

## Part I: Introduction

---

### THE STRUGGLE FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE: EARLY TACTICS

The struggle for women's civil and economic rights, including woman suffrage, was one of the major movements of the 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries in the United States. New Jersey women and men were in the forefront of this movement. After the Civil War, when it became clear that the proposed Fourteenth Amendment to the United State Constitution would not enfranchise women as it did African American men, woman suffrage advocates became alarmed. New Jersey women were among the first to take action. Though suffragists were criticized as extremists, they organized at the local, county and state levels, they spoke out publicly, they published tracts and broadsides, they petitioned governmental bodies, they worked for sympathetic political candidates, and they engaged in various types of public protest.

**New Jersey Women's Unique Position.** New Jersey women rallied around the fact that they once were allowed to vote and had this right taken away. How had this come about? The first constitution of the state, the [New Jersey Constitution of 1776](#), (Article IV) gave all inhabitants worth fifty pounds the right to vote, without reference to gender or race. New Jersey women were the only women in the nation with this right and some of them were known to have voted in several elections until their voting rights, and those of African Americans, were stripped from them. In 1807 the New Jersey Legislature passed "[An Act to regulate the election of members of the legislative council and general assembly, sheriffs and coroners in this state](#)", that did away with property requirements but limited the vote to white men. Later white male suffrage was written into the revised [New Jersey Constitution of 1844](#) (Article II).

**The Beginnings of the Suffrage Movement.** In 1867 and 1868, the woman suffrage movement in the United States was in its infancy. The 37 states were recovering from Civil War and reformers were committed to expanding the civil rights of those who had been left out of the political process. [Lucy Stone](#) of Orange, a nationally-known reformer and orator, took the lead in the struggle by speaking before the New Jersey legislature on March 6, 1867, advocating the vote for women and African Americans. That spring she traveled with her husband, Henry Blackwell, throughout Kansas to advocate the passage of a similar state referendum there. Later that year the suffrage movement in New Jersey was launched.

**New Jerseyans Organize.** [The New Jersey Woman Suffrage Association](#) was one of the very first state suffrage organizations in the nation. It was organized in Vineland, Cumberland County, in December 1867 by a group of women and men who believed

citizens should be allowed to vote regardless of color or sex. Lucy Stone was elected president; her sister-in-law, [Antoinette Brown Blackwell](#) of Somerville, was a vice-president. The NJWSA knew it had a difficult road ahead. They believed the best way to enfranchise women in New Jersey was to amend the state constitution. To do this, suffragists had to convince both houses of the legislature in two successive sessions to pass bills proposing a woman suffrage amendment to the New Jersey Constitution of 1844; they then had to convince the male electorate to vote for the amendment in a special referendum.

**Suffrage Work at the National Level.** Other New Jersey suffragists, especially those who followed the lead of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, worked for amendment of the U.S. Constitution. They believed the state-by-state strategy was too cumbersome. Between 1868 and 1885, Stanton lived in Tenafly and used her home there as a base for her writing and political work.

For over 50 years New Jersey suffragists worked to regain the vote. They went through two campaigns to amend the state constitution, only to have the measures defeated by male voters at the polls. New Jersey suffragists also worked for suffrage at the national level. In the 20th century [Alice Paul](#) of Moorestown was a leader of the radical wing of the suffrage movement, the National Women's Party. Finally, in 1920 New Jersey women were enfranchised when the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution was ratified. New Jersey was the 29<sup>th</sup> state to ratify.

**Early Documents.** The documents you find here represent an early and very limited part of the suffrage struggle, yet they give valuable insight into the ways women worked to expand their civil rights in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Early suffragists tried several tactics to popularize woman suffrage and to convince the state legislature to propose a suffrage amendment. The activities outlined here will help you better understand the ideals and behaviors of early New Jersey suffragists as well as the obstacles that blocked them from their goal.



This drawing by noted illustrator Howard Pyle appeared in the magazine, *Harper's Weekly*, in 1880, a Presidential election year. Suffrage leaders were actively trying to convince Democratic, Republican and Greenback Labor candidates to endorse woman suffrage. This illustration recalls the fact that women had once voted in New Jersey in 1800 and suggests a precedent for women's demand.

New Jersey Women's History

High School Lesson Plan

Woman Suffrage

## Part II: Documents on the Struggle for Woman Suffrage

---

### Document 1

"*Women Suffrage in New Jersey.*" An address delivered by Lucy Stone, at a hearing before the New Jersey Legislature, March 6th, 1867

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE IN NEW JERSEY

##### **Gentleman of the Committee:-**

Grateful for the hearing so promptly accorded, I will proceed without preliminary to state the object of the petition, and to urge its claim.

Women ask you to submit to the people of New Jersey amendments to the Constitution of the State, striking out respectively the words "white" and "male" from Article 2, Section 1, thus enfranchising the women and the colored men, who jointly constitute a majority of our adult citizens. You will thereby establish a republican form of government.

I am to speak to you of Suffrage. In any other country, it would be necessary to show that political power naturally vests in the people. But here the whole ground is granted in advance. When our fathers came out of the war of the Revolution, made wiser by those seven years of suffering, they affirmed these truths to be self-evident:

"Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

The Declaration of Independence, affirming these self-evident truths, was unanimously adopted by the representatives of the thirteen United States. The descendants of those representatives have held these principles in theory ever since. We have called it "The Immortal Declaration." It has been read in every State, on every Fourth of July, since 1776. We have honored its authors and the day that gave it utterance, as we honor no other day and no other men. Not only we, but, the wide world round, men suffering under hoary despotisms, by a quick instinct turn their longing eyes to this country, and know that in the realization of our self-evident

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 4}*

truths lies the charm by which their own bonds shall be broken.

New Jersey, in her State Constitution, in the very first Section of the first Article affirms that, "All men are, by nature, free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness." Again in

Article 2. That, "All political power is inherent in the people. Government is instituted for the protection and benefit of the people, and they have a right, at all times, to alter, or reform the same, whenever the public good may require it."

Gentlemen will see it is no new claim that women are making. They only ask for the practical application of admitted, self-evident truths. If "all political power is inherent in the people," why have women, who are more than half the entire population of this State, no political existence? Is it because they are not people? Only a madman would say of a congregation of negroes, or of women, that there were no people there. They are counted in the census, and also in the ratio of representation of every State, to increase the political power of white men. Women are even held to be citizens without the full rights of citizenship, but to bear the burden of "taxation without representation," which is "tyranny."

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." Not of the governed property-holders, nor of the governed white men, nor of the governed married men, nor of the governed fighting men; but of the governed. Sad to say, this principle, so beautiful in theory, has never been fully applied in practice!

