently included nonwhite women. whereas essentialism and "expediency" sacrificed any principle (most emphatically, citizenship for former slaves) to attain the vote for white women. 15 With suffragists now arguing that "the reason women should vote was not that they were the same as men but that they were different," DuBois writes, "that made for a rather thorough reversal of classic women's rights premises" (1987, 848).16

The shift toward difference feminism and expediency emerged in debates that pitted women's and Blacks' voting rights against each other, culminating in the Kansas Campaign of 1867, which "shattered...abolitionist feminism" and ended with the failure of both measures (DuBois 1978, 80). The Fourteenth Amendment (which granted explicit rights to

¹⁵ Although abolitionism and early white suffragism relied on some common principles, which allowed them to influence each other, the movements were never fully united. A desire to maintain some distance between the movements was apparent among leading suffragists by 1848, as the Seneca Falls statement did not call for the end of slavery.

¹⁶ That shift was acknowledged symbolically when prominent women's rights leaders left the American Equal Rights Association and formed the National Woman Suffrage Association. Although the new approach was difference based, it was not a simple return to separate spheres, because it called for women's political inclusion (Cott 1977; DuBois 1987).

¹⁴ Grimké also urged women to reject gender difference as a basis for respect: "'Her influence is the source of mighty power.' This has ever been the flattering language of man since he laid aside the whip as a means to keep woman in subjection. . . . Alas! she has too well learned the lesson which MAN has labored to teach her. She has surrendered her dearest RIGHTS, and been satisfied with the privileges which man has assumed to grant her" ([1838] 1970, 17).

Black men in the face of white women's demands) and related debates had dealt crucial blows to the natural rights perspective in the women's movement. Stanton, who had planned for white women to follow Black men through the newly opened "constitutional door," denounced the Fourteenth Amendment as a "desecration." In the fallout from this defeat, the tactical nature of the alliance between abolitionism and suffragism was revealed. In "reaction to the strategic antagonism between black suffrage and woman suffrage," DuBois writes, "the new suffrage arguments . . . contained a strong theme of race antagonism" (1987, 845–49; Landsman 1992, 257).¹⁷

Steven Buechler (1987) exhibits the changes in the suffrage movement by following the career of Elizabeth Boynton Harbert, a leader during the period of transition from equality- to difference-based arguments. After the shift, in suffrage polemics "the beneficiary of female suffrage was less often construed as women themselves and more often couched in abstract terms like society, the nation, the race, and civilization" (90). But Stanton anticipated by some twenty years the change from demanding suffrage for the benefit of women to offering women's vote in service to white America. In the handwritten text of an 1867 speech before a New York State Senate committee, Stanton wrote, "I for one, gentlemen, am not willing to be thus represented [by all men]. I claim to understand the interests of woman"—and then she crossed out "woman" and inserted "the nation" in its place. Her voting rights would serve not the narrow interests of "woman" but the urgent needs of the nation as a whole. From her statement that women's votes represented "loyalty, virtue, wealth, and education," all of which were needed "to outweigh the incoming tide of poverty, ignorance, and vice that threatens our very existence as a nation," a white, native-born definition of "woman" may be inferred. 18

With Black men allowed to vote, Stanton argued that "a man's government is worse than a white man's government" and complained that the

¹⁸ Speech before the Judiciary Committee of the New York Senate, May 1867, Stanton Papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress.

¹⁷ Stanton's view of slavery apparently changed in this period as well. In 1856 Stanton had argued that woman's "bondage, though it differs from that of the negro slave, frets and chafes her just the same. She too sighs and groans in her chains and lives but in the hope of better things to come" (Elizabeth Cady Stanton to Lucy Stone, November 24, 1856, Stanton Papers, Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress). This sympathetic comparison differed sharply from her casual dismissal in 1870, when writing of the tribulations of women seeking divorce: "Verily, slavery is nothing to these unclean marriages" (Elizabeth Cady Stanton to Mrs. Griffing, December 1, 1870, ibid.). Sarah Grimké, unlike later suffragists, chose to identify openly with slaves, and not just when it suited her. "Woman has been placed by John Quincy Adams, side by side with the slave. . . . I thank him for ranking us with the oppressed" ([1838] 1970, 12). Compare this to the imaginative reading by Davis (1981, 33), who quotes white women workers saying, "I will not be a slave," and sees this as evidence that they perceived a common bond with slaves. See Roediger 1991, 68, on this important distinction.

