DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 467 534 CE 083 678

AUTHOR	Nackenoff, Carol
TITLE	Whose Citizenship? Which State? Work and Its Challenges for Women's Visions of Citizenship, 1900-1925.
PUB DATE	2001-00-00
NOTE	42p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (San Francisco, CA, August 29-September 2, 2001).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Attitude Change; Behavior Change; Citizen Participation; *Citizenship; Definitions; *Feminism; Labor Legislation; Literature Reviews; Policy Formation; Political Affiliation; Political Attitudes; *Political Socialization; Public Policy; Service Workers; *Social Change; Social Class; Social History; Socialism; Trend Analysis; Womens Education; *Womens History; Womens Studies; Working Class
IDENTIFIERS	League of Women Voters; Maternal Sensitivity; Progressive Era; Radicalism; *Womens Suffrage

ABSTRACT

The role of the women's movement in shaping women's vision of the obligations of citizenship in 1900-1925 was examined. The analysis focused primarily on the final 2 decades of the suffrage struggle. Special emphasis was placed on the class alliances and tensions that were forged during the struggle for suffrage and later helped set the stage for the shape of maternalist policies to come. The following were among the key themes and topics considered: (1) the thesis that maternalism or "difference feminism" was responsible for social policies that engendered a second-class citizenship for working women and women of color during the 1920s-1930s and that had continuing impact in the welfare state; (2) the emancipatory potential of gender difference and attempts to transform interpersonal service from an activity performed by those in subordinate and dependent positions to an activity involving equals rather than servants; (3) the question of whether the maternalist agenda was more about statism than about participation; (4) the theme of class as a contradiction at the suffrage movement's heart; (5) women's contributions to the definition of citizenship; and (6) "scientific motherhood" as an attempt to legitimate women's claims on the political agenda. (Contains 34 references.) (MN)

Whose Citizenship? Which State? Work and its Challenges for Women's Visions of Citizenship, 1900-1925

Carol Nackenoff
Department of Political Science
Swarthmore College
500 College Avenue
Swarthmore, PA 19081
cnacken1@swarthmore.edu

Prepared for delivery at the 2001 meetings of the American Political Science Association, August 29-September 2, San Francisco. Please do not cite or quote without permission.

Whose Citizenship? Which State? Work and its Challenges for Women's Visions of Citizenship, 1900-1925

Carol Nackenoff, Swarthmore College

> "that such an army of tenement mothers and working women marched with Mrs. Belmont ought to stir the sluggish to action."
>
> Mary Beard to Leonora O'Reilly, of a suffrage parade circa 1911, O'Reilly Papers, quoted in Lerner, 200

Pressing for both suffrage and for changes in social policy during the early decades of the twentieth century, the mainstream women's movement habitually stressed the special--indeed, broader and transformative--perspectives, values, and sense of citizenship that women as nurturers would bring to politics. The wider vision of the obligations of citizenship forged in organizations even as moderate as the National American Woman's Suffrage Association and its successor League of Women Voters resulted in broader expectations of politics; in demands for increased federal and state activism in legislation on social welfare, education, public health, and political reform. There is no longer doubt that early twentieth century feminists helped pave the way for a great deal of New Deal social welfare legislation. The meaning and evaluation of the maternalist legacy, however, is not as clear.

Progressive era women's relationship with the state was highly specified by class, and women's relationship to work was central to their thinking about citizenship. The authority of woman-centered knowledge and power claims was premised on women's position in the home, on her experience in caring for others in the community through volunteerism and/or unpaid labor. Middle-class women activists expected their moral authority to be acknowledged. If republican citizens were engendered male because they were "self-reliant, given to simple needs and tastes, decisive, and committed first to the public interest," women reformers would try to lay claim to as much of this image as possible, downplaying the image of woman as attracted to luxury, dependent, self-indulgent, and subject to passions. (Baker, 624, following Kerber, *Women of the Republic*). As mothers, women could demonstrate civic virtue and concern for the public weal. (Baker, 625). They could be sensible, methodical, wear clothing with pockets (see Harriot Stanton Blatch Scrapbooks, Gilman, *Herland*). Working for others, especially in industrial labor, was a mark of dependence, not independence. Highly emotional appeals, common among labor leaders involved in the suffrage struggle, identified bourgeois women uncomfortably with self-interested, passionate women. And while some work made women independent, many wage-earning women were incapable of

self-sufficiency. In this framework, the working woman did not easily establish a claim to independence and thus virtue through labor. Suffrage activists both needed working women and generally felt the needed to control the image of woman to maintain their authoritative voice.

This paper focuses chiefly on the final two decades of the suffrage struggle, because this struggle, and the class alliances and tensions forged there and then helped set the stage for the shape of maternalist policies to come. This struggle reveals a complex legacy of the vision that women had unique experiences and gifts to bring to citizenship and to the state.

* * *

During the Progressive Era, middle-class and working-class women expanded political space/the political sphere and the boundaries of politics while engaging in a wide range of participatory activities. Through marches and carefully choreographed parades, street theater, suffrage balls, bonfires, torchlight parades, soapbox speechmaking in parks and squares and before factory gates, silent performative advertisements in department store windows, costumes, suffrage balls, suffrage plays, human billboards, protests, picket lines, and strikes; caravans, state-wide horseback or automobile or train treks, Coney Island and "newsies" costumed performances, women pressed the suffrage cause and the cause of working women while at the same time broadening notions of political participation (see Finnegan, 1999; Harriot Stanton Blatch Scrapbooks; Lerner, 210-24). Production of spectacles such as suffrage parades both represented class relations by the inclusion of women under banners identifying their profession or trade, and also served as a sign of power. Women displayed their ability to organize, choreograph, and marshall large numbers in an orderly and punctual manner (Sue Davis 20-21 and 169-170; Finnegan). Women who engaged in politics as theater and who stepped forward to speak out as orators and lecturers learned extremely valuable skills for twentieth century politics.

Women also received a tremendous political education as they engaged the state and its institutions in more traditional ways. They tirelessly lobbied state legislators in person and through letters and telegrams, appeared in legislative hearings, kept lists of legislators' votes, worked for pro-suffrage and pro-labor candidates and worked to punish their opponents at the polls, wrote, held fundraising events, tried to work with other organizations with similar or related goals, sought positive publicity and sought to shape public opinion. They became shrewdly and intensely political.

At a time when men were abandoning the streets and the torchlight parades and election spectacles of nineteenth century

politics--an exercise in partisan politics that constituted a marker of common manhood and tended to bring men together across class lines, (Baker, 628) women were asserting their claim to the streets on behalf of suffrage and were developing spectacles of their own. "The suffragists chose to do something that men had stopped doing" (Baker, 628; McGerr, 1986; Finnegan, 1999; Andersen 1996; quote from McGerr, 1990, 870). Women began engaging in a very vocal, even noisy in-your-face kind of citizenship. Women canvassed, established and maintained voter files, distributed literature, and sought press coverage much as male-dominated parties had been doing (McGerr, 1990, 871-872; Lerner 224-27). Canvassers were exhorted to their task by a litany of personal benefits; canvassing would "broaden their outlook, make them really believe in democracy, teach tolerance, make them realize the big issues in life while overlooking the small things, and 'above all, it brings out all of one's initiative." (Lerner, 226). It required, New York canvassers in the nineteen-teens were told, "kindly feeling for all you call upon" and a "Cheery love for all God's creatures." (Lerner, 226).

The growth of women's trade union organizing taught activists such as Blatch, who was heavily involved in the Women's Trade Union League, new and bolder suffrage tactics. Earlier temperance women had marched and held outdoor vigils in cities and towns of the East and Midwest, and their experiences helped create examples for suffrage women as well. There were indigenous examples from which would-be militants could draw; changes in the style and approach of the suffrage movement in the early years of the century were not merely imported from British militant suffragettes who were willing to go to jail for their cause (DuBois, 1987, 36). It is clear that laboring women's use of public space, their militance and leadership spilled over into the mainstream women's movement.

Women in the suffrage movement tended, until around 1908, to be quite conscious of and to respect the boundaries of lady-like behavior. The National American Woman Suffrage Association remained rather within the boundaries of propriety, fearful of losing their legitimacy and access to public officials. But in the first decade of the twentieth century, some began to violate these boundaries quite deliberately. This extended to where they spoke out and how. For Blatch, militant tactics were a way to obtain much-needed publicity for the suffrage movement. By the later years of the century's first decade, new open-air meetings and trolley car campaigns began to generate this publicity when middle-class suffragists broke through Victorian conventions that held that respectable women avoided courting public attention. By 1908, even the *New York Times* was reporting regularly on suffrage (DuBois, 55-56). In a logic not so unlike the Mau Maus, suffrage militants believed that "overstepping the boundary of respectability would etch suffrage beliefs on women's souls,

beyond retraction or modification" (DuBois, 56).

Mindful of the problem of violating respectability while nonetheless reframing it and maintaining their feminine authority, and aware of the need to mobilize public opinion to their cause both through the press and on the streets, bourgeois women took their domesticity outdoors.

In the Gilded Age, bourgeois women creatively used "heretofore quintessentially 'private' idioms of domesticity and motherhood precisely as springboards for public activity." (Fraser, 115). For decades during the nineteenth century, women's organizations and settlement house workers had increasingly assumed public functions in the city in arenas including sanitation and social welfare; "women met a public need, saved public funds, and behaved as shrewd politicians" (Ryan, 1992, 279). During these decades, women "maneuvered around the gender restrictions of the public"; "denied admission to the public sphere directly and in their own right, women found circuitous routes to public influence" (Ryan, 1992, 284). They "fashioned significant public roles by working from the private sphere." (Baker, 1984, 621). "Women had found multiple points of access to the public. . . By occupying these scattered public places, nineteenth-century women worked out their own political identities, opened up the public to a vast new constituency, and enlarged the range of issues that weighed into the 'general interest'." (Ryan, 1992, 283). By the end of the nineteenth century, however, the municipal franchise was inadequate. "The efforts of women to deal locally with social problems were no longer sufficient in a nation where the sources were extralocal, and created by male, self-interested political and economic behavior" (Baker, 638).

In the Progressive Era, activist women who could now claim to be engaged in the public business, became more vocal about making claims for full citizenship. As women worked to expand the public sphere, challenging to whom such space was accessible and what public debate would encompass, they were struggling to alter this "historically changing arena for action, one influenced by the conflicts that shape other domains." (Sue Davis, 166). As Nancy Fraser points out, social identities are negotiated in the public sphere (Fraser, 125); so, too, are the scope and meaning of citizenship. Though the women who were most effectively able to contest the parameters of the bourgeois male public sphere proved to be organized white bourgeois females, these women may be appropriately (if modestly) viewed as one competing public--a counterpublic that "contested the exclusionary norms of the bourgeois public, elaborating alternative styles of political behavior and alternative norms of public speech." (Fraser, 116). Following Fraser, we can think of suffrage organizations as competing with the dominant bourgeois public (Fraser, 116). Through networks of women's voluntary

organizations that included several women's working-class suffrage organizations, women developed strategies for action. As they carried the suffrage campaign forward, they expanded the public spaces in which political issues were deliberated, prompting the inclusion of "interests and issues that bourgeois masculinist ideology labels 'private' and treats as inadmissible" in the public sphere (Fraser, 137). "Americans," Hannah Arendt argued, "knew that public freedom consisted in having a share in public business, and that the activities connected with this business by no means constituted a burden but gave those who discharged them in public a feeling of happiness they could acquire nowhere else" (Arendt, 115).