What is Suffrage? It is the prescribed method whereby, at a certain time and place, the will of the citizen is registered. It is the form in which the popular assent or dissent is indicated, in reference to principles, measures and men. The essence of suffrage is rational choice. It follows, therefore, under our theory of government, that every individual

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 5}*

capable of independent rational choice is rightfully entitled to vote.

The alien who is temporarily resident among us is expected. He is still a citizen of his native country, from which he may demand protection and to which he owes allegiance. But if he become a permanent resident and renounce allegiance to foreign potentates and powers, then he is admitted to all the rights of citizenship,-suffrage included.

The minor is excepted. He is held an infant in law. He has not attained mental maturity. He is under guardianship, as being incapable of rational choice. He cannot legally buy, nor sell, nor make a valid contract. But when the white male infant arrives at years of discretion, he may do all these things and vote also.

Idiots and lunatics are excepted, because they are incapable of rational choice and so cannot vote.

None of these cases conflict with the principle. But when a person is disfranchised because he is a negro, the principle of rational, individual choice is violated. For the negro possesses every human faculty. Many colored persons are wiser and better than many white voters. During the late war, the negroes were loyal to a man. Neither threats nor bribes could induce them to join their enemies and ours. They freely shared the poverty of their small cabins with our sick and wounded soldiers, tenderly offered the cooling cup to their fevered lips, and, again and again, at great personal peril guided them to our lines. Two hundred thousand colored soldiers wore the blue uniform of the United States and fought bravely in the Union ranks. Their blood was mingled with ours on many a hard-fought field. Yet this class, so loyal and patriotic, have no vote in the loyal State of New Jersey!

So, too, when a woman is disfranchised because she is a woman, the principle is violated. For woman possesses every human faculty. No man would admit, even to himself, that his mother is not capable of rational choice. And if the woman he has chosen for a wife is a fool, that fact lies at least as much against his ability to make a rational choice as against hers, and should accordingly put them both into the class of excepted persons.

---

*{Page image}*  
*{Begin page no. 6}*

The great majority of women are more intelligent, better educated, and far more moral than multitudes of men whose right to vote no man questions.

Women are loyal and patriotic. During the late war, many a widow not only yielded all her sons to the cause of freedom, but strengthened their failing courage when the last good-bye was said, and kept them in the field by words of lofty cheer and the hope of a country really free.

An only son, crowned with the honors of Harvard University, living in elegance and wealth, with every avenue to distinction open before him, was offered the Colonelcy of a regiment of colored volunteers. His mother, with pulses such as thrilled the proud mother of the Gracchi when she called her sons her jewels, hailed that son's acceptance of the offer of fellowship with the lowliest for his country's sake. And when he fell, murdered at Fort Wagner, and was "buried with his negroes," her grief for his loss was more than equaled by the high satisfaction she felt that that young life, so nobly lived,

was so nobly given back to Him from whom it came. That mother is classed politically with madmen and fools. By her side stand ten million American women who are taxed without representation and governed without consent. Women are fined, imprisoned, hanged-and to no one of them was ever yet granted a trial by "a jury of her peers."

Every Fourth of July gentlemen invite women to "reserved seats for the ladies," and then read what these women too well knew before, that governments are just only when they obtain the consent of the governed. Strange to say, men do not seem to know that what they read condemns their practice.

But it may be said, "the consent of the governed is only a theory, a glittering generality"-that, in fact, the governed do not consent and never have consented. Yet this theory is the "golden rule" of political justice. The right of the citizen to participate in making the laws is the sole foundation of political morality. As Mr. Lincoln said of slavery-if a government without the consent of the governed is not wrong, nothing political is wrong. Deny this and you justify despotism. On

---

[{Page image}](#)

*{Begin page no. 7}*

the principle of limited suffrage, aristocracy is blameless and republican institutions are impossible. Can you believe that when God established an immutable code of morals for the individual, he left society without a moral code-a mere battle-ground of force and fraud? The men who deny political rights to the negro and the woman can show no title to their own.

Now, as there can be no argument against a self-evident truth, so none has ever been attempted. But ridicule, without stint or measure has been so heaped upon those who claim political equality, that many women have been induced to deny that they desire it, lest "the world's dread laugh," which few can bear, should burst upon them as unsexed viragos, "strong-minded women who wish to drive men to the nursery while they take the rostrum." As, in the days of the Revolution, Tory priests sought to weaken the hands of our fathers by the Scripture, iterated and reiterated, "Honor the King," so now the haters of human liberty hurl texts at women and do not know that the golden rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them,"-that central truth round which all other divine utterance revolves-would settle this question in favor of women.

We are asked in triumph: "What good would it do women and negroes to vote"? We answer: "What good does it do white men to vote? Why do *you* want to vote, gentlemen? Why did the Revolutionary fathers fight seven years for a vote? Why do the English workingmen want to vote? Why do their friends-John Bright and Thomas Hughes and the liberal party-want the suffrage for them?" Women want to vote, just as men do, because it is the only way in which they can be protected in their rights. To men, suffrage stand for "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work." The workingmen of England do not get that because they have had no vote. Negroes and women in America do not get it, because they have no vote.

In Auburn, New York, the teachers of the public schools, male and female, united last spring in a petition for an increase of salary. So \$200 was added to the salary of each

---

[{Page image}](#)

{Begin page no. 8}

man, and only \$25 to that of each woman. The women, indignant at the injustice, wrote an ironical letter of thanks to the Board of Education for their very large liberty. Thereupon the Board required them to retract the letter, and coupled the demand with a threat of dismissal if the teachers did not comply. A part, driven by necessity, succumbed. A part, who preferred their own self-respect and a poorer crust, refused. Would those women have been thus treated, either in regard to salary or dismissal, if, as voters, they could have had a voice in the selection of the Board for the following years?

It is said that women are now represented by their husbands, fathers, brothers or sons. Would *men* consent to be represented by their wives and sisters? If it were possible for any class to legislate well for another, it might be supposed that those who sustain to each other these tender relations, could do so. But we find, on the contrary, that in every State, the laws affecting woman as wife, mother and widow, are different from and worse than those which men make for themselves as husband, father and widower.

I will quote a few laws to show how women are represented in New Jersey.

A widower is entitled to the life use of all his deceased wife's real estate, but a widow is entitled only to the life use of one-third of her deceased husband's real estate.

A widower succeeds to the whole of his deceased wife's personal property, whether she will, or not, with the right to administer on her estate without giving bonds. But a widow has only one-third of her deceased husband's personal property (or one-half of it if he leaves no children), but none at all if he choose to will it to any one else, and if she administer on his estate she must give bonds.

