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Long before the likes of Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton began their rally cries of equality and freedom at the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, women did have the right to vote in the United States. During the early Republic and the formation of its territories suffrage was limited to certain states such as New Jersey and later Utah. However, women that once had the right to vote were systematically stripped of that right through legislation. In New Jersey voting that was given to all “free inhabitants” by the original state constitution of 1776 became limited to free white males by 1807. Meanwhile in Utah, voting for women ended in 1887, with the passage of the Edmunds-Tucker Antipolygamy Act. In response to the lack of access to the franchise and other rights, suffragettes advocated vociferously for the vote over many decades into the early 20th century. They believed their cause was just and necessary for every woman. For them it was a civil right.

Yet, perhaps surprisingly, not every woman wanted the franchise. Many women were not interested in voting. In fact, many adamantly opposed a woman’s right to vote. Who were these women? What drove them to want to remain in the domestic sphere? Why did they ultimately venture out into a world of electoral politics that they felt was out of their domain? Why did it become an extremely important and at times an all-consuming mission to stop the vote?

Many historians have focused on the suffragettes and their fight to gain enfranchisement. This paper examines the women on other side of the suffrage argument. These women were not the quiet and docile “backwards traditionalists” they were often characterized as in suffragist literature. Instead, anti-suffragists were women with strongly held conservative beliefs including notions about their citizenship that were gleaned from the concept of “republican motherhood” and the need to maintain a separate private domestic sphere apart from the public dealings of men.

The anti-suffragists, or “antis” as they were sometimes called in their day, were important political actors in their own right. Antis were intelligent, well educated, and had a keen understanding of the rhetoric of the time that they used to their advantage. These savvy women understood the power of mass media and employed it proficiently to support their cause. These women believed in the unique power of womanhood—a power that was more effective because women were assumed to be naturally more virtuous than men. It was their definition of citizenship through republican motherhood that made them uniquely qualified to effect change without the need for enfranchisement. Also, they argued that as disinterested members of society, they could effectively rise above party politics when championing a cause.

These women who are often viewed as having been on the wrong side of history nevertheless held a widespread point of view deserving of study by scholars. After all, if we are to truly study the history of women’s path to becoming a voting citizenry we have to take a serious look at all women, even those with unpopular, complex, and divergent points of view. The historiography of women has often discounted the voices of those that said “No!” to the vote to the detriment of having a complete understanding of women’s history.

Women Versus Women: The Suffragists’ View of the Anti-suffragists

Suffragists often painted anti-suffragists in an unflattering light. Weak-willed and easily led by men according to suffragists, anti-suffragists were seen as puppets stripped of their agency. Antis were regularly portrayed in poetry and cartoons in suffragist periodicals as lazy, vapid, and only interested in vain subjects like fashion. One poem,
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“The Anti-Suffragists” by feminist Charlotte Anna Perkins Gilman, written in 1898, goes so far as to say anti-suffragists are: Selfish women, — pigs in petticoats, — But all sublimely innocent of thought, And guiltless of ambition, save the one Deep, voiceless aspiration — to be fed.

By wanting to maintain the domestic sphere anti-suffragists were viewed as submissive followers, without thoughts of their own, or as having no ambitions outside of the home. They were certainly not the leaders they should be in the minds of the suffragists. In suffragette Ida Sedgwick Proper’s cartoon “The Anti-Suffrage Parade” (Figure 1) anti-suffrage women are tied to anti-suffrage men through their common “false beliefs.” They are caricatures of fancily dressed women who “do nothing for society” or they are “backwards”, “old fashioned” women who are stuck with these unfavorable backwards men. One woman depicted in the top of the cartoon is a representation of an actual notable individual of the time – Mrs. Gilbert Jones. She is drawn in an oversized hat that has her blinded to what is happening around her. Allusions are made to her siding with or throwing her hat in the ring for the anti-suffrage movement along with her husband Gilbert E. Jones. Jones’ father owned the New York Times and in the late 1800’s and early 1900’s it was a paper clearly opposed to suffrage. Mrs. Jones often wrote pieces advocating the anti-suffrage position and was the chairman of the National League for the Civic Education of Women. Lectures arranged by this group to encourage women’s involvement in reform outside of the political arena were eventually canceled due to threats of protest by suffragists wielding eggs.

