

The Pink Scare: *The Woman Patriot* and the Gendering of Radicalism

Frances Johnson

May 3, 2021
Professor James Gregory

On May 24, 1869, the Massachusetts state legislature formed a “Joint Special Committee on Woman Suffrage” in response to a petition for women’s suffrage.¹ Two hundred anti-suffrage women successfully lobbied against the petition with the argument that the “exercise of elective franchise would diminish the purity, the dignity and moral influence of woman, and bring into the family circle a dangerous element of discord.”² Battle lines deepened with the contemporaneous merger of the National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) and the American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA) into the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA).³ Much like its opponent, the countermovement to women’s suffrage firmly rooted itself in the Northeast. The crusade for public opinion centered around the media. *The Remonstrance*, the oldest anti-suffrage publication, began publication in Massachusetts in 1890.⁴ The New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage (NYSAOWS) first published *The Anti-Suffragist* in July 1908. *The Anti-Suffragist*, a quarterly newspaper, remained in circulation until April 1912. The publication’s dissolution did not mark the demise of the anti-suffrage movement. Rather, state anti-suffrage organizations coalesced nationally, creating the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage (NAOWS) in November 1911.⁵ State associations like New York’s composed the NAOWS. A monthly national anti-suffrage organ named *The Woman’s Protest* superseded *The Anti-Suffragist* in May 1912.⁶ This first issue

¹ Massachusetts General Court Joint Special Committee on Woman’s Suffrage, *Senate, No. 343, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in Senate, May 24, 1869* (Boston: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Senate, 1869), <https://www.loc.gov/item/93838295/>.

² Thomas J. Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party: Female Anti-Suffragists in the United States, 1868-1920*, Scholarship in Women’s History (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Pub., 1994), 2.

³ Lee Ann Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage* (Princeton University Press, 1996), 9.

⁴ Kristy Maddux, “When Patriots Protest: The Anti-Suffrage Discursive Transformation of 1917,” *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 7, no. 3 (2004): 287.

⁵ Tiffany K. Wayne and Lois W. Banner, eds., *Women’s Rights in the United States: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia of Issues, Events, and People* (ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2015), 17.

⁶ Wayne and Banner, eds., *Women’s Rights in the United States*, 18; *The Woman’s Protest against Woman Suffrage*, vol. 1, no. 1 (New York: National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, 1912), 1.

claimed the “blood relationship of Woman Suffrage and Socialism.”⁷ With the seeds of anti-radicalism planted, they preserved a constituency of principally middle-class women with the support of men in politics and business.⁸ The strategic situation changed on November 6 when New York enfranchised women.⁹ New York’s constitutional amendment shifted the NAOWS focus from state legislatures to Congress. After relocating to Washington D.C. in the summer of 1917 and the House of Representatives’ passage of the women’s suffrage amendment in January 1918, *The Woman’s Protest* published its final edition in February 1918.¹⁰ In its place, the NAOWS published the first edition of *The Woman Patriot* on April 27, 1918. The first version of the subtitle reads “For Home and National Defense Against Woman Suffrage, Feminism, and Socialism.” With it, *The Woman Patriot* solidified its dedication to the gendering of radicalism.

This paper will analyze how *The Woman Patriot* adapted to the rise of women’s suffrage and changed the course of women’s organizations. Popular conception holds that the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment invalidated the anti-suffrage movement. However, *The Woman Patriot* remained in publication until 1932.¹¹ The various iterations of anti-suffrage organization newsletters demonstrate the reconfigurations and renegotiations in response to a protean sociopolitical context. In addition to the use of newspaper articles, congressional records, and scholarly research, this essay relies on an analysis of *The Woman Patriot* using social movement theories. Success and failure will be assessed through resource mobilization theory and political opportunity theory. Resource mobilization theory argues that social movements employ rational

⁷ *The Woman’s Protest*, vol. 1, no. 1, 5.

⁸ Susan E. Marshall, “Ladies against Women: Mobilization Dilemmas of Antifeminist Movements,” *Social Problems* 32, no. 4 (1985): 349.

⁹ Tessa Melvin, “1917: When Women Won Right to Vote,” *The New York Times*, November 1, 1987, sec. New York, <https://www.nytimes.com/1987/11/01/nyregion/1917-when-women-won-right-to-vote.html>.

¹⁰ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 354–55.

¹¹ Marshall, 355.

cost-benefit analysis. Growth hinges on the acquisition and mobilization of resources.¹² According to historian Robert A. Goldberg, resources are “the tools used to gain influence.”¹³ Resources can include capital, members, information, leadership, and solidarity. The model of sociologist Charles Tilly divides “contenders for power”—those mobilizing their resources for policy change—into the establishment polity members and outside challengers.¹⁴ Contenders attain power by either convincing or disrupting authorities. Alliances have the potential to both compile and demobilize resources. Lastly, the government arbitrates through conciliation, co-optation, and censorship.¹⁵ Government involvement introduces the influence of political power into the social movement matrix. Adding onto the resource component, political opportunity theory evaluates the political context. The factors composing these opportunities include formal institutions, the political contenders for power, and informal decision-making.¹⁶ Per the work of political scientist Lee Ann Banaszak, political opportunity theory includes the status quo, coalition, and group values it influences.¹⁷ With both theories, the procurement of power defines success. The power of *The Woman Patriot* will be measured through its resources, political change, and values.

The Groundwork of *The Woman’s Protest* (1912 - 1918) and the NAOWS (1911 - 1920)

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage experienced the most growth between its conception in 1912 and 1916.¹⁸ At the end of 1912, the NAOWS counted 105,000

¹² Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 27.

¹³ Robert Alan Goldberg, *Grassroots Resistance: Social Movements in Twentieth Century America* (Waveland Press, Incorporated, 1996), 8.

¹⁴ Goldberg, *Grassroots Resistance*, 9.

¹⁵ Goldberg, 10–11.

¹⁶ Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 30–31.

¹⁷ Banaszak, 34–39.

