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Chapter 1
Introduction

Women have been fighting for their rights since the very beginning of time. Until the summer of 1920, women across America did not have the right to vote. At the time, this was known as the fight for woman’s suffrage. The definition of suffrage is “the right to vote” (Merriam-Webster, 2019). Woman’s suffrage simply meant a woman’s right to vote. This fight for suffrage began in the 1840s as women were tired of being seen as secondary to men (Weiss, 2019). At the time, women were expected to stay at home with their children, prepare all meals, and depend on their husbands to do critical work like voting, owning property, and getting a loan from the bank.

During the 1840s, a group of women emerged called the suffragist (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 2). The first attempt to organize the movement began in Seneca Falls, New York, in July of 1848, organized by suffragists Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. The event hosted 300 people, primarily women, and explained the outline of the suffrage movement. Stanton presented her speech “Declaration of Sentiments,” named after the Declaration of Independence. At this event, Stanton and Anthony demanded that women be seen as a sacred right to the American franchise (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 2).

Stanton and Anthony not only fought for woman’s suffrage but for emancipation across the United States following the American Civil War. Following the emancipation of slaves, Republican lawmakers wanted to extend citizenship rights and equal protection under the law to “all persons born or naturalized in the United States,” as outlined in the 14th Amendment (U.S. Const. art. I4, § 2). Stanton and Anthony wanted to ensure that this also included women; however, upon completion, the 14th Amendment stated that all male citizens, despite color,
would have the right to vote, not women. This was the first time that gender was added into the constitution (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 4).

This simple change of wording left Stanton fighting even harder for women, leaving her to write letters petitioning Congress to allow women the right to vote. Two Congressmen, James Brook of New York, and George Washington Julian of Indiana were open to the idea and proposed a constitutional amendment that all citizens would be guaranteed the right to vote, “without any distinction or discrimination whatever founded on race, color, or sex,” but the amendment never came to fruition (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 5). In the same year, Congress ratified the 15 amendments, declaring that the right to vote, “shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude” (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 6).

Due to these drawbacks, women began forming their message singularly around the right to vote. Due to a difference in policy and tactics, the women’s movement split into two organizations: The National Woman Suffrage Association (NWSA) and the American Woman Suffrage Association (AWSA). The NWSA, formed by Stanton and Anthony, focused its efforts on changing federal law. They hoped that if individual states began to adopt suffrage, then the federal government would as well. The AWSA, formed by suffragist Lucy Stone, focused its efforts on mobilizing state and local efforts by petitioning in Washington, D.C. (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 10).

In the late 1880s and 1890s, the United States began to see volunteerism for women’s suffrage surge. Women participated in clubs and professional societies, temperance advocates, local civic groups, and charity organizations (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 11).
Because of these efforts, the NWSA and the AWSA decided to unite to form the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA).

Together, women fought in the West for suffrage and secured the right to vote in Colorado (1893), Utah (1896), and Idaho (1896) (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 13). Scholars believe women chose to fight west of the Mississippi because it proved to be more progressive than the east. Other scholars believe nontraditional roles on the frontier led those in the west to be open to discuss voting (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 14).

Between 1910 and 1914, the NWSA continued to win and secured the vote at the state tactic in Washington, California, Arizona, Kansas, and Oregon (US House of Representatives: History, 2006, para. 15). However, in 1913 the persuasive approach to suffrage began to change drastically. Alice Paul, a young activist who participated in the British suffrage movement, developed the National Woman’s Party (NWP). Paul approached suffrage with robust masculinity and attended lively protests and picketing. Women in the NWP gained national attention and tirelessly attacked President Woodrow Wilson for not adopting suffrage (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 17).

In contrast, Carrie Chapman Catt, a conservative veteran suffragist and former president of the NAWSA, returned from Britain in 1915 to lead the NAWSA (US House of Representatives, 2006, para. 18). Although they split into two groups, both still organizations worked to persuade men in their specific region and in their way. The National Union of Women's Suffrage Societies, led by Carrie Chapman Catt, wanted to prove they did not need to act like a man to identify with a man. However, it seemed that Carrie Chapman Catt’s dynamic leadership and uniquely feminine approach brought curiosity amongst both genders.
Catt, president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, was an idealist and a savvy politician (Weiss, 2019, p. 147). Catt was born on January 9, 1859, in Ripon, Wisconsin. She spent most of her time as a child in Iowa, where she later went to Iowa Agricultural College, now Iowa State University (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 2). Catt completed a bachelor’s degree in general science and was the only woman in her graduating class. During her time as a student, Catt washed dishes, taught in the classroom, and served as a librarian assistant to pay for school. She was also a part of the Pi Beta Phi international women’s Fraternity. Catt was also unique because she established military drills for women while in school and became the first female student to give a speech before her debating society. In 1883, after her time at Iowa Agricultural College, she became a teacher and later a superintendent in Mason City, Iowa, 120 miles north of Des Moines. While in Mason City, Catt was beginning to defy stereotypical womanhood as it was unheard of for a woman to be a school superintendent (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 3).

Two years later, Catt married publisher and editor Leo Chapman of California. Chapman, however, died the following year due to typhoid fever. Catt decided to stay in San Francisco and work as a freelance writer. Three years later, in 1887, Catt returned to Iowa, and her passion for suffrage began (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 4). Catt joined the Iowa Woman Suffrage Association and assisted in event planning and writing for the team. In 1890, she married wealthy engineer George W. Catt. Despite opposition, George was supportive of Catt’s efforts for suffrage. During this time, Catt became active in the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) and was elected to succeed Susan B. Anthony as President in 1890. Catt played a significant role in the NAWSA with her rhetorical speaking style and writing skills (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 5).
In 1904, Catt stepped down as a leader in the NAWSA to take care of her husband, who later passed away in 1905. Soon after Catt’s husband's death, Susan B. Anthony passed away in February of 1904, with her mother and younger brother, passing in 1907. Her friends and fellow sisters encouraged her to stay on the suffrage trail to combat this grief-stricken time in her life. Catt decided to take her efforts internationally when she went to Europe to help grow its voice for suffrage. (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 7).

Carrie Chapman Catt dedicated her life to two ideals: women's rights and world peace (Library of Congress, 2020, para. 1). Upon her return to the U.S. in 1915, Catt’s “Winning Plan” helped pass and ratify the 19th Amendment in 1920. Her winning plan included coordination of state work while lobbying nonpartisan efforts in Washington, D.C. for the constitutional amendment.

Catt delivered two famous speeches in 1916 and 1917. On September 7, 1916, Carrie Chapman Catt delivered "The Crisis" to a group of suffragists in Atlantic City, New Jersey (Catt, 1916). “The Crisis” was given at an emergency convention of the National Women’s Suffrage Association (NAWSA). With the Presidential election right around the corner, the convention members debated whether the NAWSA should concentrate on the state or federal ratification. In November 1917, Carrie Chapman Catt wrote her "Open Address to the U.S. Congress," which was delivered on several occasions in late 1917 and 1918 during her speaking tours (Catt, 1917).

Because of her leadership, several states, including New York, ratified women’s suffrage (Archives of Women’s, n.d., para. 9). In a shocking turn of events, even President Woodrow Wilson converted to the cause and supported suffrage. Because of her continual support and tireless effort for suffrage, the 19th Amendment was finally ratified in Nashville, Tennessee, the
36th state, in the summer of 1920. The 19th Amendment was added to the United States Constitution on August 26, 1920.

Catt was known for being an incredible organizer and leader of the movement (History.com Editors, 2018, para. 7). She had a knack for administration and rallying women to support a cause. She was easy to follow because of her calm spirit, poise, and resilience. Catt struggled against great odds, including anti-suffrage women who were against her. Catt participated in dozens of campaigns, recruited nearly one million volunteers, and eloquently delivered hundreds of speeches.

Catt argued that if women could vote, they would become a force for world peace to improve the lives of their future children (History.com Editors, 2018, para. 6). Catt's overarching goals were world peace and the dignity of a woman's voice in the political arena. She was a skilled communicator with her persuasive words. Democracy was at the heart of Catt’s mission, and her vision for America impacted women's rights today.

**Justification**

In 1787, when the United States Constitution was adopted, it was not interpreted to guarantee the rights of women as a class and the rights of men as a class to be equal (Alice Paul Institute, 2014, para. 1). According to the United States Constitution, women did not have equal rights with men. In 1923, three years after women's suffrage became legal in all 50 states, suffragist Alice Paul and Crystal Eastman introduced the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) (Cohen & Codrington III, 2020, para. 3). The ERA states that “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of sex. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.” (Cohen & Codrington III, 2020, para. 5). Paul and Eastman believed that the ERA could
be a tool to legal remedy against sex discrimination. The Equal Rights Amendment was proposed to fall under the “Equal Justice Under Law,” as established by the Supreme Court (Alice Paul Institute, 2014, para. 1).

However, it was not until March of 1972 that Congress considered Paul and Eastman’s ERA amendment (Alice Paul Institute, 2014, para. 2). In 1972 the amendment passed through Congress and would now be taken to all 50 states for ratification. Thirty-eight of the 50 states would need to ratify the ERA for it to go into the U.S. Constitution. Furthermore, for the ERA to go into effect, the states would have to ratify within a seven-year deadline. Within one year, 30 states ratified the ERA, and by 1977, five more states joined, meaning three more states needed to ratify the ERA. However, it was not enough, and in 1982 the seven-year deadline ended.

In the 21st century, social movements like #MeToo, have sparked a resurgence for feminist woman’s rights and the ratification for the ERA, despite missing the seven-year deadline (Delton, 2020, para. 2). In 2017, Nevada became the first state to approve the Equal Rights Amendment in 35 years, Illinois followed suit in 2018, and, in 2019, Virginia became the 38th state to ratify the ERA. Although 38 states ratified the ERA, it has not been added to the U.S. Constitution since Nevada, Illinois, and Virginia missed the seven-year deadline (Alice Paul Institute 2014, para. 3).

Despite no fundamental change, the ERA can help men and women understand that women’s rights are still at the forefront of America. The study of Carrie Chapman Catt’s persuasive rhetoric during the women’s suffrage movement can provide men and women practical ways to communicate with the opposite sex. This study gave practical communication methods that work best between the sexes and the language they speak. This study’s research
question was: How did Carrie Chapman Catt use persuasive rhetoric in the women's suffrage movement to identify with men and women differently?

This study included a literature review focusing on the history of suffrage, gender roles, and gender imbalance, genderlect theory, identification theory, and Aristotle’s forms proofs. After explaining the necessary literature for the study, the results chapter reviewed how Carrie Chapman Catt used her rhetoric to identify with men and women differently. Following the study’s results is a discussion concerning Catt’s rhetoric and the role it played in passing the 19th Amendment.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

For this study, the review of literature broke into six central themes. These central themes were historical, symbolism, gender imbalances and feminism, genderlect theory, identification theory, and Aristotle’s forms of proof.

Historical

Because this thesis relied heavily on the historical account of women's suffrage, it is essential to understand the history throughout the movement. Since the beginning of time, there has always been a push towards - and reaction against - expanding the American franchise (Weiss, 2019). The American franchise excludes groups that were previously forgotten and purposefully left out. The suffrage movement questioned America's democracy and the sincerity of women's freedom. Due to suffrage, women can now claim their rightful power of citizenship by understanding their rights. Throughout the woman’s suffrage movement, the various campaigns defined the movement’s success throughout the late 1800s and early 1900s. Likewise, after decades of struggle and defeat, the 1920 suffragists finally won the right to vote, 144 years after signing the Declaration of Independence (Courage In Corset, 2010, 1:17).

Because this study was specific to the early 1900s, the history between 1900-1920 was noted. In 1906, a new type of suffrage emerged when Emma Smith DeVoe and May Arkwright Hutton changed the way women approach the movement. By 1910 suffrage became more radical and modern with banners, marches, and newspaper articles promoting the suffragist ideals. To achieve any change, women needed to alter the trajectory of the future by getting the vote.

During this time, conservative veteran suffragist Carrie Chapman Catt led the National Woman’s Suffrage Association (US House of Representative, 2006, para. 18). Following Emma
Smith DeVoe, Carrie Chapman Catt led the conservative movement and Alice Paul, following May Arkwright Hutton, led the nonconservative movement. Although both approached suffrage differently, they fought for suffrage throughout the West in their way.

By 1916, women's suffrage had made significant progress in Western states, but it was not Constitutionally ratified until 1920 (Soffer, 2012). 1916 was an essential year in suffrage as the radical National Woman's Party (NWP) broke off from the moderate National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA). Not only was suffrage on the line but many were afraid that a woman's vote would impact the prohibition, allow black women to vote, and taint US military-preparedness. The suffrage movement became the very definition of democracy.

The history of women's suffrage often only focuses on a few iconic female leaders (Ware, 2019). Many women throughout suffrage had a passion for localized government and the drive to protest changed the nation's history. Susan B. Anthony is one hero of women's suffrage, but suffrage heroes also included Mary Church Terrell, Rose Schneiderman, Claiborne Catlin, Mary Johnston, and Emmeline W. Wells. The suffrage movement did not unfold in the streets of Washington, D.C. It evolved in church parlors, private meeting rooms, college campuses, and even at the top of Mount Rainier. Thousands of women will never be mentioned in a history book but they made leaps and bounds for the suffrage movement.

**Symbolism**

One of the significant reasons voters opposed suffrage was because they believed it would diminish women's role in the home. To oppose this, women used symbolism in their campaigns to nonverbally communicate.

Pins and flowers worn on the torso became a symbol of the suffrage movement (U.S. Department of the Interior, 2020). During suffrage/anti-suffrage meetings, the suffragist wore
yellow roses, while the anti-suffragist wore red roses. Similarly, the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association chose a bluebird as their emblem, leading up to the 1916 state referendum day on women's suffrage (Clio History, n.d.). The women named this day "Blue Bird Day" and placed 100,000 tin bluebird signs on display worldwide. The words "November 2" could be seen on the bluebird’s tail feathers to remind men to vote for the referendum on women's suffrage. The bluebird pin was bright blue and yellow with the words "Votes for Women" written down its chest.

Some suffragists chose to wear a sunflower pin, the Kansas state flower, during the Kansas campaign in 1867 (JFK Library, n.d.). Although Kansas did not choose to ratify the 19th Amendment, yellow continued as a symbol for the suffrage movement’s entirety.

Yellow was not the only color included in the suffrage movement. The suffrage organization had three primary colors: purple, white, and gold (Colors of the Suffrage Movement, 2020, 0:44). Purple was chosen as the color of loyalty, symbolizing suffragists’ faithfulness to suffrage purposes and unswerving steadfastness to the cause. White was chosen as the color of purity, representing the quality of their significance. Gold was chosen as the color of light and life. The torch guided their unwavering purpose and commitment.

Lastly, every time a state would vote to ratify the 19th Amendment, the NWP sewed a star on the suffrage (Howell, 2020, para. 2). Thirty-six states were needed to ratify the constitutional amendment, and all eyes were on Tennessee in the summer of 1920. In a dramatic event, the legislature voted to ratify and Alice Paul, leader of the NWP, sewed the 36th star on the suffrage flag. To commemorate this event, she walked out of her Washington D.C. balcony and unfurled the banner, allowing it to hit the streets below to celebrate what had just occurred.
Feminism & Gender Imbalances

Feminism and its constantly changing nature have roots in the women's suffrage movement. Because this study focused on the rhetoric of women’s rights, it was imperative to see the changes it has made over time due to the movement’s success.

The first wave of feminism began in the late 19th century at the Seneca Falls Convention for Suffrage in 1848 (Rampton, 2015, para. 3). The first wave emerged from a new environment of urban industrialism, social politics, temperance, and abolitionist movements. Women in the suffrage movement also fought at the same time as the temperance movement.

Historically, the second wave of feminism began in the 1960s and went into the early 1990s (Rampton, 2015, para. 5). This wave began to unfold after the Civil Rights Movement and the anti-war movement. In this movement, women began pushing for sexuality, reproductive rights, and equal pay.

The third wave of feminism began in the mid-1990s and started the notion of universal womanhood, body, gender, sexuality, and heteronormativity (Rampton, 2015, para. 10). This wave was seen as post-colonial and post-modern thinking. Language, slur, and exposed clothing were symbolic in this wave as women fought to change their stereotype as sexist, patriarchal objects.

Lastly, the fourth wave of feminism is being cultivated throughout the 21st century (Rampton, 2015, para. 13). By now, women are in leadership positions in higher education, business, politics, have access to abortion rights, education, public forums for women's rights, and societal discourse about women's suppression and reform.

Women worldwide are stepping forward and protesting the oppression of women to fight against things like rape, unequal pay, access to work, and sexual violence in and outside the
family. Women are pushing activists and academics to clearly define patriarchy and its link with social economics and gender class. Women are no longer shy to call themselves feminist, and are openly challenging male chauvinistic practices (Omvedt, 1986).

A statistical analysis that was done cross-nationally found that countries with greater democracy and more extended experience of women’s suffrage have a higher proportion of the population that is female (Beer, 2009). The study also showed a higher female life expectancy ratio to male life expectancy, lower fertility rates, and higher female labor force participation. The study's main argument was that long-term democracy can provide new opportunities for women to promote their interests through government.

**Genderlect Theory**

Genderlect theory proposes that there are cross-cultural language differences based on gender. The theory explains how different sets of linguistic characteristics by males and females develop through the gender acculturation process (Johnson, 2009). Because this study is a rhetorical analysis that investigates the differences of communicating to both genders, this theory helps to understand the root difference between language and dialect differences between men and women.

Formulated by theorist Deborah Tannen, Genderlect Theory claims that women use rapport to establish a connection with other and men use report to gain status (Whitt, n.d., para. 1). Tannen suggested that men and women are speaking different dialects because of their deep-set language differences. Genderlect theory acknowledges and appreciates the language of sex to achieve mutual respect.

Tannen claimed that women speak with connection and intimacy, while men speak with status and independence (Tannen, 2013, p. 28). Looking at gender through a cross-cultural
approach allows for conversation to happen without thinking less of the other gender (Tannen, 2013, p. 18). Tanner claimed that understanding what the opposite sex does will not change them, but shared understanding can men and women familiar with the other territory. This increased power of understanding language creates communication.

**Burke's Identification Theory**

This study primarily used Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory to analyze how and when identification happened through the art of persuasion through rhetoric. Theorist and rhetorician, Kenneth Burke, formulated Identification Theory with the belief that the simplest case of persuasion is the ability to identify with one another (Burke, 1984, p. 55).

Identification is the act of persuading others by talking in their language, speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, and identifying your way with his. If the speaker wants to change the audience's opinions, they can only do so by yielding to their beliefs and values (Burke, 1984, p. 55). This persuasion relies on the transformation of ideas and the imagery of identification (Burke, 1984, p. 20). Identification is not the act of relating to others or having a shared vision but is a transformation between both parties (or both genders) (Burke, 1984, p. 11).

According to Burke, there are seven tactics of identification (Stewart et al., 2012, pp. 145-147). Tactic one is the speaker’s use of the word “we” in place of pronouns such as “I” and “me”. Tactic two is the way both parties dress to communicate. Tactic three is the way the speaker adapts to the audience by changing his or her speech style. Tactic four is the use of examples to make the audience realize similarities between them and the speaker. Tactic five uses moral symbols or revered documents of society to identify with the values of the audience. Tactic six is the speaker’s reference to a hero or founder that identifies with the audience's ethics.
or beliefs. Tactic seven is the speaker’s reference to an unrelated individual or successful social movement.

In a study using Kenneth Burke's Identification Theory, researchers focused on gender and race to explore how listening creates better cross-cultural relationships (Ratcliffe, 2005). The study claimed that we could establish listening skills when identifying with the other gender through commonalities and differences. The art of listening has been lost through generations as people become dependent on visuals rather than the spoken word. Rhetorical listening is a way of expression, signifying a stance of openness, allowing the audience to choose to assume about any person, text, or culture.

**Aristotelian Forms of Proof**

In this study, Aristotle’s forms of persuasion was used to determine how Carrie Chapman Catt's uses of rhetoric helped her achieve her goal of suffrage. Rhetoric is defined as the “faculty of observing in any given case the available means of persuasion” (Roberts, 2004, p. 27). According to Aristotle, “It is clear, then, that the rhetorical study, in its strict sense, is concerned with the modes of persuasion. Persuasion is clearly a sort of demonstration, since we are most fully persuaded when we consider a thing to have been demonstrated” (Roberts, 2004, p. 26).