A mother inherits the whole of her deceased child's estate only when that child leaves no brothers, nor sisters, nor children of brothers and sisters, and no father. But a father inherits the whole property of such a child when all these survive. In this State, where my child was born, a father has the sole custody of the children. The law provides (see Revised Statutes, page 915, Sec.9,) that "any father, whether

---

[{Page image}](#)

{Begin page no. 9}

he be of age, or not, by a deed executed in his life-time, or by a last will, may dispose of the custody of his child, *born or to be born* -and such disposition shall be good against the child's mother and against every other person. And if the mother, or any other person, shall attempt to acquire the custody of the child, she, or they shall be subject to an action for ravishment, or trespass." Thus, the minor, whom the law holds incompetent to make any valid contract, whose written promise to pay even is worthless,



who is not old enough to vote, is empowered by law to come to her side, whose wild strife with death and agony is ushering their child to life, to seize the new-born being and will it from her sight forever. The successful attempt on her part to recover her God-given right, the law calls "ravishment." The only woman in this State who is legally entitled to her child is the unhonored mother whose baby is a bastard!

By the law of New Jersey the sole definition of an orphan is "a fatherless child." And yet, in contempt, we are asked "why do women want to vote?" There are women, too, who say they "have all the rights they want!"

"When any husband and wife live in a state of separation, and have minor children, the Chancellor, the Supreme Court, or any Justice of said Court, may, if the children are brought before them by habeas corpus, make an order for the access of the mother to her infant child, or children, at such times and under such circumstances as they may direct-and if the child, or children are under seven years of age, shall make an order to deliver them to the mother, until they are seven." And then, still just as much in need of a mother's love, they must go back to the custody of the father. (Statutes page 361.)

Thus she has no legal right to her children, whose breast blessed their baby lips, whose tender care soothed their baby sorrows, whose hand guided their first tottering footsteps, and whose love for those who are "the bone of her bone and the flesh of her flesh" will last when all other love but the love of God shall fail!

"A widow may live forty days in the house of her deceased husband without paying rent, or even longer if her dower has not, within that time, been set off to her." But when the

---

[\*{Page image}\*](#)

*{Begin page no. 10}*

dower is assigned, this home, made by the mutual toil and thrift of husband and wife, this roof under which her children were born and where her husband died, hallowed by associations of their early love and of her recent loss, can no longer give her shelter, unless she pay rent. The very crops, which would have been her food if the strong arm on which she leaned were not cold in death, are no longer hers. Appraisers have searched cupboard, closet and drawer, have set a market value upon articles of which no money could pay the price to her;-a sale is made, and this woman is houseless, as well as widowed.

But if death had chosen her for its victim, instead of her husband, the widower could remain in undistributed possession of house and property, could gather his unmothered children around the still warm heart-stone, desolate indeed, but not robbed.

A husband can sell his real estate and make a valid deed subject only to the wife's right of dower. But a wife can neither sell her personal property, nor her real estate, nor make a valid deed, without her husband's consent.

A husband can make a will of everything he possesses, except the dower of his wife. But a wife cannot will her personal property at all without her husband's consent indorsed upon the will. And even then if, after her death, the husband recall his consent before the will is admitted to probate, her will is null and void.

The above quotations show how women are now represented. They prove the truth of the old adage, "If you don't want your business done, send another; if you want it done, go yourself."

And still men object: "Women and negroes don't know enough to vote." As though it were possible for us to do worse for ourselves than they have done for us. Do they fear we shall return evil for evil? This objection comes with an ill grace from those who welcome to the polls voters of every degree of ignorance, so only they be white men. When a white man comes of age, it is never asked whether he knows enough to vote. He may not know the first letter of the alphabet. He may be an habitual drunkard, a haunter of

---

[{Page image}](#)

*{Begin page no. 11}*

gambling houses and brothels. But he belongs to the "white male" aristocracy, and so the way is prepared, without his asking, by which he shall take his place with the self-constituted sovereigns, to whose law-making power women and negroes must bow in silent submission. All such men think that "women don't know enough to vote." Will intelligent men rank their wives politically lower than these?

It is said that "if women vote it will make domestic discord." On the contrary, we always find that those who wish to secure the votes of others are extremely polite to them. Witness any election. "My dear fellow, I rely on your invaluable aid." "In this emergency, America expects every man to do his duty; let me treat you." "Here is a five dollar bill." "How is your good wife? Are the children well?" And straightway the deluded voter goes after him to vote, perhaps against his own interest and that of the State.

But seriously, does any man mean to say that if his wife have a different political opinion from his own and dare to express it, he will quarrel with her? Will he make his own narrowness and ill-temper a reason why his wife should not exercise a God-given right? If so, the argument is against him and not against her. A husband and wife often hold different religious opinions, respect their differences, and go quietly to their respective churches. It will be so in politics among decent men. But the unfortunate woman who has married a brute needs a vote all the more. With or without a vote, he will pound her all the same.

It is said that "it will demoralize women to vote." On the contrary, the presence of women would purify politics. Why is the political meeting which admits women an orderly assemblage, while that which excludes them is boisterous? If the wives and daughters of ignorant and intemperate men are not demoralized by daily association with them, it is scarcely possible that going once or twice a year to vote would do so. Are

women demoralized by going to the market, or the post-office? But experience has already proved the contrary. Women now vote in Michigan, Kentucky, and Canada upon school questions. In Holland, women who are property holders vote. In Sweden they do the same. In Austria,

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 12}*

women who are Nobles in their own right, are members of the Diet.

But we have an example nearer home. In New Jersey, women and negroes voted from 1776 to 1807, a period of thirty-one years. The facts are as follows: In 1709, a Provincial law confined the privilege of voting to "male freeholders having one hundred acres of land in their own right, or 50 current money of the province in real and personal estate," and during the whole of the Colonial period these qualifications continued unchanged.

But on the 2d of July, 1776, (two days before the Declaration of Independence) the Provincial Congress of New Jersey, at Burlington, adopted a Constitution, which remained in force until 1844, of which Sec. 4 is as follows: "Qualifications of Electors for members of Legislatures. All inhabitants of this Colony, of full age, who are worth 50 Proclamation money, clear estate, in the same, and have resided within the country, in which they claim a vote, for twelve months immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to vote for representatives in Council and Assembly, and also for all other public officers that shall be elected by the people of the country at large."

Sec. 7 provides that the Council and Assembly jointly shall elect some fit person within the Colony, to be Governor. This Constitution remained in force until 1844.

Thus, by a deliberate change of the terms "male freeholder," to "all inhabitants," suffrage and ability to hold the highest office in the State, were conferred both on women and negroes.

In 1790 a committee of the Legislature reported a bill regulating elections, in which the words "he or she" are applied to voters, thus giving legislative indorsement to the alleged meaning of the Constitution.

In 1797 the Legislature passed an act to regulate elections, containing the following provisions:

"Sec. 9. Every voter shall openly and in full view deliver his or her ballot, which shall be a single written ticket containing the names of the person, or persons, for whom he or she votes," etc.

