VOTES FOR WOMEN

READINGS, ACTIVITIES, AND HANDOUTS
VOTES FOR WOMEN: READING

In the spring of 1776, John Adams was at the Continental Congress taking steps that would lead to a Declaration of Independence asserting the universal rights of all humans. John received a letter from his wife, Abigail, asking him to include women in the drive towards freedom and equality within a republican government based upon the consent of the governed. Abigail wrote: “I long to hear that you have declared independence—and by the way in the new code of laws which I suppose it will be necessary for you to make I desire you would remember the ladies, and be more generous and favorable to them than your ancestors . . . . If particular care and attention is not paid to the ladies we are determined to foment a rebellion, and will not hold ourselves bound by any laws in which we have no voice, or representation” (Abigail Adams to John Adams, March 31, 1776) John responded in the way that most men of the time would have and mocked the extraordinary suggestion. Men, in John’s estimation, feared women’s rights would “completely subject us to the despotism of the petticoat” (John Adams to Abigail Adams, April 14, 1776). It was hardly an auspicious dawn for women’s rights; yet, an important Founding Mother had raised the issue, if only privately. Both before and after the American Revolution, some women did vote in New Jersey, and although the colonial records are unclear they also voted in some parts of Massachusetts and New York.

The emergence of a true women’s movement for equality and suffrage (the right to vote) developed after the religious revivals of the Second Great Awakening and the rise of several antebellum (before the Civil War) reform movements in the 1830s and 1840s. These women’s reform movements sought to remake society morally and even usher in a utopian age by bringing the kingdom of God to earth. Some of the reforms included abolitionism, prison reform, temperance, and common schools. During this time, the reigning view was one of “separate spheres” for the sexes with men entering public life through work and politics and women having control over the home. While some observers note that this was unfair for women, the idea of “republican motherhood” meant that the survival of the republic depended on women raising their children in a virtuous home with patriotic republican principles. Moreover, it was believed that the public sphere corrupted men’s morals because of the attraction of greed, power, and vice, but their wives cultivated good homes where men could recover their virtue. Since the view was that women were more moral, they could make the world and American politics more moral.

The pre-Civil War reform movements wished to make it permissible for women to enter public life and politics in order to civilize and moralize the public sphere. Many women working on behalf of other reforms faced discrimination in those movements and began to advocate for their own liberty and equality. For instance, women were refused a seat at the 1840 World Antislavery Convention in London. Women’s participation in other reforms taught them to organize a movement, speak in public, and lobby politically. In July 1848, a group of women led by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott met at Seneca Falls, New York, to address women’s inequality particularly regarding suffrage. The convention...
produced a “Declaration of Sentiments” modeled on the text of the Declaration of Independence. It was the first of several reform movements that appealed to the principles in the Declaration of Independence to argue for natural and civil rights. The Declaration of Sentiments began from the assertion, perhaps a misreading, that it did not include women when it said that all men are created equal. So a new statement was proposed; “We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal.” Here was a correction of the original Declaration, yet one that clarified the meaning of equality rather than changing the principles of the document. Therefore, it demonstrated respect for the universal principles of the Declaration. The Declaration of Sentiments asserted that the history of mankind was one of “repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her.” Therefore, among its many demands, the declaration argued that women did not merely have a civil right to suffrage but rather an “inalienable right to the elective franchise” (Seneca Falls Convention, Declaration of Sentiments, 1848). Former slave and abolitionist Frederick Douglass attended (he was the only African American to do so) and spoke with his usual eloquence in favor of women’s suffrage when that issue was hotly debated at the convention. “In this denial of the right to participate in government, not merely the degradation of woman and the perpetuation of a great injustice happens, but the maiming and repudiation of one-half of the moral and intellectual power of the government of the world,” Douglass said. Women—married women especially—had no legal standing, no right to own property, no profitable employment, no ability to receive a college education, and no right to be members of the clergy (except in a few denominations like the Quakers), the Declaration of Sentiments complained. While many of these goals would go unfulfilled for the better part of a century, the Seneca Falls Convention laid an agenda for the future and rooted it in the American Founding.

In the wake of the Civil War, African American males won the right to vote with the Fifteenth Amendment, but suffragettes were disappointed that the language did not bar discrimination on account of sex. By 1869, in response, Stanton and Susan B. Anthony organized the National Women’s Suffrage Association to fight for a constitutional amendment. Meanwhile, Lucy Stone and others formed the American Woman Suffrage Association, which supported the Fifteenth Amendment and pursued a state-by-state strategy for women’s suffrage since states determined eligibility requirements for voting. The state strategy met with great success particularly in the West. By 1890, when the two groups merged into the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA), several states and territories allowed women to vote. The women’s suffrage movement in the early twentieth century was at times tainted with racism toward African-Americans and immigrants. Suffragettes made the argument that if these supposedly ignorant groups had the legal right to vote, women should as well.

In 1913, Alice Paul, a suffragette who had been radicalized during her experience fighting for women’s suffrage in Great Britain, joined the ranks of leadership in the NAWSA. Paul shifted the NAWSA’s strategy away from the state level and reinvigorated the campaign for a constitutional amendment. She organized a massive parade of 5,000 women marching for the right to vote at President Woodrow Wilson’s
inauguration and drew national attention to the cause. Paul split with the NAWSA to form the National Women’s Party (NWP) and continued the efforts of picketing the White House to win President Wilson’s support.

Carrie Chapman Catt returned to the presidency of the NAWSA after a hiatus and introduced a strategy called the “Winning Plan,” which attempted to persuade states to adopt women’s suffrage in the ultimate hope that they would in turn support a constitutional amendment. The movement gained a great deal of momentum when women worked in factory and office jobs in World War I to support the war effort. Meanwhile, the NAWSA and NWP continued to lobby politicians in Congress, the White House, and both major political parties.