As they took to the streets and roads, feminists reshaped the image of where women belonged, spatially and in public discourse. But because they needed credibility and respectability, they wanted to maintain control over the image they were recreating. Images of virtue and selflessness helped make public claims for women-centered knowledge only so long as women were not perceived as advancing partial or private interests. Only as such were they "above" politics. "And since male politics determined what was public and political, most of those demands by women that fell short of suffrage were seen as private and apolitical"--that is, other calls for gender justice (Baker, 631). This had consequences for wage-earning women whose support middle-class feminists sought. Many pro-suffrage elite women wanted to control the terms on which working-class women would have access to the political system, and the very language in which their interests would be voiced (see DuBois, 39-40).

In order to be heard, early twentieth century feminists felt constrained to speak in terms of a common public interest, a common citizenship. To actually take place in public deliberation on social policy issues of the day, they had to invoke the powerful common "we" as well as the common good, and avoid provoking charges of being merely self-interested (see Mansbridge, 130). When participants are unequal in power, however, the political process ought rather "to make participants more aware of their real interests, even when those interests turn out to conflict." (Mansbridge, 130). Otherwise, "'We' can easily represent a false universality. . . 'We' may mask a relationship that works against the subordinate's interests." (Mansbridge, 135). Thus, as Mary Ryan writes, "from the vantage point of women's history, the identification of a political interest of one's own was not a fall from public virtue but a step toward empowerment." (Ryan, 1992, 285) Women's empowerment "necessitated the construction of a separate identity and the assertion of self-interest. In practice, inclusive representation, open confrontation, and full articulation of social and historical differences are as essential to the public as is a standard of rational and disinterested discourse." (Ryan, 1992, 285). Courting the 'public interest' placed maternalists

in a difficult position with regard to their working-class allies. The public interest was supposed to be harmonious, not adversarial. If their equal rights amendment former colleagues didn't have quite the same problem speaking to self-interest in the 1920s, they had another: women wage-earning activists and the Women's Trade Union League, now headed by working-class women, stood on the side of protective legislation.

There were additional important implications of the ways in which elite women attempted to use their moral authority to make a place for themselves as voting citizens in the first two decades of the century. First, that moral authority they claimed on behalf of women was linked to women's dominion in the private sphere. The "privacy" that was a bourgeois woman's birthright whether she wished it or no was bound up with woman's moral authority over hearth and home, and all that women were expanding home to encompass. Any change in either the home-centered image of women or in women's workforce status might undermine that moral authority. Second, working-class wage-earning women did not have that moral authority to trade on. They might become 'beneficiaries' of policies supported by social feminists and their progressive allies, but whether they could be dignified as equals--deserving beneficiaries entitled to public funds in Skocpol's terminology--remained to be seen. Some would become invisible in public policy making; others would find public funds only as virtuous mothers.

* * *

If middle-class activists took their domesticity outdoors for suffrage beginning around 1908-1910, organized and organizing working women had taken it to the streets before their engagement with suffrage. The Gilded Age and Progressive Era were times of intense labor drama. As labor gained power through numbers and reform movements changed the tone of politics, the spatial ordering of public life changed in late nineteenth century America. "The lower classes claimed open public places as the sites of political resistance, while their social superiors retreated into private recesses to exert power behind the scenes, in reform associations or bureaucratic channels," (Ryan, 1992, 277). The working classes didn't stake an easy claim to the streets, however. New centralization of a city's police force made it easier to arrest people using the streets for parades, protests, or street-corner oratory for disturbing the peace (Davis, 167). Parades, demonstrations, and outdoor speeches increasingly required permits (Davis, 168). As labor grew in strength, so, too, did techniques for the preservation of public order (Davis, 167). It is quite arguable that it became harder in some ways--not easier--for workers to express dissent from power relations in the streets. And yet, by the early years of the twentieth century, working-class women were moving from supporting to starring roles in the streets, in formerly male-

dominated protests, strikes, and unionization drives. This was especially true in the garment trades.

They were protesting on the street corner or in front of their workplace well before suffragists considered adopting such public tactics, and had developed "a provocative, street-smart campaign style" (Orleck, 89). Laboring women courageously used public space in ways "respectable" women were not expected to. And because they could not stake a widely recognizable claim to virtue, working-class women in public space needed courage, whether in the face of violence or when speaking up in male-dominated, female-dismissive, union meetings. Their gender offered them little protection. Courage itself may be seen as an element of citizenship, where the marginalized or unequal put identity and security at risk in the name of opposition or dissent or in service of democratic goals (Sparks, 76, 98, 100).

During the years 1905-1907, the demands of trade union women and suffrage leaders became increasingly linked. By 1907, the Women's Trade Union League embraced suffrage as a goal. (Dye, 123). But what did trade-union women expect of the vote, and in what way was it attractive as they increasingly joined in the suffrage campaign? What kind of citizenship did it promise?

Key working women activists developed sufficient confidence in middle-class reform women to join with them in the suffrage battle through associations in the Consumer's League, the Women's Trade Union League, and the settlement movement. The Women's Trade Union League was instrumental in expanding the suffrage appeal to working-class women through their support for working-class causes and strikes, especially garment workers' strikes during 1909-1915, supporting working women financially, on picket lines, and in court. Settlement women in Chicago were very early among middle-class women to support striking workers and women workers' causes in Chicago.

Harriot Stanton Blatch was persistent in her "efforts to fuse women of different classes into a revitalized suffrage movement" (DuBois, 1987, p. 35). She was among the first "to open up suffrage campaigns to working-class women, even as she worked closely with wealthy and influential upper-class women; she pioneered militant street tactics and backroom political lobbying at the same time." (DuBois, 1987, 36). Though the example of the militant English "suffragettes" surely made an impact on the American suffrage movement, Blatch learned some of her tactics from working-class women, and from her experience in the Women's Trade Union League (see DuBois, 36).

The Chicago settlement movement had embraced working women as well. Mary McDowell, head of the University of Chicago Settlement, was also president of the new National Women's Trade Union League in the summer of 1904, during the Chicago stockyard

worker strike; about 3000 women were employed in the stockyards (Nestor, 63). The WTUL party for the women strikers was held at Hull House, and Agnes Nestor from the glove-workers local and her friends who attended immediately joined the WTUL. Nestor saw the purpose of the League "to secure the organization of all women workers of the United States into trade unions, in the hope of thus gaining for these women better working conditions, a reduced working day, a living wage, and full citizenship as women." (Nestor, 64). Nestor saw the WTUL as a top-down organization; it had not begun among the lowly, but this did not damp her enthusiasm for its purpose and the advantaged women who were motivated by "great vision and high courage." (Nestor, 64). WTUL leadership would lead Nestor and some of her fellow workers to suffrage.

Chicago glove-worker and labor leader Agnes Nestor was drawn into WTUL President (Margaret Dreier) Robins's vision that "the ballot is the power of effective protest in modern civilization," and Nestor reports that Robins enlisted the interest of those surrounding her (Nestor, 118). She participated in the WTUL delegation to Springfield for the Suffrage Session, riding the train and speaking at industrial towns en route (Nestor, 118). Nestor was totally supportive of the progressive reformers' protective legislation agenda for women. She spent considerable time at the legislature in Springfield, Illinois fighting for the ten-hour day for working women and other women's legislation (Nestor, 118-119). In 1908 and 1909, having worked on amassing evidence on the need for a shorter working day for women for several years, Nestor was well aware of and supported the Louis Brandeis/Josephine Goldmark brief on "The Case for the Shorter Working Day," employed effectively in Muller v. Oregon (1908) (Nestor, 90).

By 1909, Nestor had acquired a fine working knowledge of how the legislature worked, the product of considerable experience in Springfield on behalf of women workers (Nestor, 90-104, e.g.). Already a practiced speaker from leading labor struggles, Nestor also spoke from the pulpit in Chicago on what was known as "Labor Sunday," just prior to Labor Day, speaking out against the piecework system to a wealthy Winnetka audience in 1910 (Nestor, 119-121). Jewish working women in New York were also learning to speak from wealthy Protestant pulpits, finding New Testament stories on which to draw.

The disposition of male union officials toward women's concerns and toward female labor leadership helped push some working-class female activists toward middle-class women's organizations and toward suffrage. These officials tended to be hostile to female labor leadership and neglectful of working women's interests (Antler, 95; Orleck, 170-72 and 191). Though Rose Pesotta was elected vice president of ILGWU three times, she was dispirited as she tried to advance women's issues within

union movement (Antler, 96). Continuing rebuffs from male Jewish labor leaders helped push Pauline Newman and Rose Schneiderman, both of whom would become prominent in interclass networks, away from the Jewish world of their youth (Antler, 96). Fannia Cohn, first woman on ILGWU executive board remarked that "[w]orking women who aspire to leadership find. . . that hardly one place out of thousands in the labor movement is available to them" (Orleck, 191).

Back in New York, Elizabeth Cady Stanton's daughter, Harriot Stanton Blatch was a leader in founding the Equality League of Self-Supporting Women in 1907 (Blatch and Lutz, 93-94; the League later became the Women's Political Union). Gilman and Florence Kelly were counted among the members as well (Tax, 170). Blatch later reflected:

> We all believed that suffrage propaganda must be made dramatic, that suffrage workers must be politically minded. We saw the need of drawing industrial women into the suffrage campaign and recognized that these women needed to be brought in contact, not with women of leisure, but with business and professional women who were also out in the world earning their living.(Blatch and Lutz, 93-94).

Blatch developed working relations with some politically sophisticated working-class women. She recruited both Rose Schneiderman and Leonora O'Reilly to the Equality League of Self-Supporting Women, and Schneiderman became the League's most popular speaker (DuBois, 46, 48; Tax, 170). Schneiderman, who organized the first female local of Jewish Socialist United Cloth and Cap Makers' Union, 1903 and who, as an ILGWU leader, would play a key role in the garment workers' strike of 1909, accompanied Blatch and other Equality League members on their New York suffrage tour of 1908, speaking at Vassar College (Antler, 95; Blatch and Lutz, 108).

Tax, 170).The Equality League of Self-Supporting Women in NY was Blatch's attempt to equate equality with self-sufficiency. Blatch did understand that the professional woman's labor brought her a great deal more freedom than the housemaid's labor, and became one of the bourgeois women who was highly active with the Women's Trade Union League, which sought to better the condition of working women (DuBois, 42, 46).

For Blatch and co-founder Charlotte Perkins Gilman, work outside the home was woman's route to emancipation, their title to full-citizenship, and their claims upon the state. Woman's work had moved increasingly from unpaid, home-based labor to paid labor; productive, paid work would unite women, even though women did not all have the same tastes and talents (see DuBois, 42). Blatch saw that the conditions under which wage-earning women labored were very hard, and viewed such women as exemplars to

other women (DuBois, 42). Professional women needed to understand the extent to which their success depended on the labor of the women who do "homebuilding" work for them; their freedom is so much greater than the working-woman's. She and Gilman believed that working women would want to retain career and independence after marriage, since "as human beings we must have work." But "the pivotal question for women. . .is how to organize their work as home-builders and race-builders, how to get that work paid for not in so called protection, but in the currency of the state." (DuBois, 42-43). Though these feminists formulated a work-centered understanding of citizenship, there was not a great deal of attention paid politically to how to end the brutalizing and health-destroying work that so many women performed, which undermined their equality. Later, they would call for an equal rights remedy.