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 13}*

"Sec. II. All free inhabitants of full age who are worth 50 Proclamation money, and have resided within the country in which they claim a vote, for twelve months immediately preceding the election, shall be entitled to vote for all public officers which shall be elected by virtue of this act, and no person shall be entitled to vote in any other township, or precinct, than that in which he, or she, doth actually reside at the time of the election."

Women voted. Yet no catastrophe, social or political, ensued. Women did not cease to be womanly. They did not neglect their domestic duties. Indeed the noble character and exalted patriotism of the women of New Jersey all through the Revolution have been the subject of historical eulogy. There is no evidence that the women and free negroes abused or neglected their political privileges. It is said that "women don't want to vote." Yet, in New Jersey, when they were allowed to vote, they manifested a growing interest in public affairs. Mr. Wm. A. Whitehead, of Newark, an opponent of female suffrage, expressly states that as time elapsed "the practice extended," and that "in the Presidential election of 1800, between Adams and Jefferson, females voted very generally throughout the State and such continued to be the case until the passage of the act (1807) excluding them from the polls. At first the law had been so construed as to admit single women only, but, as the practice extended, the construction of the privilege became broader and was made to include females 18 years old, married or single, and even women of color; at a contested election in Hunterdon County, in 1802, the votes of two or three such actually electing a member of the Legislature."

But, unfortunately, New Jersey remained a Slave State. And, like all communities cursed with slavery, she had no efficient system of free schools. Her soil proved less fertile than the newer States of the West, and the more enterprising class of emigrants passed on. The later settlers of New Jersey were far inferior to the original Quaker and Puritan elements which controlled the Constitutional Convention of 1776. Society retrograded. Slavery smothered the spirit of liberty. In the spring of 1807, a special election was held in Esser

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 14}*

County to decide upon the location of a Court House and Jail-Newark and its vicinity struggling to retain the County buildings, Elizabethtown and its neighborhood striving to remove them to "Day's Hill."

The question excited intense interest, as the value of every man's property was thought to be involved. Not only was every legal voter, man or woman, white or black, brought out, but on both sides gross frauds were practised. The property qualification was generally disregarded; aliens and minors participated, and many persons "voted early and voted often." In Acquackanonk Township, thought to contain about 300 legal voters, over 1800 votes were polled, all but seven in the interest of Newark.

It does not appear that either women or negroes were more especially implicated in these frauds than the white men. But the affair caused great scandal and they seem to have been made the scapegoats.

When the Legislature assembled, they set aside the election as fraudulent, yet Newark retained the buildings. Then they passed an act (Nov. 15, 1807), restricting the suffrage to white male adult citizens, residents in the county for the twelve months preceding and worth 50 Proclamation money. But they went on, and provided that all such, whose names appeared on the last duplicate of State or county taxes should be considered worth 50; thus virtually abolishing the property qualification.

In 1820 the same provisions were repeated, and were maintained until 1844, when the present State Constitution was substituted.

Thus, in defiance of the letter of the Constitution and of the Statutes and uniform practice of a generation, women and negroes were disfranchised by an arbitrary act of the Legislature, without discussion and almost without comment. Yet the very act which disfranchised voters whose only crime was sex and color, set aside the property qualification and admitted to the polls all white male tax-payers, however ignorant or degraded. Therefore, women come before you here in New Jersey with a peculiar and special claim. We have had this right. We have exercised it. It has been unjustly and

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 15}*

illegally taken away, without our consent, without our being allowed to say a word in our own defence. We have been condemned unheard, not by the people, but by the Legislature. To-day, we ask you, after the lapse of more than half a century, to give the people of New Jersey an opportunity of rectifying an act of atrocious political usurpation and injustice. For it was worse in principle than the "coup d'etat" of Louis Napoleon. He, at least, went through the form of submitting the question to the verdict of the people. The Legislature of 1807 did not submit it. Our disfranchisement can only be justified upon the robber's plea that "might makes right."

It is said that "women would vote as their husbands and brothers do." If so, why should men object? These votes, at least, they could get without bribery, and thus double the vote of their party. But does not one believe that the drunkards wives would vote with the drunkards? I do not.

It is said that "women do not want to vote." Then, let those who do not, stay away from the polls. No one is compelled to vote. Let those who do wish to vote be free to do so.

It is said that "women would sometimes want to hold office." Certainly. Those who bear the burdens of government should share its honors. Why should not a woman be President of the United States? The names Elizabeth of England, of Catherine of Russia, of Isabella of Spain, of Maria Theresa of Austria-each of these proves woman's capacity to govern. And to-day, no sovereign in the world receives such love and loyalty as Queen

Victoria. Are American women alone incompetent for great responsibilities? If so, alas, for free institutions!

It is said that "bad women will vote." True. But so do bad men. In both cases, the bad are a small minority.

It is asked "who will take care of the children while the mothers go to vote?" Who takes care of them now, while the mothers go to church fifty-two miles a year? Who takes care of them while the mothers are at parties and balls? If care-takers can be found for the children on all these occasions, it will be easy to find some one to care for them during the half hour it takes the mother to go and vote, that she may have

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 16}*

a legal right to take care of them and to share in their guardianship. Hon. Richard O'Gorman made a speech in Cooper Institute, Sunday evening, Feb. 24, in behalf of the destitute poor of the South. He said, "The women now-a-days did not want loyalty, did not want respect for their sex. They demanded liberty and equality." Whereupon there was "great laughter and applause." He said, "Women would have to talk a great deal, before they could eradicate from the pure heart of man its delicate submission to the weaker, but nobler sex." More applause. Then he drew a picture of a country ravaged by a war of the "nobler sex," showing how very bad affairs would be in such a case, and he received more applause. In conclusion, he had the hardihood to make an especial appeal to the ladies, to help him raise the funds he wanted. By-and-by, when women have the ballot, Mr. O'Gorman will probably ask us to vote for him.

It is said that "women would be insulted and annoyed by contact with rowdies to the polls." A friend in Canada West told me that when the law was first passed, giving women who owned a certain amount of property, or who paid a given rental, a vote, he went trembling to the polls to see the result. The first woman who came was a large property holder in Toronto; with marked respect the crowd gave way as she advanced. She spoke her vote and walked quietly away, sheltered by her womanhood. It was all the protection she needed. But, if it seem best, what can be easier than to have separate polls for women?

These are some of the arguments against woman's demand that she may give her consent to the laws she is required to obey; that the political power which "inheres in the people" may be shared irrespective of sex, or color, by the more than half of the people to whom it is now denied.

Now let me state some of the reasons why women and negroes need to vote.