The women’s suffrage movement finally achieved its goals when both houses of Congress passed the constitutional amendment in June, 1919. President Wilson’s public support—which was not constitutionally necessary—lent the moral suasion of the president to ratification of the amendment by the states. Finally, on August 24, 1920, the constitutional amendment for women’s suffrage reached ratification by the necessary two-thirds vote. After decades of struggle by a few generations of women’s suffragettes, American women won constitutional equality and could participate more fully in American political and civic life.
Teaching Tips

Critical Question: Evaluate the relationship between women’s suffrage and the constitutional principles of inalienable rights, equality, and consent of the governed.

Introduce the critical question for this activity, noting that all of their discussion and research should lead them to an ability to address this question. As background for this activity, distribute Handout A: Voting Rights, Women, and the Nineteenth Amendment.

Write the following quotation on the board and have students write a one-paragraph response: “Suffrage is the pivotal right.” –Susan B. Anthony.

Have students share their responses (question 2 on Handout A) and discuss as a large group. What does Anthony mean by “pivotal”? Do students agree or disagree with the statement?

Distribute Handout B: Two Declarations. Assign students to groups of three or four. Have students draft two or three paragraphs comparing the two documents. (Note: The questions at the bottom of the handout may be helpful scaffolding.)

Discuss the various groups’ comparisons of the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of Sentiments. Distribute Handout C: Suffrage Amendments. Divide small groups into pairs or trios to read the amendments and write a paraphrase of each. Depending on your students’ grade-level and reading skills, you may opt to direct them to Handout A as a support as they write their paraphrases. Conduct a large-group discussion in which students compare, contrast, and critique the groups’ paraphrases. Re-introduce the critical question (above).

Assign a response paper in which students address the critical question: “Evaluate the relationship between women’s suffrage and the constitutional principles of inalienable rights, equality, and consent of the governed.”
Handout A: Voting Rights, Women, and the Nineteenth Amendment

When the United States was founded, only adult white males who owned property could vote. The history of the amendments to the Constitution is, in one sense, a history of the expansion of certain political rights, including voting.

The Founders saw governments as existing to protect natural (or “inalienable”) rights. Natural rights are rights people are born with, and which can be exercised without anyone else taking any action. Examples are freedom of speech and freedom of religious belief. Political rights, such as voting, require positive action on the part of others – if you have a right to vote, then someone else must have the obligation to set up a polling place, count the votes, and do other things to secure that ability.

Many believe they have a constitutional right to vote in our democratic republic, but there is actually no such right listed in the Constitution. Rather, several amendments to the Constitution list conditions that the states cannot use to stop people from voting.

The Constitution may one day be amended to guarantee the right to vote, but the current document only says what the government cannot do to “deny or abridge” your rights.

Women and the Seneca Falls Convention: The Nineteenth Amendment

The first American women’s rights convention was held in 1848 in Seneca Falls, New York. It was organized by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and others. Frederick Douglass and Sojourner Truth were among the 300 people in attendance.

The delegates signed the Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions, which used the same wording as the Declaration of Independence, to list the ways women had been deprived of equal rights, including “the inalienable right to the elective franchise.” The Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions was signed by 100 people, including thirty-two men.

Women suffragists continued to campaign for the vote and other rights for the next eighty years. During that time, many states approved votes for women at the state level. After the Nineteenth Amendment was ratified in 1920, states could not stop people from voting because they were female.

Critical Thinking Questions

1. Write an eight-sentence summary of this article.

2. Susan B. Anthony said, “Suffrage is the pivotal right.” Write a one-paragraph response to this statement, based on your knowledge of the Constitution and on this article.
Handout B: Two Declarations

Declaration of Independence (1776) – Excerpts

IN CONGRESS, July 4, 1776.

The unanimous Declaration of the thirteen united States of America,

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the Laws of Nature and of Nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, --That whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shewn, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same Object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute Despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such Government, and to provide new Guards for their future security.--Such has been the patient sufferance of these Colonies; and such is now the necessity which constrains them to alter their former Systems of Government. The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries

Introduction
Explains why they wrote the Declarations of Independence. They justify the separation to the world.

Preamble
Explains that all people have equal inalienable rights. The purpose of government is to “secure” or protect these rights. Governments must protect the rights of the people. When governments do not do this, the people have the right and duty to change the government.
and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States. To prove this, let Facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has refused his Assent to Laws, the most wholesome and necessary for the public good.

He has forbidden his Governors to pass Laws of immediate and pressing importance, unless suspended in their operation till his Assent should be obtained; and when so suspended, he has utterly neglected to attend to them.

He has refused to pass other Laws for the accommodation of large districts of people, unless those people would relinquish the right of Representation in the Legislature, a right inestimable to them and formidable to tyrants only.

He has called together legislative bodies at places unusual, uncomfortable, and distant from the depository of their public Records, for the sole purpose of fatiguing them into compliance with his measures.

He has dissolved Representative Houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

He has refused for a long time, after such dissolutions, to cause others to be elected; whereby the Legislative powers, incapable of Annihilation, have returned to the People at large for their exercise; the State remaining in the mean time exposed to all the dangers of invasion from without, and convulsions within.

He has endeavoured to prevent the population of these States; for that purpose obstructing the Laws for Naturalization of Foreigners; refusing to pass others to encourage their migrations hither, and raising the conditions of new Appropriations of Lands.

He has obstructed the Administration of Justice, by refusing his Assent to Laws for establishing Judiciary powers.

He has made Judges dependent on his Will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of New Offices, and sent hither swarms of Officers to harrass our people, and eat out their substance.

**Indictment**

This is a list of ways in which the king took away the colonists’ basic rights.
Handout B: Page 3

He has kept among us, in times of peace, Standing Armies without the Consent of our legislatures.