Aristotle’s forms of proof include ethos, pathos, and logos. Aristotle used these elements to help explain the essential rhetoric function. In Greece, these terms were used to explain the components that all rhetorical situations have (Purdue Writing Lab, 2018, para. 1).

Logos is the use of logic or reasoning. Logos refers to the content and organization of the speech or written text. Logic refers to how strong the argument and reasoning are and the structure of the text (Purdue Writing Lab, 2018, para. 2). Ethos is a speaker's credibility or trustworthiness. Ethos also refers to the character of the speaker. Many people see ethos qualities
as to how well the author or speaker portrays themselves to the audience (Purdue Writing Lab, 2018, para. 3). Pathos is the audience's emotional appeal. Pathos refers to the elements of the speech that appeal to the audience's sensibilities. Pathos and logos are contrasting, as pathos refers to the audience’s perspective of the content.

When these three are all considered together, rhetoricians have called it the rhetorical triangle (Indiana University, 2010, para. 2). The triangle is an equilateral triangle suggesting that logos, ethos, and pathos be used equally within a speech. Rhetoricians say that speakers may favor one depending on the audience and the specific purpose of the address.
Chapter 3

Methodology

This thesis analyzed the rhetoric of two contrasting speeches using Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory. The study looked at the persuasiveness used and how Carrie Chapman Catt changed her rhetoric to speak to men and women differently to identify with them. Past research has focused on feminism and how gender opportunities helped win women's suffrage but failed to discuss the importance of how the persuasive rhetoric supported the suffrage movement.

This thesis was done through a study of content analysis: one speech to a group of suffragists titled “The Crisis” (Catt, 1916) and one speech to an all-male legislature titled, “Open Address to the U.S. Congress” (Catt, 1917). The following design was best for the study in order to analyze the persuasive language used in the speeches. This design determined whether Catt varied her identification style to identify with a specific gender or not.

To better understand the rhetoric used, the two speeches were broken into seven tactics of identification. In the second tactic of identification, Aristotle’s forms of proof were used to analyze Catt’s rhetorical situation through her use of ethos, pathos, and logos to achieve persuasion. Following this, the results were compared to Genderlect theory to see how Catt used her rhetoric to appeal to both genders through their language based on how they communicate.

The primary study design used Kenneth Burke's seven tactics of identification. See Figure 2.
**Figure 2**

*Burke's Seven Tactics of Identification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactic 1</th>
<th>using the word, <em>we</em> in place of pronouns like <em>I</em> and <em>me</em>.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 2</td>
<td>identification in appearance, how do different parties dress to communicate or identify with the other party.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 3</td>
<td>using adaptable language by changing speech style and persuasive appeal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 4</td>
<td>persuasion through content adaptation, a speaker uses examples that listeners and readers can easily understand to make them realize there are similarities between the persuader and the audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 5</td>
<td>identify with the moral symbols and revered documents of the society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 6</td>
<td>identify with the values and beliefs of a known hero or founder; this could be used to persuade the audience that they are heirs of the possible founders of the movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactic 7</td>
<td>refer to individuals or other social movements that are unrelated but still well-liked and known amongst the audience.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* The seven tactics of identification provided by the sixth edition of *Persuasion and Social Movements.*
The first tactic of identification is using the word “we” in place of pronouns like “I” and “me” (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 145). Burke claimed that using the implied “we” helps establish common ground between the speaker and audience to establish similarities. Burke believed that this change helps the speech from being "leader-centered" to being "audience-centered." Using individual pronouns like “I” and “me” can create a barrier between the audience and speaker instead of creating a common bond. In using “we”, the audience achieves something together instead of alone. By becoming a part of the group, they are less likely to feel intolerant to the other party.

The second tactic of identification is the speaker’s appearance (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 146). The movement’s members and the audience may share commonalities based on the exterior of the speaker.

The third tactic of identification is using adaptable language by changing speech style and persuasive appeals (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 146). When a speaker is preparing multiple speeches, the content and examples may be similar, but the style may differ based on the audience.

The fourth tactic of identification is persuasion through content adaptation (Stewart et al., 2012, p.147). Persuasion through content adaptation uses examples that listeners can easily understand to recognize similarities between them and the audience. Protestors may identify with content adaption because it makes it easy to see the similarities between them.

The fifth tactic of identification uses moral symbols and revered documents of society (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). Movements, such as abolition, women’s rights, temperance, and pro-life, have employed the Bible as their central source of ideological beliefs and evidence.
The sixth tactic of identification uses the values, beliefs, and attitudes of a known hero or founder (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). These values are used to persuade an audience that they are heirs of the movement's possible founders. At a gathering of modern women's rights leaders in the 1960s, a large portrait of Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, and Anna Howard Shaw was on display. The contemporary women's liberation leaders wanted to show the audience that they are heirs of the new societal norms.

The seventh tactic of identification uses individuals unrelated to the movement or social movements (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). In doing so, movements attempt to link themselves with other social movements that have gained respect.

Next, Aristotle’s forms of proof were used to analyze Tactic three to determine Catt’s rhetorical situation through her use of ethos, pathos, and logos. See Figure 3.
Figure 3

Aristotelian Forms of Proof

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Is the thesis clear and specific?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the thesis supported by strong reasons and credible evidence?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the argument logical and arranged in a well-reasoned order?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethos</th>
<th>What are the writer's qualifications? How has the writer connected him/herself to the topic being discussed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are sources credible? Are sources documented appropriately?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the writer use a tone that is suitable for the audience/purpose? Is the diction (word choice) used appropriately for the audience's purpose?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is the document presented in a polished and professional manner?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Are vivid examples, details, and images used to engage the reader's emotions and imagination?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does the writer appeal to the values and beliefs of the reader by using examples readers can relate to or care about?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The Aristotelian Forms of Proof chart provided by The University of Indiana School of Liberal Arts Writing Center.

Ethos, pathos, and logos are the three types of rhetorical appeals. These can also be considered persuasive strategies. These persuasive strategies are used in arguments to support
claims and respond to opposing arguments. To make a good persuasive argument, a speaker will use a combination of all three rhetorical appeals (Purdue Writing Lab, 2018, para. 1).

Logos is the speaker or writer’s use of logic (Indiana University, 2010, para. 3). The speaker’s argument must be clear, specific, and supported by solid reasons and credible evidence to use logos. The speaker or author’s argument must also be logical and arranged in a well-reasoned order.

Ethos is the speaker or writer’s credibility to the audience (Indiana University, 2010, para. 4). The speaker must express their qualifications to the audience and connect him/herself to the topic being discussed to use ethos. They must use credible sources that are documented appropriately and use a suitable tone for the audience/purpose. This also includes diction (word choice) and a polished and professional presentation.

Pathos is how the speaker or writer uses emotions to persuade the audience (Indiana University, 2010, para. 5). To use pathos, the sender must use vivid examples, details, and images used to engage the reader's emotions and imagination and appeal to the values and beliefs of the audience. Rhetoricians believe that when these three are all considered together, it is called the rhetorical triangle.

Next, Deborah Tannen’s Genderlect Theory was used to analyze the language difference between men and women. Genderlect Theory acknowledges and appreciates males' and females' communication and language to achieve mutual respect. See Figure 4.

---

**Figure 4**

*Genderlect Theory*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tenet</th>
<th>Clarification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


### Why We Communicate: Women seek connection, men seek status.

Women engage in communication to build and maintain relationships with others. By contrast, men are more likely to engage in talk only when it makes them look good, strong, competitive, or independent.

### Style of Communicating: Women use rapport talk, men use report talk.

Women express emotions, share personal feelings, relate stories, and listen empathically (rapport talk). Men engage in competitive joking and assertive speech that wins control of the conversation (report talk).

### Language: We speak the same language, but each gender has its own dialect.

Each gender has its own set of vocabulary and preferred topics, and they use spoken language differently: men talk to get things done (instrumental approach); women talk to interact with others (relational approach).

### Goal of Genderlect Theory: Mutual respect and understanding.

In contrast to feminist viewpoints that criticize men for inferior communication that represses women, Genderlect Theory simply identifies the differences between us and encourages us to acknowledge and accept the communicative culture of the other.

*Note.* The tenets and clarification of Genderlect Theory are provided by Texas Baptist University.

There are four elements to Genderlect Theory *(Whitt, n.d., para. 1)*. The first element is the communication of genders. Genderlect claims that women seek connection while men are seeking status. Women tend to engage in communication to build relationships with others, and men tend to engage in talk that makes them look good, strong, competitive, or independent.
The second element is the style of communication between genders (Whitt, n.d., para. 1). Women build rapport when talking, and men lean towards a report style of talking. Women express emotions and share personal feelings, and men engage in competitive joking and assertive speech.

The third element is the language between genders (Whitt, n.d., para. 1). Men and women speak the same language, but genderlect claims that each gender has its own dialect, which means that each gender has its own vocabulary and preferred topics. Men talk to get things done, and women talk to interact with people.

The final and fourth element is the goal of genderlect which is to create mutual respect and understanding (Whitt, n.d., para. 1). In contrast to feminist viewpoints, genderlect focuses on learning from both sides and celebrate the differences between genders. Genderlect encourages genders to acknowledge and accept the communicative culture of the other.

Chapter 4

Results

The implication that Carrie Chapman Catt used persuasive rhetoric in the women's suffrage movement to identify with men and women differently is detailed in the results below.
These results are found by using tactics one through seven of Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory. This theory proves how Catt changed her language and wording to identify with men and women differently. In tactic three, Aristotle’s forms of proof are used to analyze Catt’s rhetorical situation through her use of ethos, pathos, and logos to achieve persuasion.

Tactic 1

The first tactic of Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory is using the word “we” in place of pronouns like “I” and “me” (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 145). By using “we”, the speaker can establish common ground and similarities between them and the audience. In Catt’s “Address to the all-male legislatures of the United States,” she used “we” 55 times.

Throughout most of her address to the men, she referenced her association and identification with the suffragist when she uses “we”. She made it clear throughout the beginning of the speech what the suffrage vision and plan are. She emphasized their struggle and made it clear to the men what her winning plan was. She used phrases like: “we ask you,” (Catt, 1917, line 154) “we make this choice,” (Catt, 1917, line 198) “we reject,” (Catt, 1917, line 198) "we propose,” (Catt, 1917, lines 244) "to you we appeal,” (Catt, 1917, lines 288) and "we are tired,” (Catt, 1917, lines 318). By choosing to make pleading statements like this, she emphasized the struggle they have gone through that the men do not understand. She did this by proposing a state process versus a national strategy of the 19th Amendment.

Toward the end of the speech, she changed her language drastically by inviting men into the narrative. She began using inclusive phrases like: "we are one nation,” (Catt, 1917, line 473) "we know, and you know that we know,” (Catt, 1917, line 505) “we shall all be better friends,” “we shall have a happier nation,” "we shall be far prouder of our history,” (Catt, 1917, lines 540-
41) "we know you will meet opposition," (Catt, 1917, line 550) and "we are living in the present and facing the future” (Catt, 1917, line 580).

In doing this, Catt invited them into her vision of a new nation by pitching hope to them and a chance to be a part of it. She helped them envision what a world would look like when it is not one against the other but a nation that thrives in a democracy of men and women. See Figure 5.

---

**Figure 5**

Tactic 1: Address to the all-male Legislature of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>We referring to the men</th>
<th>We referring to the suffragist</th>
<th>Address to the all-male legislatures of the United States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“In the face of these facts we ask you, Senators and members of the House of Representatives of the United States, is not the immediate enfranchisement of women of our nation the duty of the hour?” (Catt, 1917, lines 154-56)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We elect the Federal method. There are three reasons why we make this choice and three reasons why we reject the state method” (Catt, 1917, lines 198-99).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We may justly expect American men to be as willing to grant to the women of the United States generous consideration as those of Great Britain have done” (Cat, 1917, lines 207-209).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We propose to conserve money, time and woman’s strength by the elimination of the thirty-six State campaigns as unnecessary to this stage of the progress of the woman suffrage movement” (Catt, 1917, lines 244-46).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“The three reasons why we object to the State amendment process are” (Catt, 1917, line 248). &quot;The second reason why we object to the State process” (Catt, 1917, line 290); “The third reason why we object to the State method” (Catt, 1917, line 325).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“To you we appeal to remove a grievance more insulting than any nation in the wide world has put upon its women” (Catt, 1917, lines 288-89).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“That corrupt influences have exerted their full power against woman suffrage, we know well” (Catt, 1917, line 309).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We have given to such campaigns our money, our time, our strength, our very lives. We have believed the amendment carried and yet have seen our cause announced as lost. We are tired of playing the State campaign game with &quot;the political dice loaded and the cards stacked&quot; against us before we begin” (Catt, 1917, lines 316-19).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We appeal to a method which will bring our cause into the open where every person or party, friend or foe involved in the campaign, may be held responsible to the public” (Catt, 1917, lines 342-44).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“Male voters have never been named by any constitution or statute the representatives of women; we therefore decline to accept them that capacity” (Catt, 1917, lines 401-402).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We know you will meet opposition. There are a few &quot;woman-haters&quot; left, a few &quot;old males of the tribe” (Catt, 1917, line 550).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We are one nation and those of us who live now and make our appeal to you are like yourselves not of the generation whose differences created the conditions which entrenched the tradition of State's Rights” (Catt, 1917, lines 473-75).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“We know, and you know that we know, that it has been the aim of both dominant parties to postpone woman suffrage as long as possible” (Catt, 1917, lines 505-506).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"We shall all be better friends, we shall have a happier nation, we women will be free to support loyally the party of our choice and we shall be far prouder of our history" (Catt, 1917, lines 540-41).

"Which we all know is rooted deep in the memory of bitter and, let us say, regrettable incidents of history. But the past is gone. We are living in the present and facing the future" (Catt, 1917, lines 579-580).

Note. This figure demonstrates key “we” phrases in Carrie Chapman Catt’s "Address to the all-male Legislature of the United States."

In Catt’s “The Crisis”, she used *we* 54 times. In contrast, throughout most of her address to women, she used “we” to rally the women to carry on and not give up. The women did not have to be convinced of her vision as they followed it in the past, but they were tired of losing. Catt reminds them that they are not against each other but for one another.
She began her speech to the women by emphasizing that they are going through this crisis together. Within the first three paragraphs, Catt used the following “we” statement, which provoked a response from the women:

"Why, we shall all continue to work and our cause will continue to hang, waiting for those who possess a clearer vision and more daring enterprise. On the other hand, suppose we reach out with united earnestness and determination to grasp our victory while it still hangs a bit too high? Has any harm been done? None!" (Catt, 1916, lines 25-28)

She then informed the women, "we are passing through a world crisis” by emphasizing the timeliness of what is happening (Catt, 1916, line 31). She used “we” statements to remind them of the shared experience they have gone through together by saying, "we pause to review the long struggle” (Catt, 1916, line 214).

She did not forget to mention their shared values by reminding them that "we demand for women education,” "we demand for women the right to own property and an opportunity to earn an honest living" and "we demand political freedom and its symbol, the vote." (Catt, 1916, line 220-225).

She then moved onto the crisis at hand by asking them, "And we who are the builders of 1916, do we see a crisis? (Catt, 1916, line 239). The fight was not over when she told them, "We have not won the ignorant and illiterate and we never can. They are too undeveloped mentally to understand that the institutions of today are not those of yesterday nor will be those of tomorrow. We have not won the forces of evil and we never will” (Catt, 1916, line 269-272). Catt then gave them a final call to action with the option to stand up or back down by saying:
"Shall we play the coward, then, and leave the hard knocks for our daughters, or shall we throw ourselves into the fray, bare our own shoulders to the blows, and thus bequeath to them a politically liberated womanhood? We have taken note of our gains and of our resources! and they are all we could wish. Before the final struggle, we must take cognizance of our weaknesses. Are we prepared to grasp the victory? (Catt, 1916, 282-286)

She closed the call to action by invoking an emotional response, "How can it be done? By a simple change of mental attitude. If we are to seize the victory, that change must take place in this hall, here and now!" (Catt, 1916, 313-314) Throughout the suffrage movement thus far, women have made great strides throughout the West. Catt reminded the women of this joint success, "We know that in the Colorado campaign, the brewers of Denver printed false statements and caused them to be put under the door of every house in the city. We know that in the last unsuccessful campaign in Oregon" (Catt, 1916, 432-433). To conclude, she asks them this rhetorical question: "Why should we hesitate to avail ourselves of the privileges thus created? We represent one land and one people. We have the same institutions, customs, and ideals” (Catt, 1916, 620-622).

**Tactic 2**

The second tactic of Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory is the speaker’s appearance. The movement's members and the audience may share commonalities based on the exterior of the speaker (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 146).
Because it is not known what was worn in Catt's speeches, Tactic 2 will not be included in the rhetorical analysis of this study. However, throughout the late 1910s, Catt would often wear her signature sapphire blue battlefield uniform, known as her ratification dress. This dress was known as her symbol of the amendment and her shout of triumph for suffrage (Weiss, 2019, p. 87).

**Tactic 3**

The third tactic of Kenneth Burke’s Identification Theory is using adaptable language by changing speech style and persuasive appeals (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 146). For this portion of the analysis, Aristotle's forms of proof will be used to determine the persuasive rhetoric Catt used through her ethos, pathos, and logos.

Catt knew that she had to relate to the women through an emotional appeal in this emergency meeting. Pathos relies on vivid examples, details, and the imagination to engage the reader's emotions. Ethos relies on Catt showing the woman that she is credible in this topic and can be trusted. Through her use of pathos, Catt painted a rhetorical vision with the women through “The Crisis,” by telling them to imagine a world where people will say, "Men and women of America, look upon that wonderful idea up there; see, one day it will come down” (Catt, 1916, lines 20-21). She created a world in her speech for women to reflect upon what could happen if they stopped their efforts altogether. She made the problem so significant that the women cannot help but come together.

She invites her fellow suffragist to come along with her and listen. At the same time, she paints them this picture, "I invite your attention to the signs which point to a crisis and your consideration of plans for turning the crisis into victory” (Catt, 1916, lines 29-30).
By making it personal to each woman, she called on them to reflect on their own experience, “If you believe with me that a crisis has come to our movement, -- if you believe that the time for final action is now, if you catch the rosy tints of the coming day, what does it mean to you?” (Catt, 1916, lines 323-24). Catt memorably ended her speech by using strong pathos language, "WOMEN ARISE: DEMAND THE VOTE! The character of a man is measured, it is said, by his will. The same is true of a movement. Then WILL to be free. Demand the vote. Women, ARISE” (Catt, 1916, lines 654-55). She extended a clear call to action to the women and left them thinking about what it would be like to be free.

Through her use of ethos, Catt used her qualifications and credibility. The women knew that Catt had extensive experience in suffrage, and her role as the president of the NWSA gave her credibility. Because of these qualifications, the women could trust her judgement and beliefs more than their own. She referenced her long-time involvement with suffrage dating back to 1890 when she worked alongside Susan B. Anthony.

Catt reminded them she is a veteran who has the experience that each of them lacks, "Because I was young and all the experiences were new, every event in that campaign stands out in my memory with a vividness which does not mark later and even more important events” (Catt, 1916, lines 367-69). Lastly, although it is used the least, her speech is clear and specific through her use of logos. Catt used evidence and increased her ethos this way by showing that she is knowledgeable in the topic. See Figure 6, 7, and 8.