In 1909 under the auspices of the WTUL, New York feminists staged a debate at the Carnegie Lyceum on the question "Is the Wife Supported by Her Husband," with Gilman arguing the affirmative and Reverend Anna Howard Shaw arguing the negative. Gilman, who argued that every self-respecting being gets its own living and "the woman who not only does not do the work of her own house but keeps a housekeeper to look after her servants is a mere parasite," received warm applause at times but 'lost' the debate to Shaw (*New York Times*, January 7, 1909). According to Gilman, "The woman who works hardest gets least money and the one who works least gets the most," (*New York Times*, January 7, 1909) an argument rearticulated in *Herland*. Shaw argued that "the woman working in the home gives an equivalent in labor to the finances of the man. . .the conditions of the house have now changed, but the economic value of a woman's work is the same" (*New York Times*, January 7, 1909). The article appeared next to the obituaries.

Blatch arranged to have two working-class women, members of the Equality League of Self-Supporting Women, address the legislature in New York on behalf of woman suffrage in 1907, apparently the first time "a simple working girl was standing before a body of law-makers to tell them of the realities of her life;" their testimony made quite an impression on those assembled (Blatch and Lutz, 95). Clara Silver of the Buttonhole Workers and Mary Duffy from the Overall Workers' Union linked suffrage to their needs as trade-union women. Mary Duffy argued that "trade unionism. . .is the only protector we working women have. . . We are ruled out in the State." (Blatch and Lutz, 95). Duffy said Rose Schneiderman of the Capmakers' Union wanted her to report that women workers born in America or having been a long time here are distressed when men from Europe, knowing nothing of free government, arrive and are placed above women workers, seeking to lead and dominate (Blatch and Lutz, 95-96). Duffy argued that: Foreign men "knew nothing about the country or the conditions here, but the State told them they knew everything

better than any woman. . . The State has much to answer for in filling those men full of conceit." (Blatch and Lutz, quoting Duffy, 96). "To be left out by the State just sets up a prejudice against us,' Mrs. Silver explained. 'Bosses think and women come to think themselves that they don't count for so much as men." (Blatch and Lutz, quoting Clara Silver, 97; NYT Feb 6, 1907, 6; Harriot Stanton Blatch Scrapbooks, Vol. 1, 1907; DuBois 51). Mrs. Silver who had been born in England, added that her mother had been political and had taken care of the home; "Politics and home life seem to me to be a pretty good combination. Perhaps to think outside themselves makes both men and women more self-reliant" (Blatch and Lutz, 97).

These working-class women echoed some of the elite suffragist concerns that the less deserving recently-arrived males were enfranchised while they were not; they gave voice to an earlier era of suffrage argument that the vote was necessary for women to protect themselves. They underscored the Blatch/Gilman contention that work and politics were not unwomanly and did not undermine the home. And they held the state responsible for male discrimination against women in the workplaceby countenancing discrimination against women in the franchise.

Organized working-class women tended to see suffrage as a means for women industrial workers to have power over labor laws that directly affected their work lives (DuBois, 50). Working-class leaders Rose Schneiderman, Pauline Newman, Clara Lemlich and Fannia Cohn joined the suffrage campaign, arguing that, without the vote, working women would continue to be dependent on others to serve their interests through legislation (Orleck, 87). Armed with the vote, women could begin to take control of their lives (Orleck, 87). Wage-earning women and Socialists Caroline Lowe and Leonora O'Reilly both told a Joint Congressional Committee in 1912 that wage-earning women "need the ballot for the purpose of self-protection." (Lowe in Scott and Scott, 122; Buhle, 154 on Lowe's background). According to O'Reilly, "You can not or will not make laws for us; we must make laws for ourselves. We working women need the ballot for self-protection; that is all there is to it. We have got to have it." (O'Reilly in Scott and Scott, 126). "Well-orchestrated use of the vote promised to increase their power and independence in relation to employers, to the state, and to their often-manipulative allies" (Orleck, 88). "Working women. . .must be enfranchised and so secure political power to shape their own labor conditions," argued Schneiderman at the First Convention of Women Trade Unionists in 1907 (Schneiderman quoted in Orleck, 88). Schneiderman later articulated her vision of citizenship and its connection to the vote. The vote was a necessary tool if the working woman was to free herself "from the drudgeries and worries which come with long hours and low wages" (Orleck, 88, quoting Schneiderman's Address Before the Women's Industrial

Conference, January 20, 1926).

By 1908, following the Second International's 1907 call for member parties to begin a distinct campaign for the political rights of women, the Socialist Party's interest in suffrage blossomed (Buhle, 221-22). While the Party officially supported women's suffrage, leaders considered suffrage a bourgeois issue. As Socialist and former cloakmaker Theresa Malkiel said of the Socialist woman's view of suffrage in 1908, "The ballot, though an absolute necessity in her struggle for freedom, is only one of the aims toward her goal. We cannot renovate a garment by turning over one of the sleeves--the whole of it must be turned inside out. And this renovation is possible under a Socialist regime only" (Malkiel quoted in Orleck, 95). There was much discussion about whether to cooperate with the middle-class suffrage movement, and the New York Socialists "passed resolutions against Socialist participation in NAWSA parades, and in general condemned the whole mode of women's agitation that seemingly turned attention away from organizing factory workers" (Buhle, 222). Nevertheless, cross-over activity for many leaders and activists continued, Rose Schneiderman and Leonora O'Reilly included. The Socialist Party's Women's Committee began its own campaign to convert working women for suffrage, and by early 1911, there were active branches of Socialist Suffrage clubs across Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens, with active membership in the thousands (Orleck, 97). The only disappointment for organizers Theresa Malkiel and Pauline Newman was that most of the joiners were already Socialist Party members (Orleck, 97).

Newly militant middle-class women asserted and tested their right to serve as poll watchers to keep the ballot pure, and occasionally faced arrest in the process (Blatch Scrapbooks, Reel 1). Suffrage marches, ever larger after 1910, were timed so that workers could participate; newspapers reported them to be extremely diverse, cross-class collections. The *New York Times* asserted that a 1912 parade "represented every grade of society and every walk of life. They were rich, they were poor; they were white, they were colored; they were fashionable, they were factory girls" (Lerner, quoting NYT, 218; Harriot Stanton Blatch Scrapbooks). Public spectacles and marches seemed to offer a promise of bringing women together across class lines, as men's partisan and electoral activites may have done for a time in the nineteenth century (see Baker).

Militants also engaged in publicity stunts on behalf of suffrage, advertising their cause with the use of attention-grabbing themes and technology, and appearing across the country from beaches to department store display windows, from vaudeville shows to movies, and via horseback, train, automobile caravan, parade floats, and open-air rallies. (McGerr, 1990, 874;

Finnegan). Mainstream suffrage organizations produced buttons, hats, sewing kits, fans, and many other novelties to wear or display; According to the *New York Times,* many shirtwaist strikers in 1909 wore suffrage buttons (Lerner, 216 - NYT 6/2/09; see also Finnegan on paraphernalia).

Blatch became a pioneer among middle-class leaders in suffrage spectacles. Reflecting on the first major parade in New York in 1910:

> Convinced as I was that mankind is moved to action by emotion, not by argument and reason, I saw the possibilities in a suffrage parade. What could be more stirring than hundreds of women, carrying banners, marching--marching--marching! The public would be aroused, the press would spread the story far and wide, and the interest of our own workers would be fired. (Blatch and Lutz, 129).

Irish-born shirtmaker Leonora O'Reilly, well-known member and officer of the WTUL and first head of the working-class women's organized Wage Earners' Suffrage League, spoke in Union Square at one of the earliest suffrage parades, this one organized by the American Suffragettes in 1910 (Tax, 171; DuBois 53).

Socialite Alva Belmont was drawn to suffrage in large part through Blatch and her militant tactics, and as other socialites such as Katherine Duer Mackay joined the movement around 1910, being a suffragette was proving 'fashionable'. When socialite women began to join the suffrage cause, they lent it increased positive public visibility and respectability. Many of these women could, because of their social status, educational background and leadership in women's clubs, command public attention: through the newspapers, through contact with elected and appointed officials, in Congressional and state legislative hearings, and through speeches.

Their participation augmented a tension in the movement: they were positive publicity-generators, since they commandeered public respect and interest. Society matrons were in the best position of all to keep the militant suffragists feminine in the eyes of the press and public opinion (DuBois, 57-58). Ellen DuBois believes that "by the time suffragette militance became a national movement, its working-class origins and trade-union associations had been submerged, and it was in the hands of women of wealth" (DuBois, 58).

As young and militant working women joined the suffrage movement in increasing numbers, they helped energize, revitalize, and strengthen the movement. Laboring women of the working classes joined for reasons that differed from their more leisured sisters. And their experiences on the streets and their experience with the state differed markedly from that of their

sometime-allies. What is clear is that, if working class women were increasingly joining in and doing suffrage work, provoking emotional responses among audiences and doing a great deal of the stumping in urban industrial areas, socialites and middle-class reformers and their voices were receiving the bulk of public attention. It wasn't militance per se but who was engaging in militant tactics and where that broke through the mainstream press' silence and changed the tone of what little coverage there had been. Blatch's street corner meetings took place in more fashionable neighborhoods than her working-class female counterparts(DuBois, 58). Middle-class and aristocratic women did get publicity since they were violating norms associated with true womanhood. Matrons attempting to serve as poll watchers, or ascending a street-corner platform to speak quickly received front page news coverage, while working girls speaking on the streets were often ignored by the press (DuBois, 57; Harriot Stanton Blatch Scrapbooks, especially Reel 1). NAWSA women, Congressional Union women, Equality League women who went to the legislature generally received polite hearings for suffrage. Working-class women who sought to ameliorate their own conditions generally failed to receive such polite attention. Rose Schneiderman reported to a suffrage rally circa 1913:

> I can tell you how courteous our Senators and Assemblymen are when a disenfranchised citizen tries to convince them of the necessity of shorter hours for working women. . . During the hearing at Albany our learned Senators listened to the opposition very carefully;. . . But when the Committee, who spoke for the working women came to plead for the bill [the 54 hour bill], there was only one Senator left in the room. . . . Mind you, we were pleading for a shorter work week for working women. We had evidence to show that physical exhaustion leads to moral exhaustion and the physical and moral exhaustion of women will lead to the deterioration of the human species. What did these men care? We were voteless working women - no matter what we felt or thought could not come back at them (Dye, 123).

Though suffrage was viewed as a major improvement over the "charity" offered working-class women by anti-suffrage elites, working-class women were well aware that suffrage alone did not translate into equality and justice (see Mary Duffy, Overall Workers' Union, 1907, quoted in Blatch and Lutz, 96).

Meanwhile, wage-earning suffrage activists spoke widely at venues ranging from union meetings to vaudeville performances, wrote union leaders asking their support, sent a delegation to the White House in 1914, engaged in house-to-house canvassing, and organized a noteworthy and massive rally at Cooper Union in 1912 in which leaders took turns addressing, point by point, the objections to suffrage voiced by New York legislators (Orleck,.