Being a voiceless entity was also common accusation leveled at anti-suffragettes. In her poem “A Suggested Campaign Song” suffragette Alice Duer Miller suggests that women who were against the franchise were “ladylike and quiet/ never speeches, bands or riot” and “no one knows/what we [anti-suffragettes] oppose / for we never speak for print.” In both instances the imagery of silent docile women used was false. Contrary to how they were portrayed by suffragists, as women who were acted upon, anti-suffragists regularly took action by writing editorials and sharing their views at conventions.

The True Profile of a Woman Who Says “NO!”

So who were these anti-suffragists anyway? If they were not the women that the suffragists claimed they were than who were they? Who were the women who headed organizations like the National Association Opposed to Women’s Suffrage? Who were these women with ideas and beliefs that seem so foreign to current feminist ideas? First, anti-suffragists were almost always women of significant means and significant social standing. Some of these women were wealthy before they married and many married well in order to retain their high social standing. Historian Susan Marshall’s study on the Anti-Suffrage movement in Massachusetts shows that the women who held leadership positions in the organizations were of the “Brahmin” status. They came from old, well-established families, like the Lowells, Lymans, and Coolidges that exercised significant social, economic, and political influence in their city. For example the Massachusetts’s association president was Cora Lyman Shaw, who was the granddaughter of Boston’s mayor Theodore Lyman. Other members, such as Mrs. Robert C. Winthrop, were married to the wealthiest and most powerful men in the Boston area. Winthrop’s husband, who served in the legislature, was a distinguished Harvard-educated lawyer whose family dated back to the founding of the colony. A similar pattern was found in many other east coast states’ anti-suffrage organizations.

Many anti-suffragists were not only wealthy but also well educated, with a little less than half of
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those in the Massachusetts association having a college education. While they were not as educated as the suffragists of the time (most suffragists in the United States—especially their leadership—had a college education or even advanced degrees in the late 1880’s) they were not idle housewives. According to the listed occupations of women in the different organizations they were attorneys, poets, journalists, and authors. Yet, for them their first duty was their family and the keeping of their home.

The anti-suffrage platform did not devalue education nor seek to keep other women from obtaining an education. On the contrary, these women valued education as long as the learning reinforced and prepared a woman for her unique role as a virtuous republican wife and mother. Famous educator and anti-suffragist Catherine Ester Beecher posited that women needed access to an education more than they needed the vote. “Higher education for women, as articulated by Beecher, was an extension of women’s domestic role…” and with a “liberal education” women could gain employment “in their appropriate profession.” That appropriate profession was essentially wife and mother. “In 1869 Beecher argued that any ‘wrongs’ involving women would be solved by promoting and supporting education for women on par with men, fully negating the need for the ballot.” Education, not enfranchisement, was the key to a woman’s happy, healthy, and fulfilled future according to the anti-suffragists.

What did the NO Vote Women Believe?

Why was education and not enfranchisement so important to the anti-suffrage cause? To understand the mindset of the anti-suffragists one has to go back to the beginnings of republican motherhood and the language surrounding the creation of a space for women to be good citizens. After the Revolutionary War, the ideal of womanhood was formed in the establishment of the good republican mother. During the war women were engaged outside of the home in non-traditional ways. They took over planting, dealing with finances, and acted publicly on behalf of their husbands. They were also acting in political ways that challenged the household traditional male hierarchy. To regain the balance of power and restore order after revolution, men established the idea of republican motherhood thereby further entrenching women in the private domestic sphere. In order to achieve their new roles as the cultivators of the new and future pro-republic citizenry they had to be literate and educated to the extent that would help them fulfill their new calling.

In the ensuing century, prior to the passage of the 19th Amendment, most women subscribed to their given gender and social roles that evolved from republican motherhood. Many enjoyed the respect that was gained from the newer similar ideas of the “cult of womanhood” and the “separate sphere” ideology. These ideologies emphasized the superior virtuous characteristics of women—“piety, purity, submissiveness, and domesticity” that women and society used to judge who was a “true woman” and who was not. If a woman behaved in ways that were not seen as virtuous they were becoming “unsexed” or “masculine” or behaving like “new women.” True womanhood was the ideal according to anti-suffragists and enfranchisement would directly threaten to unseat women from their unique feminine power.