¹⁸ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 349.

members.¹⁹ This number increased to 200,000 members across twenty-five state organizations in 1915, the year of a crucial referendum in Massachusetts. Over a year, its membership increased by 150,000, reaching 350,000 women in 1916.²⁰ Starting in 1912, *The Woman's Protest* gained funding through the distribution of one dollar annual subscriptions, ten-cent copies, books, and pamphlets.²¹ Suffrage state campaigns resulted in an average of fifteen states per year considered women's suffrage legislation between 1910 and 1920.²² Although legislation passed in only six states by 1916 (Oregon, Kansas, Arizona, Illinois, Nevada, and Montana), the 1917 enfranchisement of women in New York marked a transformational watershed.²³

The ability of NAOWS to mobilize their members and political success proved unsuccessful. First, membership figures may be unreliable due to inconsistent bookkeeping practices. Second, the national organization required donations to offset inadequate funds.²⁴ Third, an ideology of femininity, domesticity, and respectability defined the administration of President Josephine Dodge and Secretary Minnie Bronson. Namely, the NAOWS limited its resources through the continued isolation inherent to the domesticity of women, emphasis on education over politics, and lack of coordination with local chapters and state associations as well as other organizations.²⁵ Isolation of its members, chapters, and organizations stunted the formation of group values to rally behind. As a national newspaper, *The Woman's Protest* functioned more as a middle man between states than leadership to organize and distribute resources.²⁶ In many ways, this is by design. *The Woman's Protest* did “not intend to dictate the policy or direct the details of work to any of the State associations, believing that the women of

¹⁹ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 86.

²⁰ Maddux, “When Patriots Protest,” 287.

²¹ *The Woman's Protest*, vol. 1, no. 1, 12.

²² Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 11.

²³ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 349.

²⁴ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 86.

²⁵ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 353–54.

²⁶ Marshall, 354.

each community can judge best what is necessary or expedient, but it hopes to co-operate whenever there is a request for assistance.”²⁷ While Bronson spoke at the House of Representatives’ Committee on Woman Suffrage on December 3, 1913, *The Woman’s Protest* called to limit member attendance in Congress in 1915 and 1916.²⁸ During the 1915 campaign in Massachusetts, anti-suffragists shared “silent speeches” of written placards in the windows of headquarter “shops.”²⁹ Silence characterized their auto tours, visits to state legislatures, and distribution of materials to legislators.³⁰ Apolitical rhetoric cloistered the NAOWS from polity members and formal political institutions. While the NAOWS committed to war-time silence, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) amplified its voice. Carrie Chapman Catt formulated her “Winning Plan” in 1916.³¹ The anti-suffrage movement failed to replicate the suffrage movement’s political campaign of militant protesting, lobbying, alliances, and prominent leaders. As the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment inched further, the future of the anti-suffrage movement depended on a change in leadership and ideology. In February 1918, a month after the House of Representatives passed the women’s suffrage amendment, the final edition of *The Woman’s Protest* concluded that they could no longer be a “women’s club against a political party.”³²

²⁷ *The Woman’s Protest*, vol. 1, no. 1, 3.

²⁸ U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Woman Suffrage, *Hearing Before the Committee on Rules on the Resolution Establishing a Committee on Woman Suffrage*, 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1913, H. Doc., 45; Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 353.

²⁹ Louise L. Stevenson, “Women Anti-Suffragists in the 1915 Massachusetts Campaign,” *The New England Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (1979), 82.

³⁰ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 352.

³¹ Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 11.

³² Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 354.

***The Woman Patriot* and the Rise of “Wadsworth” Tactics**

On July 1, 1917, *The Woman’s Protest* announced that Alice Wadsworth would succeed Josephine Dodge as the President of the NAOWS. The resignation of this old guard came amid the relocation to Washington, D.C. Wadsworth already established residence in Washington, D.C. as the President of the Capitol’s NAOWS chapter.³³ She came from an elite political background as the wife of Republican Senator James W. Wadsworth Jr. and the daughter of John Hay, “Abraham Lincoln’s secretary and Secretary of State under McKinley and Roosevelt.”³⁴ Prior to her promotion, Wadsworth spoke at the Senate Committee on Woman Suffrage and the House Judiciary Committee in May 1917. Although still upholding traditional values, Wadsworth drew anti-suffragist women closer into the political sphere.

The renovation of the NAOWS culminated in the rebranding of *The Woman’s Protest* as *The Woman Patriot*. On April 27, 1918, the seminal issue of *The Woman Patriot* introduced the cause of the NAOWS and the leadership of Alice Wadsworth. Wadsworth proclaimed that “the anti-suffrage movement henceforth will wage unceasing war against the two great enemies of our civilization—Feminism and Socialism. We shall enter every State, whether women vote or not, and support the men who, noting the symptoms of decline and degeneration, have the courage and ability to apply a remedy.”³⁵ *The Woman Patriot* began with a declaration of political war. Alice Wadsworth’s ascendancy rejected Josephine Dodge’s avoidance of “controversy, notoriety, and sensationalism so far as was possible in active political campaigns.”³⁶ Dodge and Bronson propagated Progressive Era reforms and separate spheres ideology.³⁷ By contrast, conspiratorial fervor became characteristic of Wadsworth’s administration. The preeminence of anti-radicalism

³³ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 95.

³⁴ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 14 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 27, 1918), 7; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 27, 1918), 2.

³⁵ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2.

³⁶ Marshall, “Ladies against Women,” 352.

³⁷ Maddux, “When Patriots Protest,” 288.

disarmed the argument that women did not need or want the vote.³⁸ This change is supported by an analysis of six arguments used by anti-suffragists: socialism, radicalism, militarism, traditional values, country security, and needlessness. Comparing *The Woman's Protest* and *The Woman Patriot*, difference of proportion tests conducted by researcher Artour Aslanian show a statistically significant increase in rhetoric against socialism, radicalism, and national security. Appeals to traditional values remained constant while *The Woman's Protest* contained a greater proportion of arguments against suffrage's militarism and need.³⁹ An increase in the perceived threat of radicalism is correlated with a decrease in the nonnecessity of suffrage.

In the wake of New York's 1917 enfranchisement of women, *The Woman Patriot* galvanized support around a national cause. Wadsworth attributed losses to "the increased socialist vote" and wanted the "question of suffrage re-submitted to popular vote, with women voting, so that it may be repealed."⁴⁰ Paradoxically, *The Woman Patriot* positioned the female right to vote in New York to counter the federal amendment movement. Alice Wadsworth lobbied in politics and the media. She corresponded with President Wilson, intervened in the Republican National Committee, and challenged NAWSA's Carrie Chapman Catt to a debate.⁴¹ Information embraced the style of muckraking journalism. With an overhauled board of directors and editorial staff, propaganda bombarded the pages. The headlines claimed, among many others, that "BUREAUS OF FREE LOVE ESTABLISHED BY FEMINISTS AND SOCIALISTS IN RUSSIA" and "WOMAN SUFFRAGE RUSSIA INSTITUTING FEMALE SLAVE MARKET."⁴² This sensationalism demonstrated a broader claim of not an ideological

³⁸ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 111.