Fourteenth Amendment elevated the "lowest orders of manhood" over the "highest classes of women." Susan B. Anthony concurred, arguing that "if intelligence, justice, and morality are to have precedence in the Government, let the question of woman be brought up first and that of the negro last" (Buhle and Buhle 1978, 259). Eventually, Anthony would tell steadfast ally Frederick Douglass, the only man to speak in favor of women's suffrage at the 1848 Seneca Falls convention, that expedience meant he could not come to the first southern National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) convention (Giddings 1984).

The movement's new approach took some twenty years to become firmly entrenched, during which time there was an almost complete turnover of organizations and activists (Rosenthal et al. 1985). However, to the extent that the Fourteenth Amendment and the conflict with Black suffrage provoked the shift from natural rights to essentialism, a crucial influence in the development of white feminism in theory and practice was the development of relations between Blacks and whites, as opposed to relations between men and women. Subordinated groups frequently alter their political strategies to meet changing political and cultural conditions, but the change from identity to difference represented a fundamental rewriting of the leading white feminists' basic philosophy. Stanton, who had militantly refused to argue the advantages of difference, now said "difference in man and woman" was the strongest argument for women's suffrage. She wrote in 1869, "What we need to-day in government, in the world of mortals and thought, is the recognition of the feminine element, as it is this alone that can hold the masculine in check" (DuBois 1987, 849).19

At the extreme, the NAWSA eventually called for greater restriction of Black suffrage. This two-sided shift—away from bourgeois notions of inherent natural rights for women and against Black rights—is central to the point of this project. Because rather than *merely* excluding Black women from the movement, white women's suffrage organizations pursued a nationalist gender alliance. Put simply, when pressed, they sought unity with white men—their nation—in opposition to nonwhite women and men. A Kentucky suffrage leader's 1906 comment is illustrative: "In the campaign in South Carolina we . . . never hesitated to show that the white women's vote would give supremacy to the White race" (Giddings 1984, 126). In this respect the women's suffrage movement after the Four-

¹⁹ Stanton's personal conversion to essentialism was apparently tactical, as she returned to natural rights later in life, speaking of "natural rights" and "self-sovereignty" and referring to women's roles as mother and wife as only "incidental relations" in her "Solitude of Self" speech before the U.S. Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage in 1892 (Buhle and Buhle 1978, 325–27). Landsman finds both equality and difference arguments in Stanton's 1891 speech on Native Americans (1992, 267).

teenth Amendment fits within the historical pattern of white republican egalitarianism paired with exclusion of nonwhites from the national family and polity (Saxton 1990; Roediger 1991). Stanton placed the movement within this tradition when she referred to white women as "women of the republic" in 1866 (Giddings 1984, 67).

Paula Giddings (1984) argues that the political utility of natural rights diminished in light of the post-Reconstruction trend toward restricting Black voting rights. This shift in the political debate created a space in which white women sought to justify who should have the vote and why. rather than agitate for truly universal suffrage. At the same time, DuBois (1987, 849) argues that the Fifteenth Amendment's "transfer of control over the right of suffrage from the state to the national level" brought a "decidedly nationalist edge" to the difference arguments, as suffragists sought to make their case one of national importance. "Enfranchising the freedmen only promised partisan [Republican] advantage; enfranchising 'woman' would uplift the nation at its very heart, the family" (849). Uplifting the nation meant not only restoring its mythical moral fiber but also extending control over Blacks, civilizing Native-American nations and the people of America's new colonies abroad, and stopping the spread of immigrant immorality. In this way, the trend toward essentialist feminism, expediency with regard to women's suffrage, and more deliberate nationalism shaped the white women's movement as a force for nation building. No national domination could be complete or ultimately successful, white suffragists argued, without the voting citizenship of white women.

Buechler considers it "paradoxical" that, by the late nineteenth century, suffrage movement arguments "reinforced rather than challenged dominant notions about sex and gender" (1990, 89–92). But reinforcing some aspects of dominant gender relationships at that moment served the interests of the very specific women who led the suffrage movement. Essentialist feminism established women's role as one of complementary partnership with white men, rather than one of antagonistic conflict associated with the "rights" of such anticitizens as Black former slaves. The ideology of separate spheres in the long run may have undermined struggles for gender equality, but the strategy was undeniably useful to the women who pursued it.