- 1. Because it is right. Wendell Phillips once said: "The broadest and most far-sighted intellect is utterly unable to foresee the ultimate consequences of any great social change. Ask yourself on all such occasions if there be any element of right and wrong in the question, any principle of

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 17}*

clear, natural justice that turns the scale? If so, take your part with the perfect and abstract right, and trust God to see that it shall prove the expedient"

- 2. To repeal unjust laws, some of which I have quoted.
- 3. To enable women and negroes to share all profitable employments, and thus to obtain fair wages for fair work. Colored men can now only be bootblacks, barbers or waiters. It is skilled labor that pays. The skilled labor is monopolized by white men who shut them out. In the South, indeed, where white men think it a disgrace to work, the trades were all in the hands of colored men, before the War. The master pocketed the proceeds, but the negro proved his capacity to excel in every branch of skilled labor. While voters of every grade of intelligence are freely admitted to all industrial pursuits, colored men, who are not voters, but in every other respect competent, can get no openings but such as no one else will use. A colored mechanic, a Georgia slave, whose labor as a harness-maker earned him matter from three to five dollars a day, ran away to the North. A gentleman who had known him in the South found him a waiter in a hotel at Saratoga. Being asked why he did not work at his trade, he replied that he would gladly do so, but in the North, nobody would employ him. At one harness shop, the proprietor was willing to give him work, but every mechanic in his employ refused to "work with a nigger." Slavery had robbed him of all his earnings while a slave. He had no capital with which to establish himself. And so, this strong, skilful harness-maker, whose skill is his only capital, and who might provide for his family a comfortable home, and add to his country's wealth, can only earn as a waiter the pittance which supplies his daily bread. Give this colored man a vote and the harness shops will no longer exclude him. Yet, in spite of these disadvantages, there is a smaller percentage of drunkards, paupers and criminals among our Northern black population than among our whites. You seldom see a negro beggar. To women also, who are not voters, and because they are not voters, only the poorest employments are open, except that of teaching. Even as a teacher, while a woman instructs

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 18}*

as many pupils, for as many hours, in the same studies, and with equal ability, she gets only form one-third to one-half as much salary as a man gets who does similar work in every respect. This is true of the schools of New Jersey and of every other State. Horace Man advised the employment of female teachers because, he said, "they were better teachers and could be hired at a lower rate." The last annual report of the Superintendent of Public Schools in New York City stated that the salaries of the male Principals range from \$2000 to \$3000, those of female Principals from \$900 to \$1200; of male Assistants from \$800 to

\$1500, those of female Assistants from \$500 to \$800. The great mass of women are crowded by the narrow range of female occupations into house-work and needle-work. But the law of supply and demand knows no exception, and these employments, always over-stocked, are always underpaid. Rarely, by these occupations, can a woman save anything, either to make a home, or for her old age. Is it strange that multitudes, driven by the hunger-cry for the bread that perishes, should fall into the ranks of abandoned women, whose dreadful trade the New York Legislature is actually petitioned to license? Oh, if legislators could only see that neither "midnight missions" nor licenses can avail to regulate or destroy this unspeakable crime! Let them arm woman with the ballot. Acknowledge her right to protect herself, and when society has had time to adjust itself to the new, conditions, this class will disappear. Believe me, when woman can earn her bread in honor, she will not seek it by disgrace.

- 4. Women and negroes need the ballot to secure equal means of education. The children of all white voters of every nationality are admitted to the public schools of New Jersey. But the colored children are excluded. In my immediate neighborhood is an aged colored man who owns and built with his own hands the house which he has occupied for more than twenty years. He possesses 2 acres of ground. For twenty-three years, he has paid taxes for the support of the school of his district. All white children, native or foreign, go freely to the school, but neither his children, nor his grandchildren have ever been admitted. The colored school

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 19}*

in Newark is so far away, that virtually no education is provided for the descendants of this respectable, law-abiding, tax paying colored man. The two disfranchised classes, women and negroes, are the only ones excluded from the highest schools of the State, from the colleges, from the schools of Law, Medicine, and Theology. The avenues to the highest and widest spheres of influence are thus closed to us both.

But, in Boston, colored men are voters. What follows? Their children are in all the schools, doing as well as white children. They are admitted to Harvard College. Two colored men are members of the Legislature, and several others are lawyers in successful practice. Thus it is easy to see how much better it is, as a matter of policy, to open to every class the avenues to respectability and usefulness, instead of incurring, by shutting them out, the inevitable result of ignorance and degradation. The vote is a power. With the vote women can protect themselves. In the District of Columbia, previous to the passage of the recent suffrage bill, the colored people had been for years unable to get their share of the public school fund. Within a week after the passage of the bill, \$10,000 was voted to them, without their asking, by the very men who had hitherto refused the money. At the late election in Georgetown, D. C., the colored men



cast a solid vote for a loyal mayor, and elected him. Their quiet and orderly behavior in face of the grossest provocation was worthy of all praise.

Again, Society needs the direct, responsible influence of women to purify politics. Men too often think and speak of politics as "a dirty pool," an ignoble scramble for place and power, a scene of bribery and intrigue. Such is not the American idea of politics. Such will not be the case when women share the political life of the nation. Our legislation now lacks precisely what women can give and what no other class can give-viz., moral tone, a recognition of higher principles than were force and personal interest. Women will influence legislation by their tastes and character. Being temperate, they will be a power for temperance. Being chaste, they will repress licentiousness. Being peaceful, they will discourage war. Being religious and humane, they will create a religious and humane spirit in legislation.

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 20}*

In all ages, principles have been symbolized by female forms. Wisdom is represented by a woman. So, too, are Victory, Peace and Mercy. Liberty is a Goddess. These ideal figures all stand in our National Capitol chiselled in marble, silent, but perpetual reminders that from the earliest period the instinct of the race has, in this way, pointed to the fact that woman should be admitted to the administration of Justice, the guardianship of Liberty, and the dispensation of Wisdom.

One great practical argument for woman suffrage is the effect which the exercise of the duties of citizenship would exert upon the character and life of women. It would enlarge their sphere of thought, by obliging them, like men, to think upon great questions of public interest. They would learn to care less for fashion and folly, more for the duties of life. They would develop habits of self-reliance and independence, and rise out of the sphere of personalities into that of principles. As the European woman is more intelligent and virtuous than the Oriental woman shut up in the seraglio, so the American woman, who is also a citizen, when she is a voting citizen, will become more of a woman from her higher range of thought and feeling. She will be a better wife and a better mother.

Wherever the influence of men and women is united, the result is mutually beneficial. Witness churches, where, though women have a subordinate place, their presence ensures respectability and purity. So, also, in lectures and concerts and social entertainments. In colleges, where coducation exists, the spirit of lawlessness, so common elsewhere, is unknown. I am told that professors at Princeton quote the good order of Oberlin and Antioch as an example to their students. The students will follow the example, when the professors themselves imitate those of Oberlin and admit students without restriction of sex or color.