³⁹ Artour Aslanian, "The Use of Rhetoric in Anti-Suffrage and Anti-Feminist Publications," *LUX: A Journal of Transdisciplinary Writing and Research from Claremont Graduate University* 2, no. 1 (March 25, 2013), <https://doi.org/10.5642/lux.201301.02>.

⁴⁰ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2.

⁴¹ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 100.

⁴² *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 28 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., November 2, 1918), 2; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 10 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., June 29, 1918), 7.

but an existential threat to women, children, and democracy. It sought equivalence of suffrage with a nebulous, foreign, and treasonous radicalism. The weaponization of fear justified action by any means and interpretation necessary. With Wadsworth at the helm, *The Woman Patriot* became the mouthpiece of the NAOWS and its reported 450,000 members.⁴³ Wanted advertising solicited “reliable persons throughout the country to become correspondents, organizers, and local representatives.”⁴⁴ Increasingly, Wadsworth involved a male effort for anti-suffrage.⁴⁵ Starting in the first issue, *The Woman Patriot* advertised the American Constitution League (ACL).⁴⁶ The ACL emerged in December 1917 as a national men’s organization against suffrage. This mixed-gender alliance was unsuccessful on two counts. First, men dominated the lines to power. Second, this power failed to materialize achievement in the ratification fight.⁴⁷ *The Woman Patriot*’s revenue relied on subscriptions, advertisements, investments in the Woman Patriot Publishing Company (WPPC), and self-funding. Between April 12 and April 19, 1919, the unit price changed from two cents to five cents.⁴⁸ The cost doubled to ten cents on May 1, 1921. Simultaneously, the newspaper further cut costs by decreasing the publishing frequency from weekly to twice monthly.⁴⁹ Its pages included subscription promotions. One implores sending the newspaper to “your Congressman, your local officials, your public library, your organization, your pastor, and your local editors.”⁵⁰ Another appeals to joining “the 450,000 Adult American Women, who have signed Anti-Suffrage Membership Blanks in the Last Three

⁴³ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2.

⁴⁴ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 21 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 14, 1918), 3.

⁴⁵ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 103.

⁴⁶ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 8.

⁴⁷ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 77–78.

⁴⁸ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 2, no. 15 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 2, 1919), 1; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 19, 1919), 1.

⁴⁹ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 5, no. 16 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 16, 1921), 1; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 5, no. 17 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., May 1, 1921), 1.

⁵⁰ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 8.

Years.”⁵¹ Unlike *The Woman’s Protest*, *The Woman Patriot* posted advertisements for businesses like “The Washington” hotel and the Hayworth Publishing House.⁵² At ten dollars per stock, it promoted investment for “a real, live anti-suffragist, and would rather *invest* \$10 now in a patriotic enterprise than *have it taken away* from you later in increased taxes under *woman suffrage* and Socialism.”⁵³ Wadsworth drove support with patriotism and fear. Despite these fundraising efforts, *The Woman Patriot* inherited the financial issues of its predecessors. Wealthy board members offset an annual average loss of \$6,000.⁵⁴ Vulnerabilities in mobilization left *The Woman Patriot* in a precarious position.

The Nineteenth Amendment

The transitional period between *The Woman’s Protest* and *The Woman Patriot* proved to be improvident regarding the national suffrage amendment. On January 10, 1918, the House of Representatives approved the Susan B. Anthony Amendment with a margin of 274 to 136.⁵⁵ Barely meeting the required two-thirds majority, the passage in the House represented turning tides for the support of women’s suffrage. President Wilson officially voiced his support for the amendment the day before the vote, exactly a year after he declined to support it in a meeting with the National Woman’s Party (NWP).⁵⁶ However, the tides were not enough to carry the vote through Congress. President Wilson reiterated his support through an unprecedented address to the Senate on September 30, 1918. He argued that the female vote was a “vital necessary war

⁵¹ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 7.

⁵² *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 8; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 3.

⁵³ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 1, 4.

⁵⁴ Kirsten Marie DeLegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki: The Origins of Female Conservatism in the United States* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), 75.

⁵⁵ History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives, “Jeannette Rankin and the Women’s Suffrage Amendment,” Whereas: Stories from the People’s House, January 1, 2018, <https://history.house.gov/Blog/2018/January/1-10-Suffrage-Committee/>.

⁵⁶ Beth Behn, “Woodrow Wilson’s Conversion Experience: The President, the Woman Suffrage Movement, and the Extent of Executive Influence” (M.A., University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2004), 69.

measure.”⁵⁷ Beyond the war effort, President Wilson appealed to female morality. According to President Wilson, women belong in the public sphere because “[w]e shall need their moral sense to preserve what is right and fine and worthy in our system of life as well as to discover just what it is that ought to be purified and reformed. Without their counselings we shall only be half wise.”⁵⁸ His politicization and moralization of women was not successful outright. The Senate defeated the amendment on October 18, 1918. Repeating the outcome of January 25, 1887 and March 19, 1914, it fell two votes short with a margin of fifty-three to thirty-one. However, this close defeat markedly approved the pro-suffrage share of the vote from thirty-five to thirty-four in 1914 and sixteen to thirty-four in 1887.⁵⁹

While suffragists protested the loss, *The Woman Patriot* deflected the wartime argument. In the issue from September 28, 1918, the publication apologized for being deceived by “wicked suffragists when they insisted that a vote was to be taken on Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday morning and Monday morning.” Holding their presses meant that the issue was “dated a week behind.”⁶⁰ Above a “Roll of Honor” for the “manly” senators against the amendment, the banner announced “SENATE DEFEATS WOMAN SUFFRAGE / REFUSES TO JUMP ON “BAND WAGON” / NEWLY PAINTED AS CHARIOT OF WAR.” On October 5, 1918, *The Woman Patriot* published “The Defeat of Suffrage” by Annie Nathan Meyer. She rhetorically asked, “is this the time for each state in the Union—all forty-eight at once—to be this seriously divided upon an important local issue?” Responsibility for the disunification and subversion of the war effort lay in the shameful suffragists, according to Meyer. Meyer argued that “nothing would

⁵⁷ U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator William Gibbs McAdoo of California addressing a memorial of the birth anniversary of Susan B. Anthony at the Capitol on January 5, 1938, 75th Cong., 3rd sess, *Congressional Record*, vol. 83, pt. 9, 626.