Suffrage for nation building

The previous section explored how nationalism altered leading white feminists' approach as they internalized the political imperatives of the moment. In order to convince the ruling white men to vote for suffrage, suffrage leaders had to make the case that women's votes were crucial to the nation they served. At the end of the nineteenth century and the beginning of the twentieth, the issue of national formation and identity was high on the "American" agenda. Chinese workers in the West, free Blacks, and European immigrants all posed threats to the hegemonic (white) national identity—leading to prolonged battles over whiteness, citizenship, voting, and equal rights. For whites, economic crises and explosive labor struggles appeared as warning signs of potential things to come. However, the conquering of the frontier and the outward expansion heralded by the Spanish-American War offered new possibilities; the American identity was developing an explicitly imperialist character. These developments were neither immune to the effects of white women's movements nor peripheral to the nature of those movements.

Whether the task was "civilizing" Native Americans or outweighing the votes of Blacks, immigrants, and the illiterate, the suffragists' vehicle for national salvation and development was white American womanhood. In 1889 Olympia Brown told an NAWSA convention that although native-born Americans in Wisconsin outnumbered foreign-born citizens by two to one, more foreign-born than native-born men voted. What choice did America have but to give its women the vote? she asked. "Is that fair to Americans? Is it just to American men? Will they not, under this influence, in a little while be driven to the wall and obliged to step down and out? . . . The votes of women will eventually be the only means of overcoming this foreign influence and maintaining our free institutions. There is no possible safety for our free school, our free church or our republican government, unless women are given the suffrage and that right speedily" (Kraditor 1968, 258). Brown's emphasis on the needs of American men—rather than the rights of women—reflects the new approach of offering women's votes to help white men save the nation. By 1893 the NAWSA convention unanimously adopted a resolution that noted that literate women outnumbered all illiterates and that white American women outnumbered all Black as well as all foreign-born voters, so that "the enfranchisement of such women would settle the vexed question of rule by illiteracy, whether of home-grown or foreign-born production" (Kraditor 1968, 260). Suffragists were engaged in both building the nation and exerting their position as women within it, albeit in a supporting role. Their argument combined the two projects, so that neither would appear possible alone.

World's fairs provided suffrage leaders with an opportunity to assert the connection between women's suffrage and national progress. Robert Rydell's (1984) description of the international expositions held in the

²⁰ Theodore Roosevelt (1889), e.g., saw territorial expansion as pivotal to the ascendance of the new white American race.

United States from 1876 to 1916 illustrates the propagation of the new American national identity. The fairs forged industrialism, imperialist expansion, and racial evolutionism into colossal spectacles of national purpose. In forty years, Rydell estimates almost one hundred million people attended the fairs throughout the United States. White women's suffrage contributed eagerly to the fairs, hoping to bask in the glow of national celebration.

Of the 1893 Chicago World's Columbian Exposition, Rydell writes, "If, to white Americans, the fair was a reaffirmation of the nation's unity, self-confidence, and triumphant progress, . . . its impact on American blacks was quite different" (1984, 52). Whereas the white women's suffrage movement used the fair to great advantage, there were no Black representatives in positions of any authority in the planning or governance of the fair, including the Board of Lady Managers. Only by virtue of his position as minister to Haiti did Frederick Douglass succeed in landing a spot in the fair, from which he and Ida B. Wells distributed a highly critical pamphlet. When the white fair organizers announced a "Jubilee" or "Colored People's Day," all but one thousand Black people stayed away (53). Illinois suffrage leaders, joined by Lucy Stone and Susan B. Anthony, had no trouble "provid[ing] important publicity to the cause of suffrage" at the Chicago fair (Buechler 1986, 150). Their weeklong World's Congress of Representative Women drew 150,000 people.

In the West, Eva Marie Dye, chairman of the Oregon Equal Suffrage Association (and author of the 1902 novel, The True Story of Lewis and Clark), served as president of the Sacajawea Statue Association of the Woman's Club of Portland. The organization spent \$7,000 to build a statue of Sacajawea, the legendary guide of the Lewis and Clark expedition, which would be dedicated at the 1905 Lewis and Clark Centennial Exposition in Portland, the year before an Oregon vote on suffrage (Landsman 1992, 271). Movement women worked tenaciously to exert the legitimacy of their claim to the mantle of the nation at the exposition's exalting of empire and conquest.21 The NAWSA held a national convention at the Portland fair, where Dye dedicated the statue, praising Sacajawea for "revealing the secrets of [her] country and giving its trade and resources to the whites, opening the way to a higher civilization. . . . Not until women came could America take any secure hold in Oregon, and this great Pacific empire. . . . Not until mothers came was the true seed of a nation planted.... This memorial... is typical not only of the human