101 and Chapter 3 passim; Tax, 171-76; Lerner, 191-92, 224-25). In addition to spreading support for suffrage, a central goal of the Wage Earners' League, founded chiefly by shirtwaist makers, bookbinders, and gold leaf layers, was to "study how to use the vote once it had been acquired." (Lerner, 191). After the Woman's Suffrage Party (the NAWSA affiliate in New York) persuaded working class activist Rose Schneiderman to head its Industrial Committee in 1911, the well-financed Committee distributed 1,875,000 leaflets crafted for working men in Manhattan in the 1915 ratification campaign, addressed 356 City unions in six months the same year, and "wrote a series of 16 letters dealing with women's working conditions, why women needed the vote and why working men's wives needed the vote, which they mailed to all working men who were registered voters." (Lerner, 198). In the final push for statewide suffrage in New York in 1917, Schneiderman and the WTUL also created a "Suffrage Correspondence Course" intended to educate male union members about the needs of working women in the state (Orleck, 109).

Working-class women leaders who spoke out for suffrage engaged in public appeals custom-tailored for their own class; "it was gritty, sarcastic, and confrontational" (Orleck, 89). Rose Schneiderman was apparently a particularly strong, successful speaker; she and Lenore O' Reilly were star speakers at the 1907 New York Suffrage convention. (DuBois, 51) Schneiderman provoked tears when speaking to union men in industrial cities in Ohio, and her effect on the crowds was described as electric; Clara Lemlich stood on a soapbox outside factories, engaging in verbal duels with jeering male workers or delivering a stump speech to enliven tired women workers; her Yiddish was described by a reporter as "eloquent even to American ears" and she knew how to get harried women to stop and listen (Orleck, 89, 105). Pauline Newman spoke to immigrant housewives on streetcorners of the Lower East Side and held late-night, heartfelt talks on suffrage with impoverished Illinois coal miner families (Orleck, 89). Leonora O'Reilly, an extremely popular speaker, "sounded as though she had tears in her voice," reported Newman (Orleck, 101). Maggie Hinchey, who walked away from her position as forewoman during the laundry workers' strike of 1912 and became blacklisted, toured New York's ethnic neighborhoods carrying flags appropriate to the neighborhood, and it is reported that "her audience alternately wiped its tears and shook with laughter" (Tax, 174). As press coverage became more visible and more supportive of suffrage, reports of working-class women's speeches for suffrage often spoke of how much the crowd was moved. As class leaders, these women knew how to agitate and arouse a crowd.

And these working-class women made many speeches. When working women founded the Wage Earners' League for Woman Suffrage in 1911 and, anxious to prevent the marginalizing of working-class voices that tended to occur in other suffrage

organizations, restricted voting membership to workers, they apparently depended far more on speeches than on leaflets and handbills, which were expensive to produce (Orleck 96, 101).

Wealthier suffrage supporters or suffrage organizations also hired working-class women supporters to work for suffrage, providing them sabbaticals from their manual labors and helping them establish political contacts (Orleck, 92). A wealthy New York NAWSA treasurer who was also active in the Socialist Party gave Mary Beard money to pay a working-class suffrage organizer, and Beard hired Clara Lemlich for a year (until Beard grew dissatisfied with her, possibly feeling she could not control her message) (Orleck, 997-98). In 1912, Anna Howard Shaw, president of NAWSA, hired Rose Schneiderman to travel to Ohio's industrial cities and build support for the upcoming statewide suffrage referendum among working men, and Schneiderman spoke indoors and out from Toledo to Youngstown (Orleck, 104). Working women traveled for suffrage with the WTUL in states with referendums in 1915 (Orleck, 108). Maggie Hinchey was given a year's job as an organizer by the Woman Suffrage Party, NAWSA's New York affiliate, in 1913, and worked intermittently for the party for several years, but with erratic pay (Tax, 174; Lerner, 257). During the final New York suffrage ratification campaign (1916-17), both the WTUL and the Woman's Suffrage Party paid working-class women organizers (Lerner, 196-97).

There was, in sum, an extraordinary amount of women's political participation going on.

***

Wage-earning women may have received respectful hearings when they spoke at legislative hearings under the auspices of women's suffrage organizations, even receiving a bit of polite press coverage, but this was not their prevailing experience of the state. If bourgeois women expected protection and deference as women and could expected law enforcement authorities and public officials to be courteous and responsive, women organizing trade unions had no such expectations. These wage-earners saw the force of the state applied against them without regard for gender. They knew beyond any doubt that the state and its laws did not "protect" them against beatings, jailings, and the insinuations of prostitution that employers and police made against strikers or union women. Respectful treatment by agents of the state and law enforcement authorities was dependent upon class and certain class-based expectations about non-confrontational comportment.

In nineteenth century America, "women made themselves 'public women' or 'women of the streets' when they assumed performative roles outside the home." (Susan G. Davis, 47). Even women who worked in street market stalls lost their claim to

respectablity. "Working women became prostitutes, if only metaphorically, by their economic activity. This logic extended to female participation in street parades, so that when respectable women made their rare appearances in processions they were either escorted protectively by men or dressed as caricatures of purity." (Davis, 47). Middle-class women who violated these norms, such as Southern women who were verbally disrespectful to occupying Union officers and soldiers on the streets of New Orleans in the spring of 1862, were declared women of the the town plying their vocations (Ryan, 1990, 2-3). Wage-earning women picketing on the streets of New York more than four decades later, likewise acting outside prescribed roles in public space, were not-ladies. They were dangerous--sexually dangerous--women (see Ryan, 1990, 86). Wage-earning women were not in a strong position to redefine femininity by taking leadership roles in the streets--at least until the streets became a place for reputable women to be.

Working women had ample experience of arrest, beatings, and indignities during labor strikes. Women who engaged in labor action had been there beforehand. As labor activists especially, they might be seem as engaging in 'dissident citizenship', defined as "the practices of marginalized citizens who publicly contest prevailing arrangements of power by means of oppositional democratic practices that augment or replace institutional channels of democratic opposition when those channels are inadequate or unavailable" (Sparks, 75). They were sometimes treated much as were the Southern-sympathizing women of New Orleans. When workers at the Triangle Waist Company (some of whom had secretly joined the ILGWU local), went on strike on September 28, 1909, the Triangle management "hired Broadway prostitutes and their pimps, guessing that the strikers would feel more intimidated that way" than by "thugs". "The prostitutes beat up ten women in one day. After a striker was beaten, she was charged with assault and fined" (both quotes, Tax, 214). The thugs hired by Leiserson, owner of one of the shirtwaist shops struck in September, 1909, to beat up women strikers were known as "sluggers" (Tax, 213). Male workers stopped picketing because they didn't want to get beaten up, but the women persisted in the face of daily assaults and beatings. Clara Lemlich, well-known to the East Side labor movement in New York and a founder of the shirtwaist local, was singled out numerous times by hired thugs for beatings; in one encounter, her ribs were broken. During the Triangle shirtwaist strike, she was arrested seventeen times. (Tax, 209, 214). Lemlich spoke out from the floor, with male union leaders dominating the podium, at Cooper Union on November 22, 1909 when the waistmakers' local of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union called for a general strike (Tax, 205-207). Open intimidation by a group of police officers who broke into the union hall during an October 19th meeting prompted some of the women shirtwaist strikers to appeal to the WTUL for protection against false arrest. League allies went to the

picket line so they could serve as witnesses in court. (Tax, 214).

When nearly 30,000 women in the shirtwaist industry went on strike on November 22 and 23, 1909, WTUL women were responsible for most of the publicity and performed secretarial work (Tax, 217). Women from the Socialist Party were also actively assisting (Tax, 217). Picketing, mostly by women, continued through a bitter winter (Tax, 218). "The judges who sentenced the women showed extreme prejudice against the union, strikers, and women who stepped out of their assigned position in the scheme of things. Judge Cornell sentenced strikers to the workhouse--for the offense of picketing--with the words, 'I find these girls guilty. It would be perfectly futile for me to fine them. Some charitable woman would pay their fines or they could get a bond. . .'" (Tax, 220, citing Sue Ainslie Clark and Edith Wyatt, "Working Girls' Budgets: The Shirtwaist Makers and Their Strike," McClure's Magazine 36 (November, 1910), 81.) Other judges preached to girls that they were striking against God and Nature (Tax, 220). Girls sent to the workhouse were as young as 15 or 16, and when Women's Trade Union League women went to remonstrate with one judge, they reported "We asked if he realized what it would meak to a girl her age to be locked up with prostitutes, theives [sic] and narcotics addicts. 'Oh,' he said, 'It will be good for her. It will be a vacation.'" (Tax, 220 quoting Rose Schneiderman with Lucy Goldthwaite, All for One, 93.) According to Tax, "The police and courts went out of their way to classify the strikers as prostitutes as an attempt to break their spirit. Prostitution was never very far from the lives of working women who tried to live on $6 a week; they had seen women they had grown up with fall into the life of the streets, and the thin barrier between themselves and that life meant a great deal to them." (Tax, 220). Moreover, "The police and employers called the strikers whores because they were walking the streets shamelessly; they tried to insult them sexually, as if the way to stop them from rebelling as workers was to put them back in their places as sexual objects." (Tax, 220). A seventeen-year-old Jewish girl who acted as spokesperson for her shop and led a walkout in 1909 said that, at the station house "the officers treated me in such a manner that a girl is ashamed to talk about"; they made insinuations and asked her with how many men she lived; one winked at her and suggested she come along with him (Tax, 220-221; quote 221 and quoting New York Call 4 December 1909).

Working-class women did not receive much press attention when they stood on streetcorners speaking; even the Triangle Waist Company strike in 1909 garned virtually no publicity save for the Jewish and radical press (Tax, 215). However, when socialite Mary Dreier, president of the New York WTUL, was arrested while she observed police brutality on the Triangle Waist Company picket line, things began to change. Her arrest and

rough treatment garnered wide press coverage, popular interest, and sympathy (Orleck, 59). This was November 4th, 1909; the strike at Triangle had begun September 28th (Tax, 214, 215) and the Leiserson strike earlier in the month. The Socialist *New York Call* reported Dreier's arrest:

> Mary Dreier. . . Was covered with insults and arrested without cause yesterday while doing picket duty in thestrike of the Ladies' Waistmakers against the Triangle Waist Company. . . A member of the Triangle firm heard her speak to one of the girls as she came from work and in the presence of an officer he turned on Miss Dreier and shouted: "You are a liar. You are a dirty liar." Miss Dreier turned to the officer and said, "You heard the language that man addressed to me. Am I not entitled to your protection." The officer replied, "how do I know you are not a dirty liar?" (Tax, 215-216, citing *NY Call* 5 November 1909)

After her arrest, the judge discharged her and "apologized for having mistaken her for a working girl." (Tax, 216, Orleck, 59). "The publicity given the arrest was crucial in arousing the interest of the press and the public in both the strike and police brutality, and the union used the occasion to intensify its shop propaganda." (Tax, 216).

Involvement by middle-class and socialite women helped turn public opinion toward striking women, and it helped make working-class women more sympathetic to the suffrage cause so dear to their allies, but it did not end the physical and psychological traumas wage-earning women on the picket line would face.

About half the Lawrence mill workers awere women, and their life-expectancy was little more than half that of the average lawyer or clergyman at the time of the strike in 1912 (Tax, 243). In late February, of that year, police clubbed children and their mothers alike as the children waited for the train to leave Lawrence for safer havens in Philadelphia during the strike; women were jailed and children were sent to the city poor farm (Tax, 260-61). On this day, "women strikers launched their first major independent offensive in the streets," possibly to draw most of the troops from the train station. Troops attacked, then arrested the women picketers; two Italian women miscarried (Tax, 262). Apparently Mrs. Taft, upon hearing this news at a Congressional hearing, "is reported to have rushed from the room in distress." (Tax, 262). Public sympathies shifted toward the strikers in the light of such news that made headlines around the country. (Tax, 261).