This level of female virtue gave women great power within the domestic sphere. They were in charge of the running and keeping of households. They wielded their economic power in the marketplace as they procured the family’s necessities like food and clothing. They also exercised their social power that extended outside of the home (but comfortably within the woman’s domain) in their civics clubs and reform movements. Anti-suffragists participated in moral reforms that supported a healthy citizenry including temperance movements. Historian Susan Goodier
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writes, “While there were divisions in both suffrage and anti-suffrage organizations regarding temperance and the benefits of prohibition, prominent antis opposed liquor.”24 These women wanted to preserve their femininity (as they and most of society defined it) while engaging with their community.

As political actors they behaved in ways that reaffirmed their positions in the private sphere. They often remained behind the scenes and participated passively by supporting their husbands and fathers by acting as hostess within the home during political functions. With the suffrage moment there came all of these ideas that challenged their views. Anti-suffragists saw public politics as an affront to womanhood. In their minds, only women who were not beholden to party politics could lobby for social good. Also, participation in the dirty world of politics would soil women or worse, unsex them. In 1853 a newspaper covering the national woman suffrage convention labeled the women participating as “unsexed in mind” and “all of them publicly propounding the doctrine that they be allowed to step out of their appropriate sphere to the neglect of those duties which both human and divine law have assigned them.”25 To the anti-suffragists this “stepping out” of their sphere—especially politically—would lead to calamity and social upheaval.

Many antis vowed to end the enfranchisement movement and maintain the power distribution that they were comfortable with between the sexes. Miss Alice Chittenden, the president of the Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage in 1915, had this to say in an editorial about their organization’s beliefs and resolve to end the suffragists’ cause:

Opposition to woman suffrage is not merely an effort on the part of a few women to keep other women from voting, as is sometimes foolishly said, but that it is based upon principles which are so fundamental that women have organized a movement which is daily growing in strength, and which is directed wholly against the enfranchisement of their sex.26

It was these deeply engrained beliefs held by highly organized women that gave the suffrage movement a lot of trouble.

Anti-suffrage Rhetoric Reflected both Men’s and Women’s Views in Print

Women opposed to suffrage understood the importance of getting their message spread to as many supporters and new recruits as much as those that wanted suffrage. Often they spoke out on lecture circuits and debated the suffragettes. They had petitions signed by prominent men and women and had them sent to legislators. These petitions and letters reiterated their opinions about keeping women from being burdened by politics and that their true role as citizens was in raising up young men and women that would assume their proper roles in their proper spheres. In a letter to members of the Illinois legislature dated April 1909 (Figure 2) the officers and executive committee of the Illinois Association Opposed to Women’s Suffrage reminded their elected officials that they trust that “It is our fathers, brother, husbands, and sons that represent us at the ballot-box…we are content that they represent us…” and that they have conviction that, “God has wisely and well adapted each sex to the proper performance of the duties of each.”27 Antis were very aware of the power of a good petition and letter from their social reform work and they had very little difficulty in transforming them into pieces with a political tone.

Anti-suffragists were fortunate in that the dominant culture supported their beliefs. What they produced in print for their cause was important but what others produced was also influential in spreading their message. The rhetoric of the day was often in their favor. Many cartoons of the day displayed disdain for suffragists and the common beliefs about what suffrage would mean for the
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nation.\textsuperscript{28} The most common themes depicted were the emasculation of men and unsexing of women (Figures 3 and 4) as well as how badly the family would suffer if “mother went off to vote.” (Figures 5, 6, 7, and 8). In the cartoon “Down with Men” (Figure 3) we see the laughing suffragettes as jilted women using their power to throw a man from a home. He believes he is fortunate that he did not marry one of these “new women.” In “What Will Men Wear?” (Figure 4) the question of “What will men wear if women wear the pants?” speaks to the fears of women becoming masculine if they gain the vote (in fact, suffragists sometimes did wear pantaloons) while men lose an object that defines their masculinity. The cartoons “Everybody Works but Ma” (Figure 7) and “Election Day!” (Figure 5) are examples of the concerns of women abandoning their families, sloughing off their domestic household duties, and going out to vote. They are clear role reversals visually. In “Everybody Works” the husband is caregiving to a child while he wears a woman’s apron. He has put on the feminine persona and his wife has stopped the women’s work of childrearing to go off to behave publicly and in a masculine fashion by voting. Similarly, in “Election Day!”, a man is comforting two distraught children while wearing a symbol of womanhood and domesticity—the apron. His wife on the other hand wears a masculine looking dress and carries a newspaper under her arm along with her reading spectacles. She is wearing them presumably so that she can read the ballot much like the one on the bottom of the drawing.