But there is a political argument for extending suffrage to every adult citizen. Republicans and Democrats alike desire the success of their respective parties, believing that this will conduce to the prosperity of the country. A party can only succeed by getting votes. In the days of Jefferson, the Democrats

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 21}*

gained a thirty years lease of power by advocating the extension of suffrage to a disfranchised class. Almost all the States inherited from their colonial charters property qualifications for voting. Under these circumstances, the Democrats demanded and obtained suffrage for poor white men. As champions of white manhood suffrage they won the popular heart. And to this day they retain a majority of the votes of poor white men. Every emigrant who lands upon our shore is informed that he must support the Democrats because they are "the poor man's party." Property qualifications have long been abolished. No single States has ever restored them. The old issues are dead and buried. Yet their ideas remain.

Now the political condition of New Jersey is exceedingly critical. By the census of 1860, our white population was 646,699. In 1866, the total votes cast were 129,489, divided as follows:

- Republicans, ..... 65,542
- Democrats, ..... 63,947
- Republican majority, ..... 1,595

Thus a change of only 800 votes at our next election would suffice to elect or defeat the State ticket. A change of one vote in one hundred would turn the scale. But the colored population of the State in 1860 was 25,336. This would give over 5,000 colored men above 21 years of age. Whatever party, therefore, extends suffrage to colored men will probably secure the predominance in New Jersey, because these 5,000 men, once made voters, will attach themselves to the party which enfranchises them. It may be said that the attempt to enfranchise the negroes would break down the party proposing it. I think not. For if so, the Republicans would have been defeated at the last election. They were everywhere charged by their opponents with favoring negro suffrage, and every influence which such a charge could exert was brought to bear against them. But the fine, generous, human instinct, which always rallies to the support of liberty and justice, and which would have aroused popular enthusiasm like the peal of a trumpet, did not help the Republicans, because, instead

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 22}*

of meeting the issue, they disclaimed any intention of extending suffrage to anybody.

I regard to giving women suffrage, the same principle holds true. In New Jersey, there are over 1134,00 women above 21 years of age. If only one woman in ten wishes to vote,

the party which proposes to enfranchise women will have the earnest efforts of the 13,000 women put forth in the behalf during the struggle, and several times 13,000 new votes when the struggle is ended. The party which has the sagacity to advocate suffrage for every adult citizen will control the State of New Jersey for fifty years to come.

There is a peculiar propriety in immediate action. The nation has adopted the principle of "manhood suffrage" by abolishing all political distinctions of color in the District of Columbia and in the Territories. It has gone farther. It has made negro suffrage the condition of Southern State reconstruction. This step is final and irrevocable. With what consistency can New Jersey continue to disfranchise her 5,000 colored men who would compose less than one twenty-fifth part of her voting population, when her Senators and a majority of her representatives have compelled South Carolina to enfranchise the colored race who form three-fifths of her entire population?

It may be said that the white people of South Carolina are almost all rebels, while the blacks are loyal, and therefore, that negro suffrage there is a necessity. But because it is a political necessity in South Carolina, it has become equally so in New Jersey. The Southern States are already making preparations to come back on the new basis. The leading Northern Democratic newspapers are urging them to do so. Once back, all parties will be obliged to accept the fact of negro suffrage. The only question now is which party will secure the control of this State by being the first to propose the enfranchisement of our negroes.

Let us no be behind the South in comprehending the logic of events. Northern States are earnestly discussing the duty of giving suffrage to colored men and to women. The Republicans of Connecticut have just adopted the following resolution, in their State Convention.

---

*{Page image}*  
*{Begin page no. 23}*

"Resolved, That the only just basis of human government is the consent of the governed: That in a representative Republic such consent is expressed through the exercise of the suffrage by the individual citizen, and that the right to that exercise should not be limited by distinction of race, or color."

Since women are individual citizen, this resolution pledges the Republicans of Connecticut to "universal suffrage" without distinction of sex or color. The same party in Rhode Island has recently adopted a similar resolution. Bills have been introduced into then Legislature of Maine, Ohio, and other States, this winter, to strike out the word "male" as well as the word "white". Tennessee has struck out the word "white." The Missouri Legislatures has adopted an amendment striking out the word "white." A meeting is called in St. Louis to urge the Legislature to strike out the word "male," also. The Legislature of Kansas has proposed to strike out the words "white" and "male," and have submitted these two separate propositions to the people, and have also submitted,

separately, an educational qualification. The vote upon these will take place in September next. Thus, Kansas, the gallant young State which fought the battle for free soil in the beginning, leads off in the battle for free suffrage.

Last week, the Senate of New York, by a vote of 20 to 4, agreed to submit the election of delegates to the coming Constitutional Convention, to the people, irrespective of sex, or color.

The Senate of the United States have this winter devoted more than two entire days to the discussion of woman's right to vote. Many Senators ably supported our right, and declared themselves willing to vote for it as a separate measure. Among others, Wade of Ohio, Gratz Brown of Missouri, Wilson of Massachusetts, Anthony of Rhode Island, and Foster of Connecticut; and nine Senators gave their vote for woman suffrage.

In view of the rapid growth of public sentiment, and inasmuch as amendments can only be submitted to the people of New Jersey once in five years, let me respectfully suggest that you do as they have done in Kansas, propose to strike

---

*{Page image}*

*{Begin page no. 24}*

out the word "white" and the word "male," as separate propositions, and submit both to the people for their verdict.

In this solemn hour of our National Reconstruction, each State owes it to the Country and to God to establish its institutions on the immutable principles of the Declaration of Independence. All questions of mere personal and party interest should be forgotten, while men of all parties make common cause for the general good of the Republic.

But let no man dream that National prosperity and peace can be secured by merely giving suffrage to 800,000 freedmen, while that sacred right is denied to eight millions of American women. That scanty shred of Justice, good as far as it goes, is utterly inadequate to meet the emergency of this hour. The problem of American statesmanship to-day is how to embody in our institutions a guarantee of the rights of every citizen. The solution is easy. Base government on the consent of the governed, and each class will protect itself. Put this great principle of universal suffrage, irrespective of sex, or color, into the foundation of our temple of Liberty, and it will rise in fair beautiful proportions, without the sound of a hammer, or the noise of any instrument, to stand at last perfect and entire, wanting nothing. Omit it, and only He, who sees the end from the beginning, knows through what other national woes we must be driven, before we learn that the path of Justice is the only path of peace and safety.

*{Begin stamped text}* RD 16L *{End stamped text}*

[Information about SGML version of this document.](#)

## Document 2

"Portia Gage Tries to Vote in Vineland." 1868

Source, Portia Gage to C.B. Campbell, March 12, 1869. Women's Rights and Suffrage File, Collections of the Vineland Historical Society. Courtesy of the Vineland Historical Society.