During the 1914 waitress strike in Chicago, a strike supported by the WTUL and its president, Mary Dreier Robins, the police were again brutal in handling pickets, and there were hired thugs to contend with. When Hull House co-founder Ellen

Gates Starr picketed one day that spring, she was arrested (Nestor, 157, 159). Despite her prominence in Chicago and the fact that she came from an old American family, "the police did not recognize her and took her to the police station with the other arrested pickets. She was formally charged and brought to trial. Harold L. Ickes came to defend her. The jury acquitted her, and this was a great victory for the strikers, for it called public attention to the unjust arrests which were being made" (Nestor, 159).

Fannia Cohn, president of the Wrapper, Kimona and Housedress Workers' Local 41 of New York, was arrested in Chicago in 1915 during a glove-workers' strike at the Herzog plant. "[P]olice arrested not only the picketing glove workers but also many of the nonstrikers who were on their way to work." (Nestor, p 239-240; quote 240).

In a 1917 strike to try to unionize dressmakers in Chicago, Agnes Nestor spoke at the mass meeting on behalf of the WTUL; police and courts moved eagerly against strikers, pickets, union officials, and anyone who seemed to offer help to the strikers (Nestor, 240-241). Women pickets were sentenced to jail terms of fifteen to thirty days for various charges (Nestor, 241). After women won the right to vote, Nestor still saw wage-earning women convicted of contempt being sent to jail, some having young babies that had to be weaned or boarded out, one having to leave her tuberculosis treatment, and another who apparently had to give up her opportunity to attend the Summer School for Working Women at Bryn Mawr (Nestor, 245). There was no deference to maternal woman here. The arm of the state was no friend to the working women; Nestor saw several strikes in the garment industry during these years crushed and grievances silenced because of the weapon of the court injunction (Nestor, 244):

> And this Court Injunction, what was it? Originally intended to protect property from irreparable damage, it had been twisted into a weapon to be used against strikers where damage to real property was non-existent. By this injunction certain acts, such as picketing, which was legal, could be made illegal by a writ from a judge. Acting in defiance of this court order subjected one to contempt of court and a fine or jail sentence. The same judge who issued the injunction, heard the case for contempt and sentenced the arrested party. He sat as lawmaker, judge, and jury. (Nestor, 244).

And indignities came not only at the hands of police and employers. Pro-suffrage working-class women found that even union men and some Socialist men were often dismissive and belittling of suffrage, and were sometimes openly hostile. Pauline Newman recalled Socialist men yelling "Why don't you go

home and wash the dishes?" as they disrupted her street-corner speeches (Orleck, 99). Clara Lemlich was pelted with rotten tomatoes thrown by union men from a window of the Uneeda Biscuit factory; they yelled "Go home and wash your pants!" (Tax, 177). Elite women who took to the streets were not immune from derisive comments and jeers in the early years, but they generally received more polite treatment.

If strike activity highlighted for women activists how little their womanhood or integrity meant in terms of deference or respect from agents of the state, another much-publicized series of events in 1917 helped highlight the difference between working-women and their allies in terms of expectations about privacy. Alice Paul and other militants affiliated with the Congressional Union picketed the White House over Wilson's lack of support for suffrage, burned copies of Wilson's speeches, and eventually chained themselves to the White House fence. They received jail for up to seven months in a Virginia workhouse. (Ware, 151; Cott, 59). Paul and her compatriots noted the lack of fresh air and unhealthful stench, the crowding of black and white prisoners together, choking on dust deliberately swept in clouds into the cells by prison employees, cold and poor nourishment. They engaged in a hunger strike and were force-fed. "There is absolutely no privacy allowed a prisoner in a cell," she wrote. "You are suddenly peered at by curious strangers, who look in at you all hours of the day and night, by officials, by attendants, by interested philanthropic visitors, and by prison reformers, until one's sense of privacy is so outraged that one rises in rebellion."(Paul quoted in Ware, 152-153). Paul and her bourgeois companions seemed surprised by what jailed women in the labor movement knew as a matter of course.

Privacy was a bourgeois woman's luxury. For the working woman or girl, sanitary, safe, uncrowded, and healthy environments, heat and ventilation, and good nutrition were uncommon, especially in the workplace. And if the department store girl had a better--if physically stressful--work environment, her pay was often less than that of a factory girl. Privacy would become even more class-specific with social welfare legislation. Maternalists who insisted that the 'home' now included industry, state, and world found that when the state accepted the maternalist logic, 'home' became the state's business. Conditions in the home and the quality of housekeeping and nurturing there became a state interest--at least for recipients of social policy (Mink, 34). Therefore, home-based privacy became a privilege of those who were not dependents of the state.

For working women, turning to the state, to legislative reform, and to the courts for improvement in their situation must have seemed like strange and improbable remedies. Both Pauline Newman and Rose Schneiderman remained Socialists, but turned to

the State House in Albany and to Washington, D.C. looking to "legislation and administrative initiatives to improve the economic status of women and workers. This emphasis distanced them from many of their Jewish colleagues in the industrial labor movement."(Antler, 95). Faith in the state and its institutions would have to be made convincing by their middle-class female allies, who, but for gender, had not experienced the coercive apparatus of the state at first hand. Few in this generation had waged wars of confrontation with the laws of the state.

Working-class women continued to hone their political skills through organizational work. In the late teens, Fanina Cohn led a highly successful worker education movement, seeking to raise consciousness through her work in the ILGWU. She wrote that educating women "cannot but make them understand how small a return they are getting for their labor, and may make them wonder why, though they play so essential a part in our economic life, they are accorded a place so unimportant in administrative, political and social affairs." (Cohn quoted in Orleck, 170). By 1918, women were flocking to these union classes, seeking greater control over their union and empowerment more broadly. However, union leadership feared women's insurgency and crushed a major reform movement in the early 1920s (Orleck, 172). As a result, tens of thousands of women workers were purged from or left the ILGWU between 1920 and 1924 (Orleck, 172).

Special women's committees such as the Women's National Committee of the Socialist Party trained women leaders and gave them "experience in coordinating work on a large scale" (Tax, 287). According to Tax, "the fact that Socialist Party women were, if only briefly, in a position to make decisions about their own national campaigns accounts in part for that organization's large number of outstanding female organizers and speakers." (Tax, 287). The Socialist Party focused a good deal of effort on woman suffrage, since many socialists believed that "suffrage would make the sexes equal, leaving only the class contradiction to worry about." (Tax, 286). The Women's National Committee "was able to build large-scale campaigns around suffrage, put out a monthly women's magazine, and do education about the oppression of women." (Tax, 287). Many Socialists warned worker-suffragists that cooperation with "bourgeois suffrage" would mislead women into thinking the vote was everything they needed (Orleck, 97). And they had some reason for concern. Rose Schneiderman recalled that "My theme in all my suffrage speeches was that I did not expect any revolution when women got the ballot, as men had had it all these years and nothing of great importance had happened. But women needed the vote because they needed protection through laws. Not having the vote, lawmakers could ignore us" (Orleck, 100; Schneiderman, *All for One*, 121-22). But working-class suffrage speeches did

sometimes, apparently, suggest that suffrage was a panacea; and a 1911 Wage Earners' League pamphlet asked why a range of ills existed and answered "BECAUSE YOU ARE A WOMAN AND HAVE NO VOTE./VOTES MAKE THE LAW/VOTES ENFORCE THE LAW/THE LAW CONTROLS CONDITIONS/WOMEN WHO WANT BETTER CONDITIONS MUST VOTE." (Orleck, 100-101; Tax, 173-74).

A large number of working women activists had acquired a very impressive political education. They were effective mobilizers and spoke strongly for their own interests. They had a broad vision of citizenship, and they saw, in ways some of their bourgois allies did not, limitations in their allies' vision of citizenship. But political knowledge and skills didn't translate readily into power because of the nature of the issues they wanted to put on the political agenda beyond suffrage, and the difficulty of using the vote to do so. Even though their interests as women workers would sometimes be heard in legislative assemblies through their suffrage testimony, the terms of their access to the public sphere was still tightly constrained. Some of their hopes remained with the maternalists.

The messages working women received via their association with the suffrage movement were decidedly mixed, part welcoming but part distancing. The New York NAWSA, headed by Carrie Chapman Catt, recognized the advantage in Blatch's more militant suffrage approach. Forming a coalition of New York suffrage groups into the Woman Suffrage Party (which the Equality League did not join), Catt and her allies drew upon the help of the WTUL in trying to reach union members. They printed and distributed literature in the various languages of New York workers and went into ethnic communities in a search for allies. The Woman's Suffrage Party established special French, German, Slavic and Norwegian committees, and considered starting an Irish Club but thought they would receive weak support from this group (and voting figures in New York City indicated this was the case). They dressed in Chinese costumes for a rally in Mott Street and brought an organ grinder's monkey to a Little Italy open-air meeting; "at least they tried to reach immigrants in a period when much of the suffrage movement was attacking them as unfit to vote." (Tax, 170-71; Lerner, 204, 160).

At the suggestion of Rose Schneiderman, the American Suffragettes became the first suffrage group to distribute literature in Yiddish to women on the Lower East Side (Orleck, 94). Blatch and others sought to place positive suffrage news in foreign language papers (Lerner, 212-14). In the nineteen-teens, suffragists attempted to reach members of immigrant communities through ethnic or neighborhood organizations and through the community's religious groups (Lerner, 241-44). Suffrage organizations opened neighborhood headquarters and often tied their efforts to other issues of concern in the community--

support for strikers and unions, help with food boycotts, or education classes in laws, health, or cooking (Lerner, 189-90). NAWSA published and distributed leaflets and flyers in a variety of languages dealing with problems faced by tenement mothers and workers (Lerner, 212-14). After 1911, the mainstream Women's Suffrage Party organized among workers, through its Industrial Committee headed by Rose Schneiderman, at beaches and amusement parks; Coney Island proved a very successful recruiting ground (Lerner, 198-99). A Lower East Side branch of the Wage Earners' League even combined suffrage mobilizing with swimming classes at various beaches on Sunday evenings in the summer (Lerner, 201). Socialite militant Alva Belmont created her own top-down suffrage organization, the Political Equality League between 1909-1912, and was apparently very highly successful in reaching working class supporters from the Lower East Side to a Negro Men's and Women's Branch in Harlem, to a 14th Assembly District Club that attracted many young Irish women (Lerner, 199). Belmont devoted noteworthy efforts to organize African-American women for suffrage, and established a headquarters for the Colored Branch in Harlem, which offered evening classes and lectures; this area became one of the few black districts in Harlem to vote consistently for suffrage (Lerner, 201-202). One branch the Political Equality League located in an affluent section of Jewish Harlem included classes for women in public speaking, debating, and the study of government; there was a complete suffrage library (Lerner, 200).