²¹ The fair featured the period's ever-popular Filipino village display, as well as a happy Old Plantation exhibit, an Eskimo village, and blackface minstrel shows. Certified as educational by the Smithsonian, the spectacle carried the important stamp of scientific legitimacy and together with the Seattle fair drew more than four million people. One woman wrote in her diary: "We saw the dog-eaters, and had lots of fun" (Rydell 1984, 193–97).

appreciation of Sacajawea herself, but of all women, and all mothers, who, with the infant race in their arms, still lead on" (Landsman 1992, 273).²²

Suzanne Marilley (1989, 24–29) argues that, to succeed, suffragists needed to "adapt goals for social change to the reform options available in the American political system" and "put the reforms in appealing packages." This was only possible when, after the contentious 1870s and 1880s, the movement "agreed to disagree about all issues besides suffrage; they made the vote their single issue." The single-issue approach was an important element of the expediency strategy, as it allowed "the formation of a coalition that included prohibitionists, racists, anti–child labor reformers, Republicans, and Democrats but left the suffragists in control." Without such a coalition, which helped win the support of such states as Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee, the Nineteenth Amendment "probably would not have been ratified" (33–34).

Anthony led the white suffrage movement away from any alliance with Black demands, although the option of (re)uniting the two was presented repeatedly by Black activists. At an 1899 NAWSA convention, Anthony successfully condemned a resolution, introduced by a Black delegate, against segregated seating for Black women on trains, declaring, "We women are a helpless disenfranchised class. . . . Our hands are tied. While we are in this condition it is not for us to go passing resolutions against railroad corporations or anybody else" (Giddings 1984, 127).²³

For King, the single-issue approach itself inevitably excludes Black women, who, by the nature of their "multiple jeopardy" oppression, require "multiple consciousness" in their political organizing (1988, 51–52). Many Black women struggled for Black men's suffrage and contributed to the women's suffrage movement as well, despite the latter's exclusive approach. Giddings argues that "the most encompassing issue for black women in the postwar years was the suffrage campaign" (1984, 159–60). W. E. B. Du Bois, who campaigned extensively for women's suffrage, wrote, "The Negro race has suffered more from the antipathy and narrowness of women both North and South than from any other single source" (128). As editor of *Crisis*, published by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), Du Bois argued for

²² Note that "all women" here obviously does not include women of the "infant race." ²³ This event was but one instance in Anthony's campaign to keep, in Giddings's words, "woman suffrage and the Black question . . . completely separate causes" (1984, 127–28). The NAWSA leadership feared the defection of white southern women from crucial state campaigns. Alice Paul joined Anthony in quieting white fears of women's suffrage in the South, telling the *New York World* in 1919 that "Negro men cannot vote in South Carolina and therefore negro women would not if women were to vote in the nation. We are organizing white women in the South, but have heard of no activity or anxiety among the negresses" (Giddings 1984, 159–60).

women's suffrage and against racism in the women's movement. Although he helped spur Black women to the cause of suffrage, he achieved little in his efforts to rekindle the alliance of the abolition period (Yellin 1973; Aptheker 1975).²⁴ White activists' co-optation of the universal term woman for white American women, or "women of the republic," forced women from subordinate groups to use more selective terms. Mary Church Terrell said the name National Association of Colored Women was used "not because we are narrow, and wish to lay special emphasis on the color of the skin . . . but . . . because our peculiar status in this country . . . seems to demand that we stand by ourselves in the special work for which we have been organized" (Harley 1988, 315).

The tension between Black and white women around the suffrage struggle came to a head in 1913, when NAWSA and the Congressional Union, led by Alice Paul, held a march in Washington, the day before Woodrow Wilson's inauguration (Giddings 1984, 127; Canady 1985; Lunardini 1986, 27). Black women from Howard University and Chicago asked to take part, over the objections of some white women, who threatened a boycott. Instead of banning the Black women, as some urged her to do, the ever-expedient Paul instead dictated that they should march within the men's contingent, thus appeasing those white women who apparently did not consider Black women to be women at all.²⁵

Not only Black women challenged the mainstream movement. Dissent against core suffrage leaders' hegemony was most clearly heard from organizations and activists outside of the main suffrage organizations. For example, although many socialist and immigrant women had obvious disagreements with the mainstream organizations, they did contribute to the broader effort to win women's suffrage. Many socialist women "could not accept a casual relationship" with "a woman suffrage movement so patently at odds with the immigrant masses" (Buhle 1981, 216). Interestingly, however, socialist women reached out to new immigrant women with a call to "become Americans" through their struggle (298). One observer wrote of the 1917 New York referendum, which drew the active support of some immigrant and wage-earning women: "Though indeed the women's place is in the home, in our neighborhood it is also largely in the factory, workshop, the store and office" (Ewen 1985, 260). Those supporters who occupied positions away from the core of the suffrage movement had to find ways to reconcile with their own needs the leadership's essentialism and exclusive nationalism.26

²⁴ Du Bois's editorials in Crisis are reprinted in Aptheker 1983.