⁵⁸ 75th Cong., 3rd sess. *Congressional Record*, 627.

⁵⁹ United States Senate, “Timeline: The Senate and the 19th Amendment,” Woman Suffrage Centennial, accessed December 13, 2020, https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/People/Women/Nineteenth_Amendment_Vertical_Timeline.htm.

⁶⁰ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 23 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 28, 1918), 4.

have been so effective, so liberating of the great power of American womanhood as to have accepted the truce the anti-suffragists offered to them—to withhold all discussion, politics, and propaganda until after the war.”⁶¹ The anti-suffragists framed themselves as launching a defensive rather than an offensive campaign. With the opportunity provided by the Senate loss, anti-suffragists directed their attention to the state level. In South Dakota, *The Woman Patriot* reported that the suffrage campaign “striking out the word ‘male’” meant that “no voter can register his opposition to woman suffrage without also voting against the citizenship qualification.” The article claimed that the suffragists “place the ‘Cause’” first at the cost of “double the alien vote, the pro-German vote, the socialist vote, and the underworld vote, as well as increasing the race menace throughout the South.” The NAOWS resolved to “place ‘America First’” and refused to campaign.⁶² The sum of their claims against the suffragists totaled deception, treason, and foreign allegiance. However, they could not succeed on the power of their rhetoric alone. In prioritizing an inactive ideological protest over an active political protest, the NAOWS failed to stop the suffrage win in November 1918.⁶³

After falling one vote short on February 10, the Senate approved the Nineteenth Amendment on June 4, 1919.⁶⁴ On June 6, Alice Wadsworth stated, “[i]n view of the fact that there is no time limit placed on the ratification of the woman suffrage amendment, it seems to me that it would be entirely useless to make any further fight against suffrage.” *The Woman Patriot* defended Wadsworth’s opinion on June 14, claiming her “long brave fight against the Federal amendment that has meant constant sacrifice of time, money, and energy for others.” She encountered issues ensuring Southern support despite contributing thousands of dollars “to save

⁶¹ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 24 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 5, 1918), 4.

⁶² *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 23 4.

⁶³ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 29 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., November 9, 1918), 1.

⁶⁴ United States Senate, “Timeline.”

Southern civilization.”⁶⁵ In a retroactive appeal to World War I, *The Woman Patriot* claimed to carry the burden of the “millions” of people against suffrage who expect “somebody else to hold the front line trenches against Feminism.”⁶⁶ Despite this militant rhetoric, Wadsworth resigned from the NAOWS on June 24, citing ill-health.⁶⁷ She retained her position as President of the WPPC and earned the title of Honorary President. Mary Kilbreth, the Vice President of the NAOWS and chief organizer of the Woman Voters’ Anti-Suffrage Party of New York, was “unanimously elected.”⁶⁸ The NAOWS met in New York from June 26 until July 1, concluding with campaign plans to reject the Susan B. Anthony Amendment in at least thirteen states.⁶⁹ Once again, the NAOWS made a transfer of power during a surge of support for women’s suffrage.

Mary Kilbreth continued “Wadsworth” tactics in *The Woman Patriot*. Kilbreth targeted suffragists and their politician supporters. For example, Margaret Robinson, the President of the Massachusetts Public Interest League (MPIL), contributing editor to *The Woman Patriot*, and member of the WPPC board of directors, published a letter to the Governor of Vermont on July 10, 1920. She claimed that Carrie Chapman Catt, “leader of the suffragists in this country, publicly urged our Government to ‘catch up with Russia.’” Robinson offered to pay for Catt’s trip to Russia, pausing the ratification of the “Suffrage Force Bill” until Catt experienced the disastrous impacts of her propaganda campaign.⁷⁰ Since this offer was not taken, the fight for state ratification trudged on. Crucial campaigns centered around the South. In June 1919, the NAOWS helped to establish the Southern Women’s League for the Rejection of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment in Montgomery, Alabama. It appealed to racialized fear-mongering of

⁶⁵ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., June 14, 1919), 4.

⁶⁶ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 9, 4.

⁶⁷ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 24 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 27, 1919), 2.

⁶⁸ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 13 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 12, 1919), 2.

⁶⁹ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 9, 5; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 3, no. 13, 2.

⁷⁰ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 28 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 10, 1920), 5.

states' rights and a race war.⁷¹ *The Woman Patriot* replicated this sentiment in its articles; one article warned of "Votes for Colored Women" and, in its promotion of the book *The Rising Tide of Color* by Lothrop Stoddard, it claimed radicals propagandized "colored supremacy."⁷² When thirty-five out of thirty-six states ratified the amendment, Kilbreth and the NAOWS set up a headquarters in Tennessee during the summer of 1920.⁷³ *The Woman Patriot* described the anti-suffragist action in Tennessee as the "greatest popular state campaign ever waged against the suffrage amendment."⁷⁴ Regional organizations lobbied. Mrs. James S. Pinckard, the President of the Southern Women's League for the Rejection of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment, wrote a letter to James M. Cox, the Governor of Tennessee, on July 26, 1920. She argued that the "very safety of Southern civilization, the purity of Anglo-Saxon blood, is involved in this Amendment." Ratification concluded on August 18, 1920 when Tennessee approved the Nineteenth Amendment. *The Woman Patriot* underwent an identity crisis as it debated renaming itself *The American Constitutionalist*.⁷⁵ Rejecting the outcome, *The Woman Patriot* depended on the authority of the Supreme Court. On July 7, 1920, Charles S. Fairchild, the President of the American Constitutional League, filed a motion in the Supreme Court to prevent the Secretary of State "from issuing a proclamation declaring the ratification of this so-called Amendment."⁷⁶ *The Woman Patriot* claimed that the NAOWS was "by no means a 'one idea' organization, as its opposition to woman suffrage it based on determination to prevent if possible the evil results of the entire Feminist-Socialist issue" while awaiting the Supreme Court decision in October 1921.⁷⁷ However, the NAOWS officially disbanded in March 1922 after the Supreme Court

⁷¹ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 108–9.

⁷² *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 20 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., May 15, 1920), 6; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 42 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 16, 1920), 2.

⁷³ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 109–10.

⁷⁴ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 37 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 11, 1920), 6.

⁷⁵ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 39 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 25, 1920), 4.

⁷⁶ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 4, no. 42, 8.