Other cartoons had different themes but all were variations of arguments why women should not vote. Their leitmotifs were: women were not up to the physical task of being protectors so therefor they should not vote; voting and politics make women impure and dirty; only homely and ugly women wanted to vote (real women could get husbands); women should remain in their sphere and politics were too much for them; and lastly women really do not want the vote any way. These cartoons illustrate the talking points anti-suffragists repeatedly used to support their cause against the expansion of the franchise.

Women also understood the importance of the pamphlet, broadside, and occasional editorial in disseminating their views. There was an expense to printing and many organizations had line items in their budgets to create pamphlets that gave both men and women reasons why voting would be detrimental to both the country in general and women specifically.\textsuperscript{29} (Figure 12) In a survey of pamphlets produced by the anti-suffrage organizations historians can see similar rhetoric as that employed by the cartoons featured in magazines and newspapers.

Many of the pamphlets created gave women household tips for cooking and cleaning along with their anti-suffrage views (e.g. Figure 9). A pamphlet entitled “Housewives/Household Tips” was created around 1910 to encourage women not to want to vote and was produced by an organization called the National Association OPPOSED to Women’s Suffrage. It employed the trope that entering the political sphere was dangerous and it would sully women. They needed to keep clean by remaining in the domestic sphere and here were some household cleaning tips to help them with their true job of maintaining the home and hearth. It even provided handy “spot removers” to help women be clean again.

The broadsides manufactured would be posted around cities for both men and women to see. “Man’s Government by Man” (Figure 11) and “America When Feminized” (Figure 10) are two typical pieces of propaganda produced by the movement. The first is a poster list created in 1915 by the New Jersey Association OPPOSED to Women’s Suffrage. This poster used severe language regarding the cuckold of men by women who wanted to embark from the domestic sphere into the public political realm. It, like other pieces, asserted that since women could not physically uphold the vote or the law they should
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not vote. The second shows an actual cuckolded rooster having to sit on his nest full of eggs while mother hen proclaims “My country needs me!” and by this she means of course, that the country needs her to vote! She is content to cheat on her “husband” with her politics. The poster at the bottom reads “The effect of the social revolution on American character will be to make ‘sissies’ of American men…women suffrage denatures men and women.” These ideas that men will be feminized and unable to defend the country were a popular concern for both male and female anti-suffragists.

Both of these pieces deal with gender norms and expectations society has placed on both men and women as citizens. These roles are clearly defined. Men are public, political, and powerful. They are able to defend and die for the country if necessary. Women are soft and nurturing “hens” that care for their “chicks.” No rooster should ever be stuck home doing the work of a hen. And hens should most certainly not be doing, nay cannot do the work of roosters. The eggs symbolize the fragility of the whole system if women gain enfranchisement.

Seeing and Reading the World Differently

These visual and written statements from society (and the anti-suffragists specifically) strongly reflected the deeply held beliefs of many men and women at this time. Interestingly, the rhetoric may have been different but suffragists and anti-suffragists did have similar views on many values that they held in common. Each side took opposing views from a common branch of thought – women were unique and had special abilities in being women. They were the pure citizens that could bring about moral reform and save the nation from the horrors it was facing—one of the greatest threats being war. The suffragists too “placed the canons of motherhood at the core of women’s political personality.” Anti-suffragists believed that the very same femininity and exceptionality would be soiled by overt political actions taken by women. It was only in their capacity as wives and mothers that they could ensure the continuation of a great nation—a nation of men in the front acting politically, with women behind them supporting them and encouraging them to always do what is virtuous and good. Moral reform or reform of any kind would be best brought about from women who had no party agenda and were disinterested in politics.