Even as suffragists courted wage-earning women and immigrant communities in earnest in the nineteen-teens, they continued to assert that patriarchal, old-world, immigrant men were too backward and uncivilized to know the value of suffrage, an argument that was not likely to endear them to their target audience and also was not precisely true in terms of voting support for suffrage (Lerner, 246-47 and Chapter 3). Appeals continued to be made on the basis of protecting the interests of the better sorts (white women included) against the illiterate and the foreign-born. While different appeals may have been made to different audiences, this disposition toward newer or poorly-educated immigrants was impossible to miss. There were suffragists who, following Stanton's lead, called for an educational qualification for the franchise, or who spoke of the menace of "the ignorant foreign vote" (Catt), or who argued that suffrage could be used to increase the influence of "the better sort" in government (Jacobi, Belmont)(Orleck, 93). Even Jane Addams once resorted to this kind of argument to allay fears in Congressional testimony by suggesting that foreign-born women were considerably less likely to vote than native-born women (Suffrage Hearings, 1912).

NAWSA leaders did not always hide their hostility and indignation over the fact that naturalized immigrant males voted while they could not; they New York NAWSA and WSP urged inclusion

of passages that American women were "subjects of men of alien races" and that the purpose of woman suffrage was to enfranchise "white women descendents of the signers of the Declaration of Independence" in materials designed for presentation to Congress in 1916. The passages generated adverse publicity and were eventually struck. (Lerner, 247-48). After the 1915 defeat in New York, Harriot Stanton Blatch was widely quoted for a remark that immigrant men had caused the defeat, and that "No women in the world are so humiliated in asking for the vote as the American woman. . .The Amercan woman appeals to men of twenty-six nationalities, not including the Indian." She said it was "tyranny and license for them to have the power to pass upon me and upon the native born women of America, and a disgrace that the men of our country will force us to submit to it." (Blatch quoted in Lerner, 248-49). A group of capped-and-gowned university women appeared in a Naturalization Court in 1915 to protest, silently, the naturalization of a group of Russians, Serbs, Turks, and Persians; the protest was designed to display the humiliation of highly educated American women, who now had to beg these new citizens for the vote (Lerner, 248).

Since corruption--moral and political--was a frequent target of Progressive reform women in the suffrage movement, they often turned their gaze upon 'the Bowery'. Reformers often treated poor neighborhoods and working-class communities as dens of vice, and prostitution, of support for Tammany Hall and liquor interests and corrupt politics more broadly. Inhabitants of these neighborhoods were morally suspect or dangerous. For many suffrage women, it was and remained an indignity to have to go into such neighborhoods searching for votes, or to be associated with them. This attitude was expressed in Congressional testimony. This posture foreshadowed the maternalist's policy preference for government assistance to those women of sturdy character (Mink, 26 on mother's pensions).

Many elite women activists were quite confident that, once enfranchised, they would provide leadership for all women (DuBois, 39). After all, professional women and well-educated ones should surely be acknowledged universally as leaders by and for women. Mary Putnam Jacobi had suggested that elite women would "so guide ignorant women voters that they could be made to counterbalance, when necessary, the votes of ignorant and interested men" (Jacobi quoted in DuBois, 39). Those maternalists who resisted the immigrant restriction tide offered "an agenda for the social incorporation of new groups through cultural assimilation and the socialization of motherhood" (Mink, 9). They would make immigrant women and working-class women good American citizens.

Wage-earning women activists were well-aware that there was a limit to how much mainstream suffragists wanted to hear their voices. Working-class women needed the vote to protect and

advance their own interests, suffragist allies agreed. But how well did these interests harmonize when trade-union suffragists sought to get women more power over labor laws that affected their working lives and many professional women would help design or administer this same legislation? (DuBois, 49). Blatch thought work was the common denominator for women--the source of their common interest. And yet, she reasoned, wealthy women, as taxpayers, needed the vote to make sure their money wasn't squandered; women in industry needed the vote so that they could help shape the laws governing their jobs and workplaces (DuBois, 44). Was the state really a place where all interests could be harmonized by a broader and socially responsible citizenship?

In the 1915 New York Suffrage Referendum for which suffragists had fought so hard, the heavily working-class Lower East Side was one of only two New York City districts to approve suffrage; editorials in the strongly prosuffrage *Jewish Daily Forward* and strong suffrage support among Jewish voters helped suffragists then, and again in 1917 (Orleck, 108; Lerner, 145-46). New York election data from 1915 and 1917 indicate that women in unionized and politically active trades, with many pro-suffrage women working there, and where the union strongly endorsed suffrage, were likely to carry this sentiment into their homes and communities (Lerner, 174).

And yet mainstream New York suffrage leaders tended to play down the importance of Jewish and Southern Italian suffrage support in the referenda of 1915 and 1917, giving credit to enlightened and modern voters rather than to immigrant and radical ones. Catt claimed that while "all parties, races, nationalities and religions supported the amendment," most of the support came from "uptown residential" districts, and not from "radical downtown" ones (Lerner, 368-370; Catt and Shuler, 298). Catt also downplayed the anti-suffrage claim that New York had been won in part by the Socialist vote, a claim that the *New York Times* also made (Catt and Shuler, 298; Lerner, 371). But the NAWSA branch in New York, the Woman Suffrage Party, knew better with regard to Socialists and Jews, immigrants and workers, having kept careful records of voter canvasses. They had also devoted a very great deal of time, money and effort to organizing in working-class ethnic communities in the final years of the struggle. With the war on and a new push for a federal suffrage amendment, NAWSA sought to disassociate itself from a significant part of its base of support in eastern industrial cities amid a rising tide of attack on immigrant radicals and the foreign-born more generally (Lerner, 371-72, 204, 207-8, and Chapter 4 passim). Moreover, middle-class but newly militant suffrage leaders risked the support of wealthy women if they embraced the Socialists (DuBois, 57). During the New York suffrage campaign, anti-suffrage forces in New York City had asserted that "Pacifist, socialist, feminist, suffragist are all parts of the same movement - a movement which weakens government,

corrupts society and threatens the very existence of our greatest experiment in democracy." (Lerner, 373, quoting *Woman's Protest*, April 1917, 15). Suffrage forces sought the support of major parties and politicians, and finally won endorsement in 1916 by the national convention of both the Republican and Democratic parties; they fervently sought respectability and credibility, and were willing to downplay a good part of their base to secure it (see, e.g., Lerner, 211).

As Socialists, working-class leaders such as O'Reilly and Schneiderman were increasingly on a tight leash when working with their bourgeois suffrage allies. Blatch, more appreciative than most of her peers of the contributions of working-class women to the modern feminist movement, was still uncomfortable with strident class-based politics, and decided to keep the Equality League of Self-Supporting Women free of socialism (Orleck, 95). The somewhat less affluent American Suffragettes, formed by actresses, writers, teachers and social workers, also banned "socialist propaganda" by the close of the first decade of the century (Orleck, 94-95). Individual Socialist working-class suffrage women could remain on the platform, but these organizations were careful not to allow themselves to be closely associated with the party or with Socialist Propaganda (DuBois, 57). "By 1910 it was clear that factory workers would have no real say in creating policy in either organization" (Orleck, 95). Rose Schneiderman, Pauline Newman, Clara Lemlich, and Leonora O'Reilly would participate in bourgeois women's organizations only in language and perspective acceptable to middle-class feminists who sought social harmony.

Though working-class suffrage women had a different vision of what citizenship and equality required beyond suffrage, it is important to recognize that they nonetheless drew upon the maternalist and home-extending rhetoric of the Progressive Era. The Wage Earners' League for Woman Suffrage, co-founded in 1911 by O'Reilly, Schneiderman, Lemlich, Mollie Schepps (another activist from the 1909 shirtwaist strikes), and laundry worker Maggie Hinchey addressed child labor and child welfare, housing quality, pure food and milk, clean streets, abolition of the white slave traffic, and world peace along with "equal pay for all women who toil" in a 1911 Suffrage Week leaflet (Orleck, 100-101). O'Reilly told a joint committee of Congress composed of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate Woman Suffrage Committee at a hearing on April 23, 1912 that "to purify the life of the Nation we women know we have got to do our part, political as well as industrial duty" (O'Reilly in Scott and Scott, 126). Speaking of the condition of working women, she continued, "You have got us in a devil of a mess, economic and political. It is so rank it smells to Heaven; but we will come in and help you clean house. . ." (O'Reilly, 126). And her co-participant Caroline A. Lowe of Kansas City, Missouri, eloquently depicted

the constant threat of low wages to the virtue of the working woman, arguing that these young women required government protection (Lowe in Scott and Scott, 123-24). Schneiderman believed in gender difference; women had distinct values and abilities to contribute to American society and to the working-class movement (Orleck, 104).

Socialist suffrage rhetoric also made use of the 'government as housekeeping' analogy used in the mainstream suffrage movement. Thus, since industry has taken over so much of the work women used to do in the home, what used to be merely domestic problems have been elevated to important matters of government (Buhle, 219). Milk, food, clothing manufacture with its attendant spread of germs and disease in sweatshops and tenements, streets, sewers, care of children--all require investigation and impose on women a social responsibility (Buhle, 219). The whole, time-honored profession of motherhood has been transformed, and women have and use the ballot in order to regulate conditions that they had once controlled in their homes (Buhle, 219). In Italian communities, they argued that shopkeepers and landlords wanted to keep the ballot away from women because, were they to have it, wives could protect their families; in Croatian neighborhoods, Socialists told mothers to take "control over government in [their] own hands." (Buhle, 219). At least one early article in *Socialist Woman* argued that the "woman's intelligent vote will abolish the liquor traffic" (Cramer, 21, though she argues that this publication up to 1909 did not tend to articulate maternalist visions). And one Socialist waxed rhapsodic in the *Progressive Woman* in 1913:

> You are desgined to be the greatest force for social justice this country ever had. Yours is the work to help banish industrial robbery and political corruption, and this task when performed will result in the elevation and emancipation of the race. Hence your sphere is not confined to the thing misnamed 'home' but to the larger sphere of world services--social services--human service. (Barnett Braverman quoted in Buhle, 219).

The political agenda for ballot-armed Socialist women was a more ambitious agenda. So while they shared certain maternalist concerns, the Socialist woman's citizenship required more of her and encompassed more than middle-class and elite feminists were generally willing to countenance.

Rose Schneiderman also had an expansive understanding of citizenship. She believed "industrial citizenship", which included decent wages, hours, and safe working conditions, represented the first battle of working women in their quest for the "right to citizenship" (Orleck, 88). For Schneiderman, this right to citizenship included "the right to be born well, the right to a carefree and happy childhood, the right to education,

the right to mental, physical and spiritual growth and development" (Orleck, 88, quoting Schneiderman, 1/20/26). This right to citizenship was both expansive and, in the American context, rather radical. This citizenship certainly seemed to entail placing substantial obligations upon the state.

Even as many working-class women activists supported the middle-class maternalist agenda, they were aware that the femininity their allies embraced had little to do with them. In front of thousands of cheering working women in Cooper Union's Great Hall at the Wage Earner's League rally on April 22, 1912, Rose Schneiderman told the audience:

> All this talk about women's charm [by anti-suffragist legislators] does not mean working women. Working women are expected to work and produce their kind so that they, too, may work until they die of some industrial disease. (Tax, 173, Orleck, 102, 104, both quoting "Senators vs. Working Women," O'Reilly Papers).

Schneiderman continued to explain that working women would never receive the benefits upper-class women derived from respecting standards of femininity; they needed to define their own realistic notions of femininity since the rest were mere romantic fantasies meant to enslave them. "Surely. . . Women won't lose any more of their beauty and charm by putting a ballot in a ballot box once a year than they are likely to lose standing in foundries or laundries all year round." (Orleck, quoting Schneiderman, 104). Schneiderman and many of her wage-earning allies in the suffrage movement recognized that "real women experienced gender differently, depending on class and culture" (Mink, 11). The working-class members of the gender that was not one were asked to act as if they were.