⁷⁷ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 5, no. 27 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 1, 1921), 2.

unanimously rejected the standing of the challenge to the ratification in *Fairchild v. Hughes* in February 1922.⁷⁸

By 1922, anti-suffragism lacked support in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches. Suffragists succeeded as a political contender by mobilizing their resources in the government and shifting the status quo in favor of female enfranchisement. In terms of value development, suffragists came to interpret corporations as the actors behind the anti-suffrage movement. Historians have only recently contested the strength of this lobby.⁷⁹ The perception of an opponent's threat, regardless of accuracy, is important for the mobilization of resources (e.g. coalitions) and the construction of values.⁸⁰ The accuracy of an anti-suffrage alignment with liquor and other industries is important, however, to understanding its lack of coalition values. The suffrage perspective instead supplanted the status quo belief. While the 1920s began with the failure of anti-radical tunnel vision, *The Woman Patriot* was not yet relegated to obscurity in the annals of history. More opportunities remained for power in politics and coalitions.

Shifting Context

The Nineteenth Amendment expanded the political power of women. With that came a period of social disruption. Growing out of the Progressive Era, female political participation translated into coalitions, federal agencies, and legislation. Yet, the welfare movement was not the only reaction to this seismic shift in democracy. Women voters had to contend with anti-radicalism and conservatism. First, anti-radicalism reached a fever pitch in the First Red Scare. A reaction to World War I and the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution, the First Red Scare lasted from 1917 until 1920. While President Harding declared that "Too much has been said about

⁷⁸ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 6, no. 5 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., March 1, 1922), 2–3.

⁷⁹ Maddux, "When Patriots Protest," 286.

⁸⁰ Banaszak, *Why Movements Succeed or Fail*, 42.

Bolshevism in America” in 1920, his presidency ushered in a tide of conservatism.⁸¹ Republican Warren G. Harding and his running mate Calvin Coolidge successfully ran on a platform of “heroics but healing; not nostrums but normalcy; not revolution but restoration...not surgery but serenity.”⁸² This ran contrary to the Progressive Era.

The Woman Patriot traced its lineage back to both the Progressive Era and the First Red Scare. As mentioned previously, anti-suffrage reformers like Josephine Dodge and Minnie Bronson also took a progressive stance while the “Wadsworth” tactics continued to influence the newspaper that originated in 1918. As social disruption made way for power, *The Woman Patriot*’s rhetoric began to expand beyond the group. Here, the Spider Web Chart marks a crucial turning point. Lucia Ramsey Maxwell, a clerical worker for the War Department, expressly drew inspiration from *The Woman Patriot*.⁸³ Some of Maxwell’s “Miss Bolsheviki” appear in *The Woman Patriot*’s 1922 manifesto, “Organizing Revolution Through Women and Children,” including the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom, the League of Women Voters, and Margaret Dreier Robins of the Women’s Trade Union League and the International Federation of Working Women.⁸⁴ Maxwell compiled her chart entitled “The Socialist-Pacifist Movement in America is an Absolutely Fundamental and Integral Part of International Socialism” in 1922 and 1923 to link the pacifism of women’s organizations and individuals to international socialism. After it was published and analyzed in Henry Ford’s *The Dearborn Independent* in 1924, the diagram continued to be republished and inspired different versions.⁸⁵

⁸¹ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 5–6.

⁸² Library of Congress, “From War To Normalcy: An Introduction to the Nation’s Forum Collection - Presidential Election of 1920,” American Leaders Speak: Recordings from World War I, accessed December 14, 2020, <https://www.loc.gov/collections/world-war-i-and-1920-election-recordings/articles-and-essays/from-war-to-normalcy/presidential-election-of-1920/>.

⁸³ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 54; Delegard, 75.

⁸⁴ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 6, nos. 17 and 18 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 1 and 15, 1922), 4; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 6, nos. 17 and 18, 6; Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 47.

⁸⁵ Delegard, 47; Delegard, 49–51.

At various points, the WPPC relied on the allyship of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR), the Sentinels of the Republic, the MPIL, and several Catholic interest groups. It is in this context that the WPPC was able to create a coalition against welfare reform like the Child Labor Amendment and the Sheppard-Towner Act.

Child Labor Amendment

The protection of children was central to maternalism. Starting with the Keating-Owen Act of 1916, welfare reformers sought to legislate against child labor. However, the Supreme Court ruled the Keating-Owen Act unconstitutional due to the restriction of the interstate commerce of goods produced with child labor. Activists then diverted their attention to a child labor amendment. Until the WPPC interjected, the amendment enjoyed bipartisan support.⁸⁶

The Child Labor Amendment passed the House of Representatives by a margin of two-hundred and ninety-seven to sixty-nine on April 26, 1924.⁸⁷ On May 29, 1924, the WPPC wrote a petition against the amendment while it was debated in the Senate. Having been denied a hearing before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Child Labor, the Senator Baynard of Delaware submitted the document to the Congressional Record on May 31, 1924. The petition served as a coordinated attack on the Children's Bureau, a federal agency child welfare agency established in 1912.⁸⁸ The WPPC claimed the Children's Bureau originated in the socialist tutelage of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, and Alexandra Kollontay (a Soviet revolutionary that led welfare reforms for women and children post-1917).⁸⁹ The petition implicated Florence

⁸⁶ Delegard, 116–18.

⁸⁷ Jessie Kratz, "Unratified Amendments: Regulating Child Labor," National Archives: Pieces of History, March 24, 2020, <https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2020/03/24/unratified-amendments-regulating-child-labor/>.

⁸⁸ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolshevik*, 116; Delegard, 118.

⁸⁹ U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Thomas F. Bayard presenting a petition from the WPPC, *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924), 9968; *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924), 9972; Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolshevik*, 73.