**Figure 6**

*Tactic 3 Example 1: The Crisis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"If this be true, the time is past when we should say: "Men and women of America, look upon that wonderful idea up there; see, one day it will come down" (Catt, 1916, lines 20-21).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt uses imagery to imagine America with suffrage by referencing a belief/value (the wonderful idea) the audience cares about.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"If this be true, the time is past when we should say: "Men and women of America, look upon that wonderful idea up there; see, one day it will come down." Instead, the time has come to shout aloud in every city, village and hamlet, and in tones so clear and jubilant that they will reverberate from every mountain peak and echo from shore to shore: The woman's Hour has struck" (Catt, 1916, lines 20-24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt uses the NAWSA slogan “The Woman's Hour Has Struck” to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) invoke an emotional response and 2) remind them of a slogan that they believe and value.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Suppose suffragists as a whole do not believe a crisis has come and do not extend their hands to grasp the victory, what will happen?” (Catt, 1916, lines 24-25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt (1) uses a dramatic example to imagine what a world without suffrage would look like.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catt (2) uses strong language by saying there is a world crisis. Using the world crisis invokes distress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“We are passing through a world crisis. All thinkers of every land tell us so; and that nothing after the great war will be as it was before” (Catt, 1916, lines 31-32).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt uses strong language by saying there is a world crisis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using the world crisis invokes distress.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, fellow suffragists, I invite your attention to the signs which point to a crisis and your consideration of plans for turning the crisis into victory” (Catt, 1916, lines 29-30).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt (1) invites suffrage into her world, and (2) uses the word crisis twice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

“In all the warring countries, women are postmen [sic], porters, railway conductors, ticket, switch and signalmen. Conspicuous advertisements invite women to attend agricultural, milking and motor-car schools. They are employed as police in Great Britain and women detectives have recently been taken on the government staff.

In Berlin, there are over 3,000 women streetcar conductors and 3,500 women are employed on the general railways.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Catt (1) uses a vivid example of what is happening in other countries to show them that suffrage is achievable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>She (2) presents to them: If it can happen there, it can happen here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>She (3) engages the audience's imagination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In every city and country, women are doing work for which they would have been considered incompetent two years ago” (Catt, 1916, lines 107-12).

about what women are doing in other countries.

So it happens that above the roar of cannon, the scream of shrapnel and the whirr of aero planes, one who listens may hear the cracking of the fetters which have long bound the European woman to outworn conventions.

Catt (1) uses descriptive language by using words like roar, scream, whirr, and cracking that evoke an emotional response.

It has been a frightful price to pay but the fact remains that a womanhood, well started on the way to final emancipation, is destined to step forth from the war. It will be a bewildered, troubled and grief-stricken womanhood with knotty problems of life to solve, but it will be freer to deal with them than women have ever been before” (Catt, 1916, lines 174-79).

She (2) uses a fear tactic by telling the women that they will be much more scared living in a world without suffrage if they are scared now. By doing this, she evokes an emotional response.

“The Woman's Hour has struck. It has struck for the women of Europe and for those of all the world.

The significance of the changed status of European women has not been lost upon the men and women of our land; our own people are not so unlearned in history, nor so lacking in National pride that they will allow the Republic to lag long behind the Empire, presided over by the descendant of George the Third.

If they possess the patriotism and the sense of nationality which should be the inheritance of an American, they will not wait until the war is ended but will boldly lead in the inevitable march of democracy, our own American specialty. Sisters, let me repeat, the Woman's Hour has struck!” (Catt, 1916, lines 180-87)

Catt (1) uses a vivid example of what is happening in other countries to show them that suffrage is achievable.

She (2) uses words like patriotism and nationality to invoke a sense of urgency for the democracy they are trying to achieve. She is identifying with them through their values and belief system.

“How can it be done? By a simple change of mental attitude.

If we are to seize the victory, that change must take place in this hall, here and now!” (Catt, 1916, lines 313-14)

Catt (1) makes it practical for women to make a change. She challenges the women by letting them decide.

Catt (2) uses words like seize, change, here and now to invoke an emotional response.

She presents to them the idea that they either give up or charge forward.
"If you believe with me that a crisis has come to our movement, -- if you believe that the time for final action is now, if you catch the rosy tints of the coming day, what does it mean to you?

Does it not give you a thrill of exaltation; does the blood not course more quickly through your veins; does it not bring a new sense of freedom, joy and determination?" (Catt, 1916, lines 324-26)

Catt 1) uses the word crisis again. Using the word crisis invokes distress.

Catt 2) uses descriptive language by using words like thrill, blood, veins to invoke an emotional response.

Catt 3) questions the women’s values and beliefs by using words like freedom, joy, and determination. She reminds the women that they all have these characteristics.

"Let the bugle sound from the suffrage headquarters of every State at the inauguration of a State campaign. Let the call go forth again and, again and yet again. Let it be repeated in every article written, in every speech made, in every conversation held. Let the bugle blow again and yet again" (Catt, 1916, lines 332-35).

Catt uses repetitive language to make a point to the women.

"The Woman's Hour Has Struck. Yet, if the call goes unheeded, if our women think it means the vote without a struggle, if they think other women can and will pay the price of their emancipation, the hour may pass and our political liberty may not be won" (Catt, 1916, lines 651-52).

Catt, again, uses the NAWSA slogan "The Woman's Hour Has Struck" to:

(1) invoke an emotional response and (2) remind them of a slogan that they believe and value.

"WOMEN ARISE: DEMAND THE VOTE!"

The character of a man is measured, it is said, by his will.

The same is true of a movement.

Catt 1) uses strong language to get her point across to the women by using words like demand and rise

She 2) reminds the women of whom they are dealing with: man
Then WILL to be free. Demand the vote. Women, ARISE" (Catt, 1916, lines 653-55).

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of pathos in Carrie Chapman Catt's "Address to the all-male Legislature of the United States."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethos</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;My first campaign was that in South Dakota in the year 1890</td>
<td>Catt (1) connects herself to the topic being discussed by reminding them that she has not only traveled for</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because I was young and all the experiences were new, every event in that campaign stands out in my memory with a vividness which does not mark later and even more important events” (Catt, 1916, lines 367-69).

Suffrage but that she was young as well.

She (2) reminds them that she was young, also reminds them that she is not young anymore and has experience they do not have.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my judgment, that crucial moment, bidding us to renewed consecration and redoubled activity, has come to our cause. I believe our victory hangs within our grasp, inviting us to pluck it out of the clouds and establish it among the good things of the world” (Catt, 1916, lines 17-19).</td>
<td>Catt gives women advice to trust based on her qualifications by using a statement like “In my judgement.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In my judgement, the women of this land, not only have the right to sit on the steps of Congress until it acts but it is their self-respecting duty to insist upon their enfranchisement by that route” (Catt, 1916, lines 628-29).</td>
<td>Catt again gives women advice to trust based on her qualifications by using a statement like “In my judgement.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of ethos in Carrie Chapman Catt's "Address to the all-male Legislature of the United States."

Figure 8

Tactic 3 Example 3: The Crisis
"Those who profess to know, claim that 100 millions of dollars are being spent on the war every day and that two years of war have cost 50 billions of dollars or 10 times more than the total expense of the American Civil War. Our own country has sent 35 millions of dollars abroad for relief expenses" (Catt, 1916, lines 32-25).

Catt uses credible evidence through her knowledge about the economic impact of the war.

"The economic change is bound to bring political liberty. From every land, there comes the expressed belief that the war will be followed by a mighty, oncoming wave of democracy for it is now well known that the conflict has been one of governments, of kings and Czars, Kaisers and Emperors; not of peoples" (Catt, 1916, lines 39-42).

Catt uses reason by justifying the action of economic change.

"States no provision has been made by the election law for any form of contest or recount on a referendum...." (Catt, 1916, line 482).

Catt's thesis is clear.

"In New York, in 1915, the question was submitted to the voters as to whether there should be a constitutional convention. The convention was ordered by a majority of over 1,300. It was estimated that about 800 fraudulent votes were cast. Leading lawyers discussed the question of effect upon the election and the general opinion was that even though the entire majority and more was found to be fraudulent, the election could not be set aside. The convention was held..." (Catt, 1916, lines 487-91).

This argument is on the logical side and arranged in a well-reasoned order.

"In twenty States, contests on referenda seem possible under the law, but in practically every one the contest means a resort to the courts and in only eight of these is reference made to a recount. The law is vague and incomplete in nearly all of these States. In some of these, including Michigan where the suffrage amendment is declared to have been counted out, application for a recount must be made in each voting precinct. To have secured redress in Michigan, provided the fraud was widespread, as I understand it was, it would have been necessary to have secured definite evidence of fraud in a probable 1,000 precincts and to have instituted as many cases.

The penalties for bribery range from $5 to $2,000 and from 30 days to 10 years, but only one State (Ohio) provides in terms for punishment of bribery as part of the penalty in an election contest....With a vague, uncertain law to define their punishment in most States and no law at all in 25 States, as a preliminary security, corrupt opponents of a woman suffrage amendment find many additional aids to their nefarious acts. The orders went forth to vote down the Constitutional provisions and it was done by a majority of 482,000, or nearly 300,000 more than the majority against woman suffrage. On the ballot containing the suffrage amendment which was No. 1, there was proposition No. 3, which all the political parties wanted carried. It could easily be found by all illiterate as it contained more lines of printing, yet so difficult was it to teach ignorant men to vote "no" on suffrage and "yes" on No. 3 that, despite the fact that orders had gone forth to all the State that No. 3 was to be carried, it barely squeezed through.

Catt uses evidence to justify her thesis.

Catt uses evidence to justify her thesis.

Catt uses evidence to justify her thesis.

Catt uses evidence to justify her thesis.
In Pennsylvania there are no emblems to distinguish the tickets and, on the large ballot, the suffrage amendment would have been difficult to find by an untutored voter. In consequence, as I believe, Pennsylvania polled the largest proportional vote for the amendment of any Eastern State.

In Massachusetts, the ballot was small and the suffrage amendment could be easily picked out by a bribed illiterate. In Iowa, the suffrage ballot was separate and yellow, while the main ballots were white. In consequence, there were 35,000 more votes cast on the suffrage proposition that for the nomination of Governor, although the contest was an exciting one.

In North Dakota, the regular ballot was long and complicated and the suffrage ballot separate and small. It was easy to teach the dullest illiterate how to vote "No." It might be said that it would be equally easy to teach him to vote "Yes." True, but suffragists never bribe. Both the briber and the illiterate are allies of the Antis (Catt, 1916, 492-539).

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of logos in Carrie Chapman Catt's "The Crisis."

In contrast, Catt appealed to logos and pathos more than ethos in the “Open Address to the U.S. Congress.” Catt did not follow an ethos approach because the men did not see her as an authority figure. They already knew who she was and her credibility, but her credibility did not appeal to them. Catt used logos the most when speaking to the men to identify also with the education they have. Men of that time were highly educated people and found pride in their
schooling. While women at the time would receive a high school diploma, higher education was reserved for men. In 1900, only 19% of women earned a bachelor’s degree (PBS, para. 2).

Because of this difference, she presented strong arguments more on the logical side arranged with reasoning. She used figures, numbers, and statistics so the men cannot find an area of argument. When Catt used pathos with the men, she used several different techniques to appeal to their emotions. She first used strong language referring to the men's measure of patriotism. Catt used phrases like "That is un-American" (Catt, 1917, line 46) and "Any man who has American blood in his veins" (Catt, 1917, line 144). By doing so, she subconsciously questions their love for the country and democracy.

Another technique she used was inflating the men's pride by statements like, "You are such men, Honorable Senators and Representatives" (Catt, 1917, lines 287-88). She reminded them that this decision is theirs, which gave them ownership instead of feeling as if they are being told what to do. Lastly, she referenced how men view suffrage around the world: "Other men of other lands have thrown aside traditions as tenderly revered as yours in response to the higher call of Justice, Progress, and Democracy. Can you, too, not rise to this same call of duty?" (Catt, 1917, 470-72). Catt challenged the men to do something while using words they identify deeply with, such as justice, progress, and democracy. See Figures 9 and 10.

**Figure 9**

*Tactic 3 Example 4: Open Address to the U.S. Congress*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logos</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woman suffrage is inevitable. Suffragists knew it before November 6, 1917: opponents afterward. Three distinct causes make it inevitable. (Catt, 1917, lines 1-2).</td>
<td>Catt's thesis is clear as she first addresses the men.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We elect the Federal method. There are three reasons why we make this choice and three reasons why we reject the state method (Catt, 1917, line 198).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objection to State No. 1</th>
<th>The constitutions of many States contain such difficult provisions for amending that it is practically impossible to carry and amendment at the polls (Catt, 1917, lines 248-50).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objection to State No. 2</td>
<td>The second reason why we object to the State process is far more serious and important than the first. It is because the statutory laws governing elections are so inadequate and defective as to vouchsafe little or no protection to a referendum in most States (Catt, 1917, lines 290-92).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objection to State No. 3</td>
<td>The third reason we object to the State method is even more weighty than either or both others. It is because the State method fixes responsibility upon no one (Catt, 1917, lines 325-26).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objection No. 1 War time is not the proper time to consider the question. Two neutral countries, Iceland and Denmark, and three belligerent countries, Canada, Russia and Great Britain, have enfranchised their women during war time and they have been engaged in war for three and a half years. That which is a proper time for such countries is surely proper enough for us (Catt, 1917, lines 353-57).

Objection No. 2 A vote on this question by Congress and the Legislatures is undemocratic; it should go to the "people" of the States (Catt, 1917, lines 391-92).

Objection No. 3 States Rights. You pronounce it unfair that thirty-six States should determine who may vote in the remaining twelve; the possible Republican Northern States should decide who may vote in Democratic Southern States (Catt, 1917, lines 413-14).

Catt presents her speech to the men with 3 answers to her objections to the State. This argument is on the logical side and arranged in a well-reasoned order.

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of logos in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "Open Address to the U.S. Congress."

Figure 10

Tactic 3 Example 5: Open Address to the U.S. Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pathos</th>
<th>Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When such questions have been raised, political leaders have replied: &quot;What! Tax men and in return give them no vote; compel men to obey the authority of a government to which they may not give consent! Never. That is un-American&quot; (Catt, 1917, lines 44-46).</td>
<td>Catt uses strong language to like the word “Un-American” to (1) get the attention of men (2) invoke an emotional response to the attack on America.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
So, it happens that men of all nations and all races, except the Mongolian, may secure citizenship and automatically become voters in any State in the Union, and even the Mongolian born in this country is a citizen and has the vote (Catt, 1917, lines 46-48).

Catt (1) refers to the process of citizenship because she knows this is something the men most likely value in American democracy. In doing so, she (2) relates to their belief system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any man who has American blood in his veins.</th>
<th>Just like in the speech to women, Catt uses descriptive language and phrases to invoke an emotional response.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any man who has gloried in our history and has rejoiced that our land was the leader of world democracy. will share with us the humbled national pride that our country has so long delayed action upon this question that another country has beaten us in what we thought was our special world mission (Catt, 1917, lines 144-47).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you realize that in no other country in the world with democratic tendencies is suffrage so completely denied as in a considerable number of our own States? There are 13 black States where no suffrage for women exists, and 14 others where suffrage for women is more limited than in many foreign countries. Do you realize that when you ask women to take their cause to State referendum you compel them to do this; that you drive women of education, refinement, achievement, to beg men who cannot read for their political freedom? Do you realize that such anomalies as a College President asking her janitor to give her a vote are overstraining the patience and driving women to desperation? Do you realize that women in increasing numbers indignantly resent the long delay in their enfranchisement? (Catt, 1917, lines 526-36).</td>
<td>Catt uses repetitive language to make a point to the men.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have myself seen men who could not speak a word of English; nor write their names in any language, driven to the polls like sheep to vote against woman suffrage and no law at the time could punish them for the musses of the vote so cheaply extended to them, nor change the result (Catt, 1917, lines 311-314).</td>
<td>Catt uses descriptive language to get the attention of men on the question of voting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When a State submits a constitutional amendment to male voters, it does a legal, constitutional thing, but when that amendment chiefly concerns one-half the people of the State and the law permits the other half to settle it the wildest stretch of the imagination could not describe the process as democratic. Democracy means “the rule-of-people,” and, let me repeat, women are people (Catt, 1917, lines 393-94).</td>
<td>Catt uses strong language referring to the men's measure of patriotism and their belief of a nation's democracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other men of other lands have thrown aside traditions as tenderly revered as yours in response to the higher call of Justice, Progress, and Democracy.

Can you, too, not rise to this same call of duty? (Catt, 1917, lines 470-72).

Catt (1) uses vivid imagery of what is going on in other lands.
Catt (2) questions if they do what men in other lands have done.

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of pathos in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "Open Address to the U.S. Congress."

Tactic 4

The fourth tactic of identification is persuasion through content adaptation (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). Persuasion through content adaptation uses examples that listeners can easily understand to recognize similarities between them and the audience. Those who protest may identify with content adaption because it makes it easy to see the similarities between them.

In both speeches, Catt used examples to prove that there are similarities between her and the audience. In the speech to men, Catt gave them an example about women in their own
families. She asked the men if they have ever considered what suffrage means to them. In the speech to women, Catt gave the audience an example about women who are silent in the suffrage movement. In both examples, she created a common ground to identify the audience on a personal level.

In the “Open Address to the U.S. Congress,” Catt presented thought-provoking statements like, “Have you ever thought that the women of your own families?” (Catt, 1917, lines 439-40). She told the men, “They are going to discover that the trust, respect, and frank acknowledgment of equality which men of other states have given their women are something infinitely higher and nobler than you have ever offered them?” (Catt, 1917, lines 42-44). Catt then questioned their role as the male by asking them, “Do you not see that when that time comes to her she is going to ask why you, her husband, her father, who were so placed… did not see the coming change of custom and save her from the humiliation of having to beg for that which women in other countries are already enjoying?” (Catt, 1917, lines 48-51).

Lastly, she reminded them that this is an inevitable conversation they are going to have to have with their wives and daughters by saying, “Someday that woman who does know the world is moving on and leaving her behind will see and know these things. What will she say and do then? What will you do for her now?” (Catt, 1917, lines 456-58).

By making these statements, Catt removed herself from the situation and places the man's family into the narrative. Because she did this, the men could see suffrage as less of an evil and see how suffrage relates to their life first-hand. Respectfully, Catt claimed that if they do not vote for suffrage, they are inevitably letting down their wives, children, and future grandchildren.

In “The Crisis,” Catt told the women about three different types of suffragists. She first told them that, “Behind us, in front of us, everywhere about us are suffragists -- millions of them,
but inactive and silent” (Catt, 1916, lines 291-92). The second type of suffragist is “thousands of other women who have never learned of the earlier struggles of our movement. They found doors of opportunity open to them on every side” (Catt, 1916, lines 298-299). The third type of suffragist is, “those who are timorously looking over their shoulders to see if any listeners be near, will tell us they hope we will win and win soon but they are too frightened of Mother Grundy to help. There are others too occupied with the small things of life to help. They say they could find time to vote but not to work for the vote” (Catt, 1916, lines 306-07). She reminded the suffragist that there are men in this group too who are waiting for the call.

The supporters spread the cause's argument but felt no sense of responsibility for its hope. Catt knew that the movement lacked cohesion, organization, unity, and momentum. In these examples, Catt identified with the women by telling them that there are millions of suffragists, male and female, out there who are silent. Catt reminded them through this example that they are fighting for the exact cause she is fighting for.

She told the women the “final struggle needs their numbers and the momentum those numbers will bring. Were never another convert made, there are suffragists enough in this country, if combined, to make so irresistible a driving force that victory might be seized at once” (Catt, 1916, lines 310-12). In this statement, she told them that suffragists are out there. It is their responsibility to join Catt in finding them. By using persuasion through content adaptation, Catt used examples that the women can easily understand to help them come to the realization that there are similarities between Catt and themselves. See Figures 11 and 12.
Figure 11

Tactic 4 Example 1: Open Address to the U.S. Congress

“In this connection, have you ever thought that the women of your own families who may tell you now that they do not want the vote are going to realize someday that there is something insincere in your protestations of chivalry protection and "you are too good to vote, my dear," they are going to discover that the trust, respect, and frank acknowledgment of equality which men of other states have given their women are something infinitely higher and nobler than you have ever offered them? Have you thought that you may now bestow upon them a liberty that they may not yet realize they need, but that tomorrow they may storm your castle and command? Do you suppose that any woman in the land is going to be
content with unenfranchisement when she once comprehends that men of other countries have given women the vote?

Do you not see that when that time comes to her she is going to ask why you, her husband, her father, who were so placed, perhaps, that you could observe the progress of world affairs, did not see the coming change of custom and save her from the humiliation of having to beg for that which women in other countries are already enjoying? Have you known that no more potent influence has aroused the sheltered and consequently narrow visioned woman into a realization that she wanted to be a part of enfranchised class than the manner in which men treat enfranchised women? There is no patronizing "I am holier than thou" air, but in equality of "fellow citizens." One never sees that relation between men and women except where women vote. Some day that woman who does know the world is moving on and leaving her behind will see and know these things. What will she say and do then? What will you do for her now?" (Catt, 1917, lines 439-58).