²⁵ This was not a unique occurrence, or limited to the NWP. O'Neill notes that "Negro women were usually segregated in [NAWSA] suffrage parades, and they were discouraged from joining the association" (1971, 71).

²⁶ This also reflects the middle- and upper-class domination of the white women's movement. Saxton's (1990) political history explains the role of class collaboration under the banner of white egalitarianism.

National war, national suffrage

After decades of struggle to establish the importance of white feminine character to republicanism and the national identity, the white women's suffrage movement moved on to its last great battle, the surge to success during World War I. Congress passed the Nineteenth Amendment as an emergency war measure. President Wilson declared to the Senate on September 30, 1918, that women's suffrage was "vitally essential to the successful prosecution of the great war of humanity in which we are engaged" (Congressional Record 1918, 10928). "We have made partners of the women in this war," he added. "Shall we admit them only to a partnership of sacrifice and suffering and toll and not to a partnership of privilege and of right? This war could not have been fought, either by the other nations engaged or by America, if it had not been for the services of the women" (10929). Further, Wilson argued, "We shall need then a vision of affairs which is theirs, and, as we have never needed them before, the sympathy and insight and clear moral instinct of the women of the world" (10929).27 Wilson's language—which typifies prosuffrage male politicians—reflects the extent to which suffragists were successful in advocating white women's political inclusion on the basis of essentialism and an alliance with white men, in service to the nation.

Such male advocacy followed a concerted effort by suffragists to prove their worth during the war. In New York, for example, where a suffrage referendum lost in 1915, the state organization launched a massive warsupport effort. They coordinated women volunteers, sold bonds, raised money for relief, ran "knitting teams" to make clothes for the Red Cross, tended war gardens, and offered canning demonstrations. At the same time, they collected more than a million signatures for suffrage—and won the referendum in 1917 (Catt and Shuler 1923, 294–95).²⁸

In a speech titled "Women Suffrage Now Will Stimulate Patriotism," prepared during World War I, NAWSA president Carrie Chapman Catt made it clear that despite their devoted service, suffragists had grievances, especially exclusion from "the people"—a reference to the nation's founding documents: "Negroes, Indians, Chinese born in this country, aliens without citizenship, or aliens in spirit though naturalized, compose a very considerable part of 'the people' to whom women born, bred and educated in America are forced to plead for their enfranchisement. . . . No woman who has carried her plea to such as these has failed to feel

²⁷ Although Wilson speaks here of women in universal terms, in the context of the congressional debate (below), a whites-only definition of women may again be inferred.

²⁸ Catt said that "every suffrage association in the country gave of its best to service at home and abroad through the war" ("Women Voters at a Crossroads," 1919, Catt Papers, Library of Congress). Scott 1990 cites suffragists' devotion of time and resources to the national war effort as one influence on male voters who had ridiculed suffrage in 1913 in Houston, Texas; they endorsed it in a majority vote in 1919.

the smart of the insult her government visits upon her when it enfranchised them and disenfranchised her." 29

Catt and the NAWSA missed no opportunity to remind national leaders of the importance of their war efforts. The day before Wilson was to address the Senate, Catt wrote to him. "Our country is asking its women to give their all, and upon their voluntary and free offering may depend the outcome of the war," she wrote. "If the Amendment fails, it will take the heart out of thousands of women" and undermine their faith in the war itself.³⁰ Beyond securing the loyalty of "women" to the war effort, Catt argued, suffrage would strengthen the allies, weaken Germany, and shore up America's world leadership. "The world expects America to be true to her ideals, to live up to the war aims she has set for herself." 31

The National Woman's Party (NWP) and the NAWSA formally disagreed over (among other issues) the role of the suffrage movement in the war effort. While the NAWSA openly supported the war, the NWP was officially neutral. But both organizations stressed that their efforts were only intended to strengthen the nation as it surged to world prominence. So, more important than whether or not to support the war was the question of suffrage militancy during the war. In March 1917 the NWP announced it would not suspend its efforts for suffrage during the war, but in maintaining militancy it remained "unalterably convinced that in so doing the organization serves the highest interests of the country" (Lunardini 1986, 111).32