Kelley, the leader of the Children's Bureau, in creating the amendment "under direct orders from Moscow."⁹⁰ Somewhat of a condensed version of the Spider Web Chart, the WPPC drew connections between individuals and pacifist organizations like the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.⁹¹ Reformers, despite their claims of protections, wanted to "nationalize the children."⁹² In other words, government encroachment on the household would propagandize women and children. The WPPC's conspiracy theory failed to convince the Senate when, on June 2, 1924, the amendment passed by a margin of sixty-one to twenty-three.⁹³ Yet, the ratification hit a roadblock: the anti-radicals in Massachusetts.⁹⁴ With the WPPC, the MPIL, the Sentinels of the Republic, and the Catholic Church coalesced into a formidable opponent. The WPPC claimed to distribute more than 60,000 copies of their petition with the help of the MPIL.⁹⁵ The MPIL was one of the strongest organizations in the region. It shared a trajectory from anti-suffrage to anti-radical. Perhaps the most important, however, was its shared membership. The WPPC board of directors consisted of Mary Kilbreth, Margaret Robinson, Katherine Balch, Harriet Frothingham, and Cornelia Andrews Gibbs.⁹⁶ Of these five women, Mary Kilbreth, Margaret Robinson, Katherine Balch, and Harriet Frothingham were members.⁹⁷ Kilbreth and Balch worked with the Sentinels of the Republic while Gibbs worked with the DAR. The Sentinels of the Republic was a mixed-gender states-rights organization based in Massachusetts.⁹⁸ *The Woman Patriot* frequently promoted their simple pledge in their pages, for which there was no initiation fee or dues.⁹⁹ Lastly, in October, the Catholic Church offered

⁹⁰ *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924), 9963.

⁹¹ *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924), 9969.

⁹² *Congressional Record*, 68th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924), 9974.

⁹³ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 119; Kratz, "Unratified Amendments: Regulating Child Labor."

⁹⁴ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 120.

⁹⁵ Delegard, 128.

⁹⁶ Delegard, 75.

⁹⁷ Delegard, 121.

⁹⁸ Delegard, 76.

⁹⁹ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 6, nos. 17 and 18, 2.

support in Massachusetts to preserve traditional gender roles. This solidarity came through Cardinal O'Connell and his mobilization of working Catholics and the sizable League of Catholic Women.¹⁰⁰ The failure to ratify in Massachusetts on November 3, 1924 spread to the other states because of the work of the WPPC's coalition.¹⁰¹ While this marked the kiss of death for the Child Labor Amendment, the WPPC only grew in prominence and its role in the larger conservative movement.¹⁰² *The Woman Patriot* levied a fatal blow on the national level for the first time since the start of the NAOWS in 1911. This came with increased resource mobilization and the creation of coalition values, both favorable to lobbying for legislation.

Sheppard-Towner Act

The Sheppard-Towner Act initiated the legislation of the post-Nineteenth Amendment welfare movement. It was the first piece of legislation supported by the Women's Joint Congressional Committee (WJCC). The Nineteenth Amendment resulted in a coalition of female reformers. The WJCC formed in November 1920 to lobby for these interests. The Sheppard-Towner Act required federal funding for maternity education and care.¹⁰³ The Children's Bureau drafted the act.¹⁰⁴ In addition to widespread female enthusiasm, the Sheppard-Towner Act passed Congress with strong support. The Senate passed it with margins of sixty-three to seven in December 1920. The House of Representatives passed it with margins of 279 to thirty-nine in November 1921. Finally, President Harding signed the act into law on November 23, 1921. However, this law was not long-term. The Sheppard-Towner Act's one

¹⁰⁰ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 125–26.

¹⁰¹ Delegard, 128.

¹⁰² Delegard, 114.

¹⁰³ Delegard, 60–61.

¹⁰⁴ Delegard, 57.

million dollar annual aid only lasted for five years. By 1926, it was either renewal or expiration for the Sheppard-Towner Act.

The WPPC was not in favor of the Sheppard-Towner Act, or what they occasionally disparaged as the “Baby Bill.”¹⁰⁵ However, the political consensus at the time silenced its outlying opposition.¹⁰⁶ Frothingham attempted a legal strategy with the Supreme Court case of *Frothingham v. Mellon* in 1923. With the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, she unsuccessfully argued that the Sheppard-Towner Act would “take her property, under the guise of taxation, without due process of law.”¹⁰⁷ Then, in 1924, the Spider Web Chart promoted factionalism and confrontation in women’s groups. Anti-radicals used this divide to assert their patriotism and win media attention.¹⁰⁸ The Daughters of the American Revolution—named on the Spider Web Chart—was maternalist and supportive of the Sheppard-Towner Act until they established the National Defense Committee in 1925.¹⁰⁹ DAR used the National Defense Committee to distribute propaganda, including that of the WPPC in 1926, to their approximately 150,000 dues-paying members.¹¹⁰ This newfound alliance aligned with the renewed debate over the Sheppard-Towner Act. On May 26, 1926, the WPPC wrote a petition against its renewal under the Phipps-Parker bill. On July 3, 1926, Senator Bayard added the WPPC petition to the Congressional Record after they were neither heard at the Senate Committee on Education and Labor nor the House hearings.¹¹¹ The petition employed the sentiment of *The Woman Patriot* in a lengthy thirty-four pages of vitriolic denunciations.¹¹² The WPPC claimed the legislation was “Bolshevik

¹⁰⁵ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 5, no. 17, 1.

¹⁰⁶ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 85–86

¹⁰⁷ *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447 (1923), 448; *Massachusetts v. Mellon*, 262 U.S. 447, 480.

¹⁰⁸ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 64–65.

¹⁰⁹ Delegard, 47; Delegard, 114; Delegard 10.

¹¹⁰ Delegard, 98; Delegard, 10; Delegard, 79.

¹¹¹ U.S. Congress, Senate, Senator Thomas F. Bayard motioning petition against H. 7555 on maternity and infancy, *Congressional Record*, 69th Cong., 1st sess, vol. 67, pt. 11, daily ed. (July 3, 1926), 12918.

¹¹² Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 150.

propaganda” in disguise, “unconstitutional and unpopular,” and a part of a conspiracy by the Child Bureau to incite “revolution by legislation” in tandem with the Child Labor Amendment. The WPPC implicated the Child Bureau further in a scheme to “standardize children.”¹¹³ Joining the incendiary dissemination of information across the country, the DAR shared the petition with its state leaders in November 1926. The WPPC further motivated the spread of information by charging twenty-three dollars and seventy-six cents for a thousand copies. Finally, in January 1927, a nine-day filibuster used the WPPC’s rhetoric against the Children’s Bureau and resulted in a compromise: the Sheppard-Towner act would expire on June 30, 1929.¹¹⁴ Joining in a coalition afforded political channels that help propagate the movement’s message.