Note. This figure demonstrates an example used in “Open Address to the U.S. Congress.”

---

**Figure 12**

**Tactic 4 Example 1: The Crisis**

"Behind us, in front of us, everywhere about us are suffragists, -- millions of them, but inactive and silent. They have been "agitated and educated" and are with us in belief. There are thousands of women who have at one time or another been members of our organization, but they have dropped out because, to them the movement seemed negative and pointless. Many have taken up other work whose results were more immediate. Philanthropy, charity, work for corrective laws of various kinds, temperance, relief for working women and numberless similar public services have called them. Others have turned to the pleasanter avenues of clubwork, art or literature."
There are thousands of other women who have never learned of the earlier struggles of our movement. They found doors of opportunity open to them on every side. They found well-paid posts awaiting the qualified woman and they have availed themselves of all these blessings; almost without exception they believe in the vote but they feel neither gratitude to those who opened the doors through which they have entered to economic liberty nor any sense of obligation to open other doors for those who come after.

There are still others who, timorously looking over their shoulders to see if any listeners be near, will tell us they hope we will win and win soon but they are too frightened of Mother Grundy to help. There are others too occupied with the small things of life to help. They say they could find time to vote but not to work for the vote. There are men, too, millions of them, waiting to be called. These men and women are our reserves. They are largely unorganized and untrained soldiers with little responsibility toward our movement. Yet these reserves must be mobilized.

The final struggle needs their numbers and the momentum those numbers will bring. Were never another convert made, there are suffragists enough in this country, if combined, to make so irresistible a driving force that victory might be seized at once" (Catt, 1916, lines 291-312).

Note. This figure demonstrates an example in “The Crisis.”

Tactic 5

The fifth tactic of identification uses moral symbols and revered documents of society (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). Movements against slavery, for women's rights, temperance, and abortion have employed the Bible as their central source of ideological beliefs and evidence.

In the “Open Address to the U.S. Congress,” the reference to revered documents is used more than in “The Crisis.” Catt used this language with men because of their commitment to patriotism and America. Being part of the United States legislature, an honorable position, these words signify strength, honor, and dedication to one's country. The legislature cannot deny that these documents are respected and the foundation of American history. Catt knew that men
wrote these documents, a gender the legislature can identify quickly with. Figure 14 demonstrates Catt’s direct quotes from the revered documents to prove that the documents inherently and undeniably support women.

In her speech to women, she quoted or referenced a value from a revered document, and (2) proves how each document intrinsically supports women from the beginning of their design. Through verbiage like this, it is nearly impossible for men to rebuke. If the founding fathers wrote it, they must follow it. To rebuke these fundamental truths would mean to rebuke these American values. Catt strategically put the men in a difficult position: to deny suffrage means to deny democracy and constitutionalism. If the men denied suffrage, they also denied democracy. See Figures 13 and 14.

**Figure 13**

*Tactic 5 Example 1: Open Address to the U.S. Congress and The Crisis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revered Document or Symbol</th>
<th>&quot;Open Address to the U.S. Congress&quot;</th>
<th>&quot;The Crisis&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document (Catt, 1917)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bible (Catt, 1917)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States' Rights, State's Rights Doctrine (Catt, 1917)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy (Catt, 1917)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Declaration of Independence (Catt, 1917) | 5 | 0  
| Constitution, Constitutions, Constitutional (Catt, 1917) | 21 | 14

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of revered documents or symbols in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "Open Address to the U.S. Congress" and her speech "The Crisis."

Figure 14

Tactic 5 Example 2: Open Address to the U.S. Congress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Address to the U.S. Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woman suffrage became an assured fact when the Declaration of Independence was written&quot; (Catt, 1917, line 61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It matters not at all whether Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots though of women when they wrote that immortal document&quot; (Catt, 1917, lines 62-63).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Hon. Champ Clark announced that he had been a woman suffragist ever since he 'got the hang of the Declaration of Independence'&quot; (Catt, 1917, 65-67).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Woman suffrage became an assured fact when the Declaration of Independence was written&quot; (Catt, 1917, line 61).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It is true; democracy, votes for men and votes for women, making slow but certain progress in 1914, have suddenly become established facts in many lands in 1917&quot; (Catt, 1917, lines 131-132).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Democracy means 'the rule-of-people,' and, let me repeat, women are people" (Catt, 1917, lines 396-97).

"Were the question of woman suffrage to be submitted a vote of both sexes, the action would be democratic, but in that use would not be legal nor constitutional" (Catt, 1917, lines 398-400).

"If other lands have been brave enough to extend suffrage to women in war time, our own counter, the mother of democracy, surely will not hesitate" (Catt, 1917, lines 493-95).

"The framers of the Constitution gave unquestioned authority to Congress to act upon women suffrage. Why not use that authority and use it now to do the big, noble, just thing of catching pace with other nations on this question of democracy? The world and posterity will honor you for it" (Catt, 1917, lines 500-503).

"Would you be content to keep a standing army of women to hold off for the special work of educating men in the meaning of democracy" (Catt, 1917, lines 519-21).

Note. This figure demonstrates the use of quoting/referencing revered documents in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "Open Address to the U.S. Congress."

Tactic 6

The sixth tactic of identification uses the values, beliefs, and attitudes of a known hero or founder (Stewart et al., 2012, p.147). These values are used to persuade an audience that they are heirs of the movement's possible founders. Throughout both speeches, Catt referenced well-known heroes but in different ways.

In the "Open Address to the U.S. Congress," she referenced only male heroes. By referencing figures such as Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, King George III, and others, she choose to relate to men with other men. Not only are these other men, but they are foundational to history. When she chose men to reference instead
of women, she proved she knows whom they would better identify with. Men identify with these heroes' values: government for the people, democracy, justice, and participation in government.

In "The Crisis," she referenced only female heroes. By referencing figures such as Susan B. Anthony, Alice Stone Blackwell, and Elizabeth Cady Stanton, she chose to relate to the women by reminding them of other suffragist who came before them. Catt also only referenced female suffrage heroes in her speech to women. By referencing female suffrage heroes, she hoped that the women in the emergency convention would see themselves as heroes.

Catt included personality traits that women have that suffragists can identify with. She told stories about struggles they had gone through, what they had done for women, and what they had to sacrifice for suffrage. By referencing these women as heroes, she encourages the women at the convention to become more like them. See Figures 15 and 16.

**Figure 15**

*Tactic 6 Example 1: Open Address to the U.S. Congress*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Hero</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abraham Lincoln</td>
<td>Government for the people and by the people (Catt, 1917, lines 15-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodrow Wilson</td>
<td>Democracy and a voice in one's own government (Catt, 1917, lines 17-18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King George III</td>
<td>taxation without representation is tyranny - no matter whether it be men or women who are taxed (Catt, 1917, line 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known Hero</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Franklin</td>
<td>The refusal of justice when justice is due (Catt, 1917, lines 190-191)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson</td>
<td>The Declaration voiced a principle greater than any man (Catt, 1917, lines 62-63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elihu Root, President of the American Society of International Law</td>
<td>The world cannot be half democratic and half autocratic (Catt, 1917, lines 76-77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of the United Kingdom</td>
<td>The course of history is everchanging - these are the times in which we now live (Catt, 1917, lines 127-30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* This figure demonstrates the values of a known hero used in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "Open Address to the U.S. Congress."

**Figure 16**

*Tactic 6 Example 2: The Crisis*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Known Hero</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abbie Kelley</td>
<td>essayed to speak in public (Catt, 1916, lines 190-91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ernestine Rose</td>
<td>she proposed that they should control their own property (Catt, 1916, lines 191-92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucretia Mott</td>
<td>Saintly, free their sex from the world's stupid oppressions (Catt, 1916, line 193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Cady Stanton</td>
<td>Legal minded, free their sex from the world's stupid oppressions (Catt, 1916, line 194)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucy Stone</td>
<td>gentle, sweet-voiced, publicly claimed that women had brains capable of education (Catt, 1916, line 196)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell</td>
<td>snubbed and boycotted by other women because she proposed to study medicine (Catt, 1916, line 197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Antoinette Brown Blackwell</td>
<td>standing before an Assembly of clergymen, angry that she, a woman attended Temperance Convention as a delegate (Catt, 1916, line 198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan B. Anthony</td>
<td>Intrepid, demanded fair play for women (Catt, 1916, line 200-201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Anna Howard Shaw</td>
<td>whom she has led to the light (Catt, 1916, line 207)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice Stone Blackwell</td>
<td>Intelligent, farsightedness, clear-thinking, knows the most vulnerable spot in a man's armor (Catt, 1916, lines 209-10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. This figure demonstrates the values of a known hero used in Carrie Chapman Catt's speech "The Crisis."

**Tactic 7**

The seventh tactic of identification uses individuals unrelated to the movement or social movements (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 147). In doing so, movements attempt to link themselves with other social movements that have gained respect.

Catt referenced prohibition as a successful social movement in both speeches but in different ways. When Catt talked about the prohibition to the men, she reminded them that they have a vote in prohibition and that this privilege of voting is not open to women. Catt used this as a persuasive tactic to envision what the prohibition vote could look like if women could vote;
would this change their good outcome? When Catt referenced prohibition to the women, she told the women that although outsiders see prohibition and suffrage as the same, they are dissimilar. She encouraged women to accept the male opposition as normal and to carry on.

Catt also referenced biblical characters and unrelated moral figures with the women but not with the men. According to Burke, movements such as abolition, women's rights, temperance, and pro-life have employed the Bible as their central source of ideological beliefs and evidence. Catt used women and men in history who had to sacrifice something in their life to achieve their goals. Catt gave these examples to the women to show that some of the most influential people in history were ridiculed, mobbed, and killed based on their belief system. Catt did not use this tactic in the men's speech because it was not relevant to them. The men had not and did not sacrifice their lives for suffrage. Catt wanted to make it as easy for the men to become a part of her vision, which does not require sacrifice on their part.

See Figure 17, 18, and 19.

---

**Figure 17**

**Tactic 7 Example: Prohibition in the Open Address to the U.S. Congress and The Crisis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Address to the U.S. Congress</th>
<th>The Crisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In twenty-four States there is no law providing for a recount on a referendum. Voters may be bribed, colonized, repeated and the law provides for no possible redress. In some States corrupt voters may be arrested, tried and punished, but that does not remove their votes from the total vote cast nor in any way change the results. When questions which are supported by men's organizations go to referendum, such as prohibition, men interested may secure posts as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The liquor interests have been driven to the aggressive defensive by the inroads of the prohibition movement. They are obsessed by the idea that woman suffrage is only a flank prohibition movement. They have the American's right to fight for their own. We cannot relieve them of their notion that woman suffrage will promote prohibition and hence must</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
election officials or party watchers and thus be in position to guard the purity of the election. This privilege is not open to women” (Catt, 1917, lines 302-08). accept their opposition as normal” (Catt, 1916, lines 457-61).

Note. This figure demonstrates a reference to a successful movement, the prohibition, in Carrie Chapman Catt’s “Open Address to the U.S. Congress” and “The Crisis.”

Figure 18

Tactic 7 Example: Biblical individuals unrelated but well-liked in The Crisis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“The Crisis”</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The Antis drove Moses out of Egypt” (Catt, 1916, line 256)</td>
<td>Moses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“…they crucified Christ who said, “Love thy neighbor as thyself” [Matt. 19:19, 22:39]; they have persecuted Jews in all parts of the world” (Catt, 1916, lines 257-58)</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. This figure demonstrates a reference to Biblical characters in Carrie Chapman Catt’s “The Crisis.”
Figure 19

Tactic 7 Example: Reference to individuals unrelated but well-liked in “The Crisis.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Crisis</th>
<th>Individual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>they poisoned Socrates, the great philosopher (Catt, 1916, line 258)</td>
<td>Socrates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they cruelly persecuted Copernicus and Galileo, the first great scientists (Catt, 1916, lines 258-59)</td>
<td>Copernicus and Galileo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they burned Giordano Bruno at the stake because he believed the world was round (Catt, 1916, lines 259-60)</td>
<td>Giordano Bruno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they burned Savonarola who warred upon church corruption (Catt, 1916, lines 260-61)</td>
<td>Savonarola</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis above suggests that Catt did take a different approach in the two speeches because of the audience. She did this to create identification and intimacy to win them over to her course.

**Observation 1**

By using “we” Catt is able to (1) identify with men and (2) become united as men and women. Men bought into voting for suffrage as they became part of the “we”. Women bought into continuing the fight for suffrage as they became part of the “we”. Previous to the speeches in
1916 and 1917, men and women did not have a reason to identify with her. In her speeches, she gave them a reason, and it connected.

Observation 2

Using adaptable language through ethos, pathos, and logos, Catt identifies with both men and women differently. In her ethos appeal to women, Catt uses her qualifications and credibility. She uses pathos with women to rally them into her vision by appealing to their values. When Catt uses pathos with the men, she uses several different techniques to appeal to their emotions. She uses strong language referring to the men's measure of patriotism, boasts of the men's pride, and references what men in different countries are doing. In Catt's logos appeal to the men, she relies on her knowledge and research of history on the current topic to show that she can be at the same level of their education. Catt chooses not to take an ethos approach because the men already do not see her as an authority figure. According to Aristotle, the ethos, pathos, and logos triangle can be used equally within a speech. However, Catt proves rhetoricians correct when she favors one over the other. She favors logos with the men and favors pathos with the women. She does this because she knows each speech has a different purpose.

Observation 3

Using examples that were easy to understand allowed the men and women to understand and recognize similarities between them. Men were drawn into the similarities because Catt involved the important women in their lives. Women were drawn into the similarities because they looked up to Carrie Chapman Catt and were able to see themselves in her. The men and women may have felt distanced from her initially, but she gave them a reason to connect with her uniquely through her storytelling.
Observation 4

Using moral symbols or revered documents allowed the men to realize they could not argue against the suffragist. By quoting The Declaration of Independence, she proved to them that democracy is by the people and for the people. Catt's direct quotes, from the revered documents, prove that the documents inherently and undeniably support women. If the all-male legislature were to not vote for suffrage, they would directly deny democracy by claiming that women were not people.

Observation 5

Identifying with the values of a known hero allowed Catt to speak out of herself and reflect her audience's values on other prominent figures. She references heroes like Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Benjamin Franklin, and Thomas Jefferson because their American values align with me (government for the people, democracy, justice, and participation in government). She references suffrage heroes like Alice Paul and Susan B. Anthony because their values align with the suffragist: the fundamental human right of voting. By referencing these heroes, she encourages the audience to want to be more like them.

Observation 6

Catt uses prohibition as an example to link them with other social movements. Until this time, men regularly had a say in prominent social movements, such as the prohibition. Catt sheds new light on this issue by casting a vision in their minds that if women could vote, maybe more women would be on their side of the issue. If women could vote, would this change the outcome? Moreover, do prohibition and women have anything to do with one another? Using prohibition in the women’s speech, she reminds the women that suffrage and prohibition are
different. She tells the women to accept the male opposition as expected and not let it deter their motives. In doing so, she is telling the women that there are some fights not worth picking.

Movements that are for women's rights have employed The Bible as their central source of ideological beliefs and evidence. Catt uses the Bible in her speech to women to remind them of their core beliefs while also referring to well-liked individuals who have sacrificed their lives for a movement. Catt does not use this tactic in the men's speech because it is not relevant to them. Catt wants to make it as easy for the men to become a part of her vision, which does not require sacrifice on their part.

**Limitations**

There were a few limitations throughout this study. The first limitation is that the tactics overlapped. Although this was inevitable, it was a drawback during the rhetorical analysis. More specifically, tactics five through seven had the most similarities that crossed over. Each of these tactics had a central theme of either a document in history, a person in history, or a social movement. Although there were only a few times that tactics did overlap throughout the study, it became puzzling when determining which tactic to use to identify a specific portion of the speech.

A second limitation of the study would be the lack of tactic two in the analysis. Tactic two is how different parties dress to communicate or identify with the other party (Stewart et al., 2012, p. 146). Because it is not known what was worn during Catt's speeches, this was not included in the rhetorical analysis. Despite this drawback, the literature review on Carrie Chapman Catt's style and clothing choice of the late 1890s and early 1900s was applied. Knowing this information more specifically could have helped understand identification through outward appearance and how it impacted the male and female audiences.
A third limitation is that researcher’s for this study is a Christian worldview of gender roles and feminism. The way the problem, solution, and results are framed may differ from a secular worldview. Not everyone shares the same paradigm, so it is only ethical that it is included as a limitation of study.

Further Recommendations

There are few recommendations for further research that would further advance this study. The first recommendation would be to use this same framework to analyze more historical speeches to see how identification occurs. Through this, it would be interesting to see what other social movements used identification and how exactly they used it to spread their vision and goal through rhetoric. During Catt's speeches, she references social movements like prohibition, therefore it would be interesting to see if the two movements simultaneously used identification. Secondly, it would be interesting to see Identification Theory in the feminism movement and the change from the 19th century to the 21st century. It would help to see how feminist identification with men has changed over time.

Conclusion

Carrie Chapman Catt used persuasive rhetoric in the women's suffrage movement to identify with men and women differently. This study looked at the persuasiveness used in two contrasting speeches and how Carrie Chapman Catt changed her rhetoric to speak to men and women. This study also shows that it is possible for men and women to connect through identification.

Genderlect Theory proposes that there are cross-cultural language differences based on gender. Genderlect is based on a set of linguistic characteristics by males and females that are developed throughout childhood. According to Genderlect Theory, women seek connection and
men seek status. Catt was able to engage in communication to build trust amongst both men and women. She helped the women connect with her by helping them see themselves through her. She gave status to the men through her logos appeal and emphasis on revered documents. Catt made both audiences feel good, strong, and independent while influencing their decisions.

Women express their emotions in rapport through personal feelings, stories, and listening. Catt catered to this through her storytelling and appeal to pathos. Men engage in report talk, an assertive speech that wins control of the conversation. Catt never told the men what to do but invited them into “we” by asking them if they would consider her plan. She was not overly emotional with them and presented her information with evidence, logic, and reasoning.

Men and women speak the same language but have their own dialect. Both genders have their own set of vocabulary and preferred topics. In this example, the men prefer talking about democracy and history. Women prefer talking about suffrage and suffrage leaders. Men talk to get things done (instrumental approach), which is why Catt presented her speech in a clear outline format. Women talk to interact with people (relational approach); Therefore, her speech comes across more like a conversation with exclamation points and all-caps wording.

The goal of genderlect is to have mutual understanding and respect between both genders. Catt was different from other suffragists because she was strong, feminine, and did not change to identify with men. Catt knew that this would not work. She knew she had to identify with men and women differently because the nature of each gender is different.

According to Genderlect, understanding why the opposite sex does what they do will not change them, but it will make the world more familiar with the other gender. Men and women both want to be heard but more so want to be understood. This increased understanding of both territories allowed Catt to acknowledge and appreciate the language they both speak. Catt was
respectful of both men and women, which made her the movement’s rhetorician. This is good criticism because Catt’s approach to gender made both sides feel acknowledged and appreciated.

Burke would be pleased with this result as Catt exemplified what identification is. According to Burke, identification is the simplest means of persuasion. Identification is not relating to others or having the same vision; it is a transformation between both parties. The goal of identification is to remove ambiguity from the situation and encourage cooperation amongst participants.

Although we do not know if Catt’s address to the U.S. legislature directly changed suffrage, we can infer that it did. This speech was heard worldwide, and one year later, suffrage was added to the United States Constitution. Similarly, Catt’s address to the women was centered around a debate over whether the NAWSA should move toward state-by-state ratification or federal ratification. After this speech, Catt achieved her goal and the NAWSA adopted the state ratification method: Catt’s “winning plan”.

Carrie Chapman Catt is an inspiration to all women. Catt proved that women do not have to be radically feminist to achieve equal rights for men and women. She proved that through mutual understanding and respect, women could be heard and make a change. Through her rhetoric, she provided women with practical ways to identify with men who may oppose them. Feminism, democracy, and gender equality are all interrelated. A statistical analysis done cross-nationally found that countries with greater democracy and more extended experience of women's suffrage have a higher proportion of the population that is female (Beer, 2009). The analysis shows a higher female life expectancy ratio to male life expectancy, lower fertility rates, and higher female labor force participation. Long-term democracy can provide new opportunities for women to promote their interests through government. Catt gave women this democracy to
share their ideas in government. She gave females in the U.S. a voice in government, democracy, and American politics.