While the NWP was picketing the White House (Nutt 1983-84), NAWSA leaders Catt and Anna Howard Shaw accepted positions on President Wilson's Women's Committee of the Council on National Defense (Lunardini 1986). The tension between the NAWSA's promise of responsible women contributing to national politics and the NWP's embarrassment to the democratic-minded president and Congress proved complementary.³³ At the same time, the growing presence of younger radical feminists (Cott 1987) and agitation by antiwar activists allowed mainstream leaders to claim more successfully the center, as Catt did in 1918,

²⁹ "Women Suffrage Now Will Stimulate Patriotism," undated, Catt Papers, Library of Congress. Notice that "Negroes, Indians, [and] Chinese" (including of course women) may have been "born in this country"—but they were not to be confused with the white women who concerned Catt, i.e., those "born, bred and educated in America." She also clearly overstates the voting power of Black, Chinese, and American Indian men, the great majority of whom were disenfranchised at this point.

 ³⁰ Letter to Wilson, September 29, 1918, NAWSA Papers, Library of Congress.
 31 "Woman Suffrage as a War Measure," 1918, Catt Papers, Library of Congress.
 32 A number of Black organizations, including the NAACP, supported the war effort at least in part to prove they deserved membership in the nation. Crisis editor Du Bois declared: "If this is OUR country, then this is OUR war" (Aptheker 1983, 160-61). Du Bois's if-then construction is significant here. Debates over World War I among Black activists are treated in Anderson 1973.

³³ Criticizing the women picketing outside the White House, Wilson wrote to Catt: "Their action represents, I am sure, so small a fraction of the women of the country who

calling the NAWSA a "bourgeois movement with nothing radical about it, . . . representative of the most coherent, tightest-welded, farthest reaching section of society—the middle" (Buhle 1981, 236).³⁴ The presence of this radicalism made suffrage itself appear one of the more palatable options for establishment politicians.

Mainstream suffragists had proffered two persuasive political arguments in favor of their inclusion as citizens of the republic and political members of the nation. First, white women's support for the war proved that in practice they were patriotic Americans before they were women looking to enhance their own interests. Second, denial of the vote would prove an international embarrassment for the democratic-minded president. Debate on the House floor on January 10, 1918, demonstrated the penetration of suffrage arguments into the white male political discourse. "No one thing connected with the war is of more importance at this time than meeting the reasonable demand of millions of patriotic and Christian women of the Nation that the amendment for woman suffrage be submitted to the states," declared Representative James Cantrill. And, he added, "Right, justice, liberty and democracy have always been, and will always be, safe in the tender care of American womanhood" (Congressional Record 1918, 764-66). With regard to the war effort, Representative M. Clyde Kelly echoed, "Every call sent out by the Nation to the women has been answered with enthusiastic devotion" (769). These men were not motivated by women's rights or women's interests but, rather, by the benefits to the nation that would come from white women's enfranchisement.

The greatest threat to the amendment came from southern congressmen who opposed a constitutional mandate on any voting qualifications for fear of increasing Black suffrage. But women's suffrage supporters were quick to point out, repeatedly, that the amendment would not have the effect of decreasing white power in the South. Montana representative Jeannette Rankin, the only woman in Congress, admonished, "Gentlemen representing the South . . . the women of the South have stood by you through every trial. They have backed you in every struggle, and they gave themselves and all they held most dear for the cause [the Confederacy] for which their men laid down their lives. Now they are asking to help you again in a big, broad, national way. Are you going to deny them the equipment with which to help you effectively simply because the enfranchisement of a child-race 50 years ago brought you a problem you

³⁴ The NAWSA publicly distanced itself from the socialists despite the latter's open support for women's suffrage, whereas some in the smaller and less powerful NWP were more supportive of the socialists (Buhle 1981, 237–38).

are urging the adoption of woman suffrage that it would be most unfair and argue a narrow view to allow their actions to prejudice the cause itself" (Woodrow Wilson to Carrie Chapman Catt, October 13, 1917, Catt Papers, Library of Congress).

were powerless to handle?" (Congressional Record 1918, 771; emphasis added).