Portia Kellogg Gage (1813-1903), one of the organizers of the New Jersey Woman Suffrage Association in 1867, was probably one of the first of the early New Jersey suffragists to go to the polls in protest of her disenfranchisement. Her experience was reported in Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony's newspaper *The Revolution*, and inspired women elsewhere to try her tactic. In this communiqué with a male suffragist in Vineland, Gage described her experience trying to vote in a municipal election.

I was induced to offer a vote first, because I felt it a duty, and second, out of curiosity. I wanted to know how men did behave at the polls. We have always been told that it was a dangerous place, one where it would not be safe for a woman to make her appearance, that the very atmosphere at the polls was freighted with pollution for women.... I feel stronger, wiser and better for having come in contact with the political influence of last Tuesday at the polls. My fears were groundless, as the men whom I there met were quiet and well behaved, and treated me as respectfully as though I were in a Church or lecture room.

Of course I felt somewhat embarrassed, being the only woman in the room but I walked through, being kindly greeted by some, not "jostled" or molested by any. On reaching the farther end of the Hall, not knowing how to proceed, I asked my husband; he gave me a ballot and told me who was to receive it; the receiver took it and asked my name; then turning to the man on his right asked if that name was registered; being answered in the negative he returned the vote saying the law would not allow him to receive it as my name was not on the register--next year if nothing happens to prevent, I shall offer my name for registration.

### Document 3

"Petition to the New Jersey Legislature from Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell," 1868. Source, *New Jersey Assembly, Minutes of Votes and Proceedings*, 1868, p. 734.

On March 24, 1868, this petition was submitted to the New Jersey Legislature by Lucy Stone and Antoinette Brown Blackwell. The petition asked for the enfranchisement of women and reforms in married women's property rights.

*To the Senate and Assembly of the State of New Jersey*

The undersigned, citizens of Newark, Essex County, New Jersey, pray your Honorable body to take such steps for the amendment of the Constitution of this State as will secure *Women* their right to vote.

Also, We pray your Honorable body so to amend the statutes of this State that *Married Women* may make a *valid will* of all property, real, personal and mixed, in the same manner that all other sane adult persons are now free to do.

Also, That a widow may be entitled to the life use of the *whole* of the deceased husband's real estate, as the widower is now to the life use of the whole of his deceased wife's real estate.

Also, That a widow may succeed to the *ownership* of the *whole* of her deceased husband's personal property, in the same manner that a widower now succeeds to the ownership of the whole personal property of his wife.

LUCY STONE  
ANTOINETTE B. BLACKWELL

## Document 4

Report of the Judiciary Committee of the New Jersey Assembly, 1868. Source, *New Jersey Assembly, Minutes of Votes and Proceedings, 1868*, 1049-1052.

Mr. Christie, from the Committee on Judiciary, to whom the petition of Lucy Stone and Antoinette B. Blackwell was referred, made the following report:

The Committee on Judiciary, to whom the petition of Lucy Stone and Antoinette B. Blackwell was referred, do respectfully report:

The gallant urging of the House as well as their own reverence for woman, have induced the Committee to give the matter their earliest and most respectful consideration.

The fair petitioners pray for such amendment of our State Constitution as will give to women the right to vote, and for such amendment of our statutes as will give to a married woman the full right of disposal of her property by will, and to a widow the same rights in the property of her deceased husband that a man now has in the property of his deceased wife.

In this day of agitation and experiment, it is natural, nay, inevitable, that all parties and classes should seek to know and strive to attain their just rights and relations in society and government. And it is neither right nor wise summarily to condemn such a spirit simply because the particular privilege claimed may seem at first absurd or wrong. But when woman is the party who agitates the question of her rights, it becomes a matter of peculiar delicacy and difficulty. It hath been said.

"When women sue Men give like Gods."

And the Committee feel almost bound to apologize while they proceed, in obedience to duty, to consider the propriety of the present petition.

The demand for suffrage is undoubtedly the chief concern of [the] petitioners, and to this the Committee will confine the report.

Should women vote? Viewing this question in one light would seem to be conclusively settled by this consideration. When legislation is claimed for any class of citizens, it is always natural and fair to ask if the majority of that class favor the claim. Now, the majority of the women of the State do not desire suffrage. If they did, it would be easy for them unmistakably to manifest it. But the petitioners are only two, while the women of the State are many thousands. And the Committee confidently assert that the silence of the women who do not petition, is an indication, not so much of their indifference as

of their aversion to the claim made in their behalf. In other words, a great majority of the women of the State would disclaim any desire to vote.

Viewing this question in another light, it does not seem any question at all. If the women of the State either unanimously or by a majority, or even in considerable numbers desire this right they will have it. There is an old couplet that reads of woman,

"When she will she will, you may depend on't, When she won't she won't, and there's an end on't."

And there is at least as much truth in it as this, even in politics, that if these women in such numbers were to press their claim for suffrage with earnestness, the ordinary considerations that control parties and legislatures would make their claim successful. Besides, the women of the State are in an actual majority over the men of several thousand, so that if there be of right no political distinction between them, the simple determination of the women to assume the right of suffrage, should of itself be effectual. Why not? But, granting what the petitioners seem to intimate, that there is an actual desire for suffrage by the women of the State, who are yet willing to abide by the determination of this Legislature, would it be wise for the Legislature to gratify that desire? Would it elevate suffrage? Men and women differ in many important respects, but under the same circumstances they are morally equal. If women were invested with suffrage, though at first they might purify the ballot box, ultimately, when they came to feel the full force of all the influences that bear upon [them], they would manifest the same tendencies. Thus it would result in a simple increase of numbers in those who exercise suffrage. It is of course a duty to protect suffrage in every way from the danger of degradation, but would mere numbers serve more to lessen or enhance this peril. Would the extension of suffrage improve the condition of woman? It may be said that it would enable her to enforce all her demands, and thus ultimately gain for her full equality of rights with man. And evidently the right of suffrage is not sought for itself, but for these general ends. But the same rights imply the same duties, responsibilities and capacity. In other words, women would be entitled to no relief from the burdens now exclusively borne by man, on the plea of any inferiority or peculiarity of organization or character, while man would be relieved from all duties to her founded upon such distinction. When it is remembered what many of those duties are, and the unquestionable unfitness of woman to discharge them, and then that she already enjoys, with rare exceptions, if any, all the rights essential to her happiness or consistent with the marriage relation, it would seem that the burdens that would be imposed on her would more than counterbalance the benefit gained. But would it consist with the same true share and true mission of woman? Not if any regard be had to the teachings of the Bible, either as to the original purpose of her creation, or as to the proper duties and character of a model woman. There it is taught that woman was made to be a help-meet for man, that she is properly subject to her husband, that her duty is to learn in silence (not to teach or usurp authority over man), to love her husband and children; that her true ornaments are a meek and quiet spirit, diligence, modesty, sobriety and virtue, and that her true sphere is home. So the highest uninspired authorities accord with these sentiments. The great poets of our own tongue have sung the praises of woman in the highest strains, and with the intuition of genius have caught and fixed the true elements



of her power and worth, her grace and gentleness, her love and dignity--elements that have their origin and gain their strength only in the domestic sphere, and are the peculiar property of woman. In her true sphere of home, and in her highest charm, woman hath been thus most happily portrayed:

"Here woman reigns; the mother, daughter, wife, Strews with fresh flowers the narrow way of life;  
In the clear heaven of her delightful eye  
An angel guard of love and graces lie;  
Around her knees domestic duties meet,  
And fireside pleasures gamble at her feet."