This study contributes to the field of communication because it is the first time identification theory has been applied to Carrie Chapman Catt. Most studies done on the suffrage movement solely focus on women like Susan B. Anthony and Lucy Stone. Studying the rhetoric of Carrie Chapman Catt allows for a new analysis of a less famous but important figure in the movement. Studying her rhetoric gives a framework for future studies on identification through rhetoric using Burke’s seven tactics. In doing a rhetorical analysis, this study investigated and discovered how and why Catt strategically identified with men and women differently.
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Appendix A

Carrie Chapman Catt - “Open Address to the U.S. Congress” November 1917

Woman suffrage is inevitable. Suffragists knew it before November 6, 1917; opponents afterward. Three distinct causes make it inevitable.

(1) The history of our country. Ours is a nation born of revolution; of rebellion against a system of government so securely entrenched in the customs and traditions of human society that in 1776 it seemed impregnable. From the beginning of things nations had been ruled by kings and for kings, while the people served and paid the cost. The American Revolutionists boldly proclaimed the heresies:

"Taxation without representation is tyranny."

"Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

Our Theories Make Woman Suffrage Inevitable

The Colonists won and the nation which was established as a result of their victory has held unfailingy that these two fundamental principles of democratic government are not only the spiritual source of our national existence but have been our chief historic pride and at all times the sheer anchor of our liberties.

Eighty years after the Revolution Abraham Lincoln welded those two maxims into a new one: "Ours is a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

Fifty years more passed an the President of the United States, Woodrow Wilson, in a mighty crisis of the nation, proclaimed to the world: "We are fighting for the things which we have always carried nearest our hearts- for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own government."

All the way between these immortal aphorisms political leaders have declared unabated faith in their truth. Not one American has arisen to question their logic in the one hundred and forty-one years of our national existence. However stupidly our country may have evaded the logical application at times, it has never swerved from its devotion to the theory of democracy as expressed by those two axioms.

Not only has it unceasingly upheld the THEORY but it has carried these theories into PRACTICE whenever men made application.

Certain denominations of Protestants, Catholics, Jews, non-land holders, workingmen, Negroes, Indians, were at one time disfranchised in all, or in part, of our country. Class by class they have been admitted to the electorate. Political motives may have played their part in some instances but the only reason given by historians for their enfranchisement is the unassailability of the logic of these maxims of the Declaration.

Meantime the United States opened wide its gates to men of all the nations of the earth. By the combination of naturalization granted the foreigner after a five-years' residence by our national government and the uniform provision of the State constitutions which extends the vote to male citizens, it has been the custom in our country for three generations that any male immigrant, accepted by the national government as a citizen, automatically becomes a voter in any State in which he chooses to reside, subject only to the minor qualifications prescribed by the State.

Justifiable exceptions to the general principle might have been entered. Men just emerging from slavery, untrained to think or act for themselves and in most cases wholly illiterate, were not asked to qualify for voting citizenship. Not even as a measure of national caution has the vote ever been withheld from immigrants until they have learned our language, earned a certificate of fitness from our schools or given definite evidence of loyalty to our country. When such questions have been raised, political leaders have replied: "What! Tax men and in return give
them no vote; compel men to obey the authority of a government to which they may not give
consent! Never. That is un-American." So, it happens that men of all nations and all races, except
the Mongolian, may secure citizenship and automatically become voters in any State in the
Union, and even the Mongolian born in this country is a citizen and has the vote.
With such a history behind it, how can our nation escape the logic it has never failed to follow,
when its last unenfranchised class calls for the vote? Behold our Uncle Sam floating the banner
with the one hand, "Taxation without representation is tyranny." And with the other seizing the
billions of dollars paid in taxes by women to whom he refuses "representation." Behold him
again, welcoming the boys of twenty-one and the newly-made immigrant citizen to "a voice in
their own government" while he denies that fundamental right of democracy to thousands of
women public school teachers from whom many of these men learn all they know of citizenship
and patriotism, to women college presidents, to women who preach in our pulpits, interpret law
in our courts, preside over our hospitals, write books and magazines and serve in every uplifting
moral and social enterprise.
Is there a single man who can justify such inequality of treatment, such outrageous
discriminations? Not one.
Woman suffrage became an assured fact when the Declaration of Independence was written. It
matters not at all whether Thomas Jefferson and his compatriots though of women when they
wrote that immortal document. They conceived and voiced a principle greater than any man. "A
Power not of themselves which makes for righteousness" gave them the vision and they
proclaimed truisms as immutable as the multiplication table, as changeless as time. The Hon.
Champ Clark announced that he had been a woman suffragist ever since he "got the hang of the
Declaration of Independence." So it must be with every other American. The amazing thing is
that it has required so long a time for a people, most of whom know how to read, "to get the hang
of it." Indeed, so inevitable does our history make woman suffrage that any citizen; political
party, Congress or Legislature that now blocks its coming by so much as a single day,
contributes to the indefensible inconsistency which threatens to make our nation a jest among the
onward-moving peoples of the world.
Our Practice Makes Woman Suffrage Inevitable
(2) The suffrage for women already established in the United States makes woman suffrage for
the nation inevitable. When Elihu Root, as President of the American Society of International
Law, at the eleventh annual meeting in Washington, April 26, 1917, said, "The world cannot be
half democratic and half autocratic. It must be all democratic or all Prussian. There can be no
compromise," he voiced a general truth. Precisely the same intuition has already taught the
blindest and most hostile foe of woman suffrage that our nation cannot long continue a condition
under which government in half its territory rests upon the consent of half the people and in the
other half upon the consent of all the people; a condition which grants representation to the taxed
in half its territory and denies it in the other half; a condition which permits women in some
States to share in the election of the President, Senators and Representatives and denies them that
privilege in others. It is too obvious to require demonstration that woman suffrage now covering
half our territory, will eventually be ordained in all the nation. No one will deny it; the only
question left is when and how will it be completely established.
Our Leadership Makes Woman Suffrage Inevitable
(3) The leadership of the United States in world democracy compels the enfranchisement of its
own woman. The maxims of the Declaration were once called "fundamental principles of
government." They are now called "American principles" or even "Americanisms." They have
become the slogans of every movement toward political liberty the world around; of every effort
to widen the suffrage for men or women in any land. Not a people, race or class striving for
freedom is there, anywhere in the world that has not made our axioms the chief weapon of the
struggle. More all men and women the world around with far-sighted vision into the verities of
things, know that the world tragedy of our day is not now being waged over the assassination of
an Archduke, nor commercial competition, nor national ambitions, nor the freedom of the seas -
it is a death grapple between the forces which deny and those which uphold the truth of the
Declaration of Independence.
Our "Americanisms" have become the issue of the great war!
Every day the conviction grows deeper that a world humanity will emerge from the war,
demanding political liberty and accepting nothing less. In that new struggle there is little doubt
that men and women will demand and attain political liberty together. Today they are fighting
the world's battle for democracy together. Men and women are paying the frightful cost of war
and bearing its sad and sickening sorrows together. Tomorrow they will share its rewards
together in democracies which make no discriminations on account of sex.
These are new times and as an earnest of its sincerity in the battle for democracy, the government
of Great Britain has not only pledged votes to its disfranchised men and to its women, but the
measure passed the House of Commons in June, 1917, by a vote of 7 to 1 and will be sent to the
House of Lords in December with the assurance of Premier Lloyd George that it will shortly
become a national law. The measure will apply to England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and all the
smaller British islands.
Canada too has enfranchised the women of all its provinces starting from the Pacific Coast to
Northern New York, and the Premiere predicted votes for all Canadian women before the next
national election.
Russia, whose opposing forces have made a sad farce of the new poverty, is nevertheless pledged
to a democracy which shall include women. It must be remembered that no people ever passed
from absolute autocracy into a smoothly running democracy with ready-made constitution and a
full set of statutes to cover all conditions. Russia is no exception. She must have time to work out
her destiny. Except those maxims of democracy put forth by our own country, it is interesting to
note that the only one worthy of immortality is the slogan of the women of New Russia,
"Without the participation of women, suffrage is not universal."
France has pledged votes to its women as certainly as a Republic of Italian men have declared
woman suffrage an imperative issue when the war is over and have asked its consideration
before. The city of Paris (Bohemia) has appointed a Commission to report a new municipal
suffrage plan which shall include women. Even autocratic Germany debated the question in the
Imperial Reichstag.
In the words of Premier Lloyd George; "There are times in history when the world spins along its
destined course so leisurely that for centuries it seems to be at a standstill. Then come awful
times when time rushes along at so giddy a pace that the track of centuries is covered in a single
year. These are the times in which we now live."
It is true; democracy, votes for men and votes for women, making slow but certain progress in
1914, have suddenly become established facts in many lands in 1917. Already our one-time
mother Country has become the standard bearer of our Americanisms, the principles she (?)
denied, and - cynical fact - Great Britain, not the United States, is now leading the world on to
the coming democracy. (The present bill provides that the parliamentary note shall be extended
to women. All other suffrage rights on equal terms with men have long been enjoyed by the
women of England, Scotland, Ireland and Wales. The women of Canada have had municipal
suffrage for many years, the qualifications varying in different provinces, and the women of
Australia and New Zealand have long had full suffrage on equal terms with men. The
Scandinavian countries too have outstripped us is applied democracy and have taken the second
lead. Universal suffrage including women is already established in Finland, Norway, Denmark
and Iceland, even Sweden long ago gave women equal political rights with men except the vote
in Parliament. The King has twice recommended that this disability be removed and action is
promised soon.) Any man who has American blood in his veins, any man who has gloried in our
history and has rejoiced that our land was the leader of world democracy, will share with us the
humbled national pride that our country has so long delayed action upon this question that
another country has beaten us in what we thought was our especial world mission.

The Logic of the Situation Calls for Immediate Action

It is not clear that American history makes woman suffrage inevitable? That full suffrage in
twelve States makes its coming in all forty-eight States inevitable? That the spread of democracy
over the world, including votes for the women of many countries, in each case based upon the
principles our Republic gave to the world, compels action by our nation? Is it not clear that the
world expects such action and fails to understand its delay?

In the face of these facts we ask you, Senators and members of the House of Representatives of
the United States, is not the immediate enfranchisement of women of our nation the duty of the
hour?

Why hesitate? Not an inch of solid ground is left for the feet of the opponent. The world's war
has killed, buried and pronounced the obsequies upon the hard-worked "war argument." Mr.
Asquith, erstwhile champion anti-suffragist of the world, has said so and the British Parliament
has confirmed it by its enfranchisement of British women. The million and fifteen thousand
women of New York who signed a declaration that they wanted the vote, plus the heavy vote of
women in every State and country where women have the franchise, have finally and completely
disposed of the familiar "they don't want it" argument. Thousands of women annually emerging
from the schools and colleges have closed the debate upon the one-time serious "they don't know
enough" argument. The statistics of police courts and prisons have laid the ghost of the "too bad
to vote" argument. The woman who demanded the book and verse in the bible which gave men
the vote, declaring that the next verse gave it to women, brought the "Bible argument" to a
sudden end. The testimony of thousands of reputable citizens of our own suffrage States and of
all other suffrage lands that woman suffrage has brought no harm and much positive good, and
the absence of reputable citizens who deny these facts, has closed the "women only double the
vote" argument. The increasing number of women wage-earners, many supporting families and
some supporting husbands, has thrown out the "women are represented" argument. One by one
these pet misgivings have been delegated to the scrap heap of all rejected, cast-off prejudices.
Not an argument is left. The case against woman suffrage, carefully prepared by the combined
wit, skill and wisdom of opponents, including some men of ill repute, during sixty years, has
been closed. The jury of the New York electorate heard it all weighed the evidence and
pronounced it "incompetent, irrelevant and immaterial." Historians tell us that the battle of
Gettysburg brought our Civil War to an end, although the fighting lasted a year longer, because
the people who directed it did not see that the end had come. Had their sight been clearer, a
year's casualties of human life, desolated homes, high taxes and bitterness of spirit might have
been avoided. The battle of New York is the Gettysburg of woman suffrage movement. There
are those too blind to see that the end has come, and others, unrelenting and unreasoning, who
stubbornly deny that the end has come although they know it. These can compel the women of the nation to keep a standing suffrage army to finance and fight on until these blind and stubborn ones are gathered to their fathers and men with clear vision come to take their places but the casualty will be sex antagonism, party antagonism, bitterness, resentment, contempt, hate and the things which grow out of a rankling grievance and democratically denied process. These things are not mentioned in the spirit of threat, but merely to voice well known principles of historical psychology.

Benjamin Franklin once said "The cost of war is not paid at war time, the bills come afterwards" So too the nation, refusing justice when justice is due finds the costs accumulating and the bills presented at unexpected and embarrassing times. Think it over.

If enfranchisement is to be given to women now, how is it to be done? Shall it be by amendment of State constitutions or by amendment or the Federal Constitution? There are no other ways. The first sends the question from the Legislature by referendum to all male voters to the State; the other sends the question from Congress to the Legislature of the several States.

Three Reasons for the Federal Method

We elect the Federal method. There are three reasons why we make this choice and three reasons why we reject the state method. We choose the Federal method 1.) because it is the quickest process and justly demands immediate action. If passed by the Sixty-fifth Congress, as it should be, the amendment will go to forty-one Legislatures in 1919, and when thirty-six have ratified it, will become a national law. In 1869 Wyoming led the way and 1919 will round out half a century of the most self-sacrificing struggle any class ever made for the vote. It is enough. The British women's suffrage army will be mustered out at the end of their half century of similar endeavor. Surely men of the land of George Washington will not require a longer time than those of the land of George the Third to discover that taxation without representation is tyranny- no matter whether it be men or women who are taxed! We may justly expect American men to be as willing to grant to the women of the United States generous consideration as those of great Britain have done.

2) Every other country dignifies woman suffrage as a national question. Even Canada and Australia, composed of self-governing states like our own, who regard it. Were the precedent not established our own national government has taken a step which makes the treatment of woman suffrage as a national question imperative. For the first time in our history Congress has imposed a direct tax upon women and has thus deliberately violated the most fundamental and sacred principle of our government, since it offers no compensating "representation" for the tax it imposes. Unless separation is made it becomes the same kind of tyrant as was George the Third. When the exemption for unmarried persons under the Income Tax was reduced to $1000, the Congress laid the tax upon thousands of wage-earning women - teachers, doctors, lawyers, bookkeepers, secretaries and the proprietors of many businesses. Such women are earning their incomes under hard conditions of economic inequalities largely due to their disfranchisement. Many of these, while fighting their own economic battle, have been contributors to the campaign for suffrage that they might bring easier conditions for all women. Now those contributions will be deflected from suffrage treasuries into government funds through taxation. Women realize the dire need of huge government resources at this time and will make no protest against the tax but it must be understood, and understood clearly, that the protest is here just the same and that women income taxpayers with few exceptions harbor a genuine grievance against the government of the United States. The national government is guilty of the violation of the principle that the tax and the vote are inseparable; it alone can make amends. Two ways are
open: exempt the women the Income Tax or grant them the vote - there can be no compromise.

To shift responsibility from Congress to the States is to invite the scorn of every human being who has learned to reason. A congress which mandates the law and has the power to violate a world-acknowledged axiom of just government can also command the law and the power to the Congress of the United States, we must and do look for this act of primary justice.

3) If the entire forty-eight States should severally enfranchise women, their political status would still be inferior to that of men, since no provision for national protection in their right to vote would exist. The women of California or new York are not wholly enfranchised for the national government has not denied the States the right to deprive them of the vote. This protection can come only by Federal action. Therefore, since women will eventually be forced to demand congressional action in order to equalize the rights of men and women, why not take such action now and thus shorten and ease the process. When such submission is secured, as it will be, forty-eight simultaneous State ratification campaigns will be necessary. By the State method, thirty-six States would be obliged to have individual campaigns, and those would still have to be followed by the forty-eight additional campaigns to secure the final protection in their right to vote by the national government. We propose to conserve money, time and woman's strength by the elimination of the thirty-six State campaigns as unnecessary to this stage of the progress of the woman suffrage movement.

Three Reasons Against the State Method

The three reasons why we object to the State amendment process are: 1) The constitutions of many States contain such difficult provisions for amending that it is practically impossible to carry and amendment at the polls. Several States require a majority of all the votes cast at an election to insure the passage of an amendment. As the number of persons voting on amendments is usually considerably smaller than the number voting for the head of the ticket, the effect of such provision is that a majority of those men who do not vote at all on the amendment are counted as voting against it. For example, imagine a State casting 100,000 votes for Governor and 80,000 on a woman suffrage amendment. That proportion would be a usual one. Now suppose there were 45,000 votes in favor and 35,000 against woman suffrage. The amendment would have been carried by 10,000 majority in a State which requires only a majority of the votes cast at the election, the amendment would be lost by 10,000 majority. The men who were either too ignorant, too indifferent or too careless to vote on the question would have defeated it. Such constitutions have rarely been amended and then only on some non-controversial question which the dominant powers have agreed to support with the full strength of their "machines."

New Mexico, for example, requires three-fourths of those voting at an election, including two-thirds from each county. New Mexico is surrounded by suffrage States but the women who live there probably can secure enfranchisement only by federal action. The Indiana constitution provides that a majority of all voters is necessary to carry an amendment; thus the courts may decide that registered voters who did not go to the polls at all may be counted in the number, a majority of whom it is necessary to secure. The constitution cannot be amended. The courts have declared that the constitution prohibits the legislature from granting suffrage to women. What then can the women of Indiana do? They have no other hope than the Federal Amendment.

Several State constitutions stipulate that a definite period of time must elapse before an amendment defeated at the polls can again be submitted. New York has no such provision and the second campaign of 1917 immediately followed the first in 1915; but Pennsylvania and New Jersey, both voting on the question in 1915, cannot vote on it again before 1920. New Hampshire has no provision for the submission of an amendment by the Legislature at all. A Constitutional
Convention alone has the right to submit an amendment, and such conventions can not be called oftener than once in seven years. The constitutional complications in many of the States are numerous, varied and difficult to overcome.

All careful investigators must arrive at the same conclusion that the only hope for the enfranchisement of the women of several States is through Congressional action. Since this is true, we hold it unnecessary to force women to pass through any more referenda campaigns. The hazards of the State constitutional provisions which women are expected to overcome in order to get the vote, as compared with the easy process by which the vote is fairly thrust upon foreigners who choose to make their residence among us, is so offensive an outrage to one's sense of justice that a woman's rebellion would surely have been fomented long ago had women not known that the discrimination visited upon them was without deliberate intent.

The continuation of this condition is, however, the direct responsibility now of every man who occupies a position authorized to right the wrong. You are such men, Honorable Senators and Representatives. To you we appeal to remove a grievance more insulting than any nation in the wide world has put upon its women.

2) The second reason why we object to the State process is far more serious and important than the first. It is because the statutory laws governing elections are so inadequate and defective as to vouchsafe little or no protection to a referendum in most States. The need for such protection seems to have been universally overlooked by the lawmakers. Bipartisan election boards offer efficient machinery whereby the representatives of one political party may check any irregularities of the other. The interests of all political parties in an election are further protected by partisan watchers. None of these provisions is available to those interested in a referendum. In most States women may not serve as watchers and no political party assumes responsibility for a non-partisan question. In the State of New York women may serve as watchers. They did so serve in 1915 and in 1917; nearly every one in the more than 5,000 polling places was covered by efficiently trained women watchers. The women believe that this fact had much to do with the favorable result.

In twenty-four States there is no law providing for a recount on a referendum. Voters may be bribed, colonized, repeated and the law provides for no possible redress. In some States corrupt voters may be arrested, tried and punished, but that does not remove their votes from the total vote cast nor in any way change the results. When questions which are supported by men's organizations go to referendum, such as prohibition, men interested may secure posts as election officials or party watchers and thus be in position to guard the purity of the election. This privilege is not open to women.