If reluctant congressmen would only believe in the contribution of white women that was waiting to be made, suffrage advocates explained. the political math was irresistible. "There are more white women of voting age in the South to-day than there are negro men and women together," Rankin said. Representative Scott Ferris assured them that poll taxes and literacy tests would remain untouched, so that "for every negro woman so enfranchised there will be hundreds and thousands of intelligent white women enfranchised" (Congressional Record 1918, 779). And Representative Thomas Blanton proclaimed, "So far as State rights are concerned, if this amendment sought to take away from any State the right of fixing the qualifications of its voters, I would be against it first, last, and all the time, but such it does not." Although states should be allowed to set qualifications for voting, he believed, they could not do so at the expense of undermining true republicanism, and, "if you deny the 14,000,000 white women of this country the right to vote, you are interfering with a republican form of government [Applause]" (786). That day, the House passed the amendment with the required two-thirds vote.

Conclusions

I have argued that white women's suffrage leaders practiced a nationalism based on exclusive citizenship that was conditioned on whiteness. In this I have employed the historical treatments of white republicanism, especially by Roediger (1991) and Saxton (1990), to help understand what too easily has been seen as simply "racism" by white women leaders. Although racial ideology is important to any historical study of this period, it is by itself unable to explain why nonwhites were excluded and opposed, not just as members of other "races," but as citizens of the nation. Insofar as citizenship itself signifies national membership, the suffrage movement became a struggle over national identity.

The use of difference-based feminism by suffrage leaders allowed the movement to make more credibly a nationalist claim. As Anne McClintock (1993) argues, "Despite nationalisms' ideological investment in the idea of popular *unity*, nations have historically amounted to sanctioned institutionalization of gender *difference*" (61). Thus, difference feminism fits into a nationalist framework—it makes feminism an acceptable part of a national movement and ideology. Debates over women's suffrage demonstrate that this approach helped convince male politicians and voters that white women's votes would serve the nation by complementing rather than challenging men's role.

I have called this building a gender alliance between women and men

of white America. Although this alliance advanced white women's suffrage, it not only reinforced women's separate and subordinate role in political life but also contributed to the oppression of nonwhite women and men who were excluded from the alliance—ideologically defined (and politically pushed) out of the citizenry. To understand better the implications of the women's suffrage movement, feminist scholars and activists need to treat their historical predecessors as agents whose choices were purposeful. Those choices were conditioned, but not determined, by the exigencies of their historical juncture. White women acted in their own political interests and yet worked against nonwhite women. This history suggests that white women may benefit from alliances with white men, but if they are unwilling to challenge such privilege, women of subordinate groups will justifiably continue to hold suspect white feminism's claims to serve the good of all women.

Department of Sociology University of Massachusetts at Amherst

References

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. Imagined Communities. London: Verso.

Anderson, Jervis. 1973. A. Philip Randolph: A Biographical Portrait. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Aptheker, Bettina. 1975. "W. E. B. Du Bois and the Struggle for Women's Rights." San Jose Studies 1(2):7-16.

Aptheker, Herbert, ed. 1983. The Complete Published Works of W.E.B. Du Bois: Selections from "The Crisis," vol. 1. Millwood, N.Y.: Kraus Thomson.

Bloch, Ruth H. 1978. "American Feminine Ideals in Transition: The Rise of the Moral Mother, 1785–1815." Feminist Studies 4 (June): 101–26.

-----. 1987. "The Gendered Meanings of Virtue in Revolutionary America." Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society 13(1):37-58.

Buechler, Steven M. 1986. The Transformation of the Woman Suffrage Movement: The Case of Illinois, 1850-1920. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

-----. 1987. "Elizabeth Boynton Harbert and the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1870-1896." Signs 13(1):78-97.

-----. 1990. Women's Movements in the United States: Woman Suffrage, Equal Rights, and Beyond. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Buhle, Mari Jo. 1981. Women and American Socialism, 1870-1920. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Buhle, Mari Jo, and Paul Buhle. 1978. The Concise History of Woman Suffrage: Selections from the Classic Work of Stanton, Anthony, Gage, and Harper. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Canady, Hortense. 1985. "Black Women Leaders: The Case of Delta Sigma Theta." Urban League Review 9(1):92-95.