He has affected to render the Military independent of and superior to the Civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his Assent to their Acts of pretended Legislation:

For Quartering large bodies of armed troops among us:

For protecting them, by a mock Trial, from punishment for any Murders which they should commit on the Inhabitants of these States:

For cutting off our Trade with all parts of the world:

For imposing Taxes on us without our Consent:

For depriving us in many cases, of the benefits of Trial by Jury:

For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offences

For abolishing the free System of English Laws in a neighbouring Province, establishing therein an Arbitrary government, and enlarging its Boundaries so as to render it at once an example and fit instrument for introducing the same absolute rule into these Colonies:

For taking away our Charters, abolishing our most valuable Laws, and altering fundamentally the Forms of our Governments:

For suspending our own Legislatures, and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsoever.

He has abdicated Government here, by declaring us out of his Protection and waging War against us.

He has plundered our seas, ravaged our Coasts, burnt our towns, and destroyed the lives of our people.

He is at this time transporting large Armies of foreign Mercenaries to compleat the works of death, desolation and tyranny, already begun with circumstances of Cruelty & perfidy scarcely paralleled in the most barbarous ages, and totally unworthy the Head of a civilized nation.

This list further explains how the king took away the colonists’ basic rights.
He has constrained our fellow Citizens taken Captive on the high Seas to bear Arms against their Country, to become the executioners of their friends and Brethren, or to fall themselves by their Hands.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us, and has endeavoured to bring on the inhabitants of our frontiers, the merciless Indian Savages, whose known rule of warfare, is an undistinguished destruction of all ages, sexes and conditions.

In every stage of these Oppressions We have Petitioned for Redress in the most humble terms: Our repeated Petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A Prince whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a Tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Nor have We been wanting in attentions to our Brittish brethren. We have warned them from time to time of attempts by their legislature to extend an unwarrantable jurisdiction over us. We have reminded them of the circumstances of our emigration and settlement here. We have appealed to their native justice and magnanimity, and we have conjured them by the ties of our common kindred to disavow these usurpations, which, would inevitably interrupt our connections and correspondence. They too have been deaf to the voice of justice and of consanguinity. We must, therefore, acquiesce in the necessity, which denounces our Separation, and hold them, as we hold the rest of mankind, Enemies in War, in Peace Friends.

We, therefore, the Representatives of the united States of America, in General Congress, Assembled, appealing to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of our intentions, do, in the Name, and by Authority of the good People of these Colonies, solemnly publish and declare, That these United Colonies are, and of Right ought to be Free and Independent States; that they are Absolved from all Allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain, is and ought to be totally dissolved; and that as Free and Independent States, they have full Power to levy War, conclude Peace, contract Alliances, establish Commerce, and to do all other Acts and Things which Independent States may of right do. And for the support of this

**Denunciation**

Explains that the colonists have complained many times to Great Britain. The people in Great Britain have not listened to them.

**Conclusion**

This is the official declaration of independence from Great Britain. The united colonies have the power to do all the things independent countries can do.
Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor.

Georgia: Button Gwinnett, Lyman Hall, George Walton
North Carolina: William Hooper, Joseph Hewes, John Penn
South Carolina: Edward Rutledge, Thomas Heyward, Jr., Thomas Lynch, Jr., Arthur Middleton
Massachusetts: John Hancock
Maryland: Samuel Chase, William Paca, Thomas Stone, Charles Carroll of Carrollton
Pennsylvania: Robert Morris, Benjamin Rush, Benjamin Franklin, John Morton, George Clymer, James Smith, George Taylor, James Wilson, George Ross
Delaware: Caesar Rodney, George Read, Thomas McKean
New York: William Floyd, Philip Livingston, Francis Lewis, Lewis Morris
New Jersey: Richard Stockton, John Witherspoon, Francis Hopkinson, John Hart, Abraham Clark
New Hampshire: Josiah Bartlett, William Whipple
Massachusetts: Samuel Adams, John Adams, Robert Treat Paine, Elbridge Gerry
Rhode Island: Stephen Hopkins, William Ellery
Connecticut: Roger Sherman, Samuel Huntington, William Williams, Oliver Wolcott
New Hampshire: Matthew Thornton

Signatures
The 56 signatures on the Declaration appear in the positions indicated.
Declaration of Sentiments, Seneca Falls Convention, July 1848 – Excerpts

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly, all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they were accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

- He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.
- He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.
- He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men - both natives and foreigners.
- Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the elective franchise, thereby leaving her without representation in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all sides.
- He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law, civilly dead.
- He has taken from her all right in property, even to the wages she earns.
- He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as she can commit many crimes with impunity, provided they be done in the presence of her husband. In the covenant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience to her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes, her master - the law giving him power to deprive her of her liberty, and to administer chastisement...
- After depriving her of all rights as a married...
woman, if single and the owner of property, he has taxed her to support a government which recognizes her only when her property can be made profitable to it.

- He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration.

- He closes against her all the avenues to wealth and distinction, which he considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

- He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thorough education - all colleges being closed against her...

- He has created a false public sentiment, by giving to the world a different code of morals for men and women, by which moral delinquencies which exclude women from society, are not only tolerated but deemed of little account in man...

Firmly relying upon the final triumph of the Right and the True, we do this day affix our signatures to this declaration.

Lucretia Mott
Harriet Cady Eaton
Margaret Pryor
Elizabeth Cady Stanton
Eunice Newton Foote
Mary Ann M’Clintock
Margaret Schooley
Martha C. Wright
Jane C. Hunt
Amy Post
Catharine F. Stebbins
Mary Ann Frink
Lydia Mount
Delia Mathews
Catharine C. Paine
Elizabeth W. M’Clintock
Malvina Seymour
Phebe Mosher
Catharine Shaw
Deborah Scott
Sarah Hallowell
Mary M’Clintock
Mary Gilbert
Sophrone Taylor
Cynthia Davis
Hannah Plant
Lucy Jones
Sarah Whitney
Mary H. Hallowell
Elizabeth Conklin
Sally Pitcher
Mary Conklin
Susan Quinn
Mary S. Mirror
Phebe King
Julia Ann Drake
Charlotte Woodward
Martha Underhill
Dorothy Mathews
Eunice Barker
Sarah R. Woods
Lydia Gild
Sarah Hoffman
Elizabeth Leslie
Martha Ridley
Rachel D. Bonnel
Betsey Tewksbury
Rhoda Palmer
Margaret Jenkins
Cynthia Fuller
Mary Martin
P. A. Culvert
Susan R. Doty
Rebecca Race
Sarah A. Mosher
Mary E. Vail
Lucy Spalding
Lavinia Latham
Sarah Smith
Eliza Martin
Maria E. Wilbur
Elizabeth D. Smith
Caroline Barker
Ann Porter
Experience Gibbs
Antoinette E. Segur
Hannah J. Latham
Sarah Sisson
Critical Thinking Questions

1. In the margins, identify the different sections of the Declaration of Sentiments and label as follows: Introduction – Preamble – Indictment – Conclusion – Signatures.

2. Compare the Declaration of Sentiments to the Declaration of Independence. What similarities do you find?

3. What is the significance of the signatures?

4. Why did Stanton and the other delegates decide to write in the style that they did?
Handout C: Suffrage Amendments

Directions: Read the following amendments to the Constitution and paraphrase each. Identify similarities and differences among these document excerpts.

Amendment XV (1870)
Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Amendment XIX (1920)
Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex.

Amendment XXIV (1964)
Section 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax.
Handouts A–C Answer Keys

Handout A: Voting Rights, Women, and the Nineteenth Amendment Answer Key
1. Accept reasoned answers.
2. Accept reasoned answers.

Handout B: Two Declarations Answer Key
1. Declaration of Sentiments should be labeled as follows:
   - Introduction: From “When in the course…” through “…such a course.”
   - Preamble: From “We hold these truths…” through “…let facts be submitted to a candid world.”
   - Indictment: From “He has never permitted…” through “……deemed of little account in man…”
   - Conclusion: “Firmly relying upon the final triumph of the Right and the True…”
   - Signatures: (the list of signatures)
2. Answers should be reasonable and based on the text. Responses may range from observation (verbatim repetition of words and phrases) to categories (see question 1, above) to comparison and analysis of the sentiments expressed in both documents.
3. Accept reasoned responses. Answers may relate to the willingness of participants to publicly attach their names to a document for which they could receive harsh criticism and which may have an effect on their standing in society.

Handout C: Suffrage Amendments Answer Key
1. Accept reasoned answers.
Teaching Tips

Guided Dinner Party Simulation


Prior to class, print and laminate the 12 individual nametags in Handout G. Make sufficient nametags for every student in your class to have one. Also, print Handout H: Nametag Backgrounds. (Suggestion: use colored paper or cardstock and color code these handouts. For example, if you have a class of 36 students, you will need 3 sets of Nametags and 3 copies of the Nametag Backgrounds. You might make one set of Handouts G and H on yellow paper, one set on green paper, and one set on blue paper. This makes distribution and pickup of the supplies much more efficient.) In each dinner party group, you will have all 12 roles, as well as one copy of the Background pages for the group to share.

Divide your class into the dinner party groups and distribute the Nametags and Background pages to each group. Have each student wear his/her nametag. Allow time (about 10 - 15 minutes) for students to study their roles and prepare for a dinner party conversation while you circulate to answer questions and provide support. Handout D: Angelina Grimké provides the narrative for the following roles: Grimké family, Pelters, Pastors. Handout E: Alice Paul provides narrative for Alice Paul, Insulters, Trippers, and Wilson. Handout F: Carrie Chapman Catt provides background for Carrie C. Catt, Wilson, and Susan B. Anthony. The additional detail needed for each role is provided on Handout H: Nametag Backgrounds. Write the Critical Question on the board as a guide for their preparation and conversation: Evaluate the relationship between women’s suffrage and the constitutional principles of inalienable rights, equality, and consent of the governed.

After students are familiar with their roles, commence the dinner party conversation, reminding each person to stay in character.

After all students have been involved in the preparation, if conducting multiple dinner party scenarios seems too noisy for your classroom culture, you might plan to assign specific individuals to play each role and just have one dinner party of 12 at the front of the classroom while other students are spectators.

Research Project Dinner Party Simulation

You may prefer to provide less structure for more advanced students. In this case, you would use Handout G Nametags, but not Handout H: Nametag Backgrounds. Distribute Handout D: Angelina Grimké, Handout E: Alice Paul, and Handout F: Carrie Chapman Catt. Have students read the narratives and select one to research. During their research, they should also select a friend or relative of this person, as well as a politician or government official who was her contemporary.
Depending on class size, divide class into groups of 5-7, so that each group includes the following:

- Angelina Grimké
- Carrie Chapman Catt
- Alice Paul
- One or two relatives of each woman
- At least two government officials

After assigning students to groups, have each group prepare to present a dinner-party scenario (or skit) in which a range of perspectives is portrayed. All of the portrayals should include references to the central issues related to women’s suffrage and be based on:

- Students’ research about Grimké, Chapman, or Catt
- Issues and perspectives of Grimké, Chapman’s, and Catt’s day – regardless of how directly they may seem to relate to the issue of women’s suffrage – that may have influenced peoples’ perspectives on women’s suffrage.
- The U.S. Constitution and constitutional principles.
- Differences of opinion among Grimké, Chapman, and Catt – as well as between and among the other guests.
In 1838 in the Massachusetts State House, a bustling crowd, including men and women, legislators and citizens, silenced their voices to hear that of a woman who had come to deliver anti-slavery petitions and to demand justice for all Americans. Angelina Grimké would be the first woman ever to speak before a legislature. Her testimony lasted three days.

“... If it is a self evident truth that all men, every where and of every color are born equal, and have an inalienable right to liberty, then it is equally true that no man can be born a slave, and no man can ever rightfully be reduced to involuntary bondage and held as a slave...” Grimké had never waivered for fear of the consequences when she wrote these words a few years before her appearance. She had grown accustomed to holding unpopular views and was adamant in her pursuit of justice, despite criticism from family, friends, and fellow Southerners.

The daughter of a prominent judge and plantation owner, Grimké grew up in South Carolina and witnessed firsthand the cruelties of slavery. As she grew older, her condemnation of the practice deepened. In 1829 at the age of twenty-four, she moved to Philadelphia to join her older sister, Sarah, in the Society of Friends (Quakers). Together, they began a lifelong mission to expose the injustices of slavery.

In 1835, Grimké inadvertently found herself in the national spotlight. She had written a letter to William Lloyd Garrison, the editor of The Liberator, an abolitionist publication. In her letter, she vigorously and eloquently supported Garrison’s anti-slavery efforts, never intending that the letter be published. She was shocked when Garrison decided to do just that and include her name. As the daughter of a prominent Southern slaveholder, she faced an uproar. Even those closest to her urged her to take back her statements. She refused. Instead, Grimké expanded her arguments into a thirty-six-page pamphlet.

Grimké’s pamphlet, Appeal to the Christian Women of the South, analyzed slavery from a biblical perspective. While some slaveholders justified the practice with examples from the Bible, she systematically examined each biblical justification. As a result of her studies, she derived standards for slavery from each situation and comparing the biblical example to American slavery. American slavery failed each test. Grimké argued, “The attributes of justice and mercy are shadowed out in the Hebrew code; those of injustice and cruelty, in the Code Noir of America.”

Grimké understood that women felt powerless to change things since they could not vote, but she believed that women could effect change in other ways. She pleaded with Southern Christian women, “What can I say more, my friends, to induce you to set your hands, and heads, and hearts, to this great work of justice and mercy.” Women could read, pray, speak, and act on the subject. She suggested they teach their slaves to read and write and to set them free if possible. She admitted that such actions were against the law but claimed, “such wicked laws ought to be no barrier in the way of your duty.”

Determined to inspire action, Grimké declared, “But you will perhaps say, such a course of conduct would inevitably expose us to great suffering. Yes! My Christian friends, I believe...
it would, but this will not excuse you or anyone else for the neglect of duty.” She referred to the prophets who were tortured and killed “because they exposed and openly rebuked public sins; they opposed public opinion; had they held their peace, they all might have lived in ease and died in favor with a wicked generation.”

Grimké anticipated the protests and questions and reminded her audience of an example from the Old Testament: “Who was chosen to deliver the whole Jewish nation from that murderous decree of Persia’s King, which wicked Haman had obtained by calumny and fraud? It was a woman; Esther the Queen; yes, weak and trembling woman was the instrument appointed by God, to reverse the bloody mandate of the eastern monarch, and save the whole visible church from destruction.”

The pamphlet brought Grimké nationwide recognition as well as scathing criticism. She and her sister, Sarah, began lecturing in New England in the late 1830s. They traveled to more than sixty-seven towns, conveying the shocking details of the slavery system they witnessed as children. Sometimes they lectured from the pulpit. Many times, their words were met with violence. They were pelted with vegetables and faced angry crowds throwing rocks. Resolutely, they believed that nothing they could suffer would compare to what those who were bound by slavery endured. The Northern audiences grew as the lectures attracted more and more abolitionists, both men and women.

In a time when women did not speak in front of mixed audiences, Grimké’s lectures caused a stir across the North. Some pastors balked, and many people were scandalized. In 1837, a “Pastoral Letter” was published; it barred women from speaking from the pulpit in churches. Grimké now found herself an outsider in both the North and the South.

Such opposition only strengthened Grimké’s resolve to fight injustice on all fronts. In addition to her work against the injustices of slavery, she served as one of the first women’s rights advocates. She believed that all human beings deserve equal treatment. As part of her work, she understood that education paved the way for change. To affect the next generation, the Grimké sisters opened a school in New Jersey. They were among the first to accept girls and boys as students, an unusual practice in the 1840s. She continued her work in education throughout the Civil War.

For thirty-one years, Angelina Grimké lived in the spotlight of the abolitionist movement. Her contributions to the movements for equal rights, equal treatment, and equal justice for all are still felt today. She refused to accept the social norm, and, instead, relied upon her understanding of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bible to guide her principles. Grimké broke out of the mold of the proper Southern woman and dared to declare her belief that slavery was wrong. She devoted her life to seeking justice for all human beings and led the way for others to do the same.

Critical Thinking Questions

1. What motivated Grimké in her cause(s)?

2. What is the relationship between abolition and women’s suffrage in Angelina Grimké’s life and beliefs?
Alice Paul was born in 1885 on a New Jersey farm. Her parents encouraged her love of learning, and her mother often brought her along to women’s suffrage meetings. Paul attended prestigious universities and earned a master’s degree in sociology. In 1907, Paul moved to England, where she continued her studies in economics and political science.

While in England, Paul joined a group working to win voting rights for women in Britain. She was arrested three times while attending demonstrations. In prison, Paul and her fellow activists began hunger strikes to bring attention to their imprisonment. British authorities force-fed the women by putting tubes down their through their nostrils. They often vomited during the violent process.

When Paul came back to the U.S. in 1910, she turned her attention to the fight for women’s suffrage in America. She wrote her Ph.D. dissertation on the legal position of women in Pennsylvania. She joined the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) and chaired the committee working for a federal amendment, but by that time the NAWSA had all but given up on a federal amendment and was instead focusing efforts on the state level.

Paul saw Woodrow Wilson’s upcoming presidential inauguration as an opportunity to bring national attention to the cause of voting rights for women. She organized a parade to coincide with the inaugural parade. The parade was a historic spectacle with more than twenty floats and over 5,000 marchers.

The parade was not without its challenges. Paul recalled years later: “We did hear a lot of shouted insults... the usual things about why aren’t you home in the kitchen where you belong.” Other men shoved and tripped the marchers, while police did little to assist. One hundred marchers were taken to the hospital.

Paul went to the White House two weeks after the parade to talk to Wilson. The President promised to give the idea of voting rights for women his “most careful consideration,” but this promise did little to satisfy Paul and the suffragists.

Paul soon grew frustrated by NAWSA, finding the group’s efforts to be disorganized and inadequate, and in 1913 founded her own suffrage organization called the National Woman’s Party. Noting that she did not look at all like a political agitator, the Chicago Tribune described her as a “delicate slip of a girl.” But “Miss Paul,” as she preferred to be called, was in fact an agitator of the most effective kind.

Paul began to organize demonstrations and parades in support of women’s suffrage. She wrote and distributed leaflets and organized daily pickets in front of the White House. The picket signs addressed Wilson directly and used his own words to make their case, “Mr. President, you say liberty is the fundamental demand of the human spirit,” and “Mr. President, how long must women wait for liberty?” Demonstrators burned copies of Wilson’s speeches, calling them “meaningless words” on democracy. They even burned an effigy of Wilson at the White House gates.

Unlike NAWSA, Paul’s party did not suspend their efforts during World War I. They believed World War I made women’s suffrage even more vital. The war was being fought because “the world must
be made safe for democracy,” as Wilson had said, but the suffragists claimed the United States was itself not a democracy, as twenty million women were without the means for self-government.

Growing frustrated, police announced that picketers would be given six months in prison. The next day, October 17, 1917, Paul defiantly led a march to the White House. The marchers, including Paul, were sentenced to six months in jail.

During her sentence in Virginia, Paul was placed in solitary confinement. Her diet of bread and water weakened her so much that she was taken to the prison hospital. But instead of eating more, Paul decided to use the strategy she’d learned in England eight years before: a hunger strike. Just as the British had done, prison officials force-fed Paul to prevent her from dying and becoming a martyr for the cause. Paul wrote to a friend of her experience during the force feeding, describing the constant “cries and shrieks and moans.” She later explained that the form of non-violent protest was “the strongest weapon left with which to continue... our battle.”

Paul’s actions alienated some who believed the suffragists were becoming too militant. On the other hand, Paul and the 500 others who were arrested for speaking, publishing, peaceably assembling, and petitioning became known as political prisoners, which mobilized their cause. Wilson eventually acknowledged public opinion and ordered the suffragists released from prison. Paul’s efforts, coupled with NAWSA’s newly focused and effective strategy of lobbying on the local, state, and federal levels, had led the suffragists to victory. Wilson lent his support to the Women’s Suffrage Amendment in January of 1918. Congress approved it within a year, and it was ratified by the states in 1920.

Critical Thinking Questions

1. How did Paul’s National Woman’s Party work for women’s suffrage?

2. Paul’s militant actions alienated some people. Why do you think Paul chose to continue them?
“[T]he time is past when we should say: ‘Men and women of America, look upon that wonderful idea up there: see, one day it will come down.’ Instead, the time has come to shout aloud in every city, village and hamlet, and in tones so clear and jubilant that they will reverberate from every mountain peak and echo from shore to shore: ‘The Woman’s Hour has struck.’”

The women listening that day drew strength and inspiration from their speaker, Carrie Chapman Catt. They had assembled at the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) meeting in Atlantic City and were prepared for action. For sixty-eight years, American women had been fighting for the right to vote. There had been minor successes and major setbacks. It was 1916, and only a few far western states, such as Wyoming and Utah, had granted women the right to vote. Most women in the rest of the nation could have been jailed if they had even tried.

Over the years, the disjointed work of suffragist organizations had generated few productive results. Some leaders believed in attacking the issue first at the state level. Others believed the only solution was an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and focused their energies on petitioning Congress. A few wanted to follow the example of English suffragists and took a militant approach: the National Woman’s Party, for example, orchestrated sit-ins and hunger strikes. Some of the most reserved suffragists spread word of their cause through organized afternoon teas and small parades.

The movement that began in the 1840s, with the first women’s rights convention in 1848 at Seneca Falls, New York, seemed to be failing by the early 1900s. Carrie Chapman Catt was determined to save it.

Catt was an educated woman with a strong will and fighting spirit. She grew up in Charles City, Iowa and graduated from Iowa State College in 1880, the only woman in her class. In short order, she became a teacher, then principal, then superintendent for Mason City schools. After one year of marriage, she was left a widow, and decided to devote her time and energy to a public cause. She joined the Iowa Woman’s Suffrage Association in 1886 and quickly rose through the ranks to positions of leadership.

After remarrying in 1890, Catt began working with suffragists nationwide. Her reputation as a speaker grew, and two years later, Susan B. Anthony asked her to testify before Congress on the proposed constitutional amendment. By 1900, Catt had been elected to succeed Anthony as president of the NAWSA. During her tenure, she became known as a strong leader, whose vision and ability to compromise strengthened the organization.

In 1904, the illness of her husband led Catt to resign her position. Devastated by his death the following year as well as that of Anthony in 1906, she retreated to her suffrage work overseas and spent the next nine years working as president of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance, which she had helped organize in 1902.

Catt remained a dynamic spokesperson for the woman’s suffrage movement. While she was abroad, the NAWSA (and consequently the movement) struggled under divided leadership. Catt returned home in 1915 to resume her position as president. A year later, at the 1916 Atlantic City convention, she unveiled a daring new strategy, which she dubbed the “Winning Plan.”
Catt’s Winning Plan contained a bold initiative. It called for a federal amendment to the United States Constitution as its ultimate goal, but it also encouraged the development of state and local initiatives. She wanted to attack the issue on all fronts. If a state offered equal voting rights, the women in that state should campaign for the federal amendment. If the state appeared open to the idea of voting rights, women should work together and organize at the state level. If not, women should devise smaller, local campaigns. What Catt realized was critical: all of these organizations would play a role in the drive for ratification.

The NAWSA adopted the strategy, and Catt traveled the country encouraging cooperative, persistent action. The Winning Plan clearly defined the goals of the NAWSA and, more importantly, the ways to achieve them. Catt provided an overall strategy and a role for each group in the push for women’s suffrage. In four years, her vision would become reality.

While establishing a base of state and local support, Catt approached congressional leaders with the proposed amendment. She impressed President Wilson and many members of Congress, and the NAWSA lobbied tirelessly. Catt made the decision to curb their petitions, however, while the country was embroiled in World War I.

The contributions that women made to the war on the home front may have helped NAWSA when it resumed its lobbying in 1919. The amendment passed in both houses in June, and President Wilson, who respected and admired Catt, came out in favor of the amendment. It moved quickly to the states for ratification.

Over the next year, state and local support became critical to the initiative’s success. Anti-suffragists organized rallies to persuade legislators to vote against the amendment. Some legislators left their states in order to prevent the necessary quorum. Without the minimum number of representatives present in order to vote, the amendment might stall or be defeated. In response, local suffrage associations monitored the referendum process to ensure its validity.

On August 24, 1920, Tennessee became the vital thirty-sixth state to ratify. Two days later—seventy-two years after the start of the suffrage movement—the Nineteenth Amendment was adopted:

*The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.*

Catt’s Winning Plan had won. “The Woman’s Hour” had struck.

**Critical Thinking Questions**

1. The suffrage movement began in the 1840s. The Nineteenth Amendment was not ratified until 1920. What factors made its ratification and adoption possible after seventy-two years?

2. What do you imagine would have happened if Carrie Chapman Catt had not developed and shared her “Winning Plan”?

3. Why do you think President Wilson resisted Alice Paul, but eventually supported Carrie Chapman Catt?
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Angelina Grimké

“Daughters of a prominent South Carolina slaveholding family, Sarah and Angelina Grimké had become dissatisfied with what seemed to them the vacuous life of the upper-class Southern girl ... The sisters became converts to Garrison’s abolition crusade and in 1836 were recruited to become antislavery agents speaking to groups of women. Angelina Grimké turned out to be an orator of considerable power. During her speaking tour a number of men began coming to hear her, so that she found herself lecturing to what the nineteenth century called “promiscuous audiences,” that is, consisting of both men and women ... The ‘mere circumstances of sex does not give to man higher rights and responsibilities, than to woman,’ Angelina insisted ... This gospel equality took her a long way: by the end of the paragraph she was insisting that women had a right to a voice in all the laws by which they were governed in church or state, even a right to sit in Congress or be president.”

Carrie Chapman Catt

“Catt had been an active suffragist since the mid-1880s and prominent in the national movement for more than two decades. When Susan B. Anthony retired in 1900, Catt was her chosen successor. She brought administrative order to the NAWSA, [during] her first presidency from 1900 to 1905 ... The 1915 referendum campaign in New York [for women’s suffrage] showcased her achievements and provided a model that was followed closely in many other states. It also made Carrie Chapman Catt the logical leader for a revitalized NAWSA ... Catt had won the support of the NAWSA leadership for a strategic approach to building an inexorable momentum for the federal amendment. The “Winning Plan” involved carefully disciplined and centrally directed effort in which each state and local suffrage group had a role ... In states where women could vote, NAWSA would lobby and petition their delegations to introduce and fight for the passage of the federal amendment. Where referenda were unlikely, suffragists were charged with working for presidential suffrage or the right to vote in party primaries ... The critical nature of these campaigns would not be self-evident to their opponents as long as they could “keep so much ‘suffrage noise’ going all over the country that neither the enemy nor friends will discover where the real battle is.”

Alice Paul

“Alice Paul had lived in England and participated in the British suffrage movement. A Quaker social worker, Paul went to England in 1907 just in time to witness the meteoric rise of Emmaline Pankhurst and to join in mass demonstrations, also experiencing jail, hunger strikes, and force feeding. Paul joined the moribound NAWSA Congressional committee and convinced NAWSA leaders to let her organize a suffrage parade on the day before the inauguration of President-
 elect Woodrow Wilson. She set up headquarters in Washington, D.C., raised over $25,000, and began an aggressive lobbying and publicity campaign for a federal amendment. When Woodrow Wilson arrived for his inaugural on March 3, 1913, his greeters had already left to see the woman suffrage parade. Five thousand women stole the scene, as they pressed their way through a hostile crowd down Pennsylvania Avenue. Aware that the NAWSA was unwilling to build on this momentum, Paul and Lucy Burns established a separate organization, the Congressional Union, in April 1913 to provide a new base for national activity ... [The two organizations] remained bitter competitors through the rest of the suffrage campaign and well beyond ... The split with the Congressional Union had the important impact of reigniting NAWSA interest in a federal amendment, but the two organizations were never able to cooperate ... The Congressional Union and its successor, the National Woman’s Party (NWP), provided a radical voice with the suffrage movement redefining the parameters of the debate.”


Judge John Grimké

Father of Sarah and Angeline Grimké

“Judge Grimké became quite ill and Sarah accompanied him to Philadelphia for medical treatment. The treatment was unsuccessful and after several months, Judge Grimké died in New Jersey in 1819. Sarah, by this time, had enjoyed living in a place where others shared her views on slavery and she decided to leave Charleston behind and relocate to Philadelphia where she became a vocal abolitionist. She left the Episcopal church and became a Quaker. With Sarah’s encouragement, Angelina soon joined her sister. They lived together and became outspoken advocates for ending slavery. As they became more well-known and were invited to address more and more groups, they ran into another sort of prejudice. They were scorned for their activism, not so much because of what they believed, but because they were women. Women who held strong opinions and were willing - even adamant - about expressing them in public forums were the brunt of anger and ridicule.

Sarah and Angelina began to see that in order to proclaim their message against slavery, they also had to address the inequities faced by women. Sarah wrote, “All I ask of our brethren is that they will take their feet from off our necks and permit us to stand upright on the ground which God intends for us to occupy”


Mary Grimké

Mother of Sarah and Angeline Grimké

“In March of 1838, just a few months after Angelina Grimké’s historic appearance before the Massachusetts Senate, she wrote to tell her mother that she was going to marry fellow abolitionist Theodore Weld. Many of the Grimké sisters’ critics had made an issue of their unmarried state. Women who had stepped so far outside their “sphere,” they said, were obviously unsuitable for marriage. The response of Angelina’s mother Mary Grimké, a South Carolina slaveholder’s wife, reveals her enduring love for her militant abolitionist daughter despite their wide differences of opinion. She also expressed her relief that Angelina would have a male “protector” and hoped that as a married woman she would retreat from public life. Although marriage and the long years of childbearing that followed did greatly reduce Angelina Grimké’s
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public activities, neither of the sisters ever abandoned her belief in the equality of women, a belief born in the antislavery movement.

See Mary Grimké’s letter: http://www.teachushistory.org/second-great-awakening-age-reform/resources/angelina-Grimkés-mother-expresses-her-opinion

Sarah Grimké

“Daughters of a prominent South Carolina slaveholding family, Sarah and Angelina Grimké had become dissatisfied with what seemed to them the vacuous life of the upper-class Southern girl. Sarah in particular resented the fact that the good advanced education given to her brothers was denied to her. In her late twenties she left home for Philadelphia and was later joined by the younger Angelina. The sisters became converts to Garrison’s abolition crusade and in 1836 were recruited to become antislavery agents speaking to groups of women ... To Sarah, men’s assumptions of superiority over women was not natural but usurped. It had resulted in multiple oppressions, from the unequal laws of marriage to the low wages of working women ... The worst consequence was that women themselves internalized male belief in their inferiority ... ‘I’ll ask no favors for my sex,’ was her essential message to men. ‘All I ask of our brethren is, that they take their feet from off our necks, and permit us to stand upright on the ground which God designed for us to occupy.’”


Pelters

(From Handout D) The pamphlet brought Grimké nationwide recognition as well as scathing criticism. She and her sister, Sarah, began lecturing in New England in the late 1830s. They traveled to more than sixty-seven towns, conveying the shocking details of the slavery system they witnessed as children. Sometimes they lectured from the pulpit. Many times, their words were met with violence. They were pelted with vegetables and faced angry crowds throwing rocks.

Trippers

(From Handout E) Alice Paul’s parade on President Wilson’s inauguration day was not without its challenges. Paul recalled years later: “We did hear a lot of shouted insults... the usual things about why aren’t you home in the kitchen where you belong.” Other men shoved and tripped the marchers, while police did little to assist. One hundred marchers were taken to the hospital.

Pastors

(From Handout D) In a time when women did not speak in front of mixed audiences, Grimké’s lectures caused a stir across the North. Some pastors balked, and many people were scandalized. In 1837, a “Pastoral Letter” was published; it barred women from speaking from the pulpit in churches. Grimké now found herself an outsider in both the North and the South.


Insulters

(From Handout E) Alice Paul’s parade on President Wilson’s inauguration day was not without its challenges. Paul recalled years later: “We did hear a lot of shouted insults... the usual
things about why aren’t you home in the kitchen where you belong.” Other men shoved and tripped the marchers, while police did little to assist. One hundred marchers were taken to the hospital.

**President Woodrow Wilson**

(From **Handout E**) Paul went to the White House two weeks after the parade to talk to Wilson. The President promised to give the idea of voting rights for women his “most careful consideration,” but this promise did little to satisfy Paul and the suffragists.

(From **Handout F**) President Wilson resisted the efforts of Alice Paul, but eventually supported Carrie Chapman Catt. (Why?)

**Susan B. Anthony**

“Susan B. Anthony was born February 15, 1820 in Adams, Massachusetts. She was brought up in a Quaker family with long activist traditions. Early in her life she developed a sense of justice and moral zeal. After teaching for fifteen years, she became active in temperance. Because she was a woman, she was not allowed to speak at temperance rallies. This experience, and her acquaintance with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, led her to join the women’s rights movement in 1852. Soon after, she dedicated her life to woman suffrage. Ignoring opposition and abuse, Anthony traveled, lectured, and canvassed across the nation for the vote. She also campaigned for the abolition of slavery, the right for women to own their own property and retain their earnings, and she advocated for women’s labor organizations. In 1900, Anthony persuaded the University of Rochester to admit women.

Anthony, who never married, was aggressive and compassionate by nature. She had a keen mind and a great ability to inspire. She remained active until her death on March 13, 1906.”


See also Susan B. Anthony timeline [http://susanbanthonyhouse.org/timeline.php](http://susanbanthonyhouse.org/timeline.php)
Handouts D–F Answer Keys

Handout D: Angelina Grimke (1805-1879) Answer Key

1. A desire for justice, her faith and beliefs, and her beliefs about equality.
2. In Grimké’s life and beliefs, both issues were related to justice and to what she viewed as equality endowed by a Creator.

Handout E: Alice Paul (1885-1977)

1. Demonstrations and parades; writing and publishing leaflets; pickets in front of the White House; using President Wilson’s own words to make their case; burning copies of the president’s speeches; burning an effigy of the president at the White House gates. Also, they did not suspend their work during World War I.
2. Accept reasoned responses based on the text and on a factual understanding of U.S. history.

Handout F: Carrie Chapman Catt (1859-1947)

1. Accepted reasoned responses based on the text and on historical understandings.
2. Accepted reasoned responses based on the text and on historical understandings.
3. Accept reasoned answers.