Wadsworth-Garrett Act

On December 1, 1923, *The Woman Patriot* claimed that radicalism attacked the constitution through “Federal amendments,” “‘Federal Aid’” Legislation,” “Communitistic Interpretation of the General Welfare Clause,” and “Reorganization of the Government Departments into great new aggregations of power.” It counted “52 Federal amendments, 3 ‘Federal Aid’ bills, 1 Communitistic interpretation of the Welfare Clause, and 1 bill to reorganize the Government departments.” The Child Labor Amendment and the Sheppard-Towner represented the “Radical Legislative Program” it opposed. On the contrary, the Wadsworth-Garrett Act (nicknamed by *The Woman Patriot* as the “Back-to-the-People” Amendment) represented its “Active Defense of Constitution Against Lobbies.” It accompanied the other goals of a “Public Opinion Law” (requiring referendums), “Publicity,” and “Legal Action.”¹¹⁵ The Wadsworth-Garrett Act sought to amend Article V of the Constitution to make

¹¹³ *Congressional Record*, 69th Cong., 1st sess, vol. 67, pt. 11, daily ed. (July 3, 1926), 12919.

¹¹⁴ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 152–54.

¹¹⁵ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 8, no. 23 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., December 1, 1924), 4.

ratification more difficult. Specifically, it prohibited ratification until the members of one of the state's houses are elected, required confirmation by popular vote, and allowed the changing of votes up until three-quarters ratified or one quarter rejected.¹¹⁶ Senator Wadsworth of New York (the anti-radical husband of the former NAOWS President Alice Wadsworth) introduced the amendment into the Senate in 1921, 1923, and 1925.¹¹⁷ During this time, the prevention of another Sheppard-Towner Act and the delay of the Child Labor Amendment motivated Senator Wadsworth. However, the amendment never passed and Wadsworth lost his Senate seat in 1926 over the issue of prohibition.¹¹⁸ While he did not lose his seat over radicalism, the loss of a WPPC-aligned senator limited access to its polity members. The Wadsworth-Garrett Act failed to produce the same coalition as the reaction to the Sheppard-Towner Act and the Child Labor Amendment did.

Aftermath

Tracing its history from *The Anti-Suffragist*, *The Woman Patriot* encountered repeated issues with lack of support and membership. Its progress in the mid-1920s demonstrates the contingency of a social movement's success on the political context. *The Woman Patriot* survived changes in leadership and ideology, even through the demise of its single-issue platform: anti-suffrage. By 1924, its distribution reached 3,000.¹¹⁹ After legislative and organizational achievements, the political context and the conditions of its coalition changed once again. In 1927, the DAR and the American Legion Auxiliary relaunched the Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense (WPCND) from two years prior.¹²⁰ Female

¹¹⁶ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 5, no. 16, 1.

¹¹⁷ *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 8, no. 8 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 15, 1924), 1.

¹¹⁸ Jablonsky, *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party*, 73.

¹¹⁹ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolsheviki*, 75.

¹²⁰ Delegard, 183.

anti-radicals converged on the issues of patriotism and militarism. However, the maternalist American Legion Auxiliary dominated the conference. The WPPC defends its stance that welfare reform obscures insidious forces, even in conservative groups.¹²¹ Falling out of alignment with coalition values inhibits the mobilization of shared resources. Considering that the WPPC's coalitions decided its two legislative successes, this sacrifice was fatal. *The Woman Patriot* ceased operations in December 1932.¹²² Funding likely remained an issue during the Great Depression.

The legacy of *The Woman Patriot* is not limited to itself after atrophy. The WPPC's involvement in the WPCND represented a larger pattern of broad conservative mobilization. Catalyzed by First Red Scare, female conservatism stunted female progressivism. The Equal Rights Amendment (ERA), or what *The Woman Patriot* branded the "Alice Paul Amendment," started a schism between social and radical feminists after its introduction in 1923.¹²³ Female conservatism embedded itself further into women's organizations through blacklists and a coercive fear of allegations.¹²⁴ The disarmament of women in progressive causes continued throughout the New Deal.¹²⁵ Female enfranchisement enabled female involvement in multi-issue conservatism through the Cold War.¹²⁶ Despite bipartisan support of the ERA in the 1970s, Phyllis Schlafly found success in a countermovement just as the WPPC had with the Child Labor Amendment.¹²⁷ Her career grew out of the DAR.¹²⁸ The 1970s ERA battle and ratification failure

¹²¹ Delegard, 192–93.

¹²² Delegard, 201.

¹²³ Marina Hodgkin and Halle McClain, "The National Woman's Party: A Year by Year History 1913-1922 - Chapter 5: Toward Equal Rights," Mapping American Social Movements Through the 20th Century, accessed December 14, 2020, https://depts.washington.edu/moves/NWP_project_ch5.shtml; *The Woman Patriot*, vol. 6, no. 6 (Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., March 15, 1922), 5.

¹²⁴ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolshevik*, 167; Delegard, 189.

¹²⁵ Delegard, 12.

¹²⁶ Delegard, 8; Delegard, 183.

¹²⁷ Lila Thulin, "The 97-Year-History of the Equal Rights Amendment," Smithsonian Magazine, accessed December 14, 2020, <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/equal-rights-amendment-96-years-old-and-still-not-part-constitution-heres-why-180973548/>.

¹²⁸ Delegard, *Battling Miss Bolshevik*, 212.

encouraged critical reflection on the suffrage movement. From November 24 through 26, 1972, the *S.F. Sunday Examiner & Chronicle* interviewed suffragist and ERA drafter Alice Paul. Amelia R. Fry, the interviewer, asked about *The Woman Patriot*. Paul described it as “the leading, the crystallization, of the opposition by the leaders of this group all over the country” until the House of Representatives voted.¹²⁹ When Fry questioned if *The Woman Patriot* involved the DAR, Paul responded, “No, not the DAR. I’m a DAR member and I’ve never heard of that. It certainly was not put out by the DAR.” After the Nineteenth Amendment, the war commenced over the enfranchised woman and precipitated the political coalition of the WPPC and the DAR. With both Alice Paul and Phyllis Schlafly on the side of the DAR, the war—and the battle over *The Woman Patriot*’s legacy—rages on a century later.

¹²⁹ Alice Paul, *Conversations with Alice Paul: Woman Suffrage and the Equal Rights Amendment*, Interview by Amelia R. Fry, November 24–26, 1972, http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=kt6f59n89c&doc.view=entire_text.

Bibliography

- Aslanian, Artour. "The Use of Rhetoric in Anti-Suffrage and Anti-Feminist Publications." *LUX: A Journal of Transdisciplinary Writing and Research from Claremont Graduate University* 2, no. 1 (March 25, 2013). <https://doi.org/10.5642/lux.201301.02>.
- Banaszak, Lee Ann. *Why Movements Succeed or Fail: Opportunity, Culture, and the Struggle for Woman Suffrage*. Princeton University Press, 1996. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt7pg6d>.
- Behn, Beth. "Woodrow Wilson's Conversion Experience: The President, the Woman Suffrage Movement, and the Extent of Executive Influence." M.A., University of Massachusetts Amherst, 2004. <https://doi.org/10.7275/dhat-zw25>.
- Delegard, Kirsten Marie. *Battling Miss Bolsheviki: The Origins of Female Conservatism in the United States*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt3fhgwx>.
- Goldberg, Robert Alan. *Grassroots Resistance: Social Movements in Twentieth Century America*. Waveland Press, Incorporated, 1996.
- History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives. "Jeannette Rankin and the Women's Suffrage Amendment." Whereas: Stories from the People's House, January 1, 2018. <https://history.house.gov/Blog/2018/January/1-10-Suffrage-Committee/>.
- Hodgkin, Marina, and Halle McClain. "The National Woman's Party: A Year by Year History 1913-1922 - Chapter 5: Toward Equal Rights." Mapping American Social Movements Through the 20th Century. Accessed December 14, 2020. https://depts.washington.edu/moves/NWP_project_ch5.shtml.
- Jablonsky, Thomas J. *The Home, Heaven, and Mother Party: Female Anti-Suffragists in the United States, 1868-1920*. Scholarship in Women's History. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Carlson Pub., 1994. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/002908564>.
- Jessie Kratz. "Unratified Amendments: Regulating Child Labor." National Archives: Pieces of History, March 24, 2020. <https://prologue.blogs.archives.gov/2020/03/24/unratified-amendments-regulating-child-labor/>.
- Library of Congress. "From War To Normalcy: An Introduction to the Nation's Forum Collection - Presidential Election of 1920." American Leaders Speak: Recordings from World War I. Accessed December 14, 2020. <https://www.loc.gov/collections/world-war-i-and-1920-election-recordings/articles-and-essays/from-war-to-normalcy/presidential-election-of-1920/>.
- Maddux, Kristy. "When Patriots Protest: The Anti-Suffrage Discursive Transformation of 1917." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 7, no. 3 (2004): 283–310.

- Marshall, Susan E. "Ladies against Women: Mobilization Dilemmas of Antifeminist Movements." *Social Problems* 32, no. 4 (1985): 348–62. <https://doi.org/10.2307/800757>.
- Massachusetts General Court Joint Special Committee on Woman's Suffrage. *Senate, No. 343, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in Senate, May 24, 1869*. Boston: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Massachusetts Senate, 1869. <https://www.loc.gov/item/93838295/>.
- Massachusetts v. Mellon, 262 U.S. 447 (1923).
- Melvin, Tessa. "1917: When Women Won Right to Vote." *The New York Times*, November 1, 1987, sec. New York. <https://www.nytimes.com/1987/11/01/nyregion/1917-when-women-won-right-to-vote.html>.
- Nielsen, Kim E. *Un-American Womanhood: Antiradicalism, Antifeminism, and the First Red Scare*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 2001.
- Paul, Alice. *Conversations with Alice Paul: Woman Suffrage and the Equal Rights Amendment*. Interview by Fry Amelia R, November 24–26, 1972. http://content.cdlib.org/view?docId=kt6f59n89c&doc.view=entire_text.
- Stevenson, Louise L. "Women Anti-Suffragists in the 1915 Massachusetts Campaign." *The New England Quarterly* 52, no. 1 (1979): 80–93. <https://doi.org/10.2307/364357>.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 1. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 27, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 10. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., June 29, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 14. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 27, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*, vol. 1, no. 21. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 14, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 23. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 28, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 24. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 5, 1918.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 1. no. 28. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., November 2, 1918.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 1. no. 29. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., November 9, 1918.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 2. no. 15. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 2, 1919.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 3. no. 1. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 19, 1919.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 3. no. 9. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., June 14, 1919.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 3. no. 13. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 12, 1919.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 3. no. 24. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 27, 1919.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 4. no. 20. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., May 15, 1920.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 4. no. 28. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., July 10, 1920.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 4. no. 37. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 11, 1920.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 4. no. 39. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 25, 1920.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 4. no. 42. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 16, 1920.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 5. no. 16. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 16, 1921.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 5. no. 17. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., May 1, 1921.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 5. no. 27. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., October 1, 1921.

The Woman Patriot. Vol. 6. no. 5. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., March 1, 1922.

- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 6. no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., March 15, 1922.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 6. nos. 17 and 18. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., September 1 and 15, 1922.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 8. no. 8. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., April 15, 1924.
- The Woman Patriot*. Vol. 8. no. 23. Washington, D.C.: Woman Patriot Publishing Co., December 1, 1924.
- The Woman's Protest against Woman Suffrage*. Vol. 1. no. 1. New York: National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, May 1912.
- Thulin, Lila. "The 97-Year-History of the Equal Rights Amendment." *Smithsonian Magazine*. Accessed December 14, 2020. <https://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/equal-rights-amendment-96-years-old-and-still-not-part-constitution-heres-why-180973548/>.
- United States Senate. "Timeline: The Senate and the 19th Amendment." *Woman Suffrage Centennial*. Accessed December 13, 2020. https://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/People/Women/Nineteenth_Amendment_Vertical_Timeline.htm.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Woman Suffrage. *Hearing Before the Committee on Rules on the Resolution Establishing a Committee on Woman Suffrage*. 63rd Cong., 2nd sess., 1913, H. Doc.: 45.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Senator Thomas F. Bayard motioning petition against H. 7555 on maternity and infancy. *Congressional Record*. 69th Cong., 1st sess. Vol. 67, pt. 11, daily ed. (July 3, 1926): 12885–13010.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Senator Thomas F. Bayard presenting a petition from the WPPC. *Congressional Record*. 68th Cong., 1st sess. Vol. 65, pt. 10., daily ed. (June 4, 1924): 9961-10070.
- U.S. Congress. Senate. Senator William Gibbs McAdoo of California addressing a memorial of the birth anniversary of Susan B. Anthony at the Capitol on January 5, 1938. *Congressional Record*. 75th Cong., 3rd sess. Vol. 83, pt. 9: 626–627.
- Wayne, Tiffany K., and Lois W. Banner, eds. *Women's Rights in the United States: A Comprehensive Encyclopedia of Issues, Events, and People*. ABC-CLIO, LLC, 2015.