That corrupt influences have exerted their full power against woman suffrage, we know well. I have myself seen blocks of men marched to the polling booth and paid money in plain sight both men and bribers flaunting the fact boldly that they were "beating the women." I have myself seen men who could not speak a word of English; nor write their names in any language, driven to the polls like sheep to vote against woman suffrage and no law at the time could punish them for the musses of the vote so cheaply extended to them, nor change the result.

It is our sincere belief based upon evidence which has been completely convincing to us that the returns were juggled and the amendment counted out. We have given to such campaigns our money, our time, our strength, our very lives. We have believed the amendment carried and yet have seen our cause announced as lost. We are tired of playing the State campaign game with "the political dice loaded and the cards stacked" against us before we begin. The position of such an amendment is precisely like that of the defendant in a case brought before an inexperienced
judge. After having heard the plaintiff, he untactfully remarked that he would listen to the
defendant's remarks but he was bound to tell him in advance that he proposed to give the verdict
to the plaintiff. From this lower court, often unscrupulous in its unfairness, we appeal to the
higher, the Congress and the Legislatures of the United States.
3) The third reason why we object to the State method is even more weighty than either or both
of the others. It is because the State method fixes responsibility upon no one. The Legislatures
pass the question on to the voters and have no further interest in it. The political parties, not
knowing how the election may decide the matter, are loth to espouse the cause of woman
suffrage, lest if it loses, they will have alienated from their respective parties the support of
enemies of woman suffrage.
Contributors to campaign funds have at times stipulated the return service of the party machinery
to defeat woman suffrage, and as such contributors are silly enough to make certain of their
protection, they often contribute to both dominant parties. Thousands of men in every State have
become so accustomed to accept party nominations and platforms as their unquestioned guide
that they ruffle to act upon a political question without instruction from their leaders. When the
leaders pass the word along the line to defeat a woman suffrage amendment, it is impossible to
carry it. It is not submitted to an electorate of thinking voters whose reason must be convinced,
but to such voters, plus political "machines" skillfully organized, servilely obedient, who have
their plans laid to defeat the question at the polls even before it leaves the legislature. From a
condition where no one is irresponsible for the procedure of the amendment through the hazards
of an election, why every enemy may effectively hide his enmity and the methods employed
behind the barriers of constitutions and election laws, we appeal to a method which will bring
our cause into the open where every person or party, friend or foe involved in the campaign, may
be held responsible to the public. We appeal from the method which has kept the women in this
country disfranchised a quarter of a century after their enfranchisement was due, to the method
by which the vote has been granted to the men and women of other lands. We do so with the
certain assurance that every believer in fair play, regardless of party fealties, will approve our
decision.
These are the three reasons why we elect the federal method and the three reasons why we reject
the State method. We are so familiar with the objections Congressional opponents tirge against
suffrage by the federal method that we know those objections also curiously number three.
Three Objections Answered
Objection No. 1. War time is not the proper time to consider the question. Two neutral
countries, Iceland and Denmark, and three belligerent countries, Canada, Russia and Great
Britain, have enfranchised their women during war time and they have been engaged in war for
three and a half years. That which is a proper time for such countries is surely proper enough for
us.
More, it is not our fault, you will admit, that this question is still unsettled in 1917. If our urgent
advice had been taken it would have been disposed of twenty-five years ago and our nation
would now be proudly leading the world to democracy instead of following in third place. Had
Congress "got the hand of the Declaration of Independence" then more men today would know
understand what a world's war "to make the world safe for democracy" means.
In 1866 an Address to Congress was adopted by a Suffrage Convention held in New York and
presented to Congress later by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton. They protested
against the enfranchisement of Negro men while women remained disfranchised as asked for
Congressional action. That was fifty-one years ago in 1867, the Federal suffrage Amendment
now pending was introduced in Congress at the request of the National Woman Suffrage Association and has been reintroduced in each succeeding Congress. The representatives of this Association have appeared before the Committees of every Congress since 1878 to urge its passage. The women who made the first appeal, brave, splendid souls, have long since passed into the Beyond, and every one died knowing that the country she loved and served classified her as a political pariah. Every Congress has seen the Committee Rooms packed with anxious women yearning for the declaration of their nation that they were no longer to be classed with idiots, criminals and paupers. Every State has sent its quota of women to those Committees. Among them have been the daughters of Presidents, Governors, Chief Justices, Speakers of the House, leaders of political parties and leaders of great movements. List the women of the last century whose names will pass into history among the immortals and scarcely one is there who has not appeared before your committees - Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucy Stone, Mary A. Livermore, Lillie Devereux Blake, Julia Ward Howe, Harriet Beecher Stowe, Frances Willard, Clara Barton and hundreds more. There are hundreds of women in the suffrage convention now sitting who have paid out more money in railroad fare to come to Washington in order to persuade men that "women are people" than all the men in the entire country ever paid to get a vote. Perhaps you think our pleas in those Committee Rooms were poor attempts at logic. Ah, one chairman of the committee long ago said to a fellow member; "There is no man living or dead who could answer the arguments of those women," and then he added, "but I'd rather see my wife dead in her coffin than going to vote." Yet, there are those of you who have said that women are illogical and sentimental! Since Congress has already had fifty-one years of peace in which to deal with the question of woman suffrage, we hold that a further postponement is unwarranted.

Objection No. 2 A vote on this question by Congress and the Legislatures is undemocratic; it should go to the "people" of the States. You are wrong, gentlemen, as your reason will quickly tell you, if you will reflect a moment. When a State submits a constitutional amendment to male voters, it does a legal, constitutional thing, but when that amendment chiefly concerns one-half the people of the State and the law permits the other half to settle it the wildest stretch of the imagination could not describe the process as democratic. Democracy means "the rule-of-people," and, let me repeat, women are people. No state referendum goes to the people; it goes to the male voters. Such referenda can not be democratic. Were the question of woman suffrage to be submitted a vote of both sexes, the action would be democratic, but in that use would not be legal nor constitutional.

Male voters have never been named by any constitution or statute the representatives of women; we therefore decline to accept them that capacity. The nearest approach to representation allowed votes to women are the members of congress and the Legislatures. These members are apportioned among the several States upon the basis of population and not upon the basis of number of voters. Therefore every congressman theoretically represents the women of his constituency as well as the male voters. He is theoretically responsible to them and to they may properly go to him for redress of such grievances as fall within jurisdiction. More, every member of Congress not only represents small constituency confined to his district, but all the people of country, since his vote upon national questions affects them all. Women whether voters or non-voters, may properly claim members of congress as the only substitution for representation provided by the constitution. We apply to you, therefore, to correct a grievous wrong which your constitutional jurisdiction gives you authority to set right.
Objection No. 3  States Rights. You pronounce it unfair that thirty-six States should determine who may vote in the remaining twelve; the possible Republican Northern States should decide who may vote in Democratic Southern States. It is no more unfair than that some counties within a State should decide who may vote in the remaining counties is no more unfair than that the Democratic city of New York should disfranchise the women of the Republican cities of Albany and Rochester as it has just done. Forty-eight States will have the opportunity to ratify the Federal Amendment and every State, therefore, will have its opportunity to disfranchise its own women in this manner. If any State fails to do it, they may agree that that State would probably not enfranchise its own women by the State method, but if it would not so disfranchise them that State is behind the times and is holding our country up to the scorn of other nations. It has failed to catch the vision and the spirit of Democracy sweeping over the world. This nation cannot, must not, wait for any State, ignorant, backward. That State more than all others needs woman suffrage to shake its dry bones, to bring political questions into the home and set discussion going. It needs education, action, stimulation to prevent atrophy. In after years posterity will utter grateful thanks that there was a method which could throw a bit of modernity into it from the outside.

It is urged that the women of some such States do not want the vote. Of course if the thought of an entire State is antiquated, its women will share the general stagnation but there is no State where there is not a large number of women who are working, and working hard, for the vote. The vote is permissive, a liberty extended. It is never a burden laid upon the individual, since there is no obligation to exercise the right. On the other hand, the refusal to permit those who want the vote to have and to use it is oppression, tyranny and no other words describe the condition. When therefore, men within a State are so ungenerous or unprogressive, or stubborn as to continue the denial of the vote to the women who want it, men on the outside should have no scruples in constituting themselves the liberators of those women.

Despite these truths there are among you those who still harbor honest misgivings. Please remember that woman suffrage is coming; you know it is. In this connection, have you ever thought that the women of your own families who may tell you now that they do not want the vote are going to realize someday that there is something insincere in your protestations of chivalry protection and "you are too good to vote, my dear," they are going to discover that the trust, respect, and frank acknowledgment of equality which men of other States have given their women are something infinitely higher and nobler than you have ever offered them? Have you thought that you may now bestow upon them a liberty that they may not yet realize they need, but that tomorrow they may storm your castle and command? Do you suppose that any woman in the land is going to be content with unenfranchisement when she once comprehends that men of other countries have given women the vote? Do you not see that when that time comes to her she is going to ask why you, her husband, her father, who were so placed, perhaps, that you could observe the progress of world affairs, did not see the coming change of custom and save her from the humiliation of having to beg for that which women in other countries are already enjoying?

Have you known that no more potent influence has aroused the sheltered and consequently narrow visioned woman into a realization that she wanted to be a part of enfranchised class than the manner in which men treat enfranchised women? There is no patronizing "I am holier than thou" air, but in equality of "fellow citizens." One never sees that relation between men and women except where women vote. Some day that woman who does know the world is moving on and leaving her behind will see and know these things. What will she say and do then? What will you do for her now?
There are many well known men in Great Britain who frankly confess that their desire to give
British women the vote is founded upon their sense of gratitude for the loyal and remarkable war
service women have performed. They speak of suffrage as a reward. For years women have
asked the vote as a recognition of the incontrovertible fact that they are responsible, intelligent
citizens of the country and because its denial has been an outrageous discrimination against their
sex. British women will receive their enfranchisement with joyous appreciation but the joy will
be lessened and the appreciation tempered by the perfect understanding that "vote as a reward" is
only an escape from the uncomfortable corner into which the unanswerable logic of the women
have driven the government. Mutual respect between those who give and those who receive the
vote would have been promoted had the inevitable duty not been deferred. We hope American
men will be wiser.
Other men of other lands have thrown aside traditions as tenderly revered as yours in response
for the higher call of Justice, Progress and Democracy. Can you, too, not rise to this same call
of duty? Is any good to be served by continuing one injustice in order to resent another injustice?
We are one nation and those of us who live now and make our appeal to you are like yourselves
not of the generation whose differences created the conditions which entrenched the tradition of
State's Rights. We ask you, our representatives to right the wrong done us by the law of our land
as the men of other lands have done.
Our nation is in the extreme crisis of its existence and men would search their very souls to find
just and reasonable causes for every thought and act. If you, making this search shall find "State's
Rights" a sufficient cause to lead you to vote "no" on the Federal Suffrage Amendment, then,
with all the gentleness which should accompany the reference to a sacred memory, let us tell you
that your cause will bear neither the test of time nor critical analysis, and that your vote will
compel your children to apologize for your act.
Already your vote has forwarded some of the measures which are far more distinctly State
Rights questions than the fundamental demean for equal human rights. Among such questions
are the regulation of child labor, the eight-hour law, the white slave traffic, moving picture,
questionable literature, food supply, clothing supply, prohibition. All of these acts are in the
direction of the restraint of "personal liberty" in the supposed interest of the public good. Every
instinct of justice, every principle of logic and ethics is shocked at the reasoning which grants
Congress the right to curtail personal liberty but no right to extend it. "Necessity knows no law"
may seem to you sufficient authority to tax the incomes of women, to demand exhausting
amounts of volunteer military service, to commandeer women for public work and in other ways
to restrain their liberty as war measures. But by the same token the grant of more liberty may
properly be conferred as a war measure. If other lands have been brave enough to extend
suffrage to women in war time, our own counter, the mother of democracy, surely will not
hesitate. We are told that a million or more American men will be on European battle fields ere
many months. For every man who goes, there is one loyal woman and probably more who would
vote to support to the most that man's cause. The disloyal men will be here to vote. Suffrage for
women now as a war measure means suffrage for the loyal forces for those who know what it
means "to fight to keep the world safe for democracy."
The framers of the Constitution gave unquestioned authority to Congress to act upon women
suffrage. Why not use that authority and use it now to do the big, noble, just thing of catching
pace with other nations on this question of democracy? The world and posterity will honor you
for it.

In Conclusion
In conclusion, we know, and you know that we know, that it has been the aim of both dominate parties to postpone woman suffrage as long as possible. A few men in each party have always fought with us fearlessly, but the party machines have evaded, avoided, tricked and buffeted this question from Congress to Legislatures, from Legislatures, to political conventions. I confess to you that many of us have a deep and abiding distrust of all existing political parties - they have tricked us so often and in such unscrupulous fashion that our doubts are natural. Some of you are leaders of those parties and all are members. Your parties we also know have a distrust and suspicion of new women voters. Let us counsel together. Woman suffrage is inevitable - you know it. The political parties will go on - we know it. Shall we then be enemies of friends? Can party leaders in twelve States really obtain the loyal support of women voters when those women know that the same party is ordering the defeat of amendments in States where campaigns are pending, or delaying action in congress in the Federal Amendment? Gentlemen, we ask you to put yourselves in our places. What would you do? Would you keep on spending your money and your lives on a slow, laborious, flimsy state method, or would you use the votes you have won to complete your campaign on behalf of suffrage for all women in the nation? Would you be content to keep a standing army of women to hold off for the special work of educating men in the meaning of democracy; would you raise and spend millions of dollars in the process; would you give up every other thing in life you hold dear in order to keep State campaigns going for another possible quarter of a century? Would you do this and see the women of other countries leaving you behind, or would you make "a hard pull, a long pull and a pull altogether" and finish the task at once? You know you would choose the latter. We make the same choice.

Do you realize that in no other country in the world with democratic tendencies is suffrage so completely denied as in a considerable number of our own States? There are 13 black States where no suffrage for women exists, and 14 others where suffrage for women is more limited than in many foreign countries.

Do you realize that when you ask women to take their cause to State referendum you compel them to do this; that you drive women of education, refinement, achievement, to beg men who cannot read for their political freedom?

Do you realize that such anomalies as a College President asking her janitor to give her a vote are overstraining the patience and driving women to desperation?

Do you realize that women in increasing numbers indignantly resent the long delay in their enfranchisement?

Your party platforms have pledged woman suffrage. Then why not be honest, frank friends of our cause, adopt it in reality as your own, make it a party program and "fight with us"? As a party measure--a measure of all parties--why not put the amendment through Congress and the Legislatures? We shall all be better friends, we shall have a happier nation, we women will be free to support loyally the party of our choice and we shall be far prouder of our history.

"There is one thing mightier than kings and armies"--aye, than Congresses and political parties--"the power of an idea when its time has come to move." The time for woman suffrage has come. The woman's hour has struck. If parties prefer to postpone action longer and thus do battle with this idea, they challenge the inevitable. The idea will not perish; the party which opposes it may. Every delay, every trick, every political dishonesty from now on will antagonize the women of the land more and more, and when the party or parties which have so delayed woman suffrage finally let it come, their sincerity will be doubted and their appeal to the new voters will be met with suspicion. This is the psychology of the situation. Can you afford the risk? Think it over.
We know you will meet opposition. There are a few "woman haters" left, a few "old males of the tribe," as Vance Thompson calls them, whose duty they believe it to be to keep women in the places they have carefully picked out for them. Treitschke, made world famous by war literature, said some years ago: "Germany, which knows all about Germany and France, knows far better what is good for Alsace-Lorraine than that miserable people can possibly know." A few American Treitschkes we have who know better than women what is good for them. There are women, too, with "slave souls" and "clinging vines" for backbones. There are female dolls and male dandies. But the world does not wait for such as these, nor does Liberty pause to heed the plaint of men and women with a grouch. She does not wait for those who have a special interest to serve, nor a selfish reason for depriving other people of freedom. Holding her torch aloft, Liberty is pointing the way onward and upward and saying to America, "Come."

To you the supporters of our cause, in Senate and House, and the number is large, the suffragists of the nation express their grateful thanks. This address is not meant for you. We are more truly appreciative of all you have done than any words can express. We ask you to make a last, hard fight for the amendment during the present session. Since last we asked a vote on this amendment your position has been fortified by the addition to suffrage territory of Great Britain, Canada and New York.

Some of you have been too indifferent to give more than casual attention to this question. It is worthy of your immediate consideration--a question big enough to engage the attention of our Allies in war time, is too big a question for you to neglect.

Some of you have grown old in party service. Are you willing that those who take your places by and by shall blame you for having failed to keep pace with the world and thus having lost for them a party advantage? Is there any real gain for you, for your party, for the nation by delay? Do you want to drive the progressive men and women out of your party?

Some of you hold to the doctrine of State's rights, as applying to woman suffrage. Adherence to that theory will keep the United States far behind all other democratic nations in action upon this question. A theory which prevents a nation from keeping up with the trend of world progress cannot be justified.

Many of you have admitted that "State's Rights" is less a principle than a tradition- a tradition, however, which we all know is rooted deep in the memory of bitter and, let us say, regrettable incidents of history. But the past is gone. We are living in the present and facing the future. Gentlemen, we hereby petition you, our only designated representatives, to redress our grievances by the immediate passage of the influence to secure its ratification in your own state, in order that the women of our nation may be endowed with political freedom that our nation may resume its world leadership in democracy.

Woman suffrage is coming--you know it. Will you, Honorable Senators and Members of the House of Representatives, help or hinder it?
Appendix B
“The Crisis” – Carrie Chapman Catt September 17, 1916 Atlantic City, New Jersey

I have taken for my subject, "The Crisis," because I believe that a crisis has come in our
movement which, if recognized and the opportunity seized with vigor, enthusiasm and will,
means the final victory of our great cause in the very near future. I am aware that some
suffragists do not share this belief; they see no signs nor symptoms today which were not present
yesterday; no manifestations in the year 1916 which differ significantly from those in the year
1910. To them, the movement has been a steady, normal growth from the beginning and must so
continue until the end. I can only defend my claim with the plea that it is better to imagine a
危机 where none exists than to fail to recognize one when it comes; for a crisis is a culmination
of events which calls for new considerations and new decisions.

A failure to answer the call may mean an opportunity lost, a possible victory postponed. The
object of the life of an organized movement is to secure its aim. Necessarily, it must obey the law
of evolution and pass through the stages of agitation and education and finally through the stage
of realization. As one has put it: "A new idea floats in the air over the heads of the people and for
a long, indefinite period evades their understanding but, by and by, when through familiarity,
human vision grows clearer, it is caught out of the clouds and crystalized into law." Such a
period comes to every movement and is its crisis.

In my judgment, that crucial moment, bidding us to renewed consecration and redoubled activity
has come to our cause. I believe our victory hangs within our grasp, inviting us to pluck it out of
the clouds and establish it among the good things of the world.

If this be true, the time is past when we should say: "Men and women of America, look upon that
wonderful idea up there; see, one day it will come down." Instead, the time has come to shout
aloud in every city, village and hamlet, and in tones so clear and jubilant that they will
reverberate from every mountain peak and echo from shore to shore: "The woman's Hour has
struck." Suppose suffragists as a whole do not believe a crisis has come and do not extend their
hands to grasp the victory, what will happen? Why, we shall all continue to work and our cause
will continue to hang, waiting for those who possess a clearer vision and more daring enterprise.
On the other hand, suppose we reach out with united earnestness and determination to grasp our
victory while it still hangs a bit too high? Has any harm been done? None!

Therefore, fellow suffragists, I invite your attention to the signs which point to a crisis and your
consideration of plans for turning the crisis into victory.

FIRST: We are passing through a world crisis. All thinkers of every land tell us so; and that
nothing after the great war will be as it was before. Those who profess to know, claim that 100
millions of dollars are being spent on the war every day and that 2 years of war have cost 50
billion of dollars or 10 times more than the total expense of the American Civil War. Our own
country has sent 35 millions of dollars abroad for relief expenses.

Were there no other effects to come from the world's war, the transfer of such unthinkably vast
sums of money from the usual avenues to those wholly abnormal would give so severe a jolt to
organized society that it would vibrate around the world and bring untold changes in its wake.
But three and a half millions of lives have been lost. The number becomes the more impressive
when it is remembered that the entire population of the American Colonies was little more than
three and one-half millions. These losses have been the lives of men within the age of economic
production. They have been taken abruptly from the normal business of the world and every
human activity from that of the humblest, unskilled labor to art, science and literature has been
weakened by their loss. Millions of other men will go to their homes, blind, crippled and
incapacitated to do the work they once performed. The stability of human institutions has never
before suffered so tremendous a shock. Great men are trying to think out the consequences but
one and all proclaim that no imagination can find color or form bold enough to paint the picture
of the world after the war. British and Russian, German and Austrian, French and Italian agree
that it will lead to social and political revolution throughout the entire world. Whatever comes,
they further agree that the war presages a total change in the status of women.

A simple-minded man in West Virginia, when addressed upon the subject of woman suffrage in
that State, replied, "We've been so used to keepin' our women down, 'twould seem queer not to."
He expressed what greater men feel but do not say. Had the wife of that man spoken in the same
clear-thinking fashion, she would have said, "We women have been so used to being kept down
that it would seem strange to get up. Nature intended women for door-mats." Had she so
expressed herself, these two would have put the entire anti-suffrage argument in a nut-shell.

In Europe, from the Polar Circle to the Aegean Sea, women have risen as though to answer that
argument. Everywhere they have taken the places made vacant by men and in so doing, they
have grown in self-respect and in the esteem of their respective nations. In every land, the people
have reverted to the primitive division of labor and while the men have gone to war, women have
cultivated the fields in order that the army and nation may be fed. No army can succeed and no
nation can endure without food; those who supply it are a war power and a peace power.

Women by the thousands have knocked at the doors of munition factories and, in the name of
patriotism, have begged for the right to serve their country there. Their services were accepted
with hesitation but the experiment once made, won reluctant but universal praise. An official
statement recently issued in Great Britain announced that 660,000 women were engaged in
making munitions in that country alone. In a recent convention of munition workers, composed
of men and women, a resolution was unanimously passed informing the government that they
would forego vacations and holidays until the authorities announced that their munition supplies
were sufficient for the needs of the war and Great Britain pronounced the act the highest
patriotism. Lord Derby addressed such a meeting and said, "When the history of the war is
written, I wonder to whom the greatest credit will be given; to the men who went to fight or to
the women who are working in a way that many people hardly believed that it was possible for
them to work." Lord Sydenham added his tribute. Said he, "It might fairly be claimed that
women have helped to save thousands of lives and to change the entire aspect of the war.
Wherever intelligence, care and close attention have been needed, women have distinguished
themselves." A writer in the London Times of July 18, 1916, said: "But, for women, the armies
could not have held the field for a month; the national call to arms could not have been made or
sustained; the country would have perished of inanition and disorganization. If, indeed, it be true
that the people have been one, it is because the genius of women has been lavishly applied to the
task of reinforcing and complementing the genius of men. The qualities
of steady industry,
adaptability, good judgement and concentration of mind which men do not readily associate with
women have been conspicuous features."

On fields of battle, in regular and improvised hospitals, women have given tender and skilled
care to the wounded and are credited with the restoration of life to many, heroism and self-
sacrifice have been frankly acknowledged by all the governments; but their endurance, their
skill, the practicality of their service, seem for the first time, to have been recognized by
governments as "war power". So, thinking in war terms, great men have suddenly discovered
that women are "war assets". Indeed, Europe is realizing, as it never did before, that women are
holding together the civilization for which men are fighting. A great search-light has been 
thrown upon the business of nation-building and it has been demonstrated in every European 
land that it is a partnership with equal, but different responsibilities resting upon the two 
partners.

It is not, however, in direct war work alone that the latent possibilities of women have been made 
manifest. In all the belligerent lands, women have found their way to high posts of 
administration where no women would have been trusted two years ago and the testimony is 
overwhelming that they have filled their posts with entire satisfaction to the authorities. They 
have dared to stand in pulpits (once too sacred to be touched by the unholy feet of a woman) and 
there, without protest, have appealed to the Father of All in behalf of their stricken lands. They 
have come out of the kitchen where there was too little to cook and have found a way to live by 
driving cabs, motors and streetcars. Many a woman has turned her hungry children over to a 
neighbor and has gone forth to find food for both mothers and both families of children and has 
found it in strange places and occupations. Many a drawing-room has been closed and the maid 
who swept and dusted it is now cleaning streets that the health of the city may be conserved. 
Many a woman who never before slept in a bed of her own making, or ate food not prepared by 
paid labor, is now sole mistress of parlor and kitchen.

In all the warring countries, women are postmen [sic], porters, railway conductors, ticket, switch 
and signal men. Conspicuous advertisements invite women to attend agricultural, milking and 
motor-car schools. They are employed as police in Great Britain and women detectives have 
recently been taken on the government staff. In Berlin, there are over 3,000 women streetcar 
conductors and 3,500 women are employed on the general railways. In every city and country, 
women are doing work for which they would have been considered incompetent two years ago.
The war will soon end and the armies will return to their native lands. To many a family, the men 
will never come back. The husband who returns to many a wife, will eat no bread the rest of his 
life save of her earning.

What then, will happen after the war? Will the widows left with families to support cheerfully 
leave their well-paid posts for those commanding lower wages? Not without protest! Will the 
wives who now must support crippled husbands give up their skilled work and take up the 
occupations which were open to them before the war? Will they resignedly say: "The woman 
who has a healthy husband who can earn for her, has a right to tea and raisin cake, but the 
woman who earns for herself and a husband who has given his all to his country, must be content 
with butterless bread?" Not without protest! On the contrary, the economic axiom, denied and 
evaded for centuries, will be blazoned on every factory, counting house and shop: "Equal pay for 
equal work"; and common justice will slowly, but surely enforce that law. The European woman 
has risen. She may not realize it yet, but the woman "door-mat" in every land has unconsciously 
become a "door-jamb"! She will have become accustomed to her new dignity by the time the 
men come home. She will wonder how she ever could have been content lying across the 
threshold now that she discovers the upright jamb gives so much broader and more normal a 
vision of things. The men returning may find the new order a bit queer but everything else will 
be strangely unfamiliar too, and they will soon grow accustomed to all the changes together. The 
"jamb" will never descend into a "door-mat" again.
The male and female anti-suffragists of all lands will puff and blow at the economic change 
which will come to the women of Europe. They will declare it to be contrary to Nature and to 
God's plan and that somebody ought to do something about it. Suffragists will accept the change
as the inevitable outcome of an unprecedented world’s cataclysm over which no human agency
had any control and will trust in God to adjust the altered circumstances to the eternal evolution
of human society. They will remember that in the long run, all things work together for good, for
progress and for human weal.
The economic change is bound to bring political liberty. From every land, there comes the
expressed belief that the war will be followed by a mighty, oncoming wave of democracy for it is
now well known that the conflict has been one of governments, of kings and Czars, Kaisers and
Emperors; not of peoples. The nations involved have nearly all declared that they are fighting to
make an end of wars. New and higher ideals of governments and of the rights of the people
under them, have grown enormously during the past two years. Another tide of political liberty,
similar to that of 1848, but of a thousandfold greater momentum, is rising from battlefield and
hospital, from camp and munitions factory, from home and church which, great men of many
lands, tell us, is destined to sweep over the world. On the continent, the women say, "It is certain
that the vote will come to men and women after the war, perhaps not immediately but soon. In
Great Britain, which was the storm centre of the suffrage movement for some years before the
war, hundreds of bitter, active opponents have confessed their conversion on account of the war
services of women. Already, three great provinces of Canada, Manitoba, Alberta, and
Saskatchewan [sic], have given universal suffrage to their women in sheer generous appreciation
of their war work. Even Mr. Asquith, world renounced [sic] for his immovable opposition to the
Parliamentary suffrage for British women, has given evidence of a change of view.2 Some
months ago, he announced his amazement at the utterly unexpected skill, strength and resource
developed by the women and his gratitude for their loyalty and devotion. Later, in reply to Mrs.
Henry Fawcett, who asked if woman suffrage would be included in a proposed election bill, he
said that when the war should end, such a measure would be considered without prejudice
carried over from events prior to the war.3 A public statement issued by Mr. Asquith in August,
was couched in such terms as to be interpreted by many as a pledge to include women in the next
election bill.
In Great Britain, a sordid appeal which may prove the last straw to break the opposition to
woman suffrage, has been added to the enthusiastic appreciation of woman's patriotism and
practical service and to the sudden comprehension that motherhood is a national asset which
must be protected at any price. A new voters' list is contemplated. A parliamentary election
should be held in September but the voters are scattered far and wide. The whole nation is
agitated over the questions involved in making a new register. At the same time, there is a
constant anxiety over war funds, as is prudent in a nation spending 50 millions of dollars per day.
It has been proposed that a large poll tax be assessed upon the voters of the new lists, whereupon
a secondary proposal of great force has been offered and that is, that twice as much money would
find its way into the public coffers were women added to the voters' list. What nation, with
compliments fresh spoken concerning women's patriotism and efficiency, could resist such an
appeal?
So it happens that above the roar of cannon, the scream of shrapnel and the whirr of aeroplanes,
one who listens may hear the cracking of the fetters which have long bound the European woman
to outworn conventions. It has been a frightful price to pay but the fact remains that a
womanhood, well started on the way to final emancipation, is destined to step forth from the war.
It will be a bewildered, troubled and grief-stricken womanhood with knotty problems of life to
solve, but it will be freer to deal with them than women have ever been before.
"The Woman's Hour has struck." It has struck for the women of Europe and for those of all the world. The significance of the changed status of European women has not been lost upon the men and women of our land; our own people are not so unlearned in history, nor so lacking in National pride that they will allow the Republic to lag long behind the Empire, presided over by the descendant of George the Third. If they possess the patriotism and the sense of nationality which should be the inheritance of an American, they will not wait until the war is ended but will boldly lead in the inevitable march of democracy, our own American specialty. Sisters, let me repeat, the Woman's Hour has struck!

SECOND: As the most adamantine rock gives way under the constant dripping of water, so the opposition to woman suffrage in our own country has slowly disintegrated before the increasing strength of our movement. Turn backward the pages of our history! Behold, brave Abbie Kelley rotten-egged because she, a woman, essayed to speak in public. Behold the Polish Ernestine Rose startled that women of free America drew aside their skirts when she proposed that they should control their own property. Recall the saintly Lucretia Mott and the legal-minded Elizabeth Cady Stanton, turned out of the World's Temperance convention in London and conspiring together to free their sex from the world's stupid oppressions. Remember the gentle, sweet-voiced Lucy Stone, egged because she publicly claimed that women had brains capable of education. Think upon Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell, snubbed and boycotted by other women because she proposed to study medicine. Behold Dr. Antoinette Brown Blackwell, standing in sweet serenity before an Assembly of howling clergymen, angry that she, a woman dared to attend a Temperance Convention as a delegate. Revere the intrepid Susan B. Anthony mobbed from Buffalo to Albany because she demanded fair play for women. These are they who built with others the foundation of political liberty for American women.

Those who came after only laid the stones in place. Yet, what a wearisome task even that has been! Think of the wonderful woman who has wandered from village to village, from city to city, for a generation compelling men and women to listen and to reflect by her matchless eloquence. Where in all the world's history has any movement among men produced so invincible an advocate as our own Dr. Anna Howard Shaw? Those whom she has led to the light are Legion. Think, too, of the consecration, the self-denial, the never-failing constancy of that other noble soul set in a frail but unflinching body, -- the heroine we know as Alice Stone Blackwell! A woman who never forgets, who detects the slightest flaw in the weapons of her adversary, who knows the most vulnerable spot in his armor, presides over the Woman's Journal and, like a lamp in a lighthouse, the rays of her intelligence, farsightedness and clear-thinking have enlightened the world concerning our cause. The names of hundreds of other brave souls spring to memory when we pause to review the long struggle.

The hands of many suffrage master-masons have long been stilled; the names of many who laid the stones have been forgotten. That does not matter. The main thing is that the edifice of woman's liberty nears completion. It is strong, indestructible. All honor to the thousands who have helped in the building.

The four Corner-stones of the foundations were laid long years ago. We read upon the first: "We demand for women education, for not a high school or college is open to her"; upon the second, "We demand for women religious liberty for in few churches is she permitted to pray or speak"; upon the third, "We demand for women the right to own property and an opportunity to earn an honest living. Only six, poorly-paid occupations are open to her, and if she is married, the wages
she earns are not hers”; upon the fourth, "We demand political freedom and its symbol, the vote."

The stones in the foundation have long been overgrown with the moss and mould of time, and some there are who never knew they were laid. Of late, four cap-stones at the top have been set to match those in the base, and we read upon the first: "The number of women who are graduated from high schools, colleges and universities is legion"; upon the second, "The Christian Endeavor, that mighty, undenominational church militant, asks the vote for the women and the Methodist Episcopal Church, and many another, joins that appeal"; upon the third, "Billions of dollars' worth of property are earned [and] owned by women; more than 8 millions of women are wage-earners. Every occupation is open to them"; upon the fourth: "Women vote in 12 States; they share in the determination of 91 electoral votes."

After the cap-stones and cornice comes the roof. Across the empty spaces, the rooftree has been flung and fastened well in place. It is not made of stone but of two planks, -- planks in the platform of the two majority parties, and these are well supported by planks in the platforms of all minority parties.

And we who are the builders of 1916, do we see a crisis? Standing upon these planks which are stretched across the top-most peak of this edifice of woman's liberty, what shall we do? Over our heads, up there in the clouds, but tantalizing [sic] near, hangs the roof of our edifice, -- the vote. What is our duty? Shall we spend time in admiring the capstones and cornice? Shall we lament the tragedies which accompanied the laying of the cornerstones? or, shall we, like the builders of old, chant, "Ho! all hands, all hands, heave to! All hands, heave to!" and while we chant, grasp the overhanging roof and with a long pull, a strong pull and a pull together, fix it in place forevermore?

Is the crisis real or imaginary? If it be real, it calls for action, bold, immediate and decisive. Let us then take measure of our strength. Our cause has won the endorsement of all political parties. Every candidate for the presidency is a suffragist. It has won the endorsement of most churches; it has won the hearty approval of all great organizations of women. It was won the support of all reform movements; it has won the progressives of every variety. The majority of the press in most States is with us. Great men in every political party, church and movement are with us. The names of the greatest men and women of art, science, literature and philosophy, reform, religion and politics are on our lists.

We have not won the reactionaries of any party, church or society, and we never will. From the beginning of things, there have been Antis. The Antis drove Moses out of Egypt; they crucified Christ who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" [Matt. 19:19, 22:39]; they have persecuted Jews in all parts of the world; they poisoned Socrates, the great philosopher; they cruelly persecuted Copernicus and Galileo, the first great scientists; they burned Giordano Bruno at the stake because he believed the world was round; they burned Savonarola who warred upon church corruption; they burned Eufame McIlyane [sic] because she used an anaesthetic; they burned Joan d'Arc for a heretic; they have sent great men and women to Siberia to eat their hearts out in isolation; they burned in effigy William Lloyd Garrison; they egged Abbie Kelley and Lucy Stone and mobbed Susan B. Anthony. Yet, in proportion to the enlightenment of their respective ages, these Antis were persons of intelligence and honest purpose. They were merely deaf to the call of Progress and were enraged because the world insisted upon moving on. Antis male and female there still are and will be to the end of time. Give to them a prayer of forgiveness for they know not what they do; and prepare for the forward march.
We have not won the ignorant and illiterate and we never can. They are too undeveloped mentally to understand that the institutions of today are not those of yesterday nor will be those of tomorrow.

We have not won the forces of evil and we never will. Evil has ever been timorous and suspicious of all change. It is an instinctive act of self-preservation which makes it fear and consequently oppose votes for women. As the Hon. Champ Clark said the other day: "Some good and intelligent people are opposed to woman suffrage; but all the ignorant and evil-minded are against it."

These three forces are the enemies of our cause.

Before the vote is won, there must and will be a gigantic final conflict between the forces of progress, righteousness and democracy and the forces of ignorance, evil and reaction. That struggle may be postponed, but it cannot be evaded or avoided. There is no question as to which side will be the victor.

Shall we play the coward, then, and leave the hard knocks for our daughters, or shall we throw ourselves into the fray, bare our own shoulders to the blows, and thus bequeath to them a politically liberated womanhood? We have taken note of our gains and of our resources! and they are all we could wish. Before the final struggle, we must take cognizance of our weaknesses. Are we prepared to grasp the victory? Alas, no! our movement is like a great Niagara with a vast volume of water tumbling over its ledge but turning no wheel. Our organized machinery is set for the propagandistic stage and not for the seizure of victory. Our supporters are spreading the argument for our cause; they feel no sense of responsibility for the realization of our hopes. Our movement lacks cohesion, organization, unity and consequent momentum.

Behind us, in front of us, everywhere about us are suffragists, -- millions of them, but inactive and silent. They have been "agitated and educated" and are with us in belief. There are thousands of women who have at one time or another been members of our organization but they have dropped out because, to them the movement seemed negative and pointless. Many have taken up other work whose results were more immediate. Philanthropy, charity, work for corrective laws of various kinds, temperance, relief for working women and numberless similar public services have called them. Others have turned to the pleasanter avenues of clubwork, art or literature.

There are thousands of other women who have never learned of the earlier struggles of our movement. They found doors of opportunity open to them on every side. They found well-paid posts awaiting the qualified woman and they have availed themselves of all these blessings; almost without exception they believe in the vote but they feel neither gratitude to those who opened the doors through which they have entered to economic liberty nor any sense of obligation to open other doors for those who come after.

There are still others who, timorously looking over their shoulders to see if any listeners be near, will tell us they hope we will win and win soon but they are too frightened of Mother Grundy to help. There are others too occupied with the small things of life to help. They say they could find time to vote but not to work for the vote. There are men, too, millions of them, waiting to be called. These men and women are our reserves. They are largely unorganized and untrained soldiers with little responsibility toward our movement. Yet these reserves must be mobilized.

The final struggle needs their numbers and the momentum those numbers will bring. Were never another convert made, there are suffragists enough in this country, if combined, to make so irresistible a driving force that victory might be seized at once.
How can it be done? By a simple change of mental attitude. If we are to seize the victory, that change must take place in this hall, here and now!

The old belief, which has sustained suffragists in many an hour of discouragement, "woman suffrage is bound to come," must give way to the new, "The Woman's Hour has struck." The long drawn out struggle, the cruel hostility which, for years was arrayed against our cause, have accustomed suffragists to the idea of indefinite postponement but eventual victory. The slogan of a movement sets its pace. The old one counseled patience; it said, there is plenty of time; it pardoned sloth and half-hearted effort. It set the pace of an educational campaign. The "Woman's Hour has struck" sets the pace of a crusade which will have its way. It says: "Awake, arise, my sisters, let your hearts be filled with joy, -- the time of victory is here. Onward March."

If you believe with me that a crisis has come to our movement, -- if you believe that the time for final action is now, if you catch the rosy tints of the coming day, what does it mean to you? Does it not give you a thrill of exaltation; does the blood not course more quickly through your veins; does it not bring a new sense of freedom, of joy and of determination? Is it not true that you who wanted a little time ago to lay down the work because you were weary with long service, now, under the compelling influence of a changed mental attitude, are ready to go on until the vote is won. The change is one of spirit! Aye, and the spiritual effect upon you will come to others. Let me borrow an expression from Hon. John Finlay: What our great movement needs now is a "mobilization of spirit", -- the jubilant, glad spirit of victory. Then let us sound a bugle call here and now to the women of the Nation: "The Woman's Hour has struck." Let the bugle sound from the suffrage headquarters of every State at the inauguration of a State campaign. Let the call go forth again and, again and yet again. Let it be repeated in every article written, in every speech made, in every conversation held. Let the bugle blow again and yet again. The Political emancipation of our sex call[s] you, women of, America, arise! Are you content that others shall pay the price of your liberty?

Women in schools and counting house, in shops and on the farm, women in the home with babes at their breasts and women engaged in public careers will hear. The veins of American women are not filled with milk and water. They are neither cowards nor slackers. They will come. They only await the bugle call to learn that the final battle is on. Give heed at once to the organization of the reserves; and then to the work that they shall do.

Organize in every Assembly District and every voting precinct. It is the only way to make our appeal invincible. Swell the army, then set it upon the trail of every legislator and congressman, for they alone hold the key to our political emancipation. Compel this army of lawmakers to see woman suffrage, to think woman suffrage, to talk woman suffrage every minute of every day until they heed our plea.

All this mere preparedness for the final drive to victory. The next question is: what shall be our aim?

We have listened to an exhaustive discussion upon the three-cornered questions: Shall we concentrate on the Federal Amendment; shall we concentrate on State Referenda or shall we proceed as before, supporting both methods. The Convention has voted to continue both forms of activity but there is one further point which should be made clear before we adjourn and that is the exact program to be followed in the support of the two methods. This should be so precisely defined by this convention that every member every friend and even every foe, may understand it.
We have long known the many obstacles imposed by most State Constitutions and that there are States in which women must wait a probable half century for their enfranchisement if no other avenue of escape is offered than amendment of their State constitutions. But there are other and even graver considerations which, in my judgment, should compel us to make the Federal Amendment our ultimate aim and work in the States a program of preparedness to win national-suffrage by amendment of the National Constitution. I must say, in passing, that this is no new opinion. I have held it for a quarter of a century and the varying suffrage events of the passing years have only served to strengthen and emphasize my conviction. To my mind, the insistence of the enfranchisement of the women of our land by Federal amendment, is the only self-respecting course to pursue. My reasons, I beg the privilege of presenting. My first campaign was that in South Dakota in the year 1890. Because I was young and all the experiences were new, every event in that campaign stands out in my memory with a vividness which does not mark later and even more important events. My first point was Mitchell, where a two days suffrage meeting was held prior to the State Republican Convention. Miss Anthony was the leader; Miss Shaw "the star," and the very best women of South Dakota were there. Of course, we wanted a plank in the Republican platform. The great concession was made the suffragists of ten seats on the platform where no one could see or be seen. I was fortunate enough to be one of the ten, and being young, I did not mind standing on a chair in order to see the convention. Peeping over the heads and shoulders of those before me, I saw a man arise and move that a delegation of Sioux Indians be admitted. They had been enfranchised by the National government and the delegate said, their votes must be won. They were admitted to the floor of the house,—three blanketed, long-haired, greasy men of the plains. On the platform sat Miss Anthony, bent with the weight of her seventy years, forty of which had been unceasingly expended to secure education, property rights and the vote for her sex. Upon her face was the expectancy born of "the hope which springs eternal in the human breast." On the floor sat the Indians unmoved and unknowing. The time came when five minutes was given the unenfranchised women, and Miss Shaw was called to speak for them. She has made many powerful addresses but never one quite so wonderful as that. All the men who packed that big skating rink combined, could not have provided so soul-stirring an appeal for any cause, but it was a prophet whose soul was lighted by a vision of truth, speaking to a mob, who marvelled at the power of the speaker but did not comprehend her message. With the crowd, I passed out of the door stunned by the knowledge I had gained that Americans did not understand the principles of self-government. On either side stood a man handing out papers. They were men of the lowest type and the papers were "The Remonstrance," published by a few rich women in Boston who were, at that date, too timid to have their names printed on the document. What agent secured the men who, every person in the town knew, were henchmen of the local saloons, I never learned. My last point in the State was Aberdeen and there on election day, I, with other women, served as watchers. All day long, at intervals, groups of five or ten Russians filed in to the order of poll workers. They, too, were saloon henchmen. These Russians could not speak English; they were totally illiterate and signed the poll-book with a cross. They had no more comprehension of the sacredness of a vote than a wild man from Borneo. The man who chiefly managed the affair and who must have voted a hundred men that day, grew bold and more than once paid his men their $2 in plain sight. No king marshalling his army upon the battle-field could bear himself with more triumphant mien than did this political criminal whenever he entered that polling place with a new line of
purchased voters. The hatred and contempt of his expression as he led them past us could not have been exceeded by an Apache chief gloating over his conquered foe. There was no remedy. South Dakota had no law to fit the case. These events at the time seemed mere local incidents, but I was to learn later that they were the early manifestation of a nation-wide condition which would remain constant in our campaigns until the end and that they were to grow into an increasingly better organized hostility to be met in every State.

Rich women, protected and serene, or women well paid by rich women, have grown bolder and more skillful in their unspeakable treachery to their sex. There have been those willing to vilify their sister women from ocean to ocean and to declare them too incompetent mentally and too unclean morally to be trusted with the privilege of self-government. Their motives suffragists will never understand.

The liquor forces have developed an organized opposition, apparently supported by large funds, which has been an active factor in every campaign except two since 1890, and in those two we won. The Secretary of one of the State Liquor Associations recently said to a man of honor, that they would not allow another State to be carried for suffrage within the next ten years. Still another representative of the same force said to another man that they could gather 10 millions of dollars if necessary to throw into any State which gave indications of a suffrage victory. These are doubtless wild threats, but the fact remains that a powerful force is arrayed against our cause, and it scruples at nothing.

In every precinct, there seem to be a few men willing to sell their citizen's right and these may be numerous enough to become a balance of power which added to the normal conservative vote may defeat our amendments. This "triple alliance," the women who work in the open, appealing to the respectable conservative element and the liquor forces secretly conniving with the purchasable vote forms a combined foe very difficult to combat since its attack is subterranean.

Opposition in the open which meets our arguments with arguments, our claims with defense, must always be welcome. Truth has ever followed in the wake of free and honest discussion. But an opposition which conspires behind closed doors to buy its victory with money or spoils is a criminal so black, so indescribably hideous that it fills the soul, not with discouragement for our cause but with shame for our Republic. We shall never know how many campaigns have been lost by such conspiracies, but it is my own sincere conviction that there have been several.

We know that in the Colorado campaign, the brewers of Denver printed false statements and caused them to be put under the door of every house in the city. We know that in the last unsuccessful campaign in Oregon, the order went out from the liquor forces to the saloons of the State to deliver a stated number of votes in opposition to the suffrage amendment. Every suffragist in Michigan seems to agree that the amendment was counted out in the first campaign and that the ballots were stuffed in the second and that the agents were the liquor forces. The Attorney General who was serving at the time of the Nebraska campaign has declared that he believes the amendment was counted out there, and again, the charge lies at the same door. The wet counties in Iowa certainly defeated the amendment there. The Boston & Maine Railway contributed to defeat the suffrage question in the Constitutional Convention of New Hampshire and afterward it was found that it had been done in collusion with the liquor lobby. The brewers, arrested upon the Federal charge of conspiracy in elections and brought to trial in Pittsburgh this year, are supposed to have contributed large sums to defeat the question in the four Eastern campaign States and although this remains unproven, it is true that their business was conducted in so irregular a fashion that check books and stubs had been destroyed. It was true in New York
that men visited trade unionists and told them that woman suffrage meant the certain loss of
positions in all trades allied to the liquor business. It is true that in New Jersey the woman poll
workers were appalled at the seemingly endless number of illiterate, drunken and degenerate
types who were lined up to vote in opposition to the amendment in that State. It is true that the
four men representing Texas, Indiana, Georgia, and New Jersey respectively, who signed the
minority report of the Resolutions Committee in St Louis, which would have taken the suffrage
plank out of the Democratic platform are all well-known henchmen of the liquor interests. It is
well-known that a group of liquor men have issued newspaper plate matter under the imprint of
an alleged Farmers' Association and have sent it broadcast to rural papers, its contents purporting
to be of interest to farmers but always containing anti-suffrage articles.
The liquor interests have been driven to the aggressive defensive by the inroads of the
prohibition movement. They are obsessed by the idea that woman suffrage is only a flank
prohibition movement. They have the American's right to fight for their own. We cannot relieve
them of their notion that woman suffrage will promote prohibition and hence must accept their
opposition as normal. But when that opposition ceases to be honest and resorts to conspiracy and
bribery to gain its ends, it becomes criminal. Since this kind of opposition has occurred to a
greater or less extent in all our campaigns, suffragists must be prepared to meet it in future.
What, if any, underground connection there may be between the women antis and the liquor antis
no one knows. Some of the women are conscientious and honest, I am sure, but the obvious fact
remains that these women secure what they want, that is their own disfranchisement by the aid
and the evident conjunction of the liquor forces with the purchasable, controllable vote and in
several campaigns, their posters, their literature and buttons were circulated through saloons.
This may have been done without the knowledge or consent of the women, but the fact remains
that the saloons and the women antis agree that votes in the hands of women are a "menace."
Corruption has existed since the beginning of things and will continue so long as there are
dishonest men to tempt and weak ones to yield. It is a far more invidious foe to our country's
weal than the bugaboos of wars with Germany, Mexico, or Japan. A French philosopher said that
"The corruption of each form of government commences with the decay of its principles."
History proves that statement to be true and in our own land, the careful student should feel
genuine anxiety at the ignorance and indifference among our people concerning those truths we
have called "American principles."
It is through the departure from loyalty to those principles that corruption has crept into our
political life and it is through the weakness created by internal corruption that most of the great
dead nations have met their downfall.
If the suffrage amendments are defeated by illegal practices, why not demand redress, asks the
novice in suffrage campaigns. Ah, there's the rub. In 25 States no provision has been made by the
election law for any form of contest or recount on a referendum. Political corrupters may, in
these States, bribe voters, colonize voters and repeat them to their hearts' content and redress of
any kind is practically impossible. If clear evidence of fraud could be produced, a case might be
brought to the courts and the guilty parties might be punished but the election would stand. In
New York, in 1915, the question was submitted to the voters as to whether there should be a
constitutional convention. The convention was ordered by a majority of over 1,300. It was
estimated that about 800 fraudulent votes were cast. Leading lawyers discussed the question of
effect upon the election and the general opinion was that even though the entire majority and
more was found to be fraudulent, the election could not be set aside. The convention was held.
In twenty States, contests on referenda seem possible under the law, but in practically every one the contest means a resort to the courts and in only eight of these is reference made to a recount. The law is vague and incomplete in nearly all of these States. In some of these, including Michigan where the suffrage amendment is declared to have been counted out, application for a recount must be made in each voting precinct. To have secured redress in Michigan, provided the fraud was widespread, as I understand it was, it would have been necessary to have secured definite evidence of fraud in a probable 1,000 precincts and to have instituted as many cases. In some States, the courts decide what the redress shall be and in these, no assurance is given by the law that such redress would include a correction of the returns. In at least seven, the applicants must pay all costs if they fail to prove their case.

The penalties for bribery range from $5 to $2,000 and from 30 days to 10 years, but only one State (Ohio) provides in terms for punishment of bribery as part of the penalty in an election contest. Just as proof of bribery does not throw out the person's vote, so the other way about, the throwing out of the purchased votes in contest cases does not bring with it automatically punishment of the purchased voter. If we may judge from this omission from the contest provisions these bribery cases would be separate actions. Twenty-one States in clear terms disfranchise (or give the Legislature power to disfranchise) bribers and bribed, but few make provisions for the method of actually enforcing the law and upon inquiry, the Secretary of State of many of these States reported that so far as he knew, no man had ever been disfranchised for this offense. This was true of States which have been notorious for political corruption.

With a vague, uncertain law to define their punishment in most States and no law at all in 25 States, as a preliminary security, corrupt opponents of a woman suffrage amendment find many additional aids to their nefarious acts. A briber must make sure that the bribed carries out his part of the contract. Whenever it is easy to check up the results of the bribe, corruption may reign supreme and with little risk of being found out. A study of some of the recent suffrage votes results in significant food for reflection. In Wisconsin, the suffrage ballot was separate and pink. It was easy to teach the most illiterate how to vote "No" and to check up returns with considerable accuracy. In New York, There were three ballots. The official ballot had emblems which easily distinguished it. The other two were exactly alike in shape, size, and color and each contained three propositions, those which came from the constitutional convention and the other those which came from the Legislature. The orders went forth to vote down the Constitutional provisions and it was done by a majority of 482,000, or nearly 300,000 more than the majority against woman suffrage. On the ballot containing the suffrage amendment which was No. 1, there was proposition No. 3, which all the political parties wanted carried. It could easily be found by all illiterate as it contained more lines of printing, yet so difficult was it to teach ignorant men to vote "no" on suffrage and "yes" on No. 3 that, despite the fact that orders had gone forth to all the state that No. 3 was to be carried, it barely squeezed through.

In Pennsylvania there are no emblems to distinguish the tickets and, on the large ballot, the suffrage amendment would have been difficult to find by an untutored voter. In consequence, as I believe, Pennsylvania polled the largest proportional vote for the amendment of any Eastern State. In Massachusetts, the ballot was small and the suffrage amendment could be easily picked out by a bribed illiterate. In Iowa, the suffrage ballot was separate and yellow, while the main ballots were white. In consequence, there were 35,000 more votes cast on the suffrage proposition that for the nomination of Governor, although the contest was an exciting one. In North Dakota, the regular ballot was long and complicated and the suffrage ballot separate and
small. It was easy to teach the dullest illiterate how to vote "No." It might be said that it would be equally easy to teach him to vote "Yes." True, but suffragists never bribe. Both the briber and the illiterate are allies of the Antis.

The election boards are bi-partisan and each party has its own machinery, not only of election officials but watchers and challengers, to see that the opposing party commits no fraud. The watchfulness of this party machinery, plus an increasingly vigilant public opinion, has corrected many of the election frauds which were once common, and many elections are probably free from all the baser forms of corruption.

When a question on referendum is sincerely espoused by both the dominant parties, it has the advantage of the watchfulness of both party machines and is doubly safe-guarded from fraud. But when such a question has been espoused by no dominant party, it is utterly at the mercy of the worst forms of corruption. The election officers may even agree to wink at fraud even when plainly committed, since it is no affair of theirs. Or, they may even go further and join in the pleasing game of running in as many votes against such an amendment as possible. This has not infrequently been the unhappy experience of suffrage amendments in corrupt quarters. With no one on the election board whose especial business it is to see that honesty is upheld, a suffrage amendment suffers further disaster through the fact that most states do not permit women watchers to stand guard over their own question.

When it is remembered that immigrants may be naturalized after a residence of five years; that, when naturalized they automatically become voters by all our state constitutions; that in nine states, immigrant voters are not even required to be citizens; that the right to vote is limited by an educational qualification in only 17 states and that nine of these are Southern with special intent of disfranchising the negro; that there is an unscrupulous body ready to engage the lowest elements of our population by fraudulent processes to oppose our amendment; that there is no authority on the election board whose business it is to see that we get a square deal; that the method of preparing the ballot is often an advantage to the enemy; that after the fraud is committed, there is practically no redress provided by election laws, it ought to be clear to all that state constitutional amendments when unsponsored by the dominant political parties which control the election machinery, must run the gauntlet of exceedingly unfair conditions. When suffragists have been fortunate enough to overcome the obstacles imposed by the Constitution of their states, they immediately enter upon the task of surmounting the infinitely greater hazards of the election law.

We are justly proud of the nine States which have been won on a referendum but these are not greater monuments to the triumphs of our cause than to the integrity of the elections in those states. I am certain that at least five other states should stand in that list. That they are not there is a reflection upon the inefficiency of the election machinery of those states.

No careful observer of the modern trend of human affairs doubts that "governments of the people" are destined to replace the monarchies of the world. No "listener in" will fail to hear the rumble of the rising tide of democracy. No watcher of events will deny that the women of all civilized lands will be enfranchised as part of "the people" and no American possessed of the least political acumen, doubts woman suffrage in our land as a coming fact.

Bear these items in mind and remember that three-fourths of the men of our nation have received the vote as the direct or indirect gift of the Naturalization laws; that the federal government enfranchised the Indians, assuming its authority upon the ground that they are wards of the nation; that the negroes were enfranchised by federal amendment; that the Constitutions of all
States not in the list of the original thirteen, automatically extended the vote to men; that in the
original colonial territory, the chief struggle occurred over the elimination of the landowning
qualification and that a total vote necessary to give the franchise to non-landowners, did not
exceed the 50 or 75 thousand in any State.
Let us not forget that the vote is the free-will offering of our 48 states to any man who chooses to
make this land his home. Let us not overlook the fact every five years of late an average of one
million immigrant voters are added to our electors' lists,—a million men mainly uneducated and
all moulded by European traditions. To these men, women of American birth, education and
ideals must appeal for their enfranchisement. No humiliation could be more complete; unless we
add the sorrowful fact that leaders of Americanism in Congress and Legislatures are willing to
drive their wives and daughters to beg the consent of these men to their political liberty.
Let us return to South Dakota a moment. During the Civil War there was an uprising of the
Sioux Indians who occupied a reservation covering a large part of the territory now comprising
that state. These Indians instituted one of the cruelest and most savage massacres in our history.
They committed atrocities upon women, so indescribably indecent that they were never recorded
in ordinary history.
By 1890, the numerous efforts to win them to civilization had culminated in an offer of land in
severalty and if accepted in good faith, these land owners were promised the vote. Their
blanketed representatives sat in the Republican Convention of that year and took their first lesson
in American politics. In 1916, I am reliably informed that there are 5,000 Sioux voters in the
State of South Dakota and that they may prove the balance of power in November to decide
whether women who have borne the burdens of pioneer life shall be permitted to vote. How
much the schools have taught them of human liberty within the last quarter of a century, I do not
know but I opine that they will make congenial allies to the antis.
To my mind, the considerations aroused by such facts entirely outweigh any philosophy which
supports the theory of suffrage by "State rights."
Again, let us not forget that while our struggle continues in this supposedly democratic land,
women have been enfranchised within a year in three provinces of Canada nearly equal in extent
to all our territory east of the Mississippi; in Denmark and Iceland by majority vote of their
respective Parliaments. All signs indicate the early enfranchisement of the women of Great
Britain by the same process.
Why, then, should American women be content to beg the vote on bended knee from man to
man, when no American male voter has been compelled to pay this price for his vote and no
woman of other countries is subjected to this humiliation? Shall a Republic be less generous with
its womanhood than an Empire? Shall the government be less liberal with its daughters than with
its sons?
The makers of the constitution foresaw the necessity of referring important questions of State to
a more intelligent body than the masses of the people and so provided for the amendment of the
Constitution by referendum to the Legislatures of the various States. Why should we hesitate to
avail ourselves of the privilege thus created? We represent one land and one people. We have
the same institutions, customs and ideals. It is the advocates of State rights who are championing
national prohibition and child labor. It will be a curious kind of logic that 845 uphold these
measures as national and, at the same time relegate woman suffrage to the States. Our cause has
been caught in a snarl of constitutional obstructions and inadequate election laws. We have a
right to appeal to our Congress to extricate our cause from this tangle. If there is any chivalry left, this is the time for it to come forward and do an act of simple justice.

In my judgement, the women of this land, not only have the right to sit on the steps of Congress until it acts but it is their self-respecting duty to insist upon their enfranchisement by that route. But, let me implore you, sister women, not to imagine a Federal Amendment an easy process of enfranchisement. There is no quick, short cut to our liberty. The Federal Amendment means a simultaneous campaign in 48 States. It demands organization in every precinct; activity, agitation, education in every corner. It means an appeal to the voters only little less general than is required in a referendum. Nothing less than this nation-wide, vigilant, unceasing campaigning will win the ratification.

Do not allow my comments to discourage you who represent the States where campaigns are pending. Your campaign may win the promise to safeguard your election from the dominant parties. It may so arouse public sentiment that any fraud may be outvoted. You are doing the best work possible. If you win, you have made Federal action and ratification more certain. If you lose, you have organized an army ready for your ratification campaign and have added testimony to the need of Federal action. What you have done in your State must be done in every State. A few women here and there have dropped out from State work in the fond delusion that there is no need of work if the Federal amendment is to be the aim. I hold such women to be more dangerous enemies of our cause than the known opponent. State work alone can carry the amendment through Congress and through the ratifications. There must be no shirkers, no cowards, no backsliders these coming months. The army in every State must grow larger and larger. The activity must grow livelier and even more lively. The reserves must be aroused and set to work. Let no one labor under the delusion that suffrage can be won in any other way than by the education and organization of the constituencies. Let no woman think the vote will be handed her some bright summer morning "on a golden platter at the foot of a rainbow."

"The Woman's Hour Has Struck." Yet, if the call goes unheeded, if our women think it means the vote without a struggle, if they think other women can and will pay the price of their emancipation, the hour may pass and our political liberty may not be won. WOMEN ARISE: DEMAND THE VOTE! The character of a man is measured, it is said, by his will. The same is true of a movement. Then WILL to be free. Demand the vote. Women, ARISE!