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“Make it a Woman’s World”: The 1911 California Woman Suffrage Campaign

Sarah Smith

Women’s rights have been a part of the modern American political scene from the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention on, but women were only officially enfranchised nationwide with the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment in 1920. However, California women, along with many other women in the American West, were enfranchised prior to the Nineteenth Amendment. Despite a lull in the national suffrage movement in the early twentieth century, often called the “doldrums,” California women were successful in winning the vote in 1911 through a special election on a state constitutional amendment. Why was this so? While suffragists were united behind the common goal of universal suffrage for women, they were divided by class and political ideology. The decentralized nature of the 1911 California women’s suffrage campaign allowed it to overcome internal ideological and tactical disagreements through a mass campaign framed around traditional ideas of femininity and rooted in the appropriation of the public sphere in order to communicate suffragist views and, ultimately, win the right to vote.

In general, histories of the suffrage movement have neglected the experiences of Western women and their fight for the vote. Some early women’s historians followed the Frederick Jackson Turner frontier thesis, which hypothesized that Western women were enfranchised earlier than their Eastern and Southern counterparts because of a unique frontier gender mentality that saw women as equal to men. However, the Turner frontier thesis also argued that men and women experienced the frontier in fundamentally different ways, men actively and women passively. Historian Susan Armitage noted that this mentality was a myth, as the traditions of gender roles and separate sphere ideologies were brought west with the frontier pioneers. Furthermore, Turner-style histories have been criticized for their tendency to perpetuate racist and patriarchal narratives of the suffrage movement. These histories often argued that frontier men gave women the right to vote as a means of civilizing the West, ignoring a history of diversity as well as perpetuating historical narratives that prioritized the experiences of white settlers. Along these lines, other historians posited that women were given the right to vote in the West earlier than their Eastern counterparts as a means to attract more female settlers to the frontier, or that men gave women the right to vote with hopes it would become a civilizing force. In all, these types of histories of the woman suffrage movement in the American West neglected to give the women fighting for their political rights the attention they deserved, effectively erasing their agency from the historical record in favor of supporting a male hegemony within the field. Instead, as political scientist Lee Ann Banaszak suggested, the early enfranchisement of women in the American West was due to the suffrage movement’s willingness to create alliances between grassroots populist and progressive movements. These alliances fostered organization and lobbying skills in Western women that would prove invaluable in the various state suffrage campaigns.

The first major scholarly study of the American woman suffrage movement, Eleanor Flexner’s Century of Struggle: The Woman’s Rights Movement in the United States, focused on the national movement and made several key points about the 1911 California campaign. Flexner argued that the California campaign was not only the most organized of the state campaigns, but also the most tireless and received the most support from ordinary women. Aileen S. Kraditor outlined the political arguments used by the woman suffrage movements and argued that these
tended to fall into two groups: natural rights arguments and political expediency arguments. Under the influence of progressivism, California suffragists blended the two arguments to persuasively argue in favor of enfranchisement as a societal benefit. More recently, Rebecca Mead and Gayle Gullett both argued that California suffragists in 1911 were uniquely positioned because of their willingness to negotiate within the movement. Suffragists crafted political alliances with the populist, progressive and socialist movements, and were also more likely to experiment with tactics that challenged familiar ideas of female political participation. Overall, historical studies of the 1911 campaign maintained that California suffragists actively fought for their right to vote, utilizing tactics unseen in other parts of the movement. This research differs from previous scholarships by contending that while suffragists challenged norms of female political participation, their ideological and tactical flexibility allowed them to manipulate socially accepted gender roles and conceptions of femininity to convince male voters to support female enfranchisement. Overwhelmingly, California suffragists in 1911 changed the rhetoric used in previous suffrage campaigns by arguing that enfranchisement would allow them to better exercise their womanly duties. By combining the justice and expediency arguments, as defined by Kraditor, California suffragists created a hybrid argument in favor of women's enfranchisement, which translated into the creation of a mass campaign that was equally used by mainstream and radical activists.

Through the blurring of distinct public and private spheres, suffragists engaged with a newly emerging civil society, which was vital in persuading male politicians and voters to support female enfranchisement. The widely accepted and socially constructed traditions of gender roles based on separate sphere ideologies created a distinct power structure in which women were inferior to men and confined to domestic concerns, while men were expected to chivalrously care for their wives, mothers and daughters. As industrialization brought women out of the home and moved the political into the home, changes in the expectations of women’s societal roles created gendered opportunities for suffragists to propose voting as part of women’s expected roles. Women were given specific opportunities for political advancement due in part to their gender, which was incredibly important in the advancement of suffrage arguments and women’s equality in the political world. On the other hand, other suffragists contended that the separation between public and private created the basis for gender inequality and that this led to the exclusion of women from the political world, weakening the very concept of the citizen and structure of the polity. This “new woman...in factories, universities, and professions” weakened the grip of orthodox gender roles and the assumption that a woman’s “appropriate place was in the home.” The growth of civil society allowed for the creation of persuasive arguments in favor of woman suffrage by combining arguments that both supported and critiqued traditional gender norms. In turn, suffragists advocated for the vote both as a means to partially reject strict enforcement of gender norms in ways that did not threaten to completely reverse orthodox notions of femininity.

The 1911 campaign operated within the context of separate sphere ideology and strict gender roles common in the early twentieth century. Separate sphere ideology maintained that men and women were inherently different and therefore lived in different social spheres; men belonged in the public political sphere whereas women were relegated to the private domestic one. While many suffragists did not necessarily agree with the enforcement of the strict gender roles championed by their anti-suffrage opponents, they quickly realized that framing their arguments within these traditional roles would benefit them politically. California suffragists moved into the public sphere by engaging civil society through membership in voluntary association groups, especially social clubs. The term “civil society” has been subject to serious debate throughout recent years and in various disciplines. While the most basic definition of civil society is a place between the private and public spheres, many scholars find it to be much more complicated. The idea of a civil society based around voluntary association groups tended to further polarize the private and public spheres, leading some to criticize it for upholding separate sphere ideology. However, in the context of the 1911 California suffrage campaign, civil society was the realm in which most...
campaigning took place. While women were expected to exist within the private domestic sphere, moving into civil society was a necessary step towards achieving their political goals. Encouraged by this muddling of the public with the private, California suffragists simultaneously challenged certain aspects of separate sphere ideologies while maintaining an image of respectable femininity in order to make suffrage appealing to potential male voters and supporters.

Following the election of a number of progressive candidates to the California state legislature in 1910, suffragists across the political spectrum eagerly awaited action on the issue of enfranchisement. Prior to the official beginning of the 1911 campaign, the College Equal Suffrage League of Northern California (CESL), one of the most active suffrage organizations in the state, began lobbying vociferously to push the progressive state legislature to act on the issue of equal suffrage. The CESL outlined the tactics they used throughout the 1911 campaign in *Winning Equal Suffrage in California, Reports of Committees of the College Equal Suffrage League of Northern California in the Campaign of 1911*, which was published following the success of the campaign as a how-to guide for other state suffrage movements. Members created a letter-writing campaign, which sent personal messages to every member of the state legislature and urged them to consider the suffrage question favorably. CESL graduates also sent letters to fellow alumni who worked in the California state government. The CESL advertised in local Sacramento newspapers, noting the potential benefits of enfranchisement and urging state lawmakers to vote in favor of it. On January 18, 1911, members of the CESL and other suffrage organizations made personal appearances at a hearing before the Judiciary Committee of the state Senate where they passionately spoke their opinions. On January 26, 1911, the Senate voted thirty-five to five in favor of suffrage. On February 2, the Assembly voted sixty-five to five in favor of suffrage, sending the question of suffrage to male voters for approval in a special election. While the state legislature did not decide to immediately enfranchise women, they did vote in favor of putting the suffrage amendment, Proposition 4, on the ballot for a special election in October of that year. This occurred despite opposition from the newly elected progressive Republican Governor Hiram Johnson, who did not think most women were educated enough to be immediately enfranchised. In fact, Johnson and many others in the progressive leadership decided “not to mention the suffrage amendment” during the special election campaign, as they worried that it would garner too much negative attention and hurt their chances at reelection. Expecting the suffrage amendment to lose, these men wanted to focus their energy on the other progressive reforms on the ballot, including the recall, referendum and initiative, which they believed were more important in the effort to expand democracy and reduce political corruption. This level of legislative support explained the growing tendency of suffragists to portray enfranchisement as part of larger reform efforts and why they took such valiant steps to reach potential voters at every social level.