The Women Who Both Lost and Won

The anti-suffragists were one of those rare bodies of protestors that both lost and won. While enfranchisement for all women was gained on August 18, 1920 with the ratification of the 19th Amendment, some women were not happy. For decades anti-suffragists kept the spread of the franchise in check through their use of mass media campaigns and the dominant culture’s rhetoric. Before the 19th Amendment was passed only eleven states had given women full voting rights, underscoring their ability to be effective political actors at the state level. It was only at the national level that they were ultimately unsuccessful. These wealthy and well-educated women had deeply held beliefs that came from the separate sphere ideology and the language of republican motherhood. In studying their actions and words historians can glean a more complete picture of the fight for women’s suffrage.

Intriguingly, the anti-suffrage movement did not end on that day in 1920. Women were still rallying to stop the vote for years thereafter. Eventually though, those that fought the hardest against voting became among the most politically active citizens. For decades women battled against women to stop what is now viewed as a commonplace. Sadly, it is a right that is often not exercised, nor cherished and struggled over in the way these women once did.

Conversely, the anti-suffragists believed that

30 Marshall, 11

**Antisuffrage Parade**

Figure 1
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**Illinois Association Opposed to the Extension of Suffrage to Women**

Woman's Protest Against Woman Suffrage

To Members of the Illinois Legislature, April, 1909:

We acknowledge no inferiority to men. We claim to have no less ability to perform the duties which God has imposed upon us than they have to perform those imposed upon them.

We believe that God has wisely and well adapted each sex to the proper performance of the duties of each.

We believe our trusts to be as important and sacred as any that exist on earth.

We believe woman suffrage would relatively lessen the influence of the intelligent and true, and increase the influence of the ignorant and vicious.

We feel that our present duties fill up the whole measure of our time and ability, and are such as none but ourselves can perform. Our appreciation of their importance requires us to protest against all efforts to infringe upon our rights by imposing upon us those obligations which cannot be separated from suffrage, but which, as we think, cannot be performed by us without the sacrifice of the highest interests of our families and of society.

It is our fathers, brothers, husbands, and sons who represent us at the ballot-box. Our fathers and our brothers love us; our husbands are our choice and one with us; our sons are what we make them. We are content that they represent us in the corn-field, on the battle-field, and at the ballot-box, and we them in the school room, at the fireside, and at the cradle, believing our representation even at the ballot-box to be thus more full and impartial than it would be were the view of the few who wish suffrage adopted, contrary to the judgment of the many.

We do therefore respectfully protest against any legislation to establish "woman suffrage" in the State of Illinois.

**Officers**

Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, President.

Mrs. E. M. Nickerson, 1st Vice-President.

Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, 2nd Vice-President.

Miss J. C. Fix, Secretary.

**Executive Committee**

Mrs. Geo. W. Smith.

Mrs. Ralph N. Isham.

Mrs. A. T. Galt.

Mrs. Wm. Eliot Furness.

Mrs. Frances Lackner.

Miss Mary Fowler Green.

Figure 2
Figure 6

My wife's joined the Suffrage Movement. (I've suffered ever since!)

Figure 7

I want to vote, but my wife won't let me.
Housewives!

You do not need a ballot to clean out your sink spout. A handful of potash and some boiling water is quicker and cheaper.

If new tinware be rubbed all over with fresh lard, then thoroughly heated before using, it will never rust.

Use oatmeal on a damp cloth to clean white paint.

Control of the temper makes a happier home than control of elections.

When boiling fish or fowl, add juice of half a lemon to the water to prevent discoloration.

Celerery can be freshened by being left over night in a solution of salt and water.

Good cooking lessens alcoholic craving quicker than a vote.

Why vote for pure food laws, when your husband does that, while you can purify your ice-box with saleratus water?

Common sense and common salt applications stop hemorrhage quicker than ballots.

Clean your mirrors with water to which a little glycerine has been added. This prevents steam ting and smoking.

Sulpho naphthol and elbow grease drive out bugs quicker than political hot air.

To drive out mice, scatter small pieces of camphor in cupboards and drawers. Peddlers and suffs are harder to scare.

To remove shine from serge, sponge with hot water and vinegar and press in usual manner.

Clean houses and good homes, which cannot be provided by legislation, keep children healthier and happier than any number of uplift laws.

Butter on a fresh burn takes out the sting. But what removes the sting of political defeat?

Clean dirty wall paper with fresh bread.

When washing colored hosiery, a little salt in the water will prevent colors from running.

If an Anti swallows bichloride, give her whites of eggs, but if it’s a suff, give her a vote.

Spot Removers

The following methods for removing spots and stains will be found efficacious.

Grass stains may be removed from linen with alcohol.

Fruit stains may be removed in the same way, but hot alcohol works quicker.

To remove axle grease, soften first with lard.

Kerosene removes vaseline marks.

Sour milk removes ink spots.

Discolorations and stains on bath enamel may be removed by turpentine.

Leather stains on light colored hosiery may be removed by borax.

There is, however, no method known by which mud-stained reputations may be cleansed after bitter political campaigns.
America When Femininized

"SET ON THEM YOURSELF, OLD MAN, MY COUNTRY CALLS ME!"

"WHY, MA. THESE EGGS WILL GET ALL COLD!"

SUFFRAGIST—FEMINIST IDEAL FAMILY LIFE.

The More a Politician Allows Himself to be Henpecked
The More Henpecking We Will Have in Politics.

A Vote for Federal Suffrage is a Vote for Organized Female
Nagging Forever.

"American pep which was the result of a masculine dominated country will soon be a thing of
the past. With the collapse of the male ascendancy in this country we can look forward to a
nation of degeneration. The suppression of sex will ultimately have its harvest in decadence,
a phenomenon already beginning. The effect of the social revolution on American character will
be to make "sissies" of American men—a process already well under way."—Dr. William J.
Hickson, Chicago University.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE denatures both men and women; it masculinizes women and
femininizes men. The history of ancient civilization has proven that a weakening of the man
power of nations has been but a pre-runner of decadence in civilization.

Will you stand for this? Prove that you will not by voting to Reject the Federal
Woman Suffrage Amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

SOUTHERN WOMAN’S LEAGUE FOR REJECTION OF THE
SUSAN B. ANTHONY AMENDMENT

WE SERVE THAT OUR STATES MAY LIVE, AND LIVING, PRESERVE THE UNION

Figure 10
MAN'S GOVERNMENT BY MAN

Every woman knows that the INTERESTS OF WOMEN—wives, mothers, sisters, daughters—are dearer to the men than their own.

EVERY SUFFRAGIST, by demanding the vote, practically DECLARES THAT THE HUSBANDS, FATHERS, SONS AND BROTHERS ARE NOT TO BE TRUSTED BY THEIR WIVES, MOTHERS, SISTERS AND DAUGHTERS.

Should strife and conflict come to our shores, as come they may, TO WHOM BUT OUR MEN CAN WE TURN FOR PROTECTION?

If men alone can protect and govern in times of storm and strife, shall we not PLACE EQUAL RELIANCE UPON THEM WHEN WE ARE AT PEACE?

The power of the BALLOT RESTS ENTIRELY UPON THE POWER TO ENFORCE THE LAW.

Man's government by women would be a GOVERNMENT WITHOUT THE POWER TO ENFORCE ITS DECREES.

Government without force behind it would be government merely in name, because unable to command obedience or respect.

Unless there exists behind the ballot the power to enforce its mandate, THE BALLOT DEGENERATES FROM POWER TO WEAKNESS AND WEAKNESS SPELLS ANARCHY AND RUIN IN GOVERNMENT.

THE MAINTENANCE OF PEACE, THE PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY, DEPEND UPON THE EXERCISE OF PHYSICAL FORCE WHEN NECESSARY, AND BY MAN ALONE CAN IT BE EXERCISED.

Vote NO on Woman Suffrage, October 19th, 1915

New Jersey Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

Headquarters

137 East State Street
Trenton, New Jersey
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