- Catt, Carrie Chapman, and Nettie Rogers Shuler. 1923. Woman Suffrage and Politics: The Inner Story of the Suffrage Movement. New York: Scribner's Sons. Congressional Record. 1918. 65th Cong., 2d sess. Vol. 56.
- Cott, Nancy F. 1977. The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780–1835. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Davis, Angela Y. 1981. Women, Race and Class. New York: Vintage.
- Dorr, Rheta Childe. (1910) 1971. What Eight Million Women Want. New York: Kraus Reprint.
- DuBois, Ellen Carol. 1978. Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.
- Ewen, Elizabeth. 1985. Immigrant Women in the Land of Dollars: Life and Culture on the Lower East Side, 1890–1925. New York: Monthly Review.
- Fields, Barbara J. 1982. "Ideology and Race in American History." In *Region*, *Race*, *and Reconstruction*, ed. J. Morgan Kousser and James M. McPherson. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Foner, Eric. 1970. Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party before the Civil War. London: Oxford University Press.
- Frankenberg, Ruth. 1993. White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Frederickson, George M. 1971. The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817–1914. New York: Harper & Row.
- Giddings, Paula. 1984. When and Where I Enter: The Impact of Black Women on Race and Sex in America. New York: Bantam.
- Glenn, Evelyn Nakano. 1992. "From Servitude to Service Work: Historical Continuities in the Racial Division of Paid Reproductive Labor." Signs 18(1):1–43.
- Grimké, Sarah M. (1838) 1970. Letters on the Equality of the Sexes and the Condition of Woman, Addressed to Mary S. Parker, President of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society. New York: Burt Franklin.
- Harley, Sharon. 1988. "Mary Church Terrell: Genteel Militant." In Black Leaders of the Nineteenth Century, ed. Leon Litwack and August Meier. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Hobsbawm, E. J. 1990. Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horsman, Reginald. 1981. Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Hroch, Miroslav. 1993. "From National Movement to the Fully-formed Nation: The Nation-Building Process in Europe." New Left Review 198 (March/April): 3–20.
- Hurtado, Aida. 1989. "Relating to Privilege: Seduction and Rejection in the Subordination of White Women and Women of Color." Signs 14(4):833–55.

- King, Deborah K. 1988. "Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology." Signs 14(1):42–72.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. 1965. The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1890–1920. New York: Columbia University Press.
- ———, ed. 1968. Up from the Pedestal: Selected Writings in the History of American Feminism. Chicago: Quadrangle.
- Landsman, Gail H. 1992. "The 'Other' as Political Symbol: Images of Indians in the Woman Suffrage Movement." *Ethnohistory* 39(3):247–84.
- Lerner, Gerda. 1967. The Grimké Sisters from South Carolina. New York: Schocken.
- Lunardini, Christine A. 1986. From Equal Suffrage to Equal Rights: Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, 1910–1928. New York: New York University Press.
- Marilley, Suzanne M. 1989. "Towards a New Strategy for the ERA: Some Lessons from the American Woman Suffrage Movement." Women and Politics 9(4):23-42.
- McClintock, Anne. 1993. "Family Feuds: Gender, Nationalism and the Family." Feminist Review 44:61–80.
- Mink, Gwendolyn. 1990. "The Lady and the Tramp: Gender, Race, and the Origins of the American Welfare State." In Women, the State, and Welfare, ed. Linda Gordon. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Morris, Aldon D. 1992. "Political Consciousness and Collective Action." In Frontiers in Social Movement Theory, ed. Aldon D. Morris and Carol McClug Mueller. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press.
- Mosse, George L. 1985. Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe. New York: Howard Fertig.
- Nutt, Rick. 1983–84. "Woodrow Wilson, Alice Paul, and the Woman Suffrage Movement." *Political Science Quarterly* 98(4):665–79.
- O'Neill, William L. 1971. Everyone Was Brave: A History of Feminism in America. New York: Quadrangle.
- Roediger, David. 1991. The Wages of Whiteness: Race and the Making of the American Working Class. London: Verso.
- Roosevelt, Theodore. 1889. The Winning of the West. New York: Putnam's Sons. Rosenthal, Naomi, Meryl Fingrutd, Michele Ethier, Roberta Karant, and David McDonald. 1985. "Social Movements and Network Analysis: A Case Study of Nineteenth-Century Women's Reform in New York State." American Journal of Sociology 90(5):1022–54.
- Rydell, Robert W. 1984. All the World's a Fair: Visions of Empire at American International Expositions, 1876–1916. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Saxton, Alexander. 1990. The Rise and Fall of the White Republic: Class Politics and Mass Culture in Nineteenth-Century America. London: Verso.
- Scott, Janelle D. 1990. "Local Leadership in the Woman Suffrage Movement: Houston's Campaign for the Vote, 1917–1918." Houston Review 12(1):3–22.
- van den Berghe, Pierre L. 1978. Race and Racism: A Comparative Perspective. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Yellin, Jean Fagan. 1973. "Documentation: Du Bois' Crisis and Woman's Suffrage." Massachusetts Review 14(2):265-75.