Progressive maternalists in the middle classes sought social harmony, cultural conformity and thought in terms of homogenizing policies.(Mink, 7) At a time of high anxieties about class and cultural diversity, these feminists could incorporate wage-earning women from immigrant backgrounds insofar as they adopted their values and approximated middle-class standards of respectable womanhood. Reformers "sought to create one motherhood from diversely situated women," (Mink, 10) and viewed this unity as essential to progress for the 'race'.

Those wage-earning women who were most successful in escaping wage work and finding a position from which to exercise political influence were those most supportive of the maternalist feminist agenda, including protective legislation for working women. Many of the working-class women drawn into political work as salaried employees of women's organizations during the nineteen-teens had nowhere to go after suffrage (Orleck, 104).

Schneiderman became president of the Women's Trade Union League in 1918 and served in that capacity for more than 30 years, leading WTUL's many campaigns for protective legislation (Antler, 95). Her association with Frances Perkins and Eleanor Roosevelt, as well as with Franklin Roosevelt, helped expand the influence of women workers and trade unionism more generally in the New Deal; as labor adviser, Schneiderman became the only female appointee of the National Recovery Administration (Antler, 95). Pauline Newman, who was apparently more respectful of the New York Socialist Party's directive to organize for suffrage apart from middle-class suffrage organizations, remained with the trade union movement her entire life, continuing with the ILGWU for seventy years. However, she found the WTUL more nurturing than the male-dominated ILGWU and found WTUL more interested in the women's issues she cared about (Antler, 95).

Maggie Hinchey, who always felt less than fully welcomed at uptown suffrage events because she was not like the other women, was bitter that she had to return to a laundry job paying less than she made at the outset of the laundry workers' strike of 1912; Hinchey, however, thought protective legislation restricted opportunities for working women (Tax, 174-77) and participated in the National Women's Party (Cott, 55). Clara Lemlich was dropped by the WTUL and the suffragists but continued to find some political work on the left, and eventually joined the Communist Party (Tax, 177-78). Leonora O'Reilly resigned from the WTUL in 1915 and opposed protective legislation as well (Dye, 147, 150).

A few of the working-class women drawn into organizing found the ear of government through institutionalized positions. Rose Schneiderman worked for unions and for the WTUL; Leonora O'Reilly was supported by Mary Dreier (Tax, 107). Former Boot and Shoe Workers' Union activist and then WTUL activist Mary Anderson would head the Women's Bureau. Former glove-maker Agnes Nestor Nestor, who participated only peripherally in the suffrage struggle (joining the suffrage parade in 1914 at the request of a wealthy friend and supporterfrom the Philadelphia shirtwaist strike days), became president of the Women's Trade Union League of Chicago in 1914 and a member the same year of President Wilson's Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education, which would make recommendations to Congress. (Nestor, 107, 146, 147, 153). Nestor was concerned when she discovered that some of the Congressmen on the committee "wished to give girls more domestic science than opportunity to learn trades. We [Nestor and Miss Florence Marshall, principal of the Manhattan Trade School for Girls] knew that most of the girls would have to become wage earners as well as homemakers. We, too, loved the home; but the girls needed also training which would equip them to earn a living. . . We felt that if domestic science were allowed the greater appropriation, it would be too easy to push all the girls into that field and not give them the technical

training they were likely to find themselves in need of." (Nestor, 151-152). Nestor and Marshall fought for the bill they wanted, and were apparently satisfied with the result. The bill which came out of her work and that of the other commission members passed Congress and became the Smith-Hughes Act. Nestor's autobiography simply notes the passage of the suffrage amendment (Nestor, 154); it was not central to her efforts in the nineteen-teens. She was, however, quite concerned with the Women's Party's ERA and the harm she thought it posed to working women.

Nestor believed that the National Woman's Party agenda in the mid-1920s presented a serious threat to labor laws for women (Nestor, 236). The Women's Trade Union League and "a representative group of working women from various sections of the country" met quickly after the ERA was proposed in 1922, to consider how to respond to this amendment, which they felt "would nullify all separate laws for women and at one stroke wipe out all the gains of a century of heartbreaking effort" (Nestor, 236). Among others, Harold L. Ickes and Edgar Bancroft, Constitutional authority and supporter of the 10-hour law for working women in Illinois, advised them (Nestor, 237). The League, now headed by working women, stood strongly behind continued protective legislation (Dye, 150-61). "[T]he organized labor movement, the trade-union women, and most other national women's organizations continued their opposition to the proposed amendment." (Nestor, 238) However, two working women's organizations in New York State formed in 1915 and 1917 began to vigorously oppose protective laws affecting women. The Women's League for Equal Opportunity and the Equal Rights League were composed of women who tended to work in traditionally male occupations; following the war, these groups sent lobbyists to each legislative hearing, and they contended that displacement of women workers would result from protective laws (Dye, 155-56).

Shortly before the final victory of the suffrage amendment, optimistic middle-class suffragists established plans and infrastructure to 'prepare' their immigrant sisters for the vote, creating extensive programs to "Americanize" them and help them become informed, registered voters. NAWSA established an Americanization Committee, which soon became the Citizenship Committee, and then made a transition in the early 1920s from a Citizenship Committee to a political education committee in the National League of Woman Voters, with Mrs. Frederick Bagley chairing until the last transition. Bagley also headed a Citizenship Committee with the General Federation of Women's Clubs (NAWSA Papers; National League of Woman Voters Papers, Library of Congress; Mink, 112 on GFWC).

In addition to child and woman-centered policy initiatives in which they were engaged, maternalist reformers claimed for

themselves a role in the socialization of new voters so that they would become proper citizens. The NLWV, in particular, stressed the identity between information and and responsible citizenship: the proper woman citizen must become educated on the political issues of the day and active in political reform issues. Education, more generally, created people capable of being citizens and became a vital component of the maternalist agenda (see Mink, Chapters 4 and 5).

To differing degrees, bourgeois women's rights organizations made an effort to include working women in their conception of "we" in their final push for suffrage. The maternalist rhetoric that helped propel women to the vote, and in which pro-suffrage women in the labor movement often participated, hardly captured nor privileged what was most salient in wage-earning women's experiences, even if the vote provided them a useful tool. Given power relations and dominant discourses, working women were not equal in their access to the public sphere as that sphere opened wider, nor were they equal in the terms of their access. The experiences of participants with different class-gender locations in this movement for greater equality through the franchise should remind us that inclusion of the once-marginalized into the public sphere does not guarantee the terms of their inclusion, and it appears that out-groups had to play by certain rules not of their own choosing to be heard (see, for instance, Fraser, 1992; Mansbridge, 135).

"Motherhood" and a re-imagined "home" spoke of a potential alliance across class and racial lines. But working-class and non-white cultures and behaviors (real and imagined) were so much a part of what virtue was defined against that Anglo-Saxon motherhood remained the predominant measure against which other women were--or were not--properly women and were--or were not--good citizens.

Conclusion

It has become a common theme in the literature that maternalism or "difference feminism" was responsible for social policies that engendered a second-class citizenship for working women and women of color during the 1920s and 30s, and that had continuing impact in the welfare state (see Mink, 1995). The social policies maternalist reformers advanced withheld "the tools of independent citizenship from most poor women." (Mink, 8). Maternalism, by enfranchising women as mothers, ended up "privileging women's private maternal roles as benefiting political society rather than women's formal political roles." (McDonagh, 167).

Activists did not control all the consequences of their efforts, nor all the uses to which their rhetoric would be put. Though they should have foreseen some of these, they couldn't possibly imagine all of them. Did the problem lie with the woman-centered claims for knowledge/power per se? It is true that maternalism played into male preferences for women's home-centered roles, instead of workplace ones except in those fields women had carved out as theirs (children, social work). It is also clearly true, as mentioned earlier, that by elevating the political status and visibility of the home, women made it much easier for state agents to enter and supervise the homes of female policy beneficiaries. It was also the case that in the 'roaring 20s', many women rejected the ideal of domesticity; "women thus abandoned the home as a basis for a separate political culture and as a set of values and way of life that all women shared;" the separate sphere no longer served as a unifying, organizing principle (Baker, 644-45).

And perhaps most importantly, "woman suffrage was adopted just at the time when the influence of parties and electoral politics on public policy was declining." (Baker, 645). Not only were parties and electoral politics declining in popular support, but there was a contraction of participatory access coterminous with an expansion of the power of the state (McDonagh, 182-83).

Moreover, if the state grew more receptive to maternalist arguments in the nineteen teens, it became more hostile to the left following the World War, and to many of the working-class suffrage women who were branded as socialists or communists. The mainstream suffrage movement and maternalist reformers became increasingly careful not to be identified as socialists, though it would not save even Maude Wood Park of the LWV from the Spider Web Chart in the early 1920s (Peace Collection, Swarthmore College). This change of climate surely had an impact on how middle-class feminist reformers would craft their maternalist image and prescriptions.

Wendy Sarvasy is one of a very few recent feminist scholars who speaks of the "emancipatory potential of gender difference." (Sarvasy, 65). She points out that a woman-first approach to labor laws was a pragmatic calculus, since the federal courts in the Lochner (1905) era had demonstrated that they would not accept a universalistic formulation (Sarvasy, 62). Even federal efforts to stop child labor were thwarted in the courts. Female reformers worked to extend such labor laws to the larger class of wage-earners. Maternalists wanted to give "the public status of citizenship to a previously privatized activity performed by women, and they wanted to create a new type of democratic participation that would engage women in the administration of public sector programs" (Sarvasy, 60).

Sarvasy sees in Jane Addams an attempt to transform interpersonal service from an activity performed by those in subordinate and dependent positions to an activity involving no servants but rather equals (Sarvasy, 66). She sees the potential in this movement to liberate service from relations of unequal power, and thinks early twentieth century feminists such as Addams were asking whether democratic citizenship could be conceptualized in more nurturing terms--terms through which women's experiences became the standard for measuring equality (Sarvasy, 67-68). This agenda, certainly a part of the maternalist legacy, was not simply reactionary, exclusionary, or elitist. It never received a full hearing.

In Sarvasy's view, maternalists in the suffrage movement struggled to expand the spaces and locations for citizen action; they struggled to expand public life, to add new modes of activity to the understanding of citizenship, and to include serving human needs in the modern city in this definition of citizenship (Sarvasy, 55-56, 62-63). Moreso than many of their contemporaries, women challenged an individualistic understanding of civil and political rights (Sarvasy, 61). "The entrance of women into public life rested on a complete reevaluation of caring and private service activities." Interpersonal service such as that the settlement women provided, was elevated to a citizen activity (Sarvasy, 59). If state agencies that served the welfare state were not accountable, it was not because women sought to insulate them from participatory politics in the least (Sarvasy, 59-60, 65). Participation by social citizens in the welfare state "was crucial to the project of turning women into citizens" (Sarvasy, 65). Maternalists stressed the interdependence of all citizens, and women like Addams greatly admired the traditions of mutual aid in immigrant and African-American communities; much could be learned from such models for public caring.