Surely, woman never fulfills her true mission or fills her true sphere if not when, as wife and mother, by her wise provision and rule she brings happiness and honor to her husband and household, and shapes the character of her children to the highest ends of life. Of such an one the wisest of men said: "Many daughters have done virtuously, but thou excellest [sic] them all." And another has said: "In her a thousand claims to reverence close." But woman, mingling in the angry strife of politics, and dragging her shining skirts in its polluting mire, is not consistent with such a conception as this. In view of all these considerations, the Committee do report adversely to the prayer of the petitioners for suffrage. And if it be proper for them to make any suggestion for the benefit of the petitioners and those who sympathize with them, they would say, with all respect, with the stern old King of the ambitious Princess--

"A lusty brace of twins may weed her of her folly. By the bearing and the training of a child Is woman's wisdom."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

C. CHRISTIE, Chairman  
CHAS. E. HENDRICKSON  
GEORGE GAGE

Mr. Whelan moved that five hundred copies of the report be ordered printed for the use of the House of Assembly.

Which motion was agreed to.

## Part III: Activities

---

1. Students should read the Introduction and the four documents, using the guidelines for reading primary documents. For background reading, students might read the XIV Amendment to the United States Constitution and identify the wording in Section 2 that alarmed suffragists.

2. Students can identify and discuss the various *tactics* used by suffragists represented in these documents.

- What did these tactics involve for the women undertaking them?

- Were they risky?

- In what ways?

- What was the reaction of public officials to these tactics?

- In what ways were these tactics effective and/or ineffective at the time?

3. Students break into two groups. One group will assume the role of suffrage advocates. The other will assume the role of government officials.

- A. Role play the attempt to vote by Portia Gage.

- or -

- B. Debate the pros and cons of woman suffrage using the arguments put forth in Lucy Stone's speech of March 6, 1867 and the report of the New Jersey Assembly Judiciary Committee of April 9, 1868.

4. Students research the answers to the following questions:

- How can our current state constitution be amended?

- When was the New Jersey Constitution last amended?

- What kinds of reforms have recently been proposed as constitutional amendments?

- Then discuss: Under what conditions should the state constitution be amended?
- What tactics would be effective today for passing a constitutional amendment?

5. For additional study, have students research the lives of national suffrage leaders Lucy Stone, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, or Alice Paul and discuss the role that New Jersey played in their careers as reformers.

New Jersey Women's History

High School Lesson Plan

Woman Suffrage

## Part IV: Curriculum Standards

---

### **High School Curriculum Standards for the High School Activity:**

*Core Curriculum Standards:* This activity addresses elements of the New Jersey Core Curriculum Standards for Social Studies. It will help students to "analyze the balance between the rights and responsibilities of citizens" (Standard 6.1) and to "acquire historical understanding" of political ideas, forces and institutions in the history of New Jersey (Standard 6.3)

According to Title 18A of the New Jersey State Statutes, each school district "shall adopt a suitable two-year course of study in the history of the United States, including the history of New Jersey, to be given to each student during the last four years of high school." Furthermore, the law states that each school district "shall adopt a course of study in community civics, the geography, history and civics of New Jersey. . . to be taken by all pupils in the public elementary schools in the grade or grades in which it given . . ." (Italics added.)

Teaching New Jersey history and geography is a major priority of the Core Curriculum Content Standards. Within these standards, there are many places where the teaching of Women's History and gender differentiation is appropriate. The Social Studies Standards specifically refer to a "historical understanding" of New Jersey in the following areas:

Standard 6.1, Cumulative Progress Indicator 5 -- By the end of Grade 4 students should be able to identify the New Jersey Constitution as one of the key documents "which represent democratic principles and beliefs." (Italics added.)

Standard 6.1, Cumulative Progress Indicator 13 -- By the end of Grade 12 students should be able to "analyze the balance between the rights and responsibilities of citizens, and apply the analysis to understanding issues facing society in New Jersey and the United States." (Italics added.)

Standard 6.3 -- All students will acquire historical understanding of political and diplomatic ideas, forces, and institutions throughout the history of New Jersey, the United States and the World. (Italics added.)

Standard 6.4 -- All students will acquire historical understanding of societal ideas and forces throughout the history of New Jersey, the United States and the World. (Italics added.)

Standard 6.5 -- All students will acquire historical understanding of varying cultures throughout the history of New Jersey, the United States, and the World. (Italics added.)

Standard 6.6 -- All students will acquire historical understanding of economic forces, ideas, and institutions throughout the history of New Jersey, the United States, and the World. (Italics added.)

Credit: NJ Historical Commission, David S. Cohen, link to Web site:

<http://www.state.nj.us/state/history/topicalguide.html>

New Jersey Women's History

High School Lesson Plan

Woman Suffrage

## Part V: Tips for Reading Documents

---

Read the documents carefully, asking yourself the following questions:

**Who** wrote or created this document?

**Who** was the intended reader or audience of this document? Who might have been the unintended audience?

**When** was it written?

**What** sort of document is it? Is it a personal letter, a newspaper article, a government document, a speech, a pamphlet? Can you find a specific date for it or place it within a particular decade?

**Why** was this document written? Under what circumstances was it written and what was its purpose?

New Jersey Women's History

High School Lesson Plan

Woman Suffrage

## Part VI: Citing Internet Sources

---

When you quote, refer to, or use the information from an internet source you must credit your source. The Drew University Library suggests you use this form for your citation.

Author. "Title of Page." Date of page. URL (Date of Access).

*Example:* Portia Gage, "Portia Gage Tries to Vote in Vineland." 1868.  
[www.scc.rutgers.edu/njwomenshistory/Period\\_3/portiagage.htm](http://www.scc.rutgers.edu/njwomenshistory/Period_3/portiagage.htm) (May 15, 2001)