Even in the earliest stages of the 1911 campaign, suffragists’ arguments tended to fall into two groups: justice-based arguments and expediency-based arguments, to use terms coined by Kraditor. On the one hand, justice-based arguments drew from American ideals such as “consent of the governed,” as some suffragists argued women were just as much citizens as men and they deserved the right to vote. Furthermore, suffragists who utilized justice-based arguments emphasized that a nation could not be wholly democratic if half of its citizens were disenfranchised. However, as immigrant populations became larger in the early twentieth century, these sorts of justifications were seen as too radical as they seemed to put forth ideas that threatened not only white Anglo-Saxon Protestant authority, but also patriarchal notions of gender roles. With this in mind, suffragists remade their claim to political equality on the basis of expediency-based arguments, which highlighted the ways in which women voters would be able to bring about concrete social and political reforms. Concurrent in these arguments, however, was the belief that the votes of white women would outweigh unfavorable votes from minority groups. Despite this, suffragists by and large argued for enfranchisement not based on what the vote could do for them, but what they could do for their communities and governments.
arguments showed the ways in which women wanted to vote not to give themselves freedom outside traditional gender roles, but to translate their duties as women and mothers to the political community. The introduction of suffragists who were conscious of the implications of their arguments on the general public moved mainstream suffrage arguments closer to expediency-based reasoning, though they never truly abandoned basic claims to equality as seen in justice-based arguments. While different in theory, these two arguments were rooted in suffragists’ unique views of democracy; though different in a few key ways, “democracy...was incompatible with the rule of force,” and “only a government whose electorate included all fit adults could be considered democratic.” Ultimately, California suffragists created a hybrid argument in favor of enfranchisement utilizing both justice-based and expediency-based arguments in order to reach the widest audience of potential supporters possible.

The California state legislature passed the suffrage issue on to male voters in a special election called for October 10, 1911, in the form of Proposition 4, “Rights of Suffrage [Permitting Women to Vote].” Section One of the proposed constitutional amendment extended suffrage to California women by removing the word “male” from the current constitution. It also stated that “every citizen of the United States, every person who shall have acquired the rights of citizenship...and ever, naturalized citizen thereof...who shall have been resident...shall be entitled to vote at all elections which are now or may hereafter be, authorized by law,” Despite the inclusion of gender, the proposition continued to maintain that “no native of China, no idiot, no insane person, no person convicted of an infamous crime, no person hereafter convicted of embezzlement or misappropriation of public money, and no person [unable] to read the constitution in the English language and write his or her name” would be allowed to vote. Abandoning any reference to gender, the proposed amendment was a major success for California suffragists, even prior to the special election.

The proposed text of the amendment was accompanied by arguments for and against the enfranchisement of women in voter information leaflets. Senator Charles Bell from the 36th Senate District wrote the affirmative position and listed several reasons as to why women should have the ballot. Bell wrote, “the reasons why women should vote are the same as the reasons why men should vote, the same as the reasons for having a republic rather than a monarchy. To vote is simply to express one’s opinion.” He further argued “women are conscientious” and their enfranchisement would “create a large reserve vote for civic righteousness,” showing the influence of middle-class clubwomen suffragists in the state legislature lobbying campaign. Bell followed this reform-minded argument for suffrage by arguing that women were “interested directly in good government; bad laws, the non-enforcement of good laws, directly affect her in all her relations, as home-keeper, wage-earner, and man’s co-worker.” Highlighting women’s special place in the home and arguing, “if women vote it will not destroy the home,” Bell’s argument for suffrage closely mirrored those used by various groups in the 1911 campaign. In order to dismiss the fear that women would abandon their homes if enfranchised, Bell argued, “she will stick closer to her home after having reached the goal of her ambition. Her personality, enlarged by the proofs of her extended activity, will raise the standard of the home higher than ever.” Bell also emphasized the importance of women’s votes as moral votes, arguing that “we must [concede] that the ballot is a moral force—that morality has entered our politics—the moral force of women is crippled by the denial of the ballot, and hence that denial retards the advancement of truth and justice.” These statements show the ways in which the male members of the state legislature argued in favor of suffrage as a reform as well as a means to achieve reform. Drawing on the reform arguments used by suffragists, Bell’s outline of the vote as reform was extremely valuable within the context of the all-male state government.

Bell also used justice arguments in his defense of women’s suffrage, arguing that the “inalienable rights of person as they are affected by the legislation must be preserved to women.” He further stated, “no one can fully
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represent her in framing laws, which deal with them.” Drawing directly from the justice-based arguments put forth by suffragists, Bell contended, “representative democracy without equal suffrage is impossible, because it is only through this form of government that people are subject to laws may have a voice in making them.”24 Combined, Bell’s arguments in favor of suffrage mirror that of the California suffrage campaign; asserting that women have a special interest in the vote both as humans and as women, Bell made a compelling case for the enfranchisement of women. Emphasizing that enfranchising women would “restore the government of this state to the people” and the falsehood of the claim that “women are sufficiently represented by men and that women can rely upon men to right their wrongs,” Bell clearly borrows from the justice arguments used by California suffragists.25

Assemblyman H.G. Cattell of the 67th District wrote a concurring affirmative position and mirrored much of the same logic and arguments used by Bell. Picking up the justice argument used by suffragists, Cattell stated, “consent of the governed means woman as well as man; for they are subject to government as well as men.”26 However, Cattell’s argument depends more heavily on the reform arguments framed in terms of traditional gender roles. He argued that “women are better morally,” and that “women would be a great factor in promoting honesty, equality, and morality if given the ballot.”27 In a direct response to those who charged that women voters would lose their femininity, Cattell challenged that “women who are in touch with public affairs are none the less womanly; but, on the contrary they are better and more compassionate wives, more interesting mothers, because they have a common interest with their sons.”28 In this line of reasoning, Cattell fell in step with mainstream California suffragists by arguing that enfranchisement would allow women to better exercise their domestic duties as wives and mothers, not lead to a moral decline. Blasting against claims that voting is inherently contrary to feminine nature, Cattell called on California’s male voters to “show the saloon element, the gambling element, the selfish element (for these are the opponents of woman suffrage), that this great state of California is real [sic] a progressive state in every way.”29 While recognizing the claims to justice used by suffragists, Cattell’s argument was more deeply rooted in the suffrage-as-reform camp.

On the other end of the political spectrum, Senator J. B. Sanford of the 4th District argued against woman enfranchisement. Sanford opened by stating that “suffrage is not a right,” further arguing that “it is a privilege that may or may not be granted,” and that “politics is no place for a woman.”30 Firmly grounded in separate sphere ideological gender roles, Sanford charged that “the mothers of this country can shape the destinies of the nation by keeping in their places and attending to those duties that God Almighty intended for them. The kindly gentle influence of the mother in the home and the dignified influencer of the teacher in the school will far outweigh all the influence of all the mannish female politicians on earth.”31 Above all else, Sanford exalted women as “the dearest creature on earth,” placing her on a pedestal above men, while arguing that they did not need the vote. Maintaining that a “woman does not have to vote to secure her rights,” Sanford believed that voting men were sufficient to protect women’s interests and that they would “go to any extreme to protect and elevate her.” Sanford, like many other anti-suffrage advocates, charged that enfranchising women would degrade them, saying, “as long as woman is woman and keeps her place she will get more protection and more consideration than man gets. When she abdicates her throne she throws down the scepter of her power and loses her influence.”32 By placing women on a pedestal above men, Sanford argued that women were too good to enter the world of politics and that men should act and vote in their stead.

Claiming that woman suffrage would be contrary to nature and that it had proven to be a failure in other states, particularly emphasizing the misconception that woman suffrage had lead to increase in divorces and prostitution in Colorado, Sanford stood by his belief that “woman is woman,” and that “she can not unsex herself or change her sphere.” Keeping women firmly within their private domestic sphere, Sanford claimed they should not be given the right to vote, and that politicians should “let her be content with her lot and perform those high duties intended
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for her by the Great Creator, and she will accomplish far more in governmental affairs than she can ever
accomplish by mixing up in the dirty pool of politics,” clearly co-opting the tone of anti-suffrage advocates across
the state. Sanford commanded voters to “keep the home pure” by not voting in favor of women’s suffrage, “and
all will be well with the republic.” Further drawing on anti-suffrage rhetoric, Sanford claimed that “manly men and
womanly women [would] defeat this amendment and keep woman where she belongs in order that she may
retain the respect of all mankind.” Essentially, Sanford drew from traditions of separate sphere ideologies that
simultaneously privileged women as morally superior to men while denying them basic civil liberties in order to
argue against the suffrage amendment in Proposition 4.

Outside of the debates in the state legislature, the majority of the supporters of the 1911 California woman
suffrage campaign were diverse in political opinion and socioeconomic background, though they were united by
their common goal of enfranchisement for women. The two most influential groups within the movement were
labor socialists and middle-class clubwomen. These groups reconciled their ideological and political differences
over effective tactics in order to build a broad coalition of support for female enfranchisement through a mass
public campaign. By distancing themselves from the influence of national suffrage organizations and traditional
suffrage allies such as the anti-liquor lobby, the various California suffrage clubs and societies sought new ideas,
tactics and support to reach their political goal. The lack of a single leading individual or group in the 1911
California suffrage campaign allowed for greater flexibility in the use of ideological and political arguments for
suffrage. Furthermore, this freedom allowed for experimentation with new tactics previously unused by the
suffrage movement while remaining largely independent of either major political party. The campaign’s
decentralized structure allowed for a diversity of political ideology and tactical approach and allowed suffragists to
reach a wider audience of potential supporters than previously possible. By distancing itself from the established
political parties and typical suffrage allies, the California suffragists of 1911 created a nonpartisan image for
women’s suffrage that fit into the narrative of traditional female gender roles and female political participation
while continually moving women deeper into the public sphere. Loosely united behind the common goal of votes
for women, the decentralized 1911 campaign blazed new trails in the suffrage movement by creating a hybrid
argument for enfranchisement while participating in a direct campaign that borrowed from their political allies.

Without much time to prepare, women’s suffrage organizations across the state quickly began to organize a mass
campaign in order to secure a favorable vote for enfranchisement. While socialist and labor organizations
concentrated on more public outreach techniques such as rallies and public speaking engagements, middle-class
club organizations focused on mailing lists and spreading literature through women’s clubs and churches.
Regardless of tactic or political leaning, California suffragists across the spectrum were quickly learning from the
shortcomings of the earlier failed 1896 campaign. Rather than being held back by the movement’s loose structure
and division, California suffragists embraced this decentralization to spark a grassroots movement designed to
reach across class lines by borrowing from both the labor movement and consumer culture. By appealing more
directly to the everyday man and woman, suffragists were able to build a wide network of suffrage support,
moving the campaigning beyond the urban areas in which it had previously been concentrated. Suffragists now
recognized the importance of the working class and rural vote to counteract negative attitudes concentrated in
wealthier urban areas, and designed their propaganda to appeal to these audiences. In order to counterbalance
the possible factions that could be engendered by the decentralized nature of the campaign, California suffragists
across the various organizations made a conscious effort to prioritize the goal of suffrage ahead of their other
political aims.

Compared to the experiences of socialist suffragists in the rest of the nation, California’s socialist suffragists were
vitally important to the campaign’s success in 1911. California socialist suffragists were pivotal in the creation of

some level of unification across an incredibly diverse and decentralized movement. Unified behind the goal of woman suffrage, socialist suffragists bridged the gap between the middle-class suffragists and working-class men and women. Maud Younger, president of the Wage Earners Suffrage League (WESL), was quoted as saying to her counterparts in the CESL to let her “handle [her] own people.” Further, Younger said, “I understand them. If one of you college women speak to them you will probably say just the wrong things.” Unlike other suffragists, the socialist suffragist camp drew upon the belief that women’s economic participation entitled them to the vote; in this way, socialist suffragists provided a new perspective on why women should be enfranchised, and persuaded many working-class men and women to join the suffrage coalition. This type of argument was clearly used by Emma Shafter Howard, who wrote that, It is becoming evident that the woman suffrage movement is one of race progress; therefore, a human movement, it calls for the contribution and representation of woman’s part, as well as man’s, in human affairs, and in values concrete and economic, first of all. This means economic justice in the sense that the laborer in the sense that the laborer is worthy of her hire, as well as he of his, and to the common human end. By connecting women voters to the possibility of helping the working-class community and bringing about economic equality, labor suffragists converted otherwise adversarial working-class men to the suffrage cause. With a firm grounding in the economic reasoning behind the enfranchisement of women, California socialist suffragists were instrumental in forming a broad base of suffrage support, crossing class lines to build a more formidable coalition.

Younger, a San Francisco socialite who left behind her wealth to experience the working-class life as a waitress and who would later became president of WESL in San Francisco, was one of the more prominent socialist suffragists during the 1911 campaign. In her article “Why Wage-Earning Women Should Vote,” Younger established the socialist perspective on a woman’s political and economic right to the vote. She argued that since women’s work had moved into the public sphere as a result of industrialization, working women needed the vote in order to protect themselves in the workplace. Younger pointed out the irrational fact that a wage-earning woman “[had] no representatives to make or to enforce the laws so necessary to her and the community.” Furthermore, Younger highlighted the particular need working-class women had compared to their upper-class counterparts. Wage-earning women were unable to buy influence, and the vote was the only way by which they could secure influence in the public sphere. Younger also emphasized that “there can be no democracy where half the population is governed without consent” and is taxed without representation. This appeal to rhetoric familiar to any American, comparing the plight of the disenfranchised woman to that of the Founding Fathers, was extremely useful in building the suffrage coalition. Similar appeals to justice and the American tradition were seen throughout suffrage literature. Suffragist Mary Austin, for example, wrote, What women are asking for is the right to consent to the laws under which they live. Wherever the ballot, which is the official means of such consent, is denied them, women are still in respect to their social rights under the regime of force, and society goes limping along with one member rejoicing in the freedom of democracy and the other still swathed in the restraints of feudalism. Rhetoric such as this further created connections between women and democracy in the minds of potential supporters, and was a vital tool in securing the vital support for Proposition 4. Younger’s argument exemplifies the type of logic used by socialist suffragists, including both the economic and political arguments for enfranchisement.

The benefits of suffrage for wage-earning women were also discussed in a meeting held by the Oakland Suffrage Amendment League on August 21, 1911. Frances A. Williamson, president of the Oakland Women’s Union Label League, was the main speaker at the meeting, and spoke on the reasons why wage-earning women in particular should have the right to vote. Echoing some of the themes in Younger’s article, Williamson said,
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[You may recall that the constitution of the United States begins with 'We the people,' and then proceeds to make laws for the people. Now we may think that women are people, but they are not taken into consideration in this document. They are people when it comes to law breakers, but not for the law makers. With the ballot women will be given power, and power always commands respect.]

Williamson’s argument borrowed not only from the justice arguments put forth by Younger, but also drew influence from the larger American political tradition. By referencing the Constitution, Williamson connected the plight of disenfranchised women to that of the Founding Fathers; deprived of representation in government, wage-earning women in particular needed the ballot to protect themselves. While Younger’s piece was directed specifically at a working class audience, Williamson’s piece differs in that her opinions were in a more open forum. This fact accounts for the slight differences in rhetoric between the two suffragists. While Younger drew heavily on socialist political ideology and appealed to industrialization as one of the major reasons for the need for female enfranchisement, Williamson took a slightly more conservative approach to the issue in this article by framing it in terms of accepted American political traditions and the mythology of the Founding Fathers. Regardless of these differences, core to both Younger and Williamson’s arguments are calls for justice; epitomizing the tactics used by the more radical socialist suffragists, they called for the enfranchisement of women on the basis that they were just as much citizens as men, and as such should have a voice in the political sphere.

Williamson further argued in favor of female enfranchisement in a September article published in the San Francisco Call. Drawing on a metaphor that saw men as the mind of the nation and women as the heart, Williamson argued that the reason government was corrupt was because women were so inactive in its execution. Decrying the anti-suffrage argument that favored the traditional “household representation” in which men were expected to vote with their wives and daughters in mind, she argued that the California suffrage campaign was the “natural result of the evolution of the idea of personal liberty...the revolt of the native spirit of western independence against social customs long since outgrown.” This argument, deeply rooted in the justice arguments of socialist suffragists, asserted that just as women’s social roles have changed, as a result of industrialization and the blurring between public and private, the “feminine soul” has grown to encompass a larger sphere of activity. No longer were women’s responsibilities solely within the home, and therefore in their control; on the contrary, as the public and political increasingly crouched in on the domestic sphere, women required the vote in order to protect their children from the corruption of the public sphere. Williamson closed her argument saying, “the state needs the unused resources of woman’s genius and tenderness, united with the energy of man’s sterner reasoning faculties and sterner executive ability, to adjust the vexed questions of this restless period in our political life.”

Interestingly, in this piece, Williamson adopted a tone similar to that of the reform arguments favored by more mainstream suffrage advocates. She highlighted the importance of women’s special skills in the public context, and noted that they could be helpful to securing reform in a chaotic political climate. However, the calls for justice, which featured so prominently in socialist suffragist campaign materials, continued to take precedent in Williamson’s article.

In addition to writing extensively on the political and economic need for enfranchisement, California’s socialist suffragists brought extremely valuable new grassroots tactics, and occasionally militant methods, to the 1911 suffrage campaign. During this campaign, suffragists engaged in precinct canvassing and organization, soapboxing, automobile campaigns, staging pageants and parades, coordinating press work, producing literature, advertising and slogans for mass distribution, and holding public outdoor meetings and rallies. Socialist suffragists were integral in establishing a highly organized precinct-canvassing program as well as experimentally engaging in more public and aggressive styles of activism and protest. This new, more militant take on suffrage activism pushed the battle for woman suffrage “out of the parlors and into the streets,” inherently challenging traditional notions of female roles and respectability by boldly moving into the public political sphere.
creation of a cross-cross suffrage coalition as it allowed suffragists to speak to potential supporters of all sorts in any number of environments. No longer restrained to private campaigning with whom they already had social connections, these tactics enabled suffragists to reach the everyday man on the street who otherwise might not seek information on the suffrage issue.

One of the key tactics introduced by socialist suffragists during the 1911 California campaign was the suffrage parade, of which the first one held in the United States was in Oakland, California in August 1908. Two to three hundred women marched to the Republican state convention in order to ask for the party's endorsement. Though the suffragists were denied an endorsement in the Republican party platform in 1908, they quickly learned the power of public demonstration, a typically masculine practice. The suffrage parade became an increasingly valuable tool in 1911 as the California suffrage movement as a whole become more decentralized and encompassed more diverse political and socioeconomic points of view. Socialist suffragists also used their close alliance with the labor movement to create floats for various labor-sponsored parades. Suffragists, including Maud Younger and Louise La Rue, partnered with the Wage Earners' League to create a parade float leading up to the special election that featured women marching in costumes of the various trades and professions. This decision to enter the political sphere in such a public manner, driven by frustration over a lack of success in securing the vote for women, was only able to occur because of the decentralized nature of the suffrage campaign. Because there was no single leader or leading group in the 1911 campaign, socialist suffragists were able to experiment with tactics in order to reach a wider audience than previously possible. The suffrage parade, as well as the creation of floats for labor parades, was a pivotal step in the socialist suffragists' attempt to push the suffrage campaign directly into the public sphere. The use of the suffrage parade was a highly public tactic and a powerful tool to challenge traditional notions of female political action. By moving into the public sphere through the use of the suffrage parade, socialist suffragists made a claim on political rights for women, effectively attempting to bring that aspect into the domain of women's roles.

Socialist suffragists further contested socially acceptable notions of political demonstration by engaging in open-air meetings and rallies. Frances Noel, a prominent socialist suffragist and activist in her own right, attempted to speak on the suffrage issue during a Fourth of July celebration organized by the Los Angeles WESL. Noted for her impressive oratory skills and ability to communicate with people from nearly every level of society, Noel was an extremely sought after speaker. While the male speakers in the group were allowed to speak after having shown authorities their permit to do so, the female speakers were halted on “some old ordinance forbidding political speeches in public parks.” Suffragists quickly responded by singing the suffrage song, “Beloved California.” Emphasizing that “the vote will make us free,” these singing suffragists circumvented the law in order to claim a piece of the public space. From open-air speeches to cooperation with labor unions in the creation of parade floats, socialist suffragists expanded the realm of possibilities for suffragists. Leading the charge in the appropriation of public space for women, their ability to innovate ideologically and tactically and directly contribute to the success of the 1911 campaign was an integral part of the expansion of women's political rights.

On the other end of the political spectrum, one of the largest and most influential groups in the 1911 California suffrage campaign was composed of middle-class white women, who had gradually begun moving into civil society and the public sphere in an attempt to secure their political goals. These suffragists were not new to the world of reform or to using traditional ideas of femininity to secure political reform. Many of these suffragists during the 1911 campaign were clubwomen who had been radicalized by their interaction with different ethnic and social groups through their involvement in reform politics and community work. More moderate than their socialist colleagues, however, these suffragists were integral in bringing in a more socially acceptable perspective to the suffrage campaign. There were two primary wings in the middle-class clubwomen suffragist group: younger,
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college-educated and slightly more conservative women; and older, more established and radical women who had been working for suffrage since the failed 1896 campaign. While the older women tended to favor the justice arguments put forth by the more radical socialist suffragists, the younger women realized that this sort of rhetoric was not to their benefit. In order to create a more socially acceptable image of the clubwoman suffragist, the younger members made an active attempt to put forth reform arguments that reconciled claims to justice with traditional ideas of women’s roles in the home and in society. Core to the younger suffragists’ identity, in part, was a rejection of this radical element; in order to make suffrage appear attractive to potential supporters in the voting public and the state political structure, these suffragists created arguments for suffrage designed around the ways in which women could use the vote to better exercise their feminine duties. Despite the appearance of internal divisions within the middle-class suffragist camp, these suffragists were ultimately unified by their common goal of women’s enfranchisement.

The arguments used by clubwoman suffragists varied. While the demand for equal rights was also central, they overwhelmingly cloaked their demand in traditional gender roles. By arguing that suffrage was an extension of a woman’s domestic duty to protect the home and serve as its moral guardian, these suffragists were able to make a case for the respectability and femininity of voting. Such an argument can be seen in Mrs. J.B. Hume’s defense of suffrage, as she argued that “The woman of the twentieth century is not helpless but brace, steadfast and self-sacrificing and ready for this new reform...That a woman’s place is in the home is an outworn creed forever passed away...Today women’s true sphere includes every interest in the city which affects the security of her home and all homes.” Against charges that such an attitude was contrary to female nature, Hume asserted that “in spite of the time she takes in all public activities, she is still the womanly woman and is simply carrying her housekeeping abilities into municipal housekeeping.” This type of argument, frequently called social housekeeping, claimed that women could use the vote to clean up machine politics and better protect the domestic sphere. Some suffragists argued that “the chief business of women is mothering...bearing children...looking after their food and clothing and housing, their bodily safety and the welfare of the impressionable minds.” Furthermore, they claimed, “the woman of today who wishes to do her business well, finds herself in a serious predicament.” Suffragist Lavina De Rackin asked, “Which is the stronger, man’s contaminating influence, which exists only in the brains of those] opposed to woman’s suffrage, or the good influence of women, which has always and will always be a purifying factor in every walk of life, even in the byways of sin and vice where good women may walk unmolested on their missions of mercy?” De Rackin further argued that “women are always fighting, fighting to bring life into the world; fighting for the conservation of life after it is here; fighting always to save but never to destroy.” By harkening back to an idea of moral superiority among women, suffragists argued for enfranchisement in such a way that emphasized their feminine and domestic duties.

Suffrage as reform was a primary frame in which clubwomen suffragists argued for the female enfranchisement, and was reliant upon some level of the perpetuation of traditional gender roles. In simple terms, clubwomen suffragists retreated into more conservative arguments in support of the vote as a means to secure their political goals. Essentially, reform arguments were used to particular affect by mainstream California suffragists because they “espoused a traditional view of women’s place in the world” while “simultaneously [modifying] that view” by “[expanding] women’s sphere to include politics.” Women and their special insights were argued to be invaluable to politics, as it would benefit democracy, the home and the lives of children and families. By abandoning the more radical claims favored by the older generations of suffrage activists and the socialist suffragists, the more mainstream members of the suffrage campaign consciously manipulated conservative ideas of gender to argue in favor of female enfranchisement. Suffragist Mrs. John F. Swift clearly used this frame, writing that woman suffrage “will be a benefit to society” and that women voters “knew what justice means for humanity, [have] minds and hearts big and kind enough to be a great help in forming the policy of our government, of any government.”

Furthermore, some middle-class suffragists allied themselves with male progressive politicians and campaigned for suffrage as a component of good government progressivism, arguing that the extension of suffrage, and therefore democracy, would benefit society as a whole. De Rackin similarly argued in this frame, writing, “The world is better and happier because of woman’s equal education with man just as it will be when woman has equal political standing with man. She will then be neither higher nor lower than man, but she will stand his equal, by his side, just as God intended they should.” This argument was clearly favored by the progressive elements in the California state legislature, who placed direct democracy reforms, such as the recall, referendum, and the initiative, on the same special election ballot as Proposition 4. Overall, these middle-class and elite clubwomen utilized their social connections and air of respectability to lend credibility to their calls for equal suffrage.

Helen Valeska Bary, general secretary for the Los Angeles Political Equality League (PEL) in 1911, was part of a larger upper-middle class group of clubwoman suffragists in Southern California. Her work in the months before the October vote illustrated the various ways the campaign depended on the decentralized and diverse structure of the movement. As general secretary, Bary was responsible for managing and recruiting volunteers, running the Los Angeles office on a daily basis and working as an unofficial liaison with labor groups across the city, delivering funds to help their campaigns. John Braly, who hoped to enlist prominent men to support the expansion of women’s rights, founded the all-male PEL in 1910. Leadership of the group soon passed to accomplished activist and clubwoman Grace Simons and it was quickly reorganized. A group of elite women who promised to behave as proper ladies, the PEL was exemplary of the attitude taken by many of the clubwomen suffragists.

After leadership passed to Simons, the PEL was dominated by women of the Friday Morning Club, one of the many women’s clubs in Southern California. The PEL primarily concerned itself with working for public reform, including a campaign for pure food regulations, and, by the spring of 1910, suffrage. Simmons reported that during the whirlwind 1911 campaign, the PEL printed over “a million” leaflets and pamphlets that “appealed to every type of mind,” 93,000 “Votes for Women” buttons, and 13,000 pennants and banners for distribution across Southern California. She found that the most effective means of public outreach was “letters of a personal nature addressed to members of the various professions and vocations,” noting that the PEL sent letters to 2,000 ministers and 60,000 to country districts. Despite their tendency towards elitism, the PEL made active attempts to build a cross-class and cross-cultural suffrage coalition based on the modern mass campaign techniques that were increasingly gaining traction across the state. One way in which this coalition was built was in the printing and distribution of suffrage literature and pamphlets in various languages, including Italian, French and German, for distribution during crowded street meetings. The PEL worked tirelessly to secure endorsements from women’s groups and newspapers, two tactics that proved beneficial. By putting a positive view of suffrage out in the public sphere, mainstream clubwomen suffragists were able to spread their views in a way that did not directly contradict their social roles as women. This shift was vital in creating a suffrage coalition across the middle and upper classes, while their socialist counterparts built links between the lower and working classes through their use of justice arguments.

Visual culture, which borrowed from the growing consumerism in the American market, was an incredibly valuable tool for middle-class suffragists in particular. The 1911 campaign was notable in this aspect, as its visually based campaign was the first of its kind in state suffrage campaigns. Suffragists were able to spread their political views and advance their cause without having to leave the spheres which society accepted. Through visual appeals to men in the public sphere, these visual ploys were designed to persuade potential supporters of the attractiveness of female enfranchisement and women voters. Suffragist Selina Solomon wrote on the topic that “Even a great power that the spoken word is the written or printed one, and we availed ourselves of this greatest agency of civilization.” From billboards to posters and newspaper advertisements, the CESL created a visual advertising
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campaign based around the positive ideal of the woman voter. These advertisements often included a combination of bold text and artistic design, and were used specifically to draw the eye of otherwise disinterested male voters. CESL design committee chairman Louise Herrick Wall wrote,

> It seems best for us to put forth positive arguments of a hopeful, constructive sort rather than arguments that ended in criticism or irony. We saw that here our chief need was to place the subject before the people of California, again and again, in a way that must hold their attention and convince the voters of California were seriously, if good-temperedly, determined to have a just share in the affairs of the State.

At the heart of these tactics was the idea that women could maintain traditional notions of femininity while exercising their political duty through the vote. While more radical suffragists openly defied gender roles by appropriating traditionally male political tactics, mainstream suffragists manipulated visual images, essentially creating pro-suffrage propaganda, by disguising their political demands in socially acceptable views of femininity and motherhood. At the heart of these tactics, however, was an attempt to spread visually-attractive pro-suffrage views to an audience that might not have otherwise sought out information on women’s suffrage, while simultaneously not challenging gender expectations or accepted notions of women’s roles.

By disguising their calls for equal rights in the rhetoric of traditional notions of gender roles, middle-class white suffragists began constructing an image of a new suffragist. A prime example of this shift can be seen in the political cartoons and suffragist-designed advertising commonly seen in 1911. In an advertisement published in San Francisco newspapers, the female voter uses the ballot to bury the “dirty pool of politics,” using her enfranchisement to clean up political and social corruption. Social and moral issues, such as graft, “white slavery,” and food purity, were a cause which women activists frequently worked to improve even prior to the suffrage campaign. Portrayed as issues that would affect the well-being of a woman’s family, the dirty pool of politics needed a woman’s touch to clean it up. The woman voter depicted in this advertisement looks traditionally feminine, in a fashionable dress and hat and expresses no physical threat to either established gender roles or male politics, while the corruptive social issues are personified as demons. This type of visual was especially important for the creation of a new image for the suffrage campaign. By depicting women voters as traditionally feminine, suffragists directly argued against the anti-suffrage elements which believed women voters would be stripped of their womanly features and accused them of being man-haters who wanted to abandon their families in favor of the political world. This advertisement in particular, depicting the woman voter burying the corruptions that threaten her family and her home, is especially successful in demonstrating how women could exercise their right to vote while maintaining traditional expectations of what it meant to be a woman.

The “I Can Handle Both, Says the Lady” advertisement in the San Francisco Call furthers the suffragist argument that women are capable of being both a mother and a voter. Bridging the gap between the private domestic sphere and the public political sphere, this cover featured another attractive and stylish woman who was balancing her motherly and political duties. In her left hand, the woman holds a globe in front of an image of women seated at a flag-covered table, presumably campaigning for suffrage. In her right hand, she holds a cradle in front of an image of a woman caring for a child in a cradle. By featuring familiar symbols of both femininity and maternity, suffragists used this visual medium to reach a wide audience, largely uneducated on the specifics of the suffrage issue. In this context, suffragists connected symbols of femininity and motherhood with political symbols of equality and democracy. By connecting these two concepts in the minds of voters, suffragists illustrated the ways in which women’s duties had evolved and expanded over time. No longer were women solely responsible for the home; if women as wives and mothers were to truly “handle both,” as the advertisement suggests, she needed the vote. Without the vote, wives and mothers would be unable to fully complete their expected duties. With the vote, however, women would finally be able to exercise their duties not only as mothers, but also as citizens.

Another key example of middle-class white suffragists’ redesign of the suffragists’ public image is seen in the famous “Votes for Women” campaign poster. Commissioned by the CESL and designed by B.M. Boyé, the “Votes for Women” poster depicted the female voter wearing a yellow and orange robe and holding a banner that read “Votes for Women,” in the style of stereotypical portrayals of women as the abstract ideals of Justice and Liberty. With a beautiful, stoic, face surrounded by a sun-like halo, middle-class white suffragists effectively portrayed the female voter as existing squarely within accepted ideals of femininity and womanly virtue. Also a religious symbol, the halo further implicated women and their supposed moral superiority over men. By using familiar symbolism, the “Votes for Women” poster sought to establish an image of a feminine suffragist and voter who respected societal expectations relating to gender. The “Votes for Women” poster is especially unique to the California campaign because of its hints at the state’s Hispanic heritage; drawing influence from the state’s Spanish-style architecture and history, such artwork was especially appealing to male voters who identified with their state. Featuring characteristics frequently seen in Spanish art and architecture, the “Votes for Women” poster also discretely incorporated bits of the California landscape into the background, including San Francisco Bay. In doing so, the “Votes for Women” uniquely connected voters to their California heritage. While advertising tended to focus on selling suffrage in terms of motherhood and feminine domestic duties, the ubiquitous “Votes for Women” poster neutralized opposition to the suffrage campaign by creating a public image of the suffragist that almost elevated her to the level of a goddess while also connecting her to the state’s unique history.

Suffragists further used this type of imagery on the cover of a suffrage song booklet, “The Great Equal Suffrage Campaign Song.” A blindfolded woman labeled “Justice” hands a sword, with the word “ballot” written across the blade to the California woman so that she can fight off political corruption and immorality. In this image, women voters are conceived of as mythical warriors, fighting off social and moral evils represented by wolves, with the vote, symbolized by the sword, as their weapon of choice. Both Justice and the California woman wore classical Grecian-style dresses, and have long wavy hair covering their backs. Justice tells women to “go take with Man thy rightful place. Do thy duty well and help protect the race.” This connection between the mythological image of women warriors and California women exercising their duty alongside men showed a twist on the clubwoman suffragists’ arguments; in creating this connection, suffragists crafted an argument in which women could fight for the protection of their families and their homes while maintaining accepted gender expectations. Perhaps more extreme than the “Dirty Pool of Politics” advertisement, this image expressed the same message: women voters would help end social and political corruption. Clubwoman suffragists repeatedly created visual reminders that female enfranchisement was not only acceptable, but also desirable; by equating the issue of enfranchisement with larger themes of justice, democracy and equality, all traditionally represented by the female form, California suffragists helped create a link between political activity and womanhood in voters’ minds.

Concurrent in many mainstream suffrage arguments were attempts to fight against anti-suffrage arguments. This was clearly seen in prolific author Gertrude Atherton’s article entitled “If Woman Fails Today She Wins Tomorrow.” Charging that anti-suffrage women were either unintelligent or hysterical, Atherton accused anti-suffragists of knowing “nothing of the history of woman, or they would have been forced to not that her progress almost from the dawn of civilized history has been as inevitable as democracy,” and further stated that “in spite of those fighting centuries...her personal ambitions were inevitably checked.” In response to this, Atherton argued that the ballot would solve that problem and that “it is only a question of a few years at worst, and then her enemies of either sex will find themselves on the scrap heap, out of date, forgotten, inadequate to the new responsibilities of life.” Commenting on the anti-suffragist attack that women were not enlightened enough to be democratic citizens or were incapable of voting, Atherton wrote that women were “more truly democratic...and are constitutionally incapable of indifference to the sufferings of the weak and submerged” than men and these were vital signs that women needed the vote. Atherton also commented on the male anti-suffragist, those who “[fancy] that woman
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wants the vote as a toy, or merely to satisfy her vanity,” and claimed that “if he had ever talked with one of the intelligent and sincere women conducting the campaign in this city, or boasted one woman of brains among his acquaintances, he would, no matter what his prejudice, have been forced to conclude that the exercise of the franchise and the duties it will entail must in time eliminate the parasite, the spoilt, idle, frivolous wife.” Atherton further claimed that women voters would help eliminate political corruption, as “only a great body of intelligent women, working together and fortified by the vote, can tear up by the roots before it has spread too far and chocked all that men hold most dear in civilization.”82 By showing the ways in which women voters would be beneficial to society and how enfranchisement would better women as citizens, Atherton utilized reform arguments for suffrage to combat anti-suffrage rhetoric.

Automobile tours were also used to particular effect by more mainstream suffragists in both rural and urban areas. The use of the automobile was appealing to many, as the car was a relatively new phenomenon in America. Automobile speaking tours were scheduled to coincide with the state fair in Sacramento, and were used to spread awareness of the suffrage question and the October 10 special election.83 The CESL planned a “woman’s day” to the state fair held in Sacramento in August 1911, and promised to be the largest suffrage demonstration in the West to date. Among others, J.B. Hume and Blanche Moore of the CESL were scheduled to speak from automobiles across Sacramento during the August state fair.84 Chartering a specially decorated car to transport delegates, as well as a train to deliver campaign literature and workers from beyond the Sacramento area, even the more conservatively minded suffragists took part in the appropriation of the public sphere.85 In more rural areas of the state, automobile tours were vital in reaching isolated communities. Lillian Harris Coffin conducted such a tour in September 1911, helping to organize new suffrage clubs and local grassroots campaigns among the new suffrage converts.86 Londa Stebbina Fletcher of the CESL, one of the speakers in their October automobile tour, argued from the back of her car that “they say a woman’s place is in the home; that is true, but under modern conditions the home does not stop at the threshold of the house. The whole city is the home of the city resident.” This statement in particular shows the ways in which suffragists maintained traditional gender role expectations while simultaneously arguing in favor of their enfranchisement. Fletcher maintained that a woman’s place was in the home, but because she argued that the domestic sphere had widened to encompass aspects of the public as well, women, and more specifically mothers, needed the right to vote. In addition to public speaking on the suffrage issue, suffragists distributed leaflets, literature and “Votes for Women” buttons to audience members.87

For more mainstream members of the suffrage movement, these moves into the public sphere helped women to claim the public as woman’s sphere just as much as it was men’s sphere. Furthering the association between womanhood and democratic values, women’s political participation through public demonstration connected women to typically male actions in order to secure the ballot. No longer were women relegated to the confines of the home; on the contrary, women were expected to be political beings as well. While some decried the use of the automobile tour as unfeminine, many suffragists recognized the necessity of the car as a means to reach audiences who otherwise would not seek out information on the suffrage issue. Combining the fascination with the new automobile with political arguments for female enfranchisement, mainstream suffragists moved more firmly into the public sphere through these automobile-speaking tours.

In addition to the automobile, suffragists utilized other new technologies to spread their message beyond what had been previously possible. On August 31, Mary McHenry Keith and Elizabeth Lowe Watson used a wireless telephone to send a message within a radius of 450 miles, declaring for the political enfranchisement of women. Men from several towns responded to the message, asking questions about the suffragists and about Proposition 4. In response to their questions, Watson said that most men “in high places” expected the suffrage amendment to pass by a considerable majority. Watson further argued that “should this prove true the justice and chivalry of the
men of California will form one of the brightest pages in the history of human progress.” Keith further stated that it fell to male voters to decide “whether this shall be a government of, by and for the people of which women are one-half; whether the principle of ‘equal rights for all and special privileges to none’ shall henceforth apply also to women; whether the working women of our state in the home, the school, the factory or the office shall be given a square deal in the battle of life.” Reaching some steamers in the harbor and at sea, many of the stations requested that Watson and Keith speak again on the suffrage issue. The use of new technologies by these middle-class suffragists was vitally important in their work spreading pro-suffrage views to a wide audience. Through the use of the telephone, for example, suffragists were able to directly communicate with potential voters without having to leave the protection of the private sphere. This blurring between public and private allowed suffragists to truly reach potential supporters on a scale previously unseen in the national suffrage movement.

In order to work around city ordinances and regulations that were often enforced only when women attempted to speak and campaign publicly, suffragists were forced to be creative in their attempt to spread pro-suffragist rhetoric through open-air meetings. While they had begun “rather timidly” at first, the power of such meetings to reach a wider audience appealed to more mainstream suffragists across the movement as women spoke from automobiles and soapboxes to reach the “man in the street.” Such open-air speeches took place in Oakland, where suffragist Sadie Cornwall ignored a police officer who tried to inform her of the illegality of her political speech by pretending not to hear him and proceeding to read him her pamphlet. Upon finishing, the officer merely asked that she secure a permit next time, which Cornwall promised to do. While Solomons reported that when crowds became too large for all to hear a speech, leaflets and buttons were distributed to the audience, some women were even prevented from handing out pamphlets and other suffrage literature in San Francisco, where a city ordinance banned the distribution of handbills on the street. While law enforcement tended to dredge up old regulations to prevent women from working publicly on political matters, suffragists used a combination of wit and ingenuity to subvert traditional notions of women’s gender roles to communicate their ideas. Wielding political, economic, and social influence, these women created a public image of an acceptable, feminine, suffragist who did not violate gender norms or the separate sphere ideologies of the day. By using familiar ideas of feminine respectability and responsibility, middle-class suffragists advocated for equal suffrage by asserting that the ballot would fully allow women to exercise their private sphere duties.

The Public, a progressive paper based in Chicago that devoted a significant amount of space to coverage of the California campaign, published a letter written by Margaret A. Haley from the campaign trail. Haley, a suffrage and labor activist from Chicago, came to California to help organize a grassroots campaign across the more rural parts of the state. She wrote, “I am ‘on the fly’ going from town to town talking to California men and women to arouse them from their lethargy and bestir themselves to get the woman suffrage amendment into their constitution.” Noting “the liquor interests are collecting barrels of money,” Haley provided a vital insight into the anti-suffrage opposition faced by California suffragists, as she “found whole counties dead as doornails until we came and woke them up.” However, Haley’s letter also illustrated the vehement anti-Asian sentiment undercurrent in the California suffrage campaign. Having met a Mrs. Dean from the CESL, Haley notes that she “tells the men of California how eight hundred native-born Chinese in San Francisco will vote on October 10 as to the moral and intellectual fitness of the white women of California.” By playing off the racist fears of white men, California suffragists manipulated this prejudice to their advantage; by portraying themselves as superior to the Asian population both morally and intellectually, suffragists attempted to persuade men to vote in favor of suffrage to outweigh the Asian influence. Maud Younger also highlighted the more unsavory, though fairly common, racist tactics used by suffragists throughout the 1911 campaign. Arguing that “women of California are in daily competition with Asiatics,” Younger contended that the enfranchisement of Asian and African Americans was particularly heinous when the disenfranchisement of white women is considered. Younger further writes “in
different parts of the country the vote has been given to negroes, Indians, Hindoos, and other Asians. Have they
greater interests to protect than have the American women? Are they more capable of citizenship?" By playing
into the racist attitudes of the time and a general fear of Asian interference in California, Younger and other
suffragists used their whiteness to elevate themselves above those of color. Suffragists across the movement
illustrated the enfranchisement of white women as a means to overcome the negative votes of unfavorable ethnic
minorities, and this tactics was by and large extremely effective.

Regardless of political affiliation, suffragists recognized that framing their argument in terms of these gender roles,
albeit expanded ones from traditionally accepted, was pivotal in convincing male voters and politicians of the
necessity of votes for women. As working-class women moved into occupations outside, the home and middle-
class and elite women moved into the public sphere through social work, the blurring of the previously stark divide
between the public and private spheres led to the development of a civil society which “helped persuade the
population more generally, including male political decision-makers in state legislatures and the electorate, of
women’s ability to participate in the public sphere, including politics.” The development of a civil society in which
women’s roles incorporated aspects of both the traditional public and private spheres enabled suffragists to argue
for enfranchisement as part of women’s feminine duties. Women moved into this shared public sphere with men,
and the notion of shared political power between the genders became more plausible to men in the electorate and
legislature. Drawing on the newly developed idea of civil society, political decision-makers slowly began to
change their minds on the suffrage issue.

As Election Day approached in the San Francisco area, Mary Fairbrother of the California Equal Suffrage Association
(CESA) commented that “the time has come when it is no longer any use to try to convert persons to the suffrage
viewpoint; from no one we must concentrate all our energies on the one idea of personal service.” Further,
Fairbrother maintained that “the strongest argument in favor of the ballot in the hands of women is the longer
personal service they have rendered at all times and in all conditions of civilization without any expectation or any
thought of reward.” Continuing on, Fairbrother asserted the importance of election day activities, commenting
that “the personal service required of all is almost more than we can render. We have literature to distribute in
public and private, envelopes and postal cards to address; meetings must be held in every section not only of the
city but of the state, and we must help make them a success. But the work on election day is the most vital of all.”
The CESA looked to recruit at least 4,500 women to spend at least half a day at the booths, to “go to the polls with
the men and ask them to vote in their favor,” commenting that where suffrage had already been extended to
women that this “has been proven to be one of the surest means of securing votes for them.” Suffragists soon
realized that they had done all they could to spread their message to potential supporters and voters, and that
they could do little more to sway election results. However, their willingness to stand watch at polling sites and to
talk with men as they were about to vote marked a radical departure for clubwomen suffragists. Moving from the
private campaigning they had embraced at the start of the movement, clubwomen suffragists engaged with the
public sphere in unprecedented levels in California as they fought to secure their political rights.

In Los Angeles on the eve of the special election, Bary helped organized PEL meetings across Southern California
and sent out ever-increasing amounts of literature to women’s clubs and churches throughout the region. On
election night, Bary and her fellow PEL members were largely dejected as San Francisco and Orange County came
out against suffrage with a significant majority. The Los Angeles Times reported that the suffrage amendment
appeared to have lost, though results from rural and mountain areas had yet to be counted and the vote was too
close to call when the polls closed. Noting significant down-ticket drop-off and the lack of votes cast either in
favor or in opposition to the woman suffrage issue, suffragists across the state began to lose hope that they would
be victorious. The next morning, believing the amendment had been defeated, hundreds of people came in to PEL

headquarters with donations and signed up to work for the next suffrage campaign.\textsuperscript{103} The \textit{Times} reported that suffrage had passed in rural areas, but only one-third of the state had voted in favor of enfranchisement.\textsuperscript{104} But as rural and mountain votes were finally counted and reported, the suffragists began to slowly regain hope that they would finally, after several failed campaigns and over fifteen years of fighting, secure the ballot for women. By early Thursday morning, much to the suffragists’ relief, the last of the rural “cow county” ballots had been counted. Favor had shifted to the suffragist camp, with 121,566 votes for suffrage and 118,777 votes against,\textsuperscript{105} and by Friday morning the gap was even larger.\textsuperscript{106} This pushed Proposition 4 to victory, effectively enfranchising California women.\textsuperscript{107} With even the anti-suffrage \textit{Times} reporting that Proposition 4 would likely pass, suffragists from Los Angeles to Sacramento celebrated their triumph.

Central to the suffrage campaign’s rhetoric, regardless of political affiliation or economic class, was an attempt to redefine what it meant to be an American citizen. Overriding the traditional narrative that prioritized maleness as an inherent part of citizenship, suffragists attempted to create a new idea of citizenship that was not predicated on gender. This is clearly seen from the outset of the campaign, with the removal of the word “male” from the suffrage amendment, and is carried throughout the campaign’s rhetoric. Traditionally, citizenship was conceived of as strictly dealing with interaction with the public sphere, whether it be through political or economic activity. In reaction to this, suffragists attempted to show the ways in which the public world had direct and indirect effects on the private domestic sphere. As a result of this interaction, suffragists argued, citizenship could no longer be withheld from women on some nebulous idea of feminine domesticity. By pointing out the instances in which the public and the private meshed within the domain of the home, suffragists attempted to redefine citizenship to include those who interacted with that public in ways that were political or economic in nature. Ultimately, this process convinced male politicians and voters, as well as female supporters, that women could in fact be citizens, and as such should have the same right to the vote as men.

One of the key decisions of the 1911 California suffrage campaign was to use its internal diversity to its advantage. Rather than expecting elite women to speak to the concerns of working-class women or vice versa, suffragist organizations at nearly every social and economic level were able to tailor their arguments and tactics to their specific audience. This allowed the movement to successfully construct a cross-cultural and cross-class suffrage coalition. The lack of a leading woman or group allowed California suffragists to win, and in doing so changed how suffrage movements would operate in the future. Mainstream middle-class suffragists used more discreet methods such as parlor meetings and visual media propaganda, while the radical socialist suffragists embraced street speaking and parades. By acknowledging the economic, political and social arguments for suffrage throughout their public campaign for the vote, California suffragists constructed a uniquely feminine image of the woman voter; using the ballot to protect the home and her children, the California woman voter exercised her natural right to the franchise without threatening to overturn the current political system. No longer arguing for the vote merely to have it, California suffragists fought for the vote as a tool necessary to exercise their feminine duties. By convincing male voters of the political need for female enfranchisement, California suffragists advocated for enfranchisement as a reform in itself and to secure reform in a corrupt world. In challenging traditional notions of respectable female behavior through the appropriation of typically male public spheres, California suffragists redefined what it meant to be a woman and, ultimately, won the right to vote.
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7 Aileen S. Kraditor, The Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement, 1820-1920, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), 66. The natural rights argument, that women had a natural right to vote as American citizens as outlined in the Declaration of Independence and the US Constitution, was more popular in the years following the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848 until the end of the Civil War and Reconstruction. In reaction to the Reconstruction amendments’ failure to enfranchise women as well as black men, many suffrage activists changed their argument. Arguments for suffrage no longer relied upon some abstract concept of equality, but instead emphasized concrete demands and political goals. This argument became known as the expediency argument. Simultaneously arguing that female enfranchisement would allow women to protect themselves and their homes and would facilitate governmental and societal reforms, the expediency argument gained significant traction during the early twentieth century with the rise of progressivism.
8 Gayle Gullett, Becoming Citizens: The Emergence and Development of the California Women’s Movement, 1880-1911, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Mead, How the Vote Was Won; Gullett argues that middle-class white California suffragists constructed a “universal womanhood” that allowed them to create alliances with men involved in the Good Government and progressive movements. Gullett also argues that this legitimized women’s political activism and allowed the 1911 referendum to occur at all. Mead broadens this alliance to include populist and grassroots progressive movements, and also highlights the importance of socialist women working in conjunction with Gullett’s middle-class white clubwomen.
15 Harper, History, 37-38; Woman suffrage was frequently lumped together with other progressive direct democracy reforms, such as the recall, referendum, and the initiative. The recall is a process by which voters can remove an elected official from office before the end of their term, allowing voters to eliminate officials who were corrupt or incompetent. The referendum is a direct vote on potential proposals, such as an amendment to the constitution or a law. The initiative is the process by which voters can petition to get a certain issue on the ballot for public vote. These three processes combined were designed to return power from the state legislatures to the voting public. By bringing voters closer to the inner workings of government, furthermore, progressive politicians believed that more transparent democracy would lead to less political corruption.
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Noel was one of the most prominent of the socialist suffragists, though she had ties to almost every level of the suffrage campaign. Radicalized in Denver, Noel became a member of the Socialist Party in 1893, and voted in the state of Colorado before moving to California. A German immigrant, Noel was sought out by suffrage organizations of various political and socioeconomic backgrounds across the state for speaking engagements large and small. For thorough pieces on Noel’s work within both the labor and middle-class branches of the 1911 suffrage campaign and in progressive reform in California in general, see Patricia Loughlin’s article “In Search of Capable Allies:
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While the majority of these clubwomen suffragists were white, there was a significant population of Spanish-Mexican clubwomen in their ranks as well. Coming from prominent families that had lived in California since the state was Spanish, and then Mexican, territory, these women occupied a unique role in the state suffrage campaign. Most suffrage organizations were antagonistic towards women of color, though many of these Spanish-Mexican women were considered to be white, and their participation was not thought to be of any radical consequence. So long as a woman could prove that she had Spanish (read: white) heritage, her membership was allowed, though they never advanced to leadership positions in these clubs. A more in-depth piece on the experiences of Spanish-Mexican clubwomen in California can be found in Eileen V. Wallis’ article, “‘Keeping Alive the Old Tradition’: Spanish-Mexican Club Women in Southern California, 1880-1940.”

A note on names: whenever possible, I have tried to find women’s maiden names, though this has not always been possible. When this has been the case, women are referred to as “Mrs.,” followed by their husband’s name. This trend is due to American adoption of coverture. Coverture refers to the English common law practice in which women lost their legal identity upon marriage. In this system, married women’s identities, for all intents and purposes, was absorbed into that of their husbands. This loss of legal rights was a major issue for early feminists and many suffragists, as they fought for women’s legal and property rights as part of the early campaigns for women’s votes. Interestingly, the state of California adopted Mexican property laws, which allowed married women to own property in their own names; however, the fact that many white women were suffragists negated this trend in the public record. As a consequence of this, it is difficult at times to find women’s unmarried names in the public record.
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