Eileen McDonagh poses an important question, however, for Sarvasy's perspective. Women contributed to the expansion of the power of the state and to the development of bureaucratized social welfare institutions. How much popular participation was countenanced by the feminist agenda? Was the maternalist agenda more about statism than about participation? (McDonagh, 146-47). Paula Baker suggests, too, that women, having yielded to government many of the functions that had once belonged in the 'woman's sphere,' came to feel less responsible for these tasks, relying instead on experts and on government aid (Baker, 644). When it came to the implementation of policy, languages of science and objectivity may have encouraged this result.

While Addams should not be taken as the most "representative" of the maternalist reformers (though one of the most admirable), the difference in perspective on maternalism one

finds when looking at some of the settlement women leads at least to the conclusion that there were different trajectories and different possibilities inherent in woman-centered knowledge/power claims.

As Ellen Carol DuBois argues, "class was the contradiction at the suffrage movement's heart" (DuBois, 58). Work itself was creating a great deal of this contradiction. The early twentieth century saw more and more women working outside the home, very often out of necessity, and yet maternalists needed home in order to be able to speak in the name of women. Women's nurturing was vital to woman's authoritative voice; for unmarried settlement women, people other than their own children would be nurtured. Middle-class suffragists and reformers were not alone in drawing on maternalist visions, but neither were the home-expanding activists united in what maternalism should entail when it came to working women.

Addams, working-class maternalists and others notwithstanding, the policies shaped with the aid of maternalists did tend to exhibit the assumption that middle-class, educated women and their progressive male allies would make and administer policies for wage-earning women and the poor. "For the least privileged women--southern and eastern European immigrants and women of color--their relationship to the state was limited to their condition as subjects of maternalist social policy" (Mink, 5).

The direction and emphasis of the League of Women Voters contributed to this outcome. Linking citizenship to information and sustained participation in 'good government' reforms and other maternalist agenda items, the LWV educated, armed, and mobilized a vast cadre of women largely of the middle-classes, who were generally not dependent on full-time work for their own support. LWV chapters in at least twenty-six states organized a vast array of citizenship schools in their states throughout the early and mid-1920s (LWV Papers, Library of Congress). A good citizen, and one who deserved to lead, was one armed with knowledge/information. "Education replaced marching companies, parades, and even rallies with pamphlets and other literature; it replaced emotional, demonstrative partisanship with a subdued politics of reason and supposed objectivity; it accepted some independence from party and welcomed the participation of pressure groups" (McGerr, 1990, 869-870). Emphasis on rationality, education, and nonpartisanship made LWV-stype politics so much less exciting than it had been for nineteenth century party loyalist males and for many wage-earning women.

Women contributed importantly to an expanded and more comprehensive definition of citizenship, which corresponded to growth in the sphere of governmental activity, extending to the federal level. However, this more comprehensive definition of

citizenship can be seen as a more "high stakes" definition: responsible citizenship demanded information-gathering and engagement in public issues in a more "scientific" and less emotional manner--the kinds of activity that students of participatory activity term more difficult. Along with their Progressive allies, they "embraced an expansive, activist, and positive view of democratic citizenship. . . an engaged, interventionist, and national citizenship" (Mileur, 271). There was a perceived duty to be a "full-throated" citizen rather than one who merely said yes and no at the ballot box (Mileur, 271); anything less was a dereliction of duty. Those who did less than this were less deserving of the name citizen. "High stakes" citizenship made it easier to rationalize exclusion on the basis of literacy tests, and easier to exclude working-class foreign-born immigrants. And for those who were voters in name if not citizens in behavior by the new definition, non-partisan and anti-politics reforms "raised the costs and lowered the benefits of political participation for working- and lower-class voters, especially immigrants and minorities, and made a politics of mass organization more difficult." (Mileur, 280)

Women who wanted both to change the meaning of citizenship and to be taken seriously when playing the male game of politics looked for other ways to bolster their claim to advance public policy in the national interest. They created scientific motherhood. Home economics became scientific; social work became a data-gathering, scientific study. Efficiency in government was a byword of civil service reform efforts. Social progress required organized and scientific effort by women (see Baker, 631, 636). Women legitimated their claims upon the political agenda by becoming more "objective," neutral, professional, apolitical, and thereby more twentieth-century male-identified in their methods.

All these developments created distance between such female reformers and the more passionate and political style of the working-class women sometimes allied with them. Modes of participation and political involvement recognized by middle-class reformers and working-class women diverged.

Somewhat like Addams, perhaps, Harriot Stanton Blatch was a bit of an outlier in this story. She seemed almost to identify with an older male style of politics as rough-and-tumble, as combat; she was drawn to politics, which she saw as a male 'sport' she was sure she would master (DuBois, 56). Blatch came to identify her interests with those of the Socialist Party in the U.S. and began working actively with the Party in 1920, running twice for office in New York on their ticket. She devoted so much time to the Socialists, she said, because of her "great desire to help improve the position of the worker. This seemed imperative if we were to raise the caliber of our civilization" (Blatch and Lutz, 316-17). Blatch had not been a

supporter of protective legislation, joined the Women's Party and supported its Equal Rights Amendment rather than the protective legislation favored by the maternalists (Blatch and Lutz, 84-85, 287-89, 278, 322). She felt that special legislation for women threw them out of employment or crowded them into the lowest grades of work (Blatch and Lutz, 322). Mary Beard left the National Women's Party when it took a position against special legislation for women (Becker, 136-37).

But the radical potential in the vision that home was now just about everywhere did exist, and it expanded the notion of what politics would be about. It had different cadences in different circles and classes. In critiques of industrial practices, individualism, and militarism, women who derived their authority from knowledge of the now broadly-defined home posed far-ranging criticisms of the status quo. Those who believed in woman-centered political knowledge could be found on different sides of the protective legislation chasm (e.g. Gilman). Some of the activists in the suffrage and reform movements were committed to a larger transformation of citizenship. The failure of home-based knowledge and power to more radically transform social policy should not be laid solely on the doorstep of the vision.

References

Andersen, Kristi. *After Suffrage: Women in Partisan and Electoral Politics Before the New Deal.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

Antler, Joyce. *The Journey Home: Jewish Women and the American Century.* NY: Free Press, 1997.

Arendt, Hannah, *On Revolution.* (New York: Viking, 1965).

Baker, Paula. "The Domestication of Politics: Women and American Political Society, 1780-1920," *American Historical Review* 89 (June, 1984): 620-647.

Becker, Susan D. *The Origins of the Equal Rights Amendment: American Feminism Between the Wars.* Contributions in Women's Studies, Number 23. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1981.

Blatch, Harriot Stanton. Scrapbooks. Library of Congress, microfilm reels 1-3.

Blatch, Harriot Stanton and Alma Lutz. *Challenging Years.* New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1940.

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

Catt, Carrie Chapman and Nettie Rogers Shuler. *Woman Suffrage and Politics: The Inner Story of the Suffrage Movement.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Cott, Nancy F. *The Grounding of Modern Feminism.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.

Cramer, Janet M. "Woman as Citizen: Race, Class, and the Discourse of Women's Citizenship, 1894-1909," *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs* 165 (March, 1998).

Davis, Susan G. *Parades and Power.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1986.

DuBois, Ellen Carol. "Working Women, Class Relations, and Suffrage Militance: Harriot Stanton Blatch and the New York Woman Suffrage Movement, 1894-1909," *Journal of American History* 74 (June, 1987), pp. 34-58.

Dye, Nancy Schrom, *As Equals and As Sisters: Feminism, Unionism, and the Women's Trade Union League of New York.* Columbia and London: University of Missouri press, 1980.

Finnegan, Margaret. *Selling Suffrage: Consumer Culture and Votes for Women.* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999).

Fraser, Nancy. "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy," in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), pp. 109-142.

Lerner, Elinor. *Immigrant and Working Class Involvement in the New York City Woman Suffrage Movement, 1905-1917: A Study in Progressive Era Politics*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Sociology Department, University of California, Berkeley, 1981. University Microfilms International, 1982.

Lowe, Caroline A. "Statement of Miss Caroline A. Lowe, of Kansas City Mo.," U.S. Congress, Senate, Joint Committee, 62nd Congress, 2nd session, Senate Document 601, pp. 16-20 [1912], reprinted in Anne Firor Scott and Andrew M. Scott, *One Half the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage*. Philadelphia, New York, and Toronto: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1975, pp. 122-26.

Mansbridge, Jane. "Feminism and Democracy," *The American Prospect* 1 (Spring, 1990), pp. 127-139.

McDonagh, Eileen L. "Race, Class, and Gender in the Progressive Era," pp. 145-191 in Sidney M. Milkis and Jerome M. Mileur, eds., *Progressivism and the New Democracy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

McGerr, Michael. *The Decline of Popular Politics: The American North, 1865-1928*. (New York: Oxford, 1986).

_____. "Political Style and Women's Power, 1830-1930," *Journal of American History* 77 (December, 1990), pp. 864-85.

Mileur, Jerome M. "The Legacy of Reform: Progressive Government, Regressive Politics," pp. 259-87 in Sidney M. Milkis and Jerome M. Mileur, eds., *Progressivism and the New Democracy*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1999.

Mink, Gwendolyn. *The Wages of Motherhood: Inequality in the Welfare State, 1917-1942*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995.

National League of Women Voters, Papers of the League of Women Voters. Library of Congress and Boxes 1-64 on microfilm.

Nestor, Agnes. *Woman's Labor Leader: An Autobiography of Agnes Nestor*. Rockford, Illinois: Bellevue Books Publishing Company, 1954; copyright Mary Nestor, 1954.

O'Reilly, Leonora. "Statement of Miss Leonora O'Reilly, of New York City," U.S. Congress, Senate, Joint Committee, 62nd Congress, 2nd session, Senate Document 601, pp. 16-20 [1912], reprinted in Anne Firor Scott and Andrew M. Scott, *One Half the People: The Fight for Woman Suffrage*. Philadelphia, New York, and Toronto: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1975, pp. 122-26.

Orleck, Annelise. *Common Sense and a Little Fire: Women and Working-Class Politics in the United States, 1900-1915.* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1991).

Ryan, Mary P. "Gender and Public Access: Women's Politics in Nineteenth-Century America," in Craig Calhoun, ed., *Habermas and the Public Sphere.* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992), pp. 259-288.

Ryan, Mary. *Women in Public: Between Banners and Ballots, 1825-1880.* Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.

Sarvasy, Wendy. "Social Citizenship from a Feminist Perspective," *Hypatia* 12 (1997): 54-73.

Sparks, Holloway. "Dissident Citizenship: Democratic Theory, Political Courage, and Activist Women," *Hypatia* 12 (Fall, 1997), pp. 74-110.

Tax, Meredith. *The Rising of the Women: Feminist Solidarity and Class Conflict, 1880-1917.* New York and London: Monthly Review Press, 1980.

Ware, Susan. *Modern American Women: A Documentary History.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company; copyright Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1989.

CE 063 678

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Whose Citizenship? Which State? Work and its Challenges for Women's Visions of Citizenship, 1900-1925	
Author(s): CAROL NACKENOFF	
Corporate Source: paper delivered at the 2001 meetings of the American Political Science Association, Aug 29 - Sept 2, San Francisco, CA	Publication Date: —

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

[X]

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

[ ]

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

[ ]

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Carol Nackenoff	Printed Name/Position/Title: Professor CAROL NACKENOFF
Organization/Address: Dept. Political Science Swarthmore College 500 College Ave, Swarthmore, PA 19081	Telephone: (610) 328-8126 FAX: (610) 328-8442
	E-Mail Address: cnacken1@swarthmore.edu Date: 7/9/02

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: