

IN THEIR PLACES: REGION, WOMEN, AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

Susan Klepp
Temple University, Emerita

Abstract: Was there a distinct Mid-Atlantic region for either women or gender relations? An examination of women and politics between the early eighteenth century and the early twentieth century suggests the answer is no, there was not. A regional definition for politically active women encompassed the entire northeast, not just the mid-Atlantic and became the center of the suffrage movement. As late as 1915, however, the anti-women's rights forces were dominant and it was the far west that led in the movement for the vote.

Keywords: Lenape; Munsees; Iroquois; Quaker women; Elizabeth Ashbridge; New England; Delaware Valley; New York; New Jersey; Pennsylvania; American Ladies' Association; Women's rights advocates; women's suffrage.

*W*as a Mid-Atlantic regional identity shaped by American women or were American women influenced by the geographical space they happened to inhabit? What follows is a quick look at a few historical examples that suggest there was no fixed Mid-Atlantic region for women. Sometimes this region was primarily confined to the valley of the Delaware River; at other times Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New York were subsumed within the much larger region of the industrialized, free northern half of the

United States. Currently, progressive stances on gender rights in Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey are often seen as a part of an East Coast or bicoastal region defined by culture, cosmopolitanism, and more liberal political leanings. The settlement patterns of particular religious groups, the presence or absence of slavery, the existence of discomfiting nearby regions, particularly the contrast with the South, are among the important factors producing regional affinities among activists, that is a developing regional identity on women's issues.

Regional identities are sometimes visible only to historians; at other times they are acknowledged, even embraced, by contemporaries, once to the point that they sparked a civil war. The creation of a region can also be an artifact of scholarly research, a means by which historians create manageable projects based on the accessibility and richness of relevant archives and the time constraints of academic life. Mid-Atlantic then becomes a synecdoche for modal American culture, structures, or events.¹ Region can be a geographic and a cultural space as well as a pragmatic device by historians to plot trends and affinities in a complex and elusive past.

A study of physical space yields little to support the existence of a readily identifiable feminine Mid-Atlantic region or any other region for that matter. For most of American history, women were not free to choose where they lived. Plotting their lives and experiences on a map generally says more about men's interests than women's. The vast majority of American women, especially before the middle of the twentieth century, received minimal formal educations or other training and expected that their fate was to marry and bear children. They would raise those children or the children of others and nurse the sick, while tending the orchard, garden, and dairy, and providing largely nondurable products, especially clothing and other textiles, food, and beverages to their overlords, who might be fathers, husbands, adult sons, guardians, employers, or masters. Even wage work tended to follow these same paths. Whether in Maine or Mississippi or Maui some variant of this schematic prevailed and was defended as natural, eternal, and pleasing to religious authorities.

It is, of course, in the details of women's lives and aspirations, in slavery or freedom, change over time, private or public, rural or urban, illiterate or literate, poor or comfortable and wealthy and in the relative degree of power afforded or claimed by women that regions might be defined. Neither gender nor geography was in fact fixed as most of the voluminous scholarship on women suggests. Women's experiences and regional definitions evolved

and mutated over time. What follows are a few instances where the study of women, particularly women in public reform activities and in politics, might identify unique local cultural geographies. A different set of examples or topics might produce a very different history of women and region.

The first case study looks at gender among the Lenape and Munsees of the eighteenth century. Lenape avoidance of war, preference for diplomacy, and constructions of femininity and masculinity produced unique identities. A second example of regionalism and women involves the settlement of Europeans and Africans in the “motley middle” of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Scholars have noted the heterogeneous, “motley” mix of religions, ethnicities, races, and statuses in these three colonies although the affinity of these three colonies is far more apparent to current historians than it was to contemporaries.² The third study considers the creation of a regional locus for American women’s rights advocacy that emerged in the nineteenth century in both the Mid-Atlantic and New England. The primary “other” to the Northeast was the Deep South. At times contiguous or even noncontiguous areas could be added to or dropped from the regional designation—in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries these might include the old Northwest or the Chesapeake, or in the Rocky Mountain states. Currently East Coast/West Coast seem combined as locales where a majority of the inhabitants support progressive rights for women, including, for a few examples, marriage equality, access to contraception and abortion, political office, ending pay and promotion barriers, and considering “traditional” feminine roles not as normative but as only one possible choice.

A Region Where Everyone Was a Woman

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, an autonomous portion of the region now identified as the Mid-Atlantic encompassed the Delaware River in the south and the Hudson River in the North. The Lenapes controlled what is now southeastern Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, and northern Delaware, and territory as far west as the Susquehanna River. The closely related Munsees controlled areas from Minisink, Pennsylvania, to Esopus, New York, on the west bank of the Hudson River. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries this region was called the Lenapehoking.

In the middle of the eighteenth century, the culturally and linguistically related Lenapes and Munsees would unite as the Delawares. These were

matrilineal and matrilocal societies based on hunting and horticulture, as were most Eastern Woodland peoples. As historian Gunlög Fur has shown, however, the inhabitants of this area were unique in that the men accepted being called “women” even though this was a form of derision employed by their more powerful neighbors, the Iroquois. The Delawares preferred diplomacy and peace to battle defeat when outnumbered by potentially hostile Iroquois to the north, expansionist French and their allies to the west, and grasping British colonists to the east. The designation “women” was also misunderstood by English colonial officials as proof of subordination, if not conquest. But a third understanding was the belief among these Algonquian speakers that “association with feminine qualities did not contaminate male persons” because “masculinity contained peacemaking as well as warmaking aspects” so that “metaphorical femininity received sanction in the highest circles of Delaware leadership.”³

The inclusive definition of “woman” could be accepted and dropped as need be, but was based on a culture in which women controlled property. Lenape/Delaware women themselves, like Hannah Freeman (1730–1802), were “independent” and able to “adapt to constantly changing economic opportunities.” It was an unusual and complex gendered identity that the Delawares embraced as they were surrounded by potential enemies, and it allowed them to avoid, at least for a time, a war that they surely would lose. The Delawares’ gender norms seem to have had no influence on either contemporary colonial settlements or on subsequent developments among the Delawares.

The Subversiveness of Radical Godliness

Quakers migrated to the Lenapehoking starting in the 1680s. Settling primarily in Pennsylvania, southern New Jersey, and northern Delaware (although eventually establishing outposts in New England, North Carolina, and elsewhere), they had a substantial impact on the culture of the Delaware Valley.⁴ From the beginning they intended to modify English gender norms by giving women some religious roles independent of husbands. Women had their own separate meetings for business where they doled out charity to poor neighbors and closely supervised marriages. Women were not only allowed to preach, but also were often financially supported in ministering to distant meetings. The impact of more tangential practices was also important,

if less evident. Initially, Quaker men were discouraged from entering the professions, especially law, and they had no use for trained ministers. They therefore had little use for colleges. Quakers saw these professions as contrary to the simplicity and egalitarianism promoted by the sect. Since university training and the professions were closed to all women, one source of women's supposed inferiority, their traditional lack of access to higher education and to the professions, diminished in importance.

As with the Delawares' avoidance of war, Quaker pacifism helped moderate another customary difference between masculine and feminine roles. Quaker men's refusal to adopt warrior ethics or go to war or support military activities would cause most Quakers to leave political office at the outbreak of the French and Indian War and concentrate instead on social policy, where men and women could jointly or separately practice their interpretation of Christian benevolence by establishing charitable institutions, expanding primary education for the poor, reaching out to native Americans, or opposing slavery. Quaker women in the Delaware Valley had a larger public presence than did other women.

In addition, Quaker tolerance of monotheistic religions coupled with William Penn's financial incompetence brought a diverse mix of European and African ethnicities and sects to the "motley middle." For a few women this brought a chance to choose among various Christian faiths. Elizabeth Ashbridge (1713–55) was raised an Anglican, came close to converting to Catholicism, and discussed theology with Presbyterians and Puritans before finally converting to Quakerism and becoming a public Friend and traveling minister in the colonies, England, and Ireland. There was, as her editor Daniel B. Shay has noted, a "Pennsylvania of the Soul" revealed in Ashbridge's autobiography, a chance to experiment and find a new identity among the doctrinal choices available.⁵ By the mid-nineteenth century, Quaker mistrust of the professions had waned and members established colleges and the Female Medical College among other institutions for women, but there were earlier colleges for women in New England.

Puritans from New England settled on Long Island and in northern New Jersey in the late seventeenth century, bringing with them not only fairly typical contemporary English notions of female irrationality and lack of self-control, but also the theological position that women, as well as men, could be elected by God as saints. As saints, they were tasked with enforcing a godly regime over the vast majority of sinners benighted by following Satan's blandishments. Historian Elaine Crane has noted, "Despite the patriarchal

and hierarchal nature of the [Congregational] church, membership and participation offered women political, organization, and financial opportunities. Such cumulative experience was at once public and prestigious.”⁶ While women saints could not preach, vote, or govern, they could seek out sin and disorder and inform the proper authorities of their findings. This was an especially important role for women since unredeemed women were considered weak, disorderly and irrational, prime candidates for witchcraft.

For their supervisory role and for the salvation of their immortal souls women needed to be able to read the Bible and take notes of sermons. Esther Burr (1732–1758) of New Jersey and other Puritans “believed that their proper vocation . . . required them to teach others by the example of their [spiritual] striving and by the model they might provide as ‘godly women’” through their writing, according to historians Carol F. Karlsen and Laurie Crumpacker.⁷ Religious duty could be superior to other claims of feminine subordination. Schooling for girls was far more widespread in these areas than was typical and women assumed important responsibilities in carrying out God’s commandments.

What about New York? With godly societies to the north and south of that state offering women a few public positions of responsibility, does the same apply? The most ambitious work on the major subcultures in early America, David Hackett Fischer’s *Albion’s Seed*, skips over New York and northern New Jersey in three lines of a 900-plus-page book.⁸ If the religious tenets of the Puritans and Quakers seem to establish a foundation for later historical developments in these areas of settlement, then New York appears to be an outlier, at least before the early nineteenth-century Second Great Awakening swept across the state. Then women and men embraced the promise of another path to spiritual rebirth and social perfectibility through the “androgynous spirit” of evangelical reform, as John Brooke has called it, coupled with the culture of the radical Enlightenment.⁹

In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries it was Dutch women’s property rights, not religion, that historians have found that distinguished greater New York from other colonies and later states. Brendan McConville has pieced together the remarkable story of Madelaine Fauconier Valteau (active 1740s). She was from a French Huguenot family and married an Englishman who also was of French ancestry. They settled in New York City. She soon changed her name from a francophone Madelaine to the Dutch Magdalena and began attending the Dutch Reformed Church. Both moves provide evidence of her “self-conscious recreation of herself

as Dutch.” She used her control over property to become politically active as a leader of violent protests against northern New Jersey land policies.¹⁰ Valteau was exceptional in her ability to choose between two different economic cultures, just as Ashbridge may have been somewhat unusual in her ability to choose among different faiths. It is doubtful that most early American freeborn women had that freedom of choice although the number of wives who ran from their husbands and who were advertised in the newspapers by their spouses suggests a more widespread discontent with limited options.¹¹

While religious toleration was a feature of early New York as well as of Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the scholarly literature suggests that an unusual toleration of nontraditional, even scandalous or criminal behaviors characterized the city of New York from the earliest days of the new republic, if not before. Nancy Randolph Morris (1774–1837), rumored to have murdered her newborn baby conceived in an incestuous relationship in Virginia, later married Gouverneur Morris and achieved a degree of respectability at their estate in the Bronx.¹² There were other examples. Was New York City a den of iniquity from the early days of the republic or do historians of New York expect Wall Street and worldliness to gain a stronger foothold there than elsewhere?

To sum up: there were at least four regions in the eighteenth century. They included a beleaguered Lenape polity, a Quaker-influenced culture in the Delaware River Valley, a distinct religious orientation and polity in New England and the Delaware Valley, and, it seems, an emerging urban center in New York of unbridled market rather than religious values.

The Failure of Revolution

Regionalism was less a factor for women in the power struggles during the Revolutionary War than either very local divisions or on the development of a nascent nationalism. Esther DeBerdt Reed (1746–80) and Sarah Franklin Bache (1744–1808) established a pro-American Ladies’ Association that briefly mobilized women in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia (New York was then in British hands, while much of the South was embattled) to raise money for the troops. That they chose Martha Washington to head the organization indicates the national ambitions of the group, despite its Philadelphia origins.

In breaking from Great Britain, supporters of the Revolution seemed at first to be moving toward greater political participation by taxpayers. But five of the largest states specified for the first time in their new constitutions that only male taxpayers were eligible to vote. These were Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Georgia—hardly a regional reaction to questions about women's place in the new nation.

Yet one state, New Jersey, specifically granted the vote to unmarried women who owned property as well as to African Americans who met the property qualifications. While Quakers have sometimes been given the credit for this remarkable break with tradition because of their relatively egalitarian stance on gendered issues, there is no evidence that this was the case.¹³ Had this been a Quaker move, the Yearly Meeting of the Quakers, which governed local meetings, would have provided a uniform policy, considering the controversial nature of the issue. There is no evidence of such an intervention. Between 1790 and 1807 the highest turnout of women in New Jersey elections came from the northern counties in the state where Congregationalists and Reformed churches, not Quakers, dominated and where the lingering Dutch influence allowing women more control over inherited property still had some salience. And since the franchise was meant to represent property rather than individuals (that shift lay in the future), propertied women may have been more motivated to vote where their ownership of land and goods was most clearly in their hands. By 1807 both Federalists and Democratic Republicans were embarrassed by the large numbers of both women and African Americans voting in New Jersey. The franchise was limited to white males in 1807. The linkage of African American and women's rights would continue, albeit uneasily, until the present—the race for the Democratic presidential nomination of 2008 being a recent example. Regionalism and a nascent nationalism jostled for pre-eminence during the American Revolution and thereafter.

Two Regions Emerge

The emergence of a woman's regional geography came in the early nineteenth century and was primarily an artifact of the intensifying controversies over slavery rather than being directly defined by women. Between 1775 and 1804 the states from New Jersey north provided for the eventual abolition of bondage while states from Delaware on south preserved the legality of the

slave system. Most northern legislation plotted a gradual transition from enslavement to indenture to a second-class freedom. Yet African American women as well as men shaped their own path. They moved from rural areas into northern cities and began dismantling the remnants of slavery by creating institutions that would support their new communities: economic development, marriage, child custody, education, churches, benevolent and literary societies, and more. Full equality was the goal for both men and women in these rapidly growing communities.¹⁴

The rise of the colonization, antislavery, and abolitionist movements involved growing numbers of women who faced legal limitations of their own, as is well documented in the last half century's scholarship.¹⁵ The consequence was the emergence of a women's rights movement at Seneca Falls, New York, which combined Quaker, Calvinist, Methodist, and evangelical women, many of whom had been active in the temperance, antislavery, or abolitionist movements. Most had been born in New York, Pennsylvania, or New England.¹⁶ While there was a national elite of women and men that transcended region, the upper-middle-class and middle-class women who launched the women's suffrage movement were to be found primarily in the Northeast. The Civil War, Reconstruction, and Republican politics only widened the gap between the North, upper Midwest, and far West on the one hand, and the South on the other. Yet it would be the western territories and states that led in the establishment of suffrage rights for reasons that included a stronger socialist presence, less industrial presence, and boosterism.¹⁷

A Region for Women's Rights Activists

The most prominent of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century women reformers moved from place to place over the course of their lives, but they found the Northeast and upper Midwest to be the most desirable places to settle. A geographic map of reformist activity in favor of women's rights was emerging. Sojourner Truth (1799–1883) left rural New York for the city and eventually retired to Battle Creek, Michigan. Angelina Grimke (1805–79) came north from South Carolina to live in Philadelphia and New Jersey. Mary Gove Nichols (1810–84) resided in New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York City. Lucy Stone (1818–93) was born in Massachusetts, educated at Oberlin in Ohio, spent time in New Jersey, and eventually returned to Massachusetts. Susan B. Anthony (1820–1906) was born in Massachusetts,

educated in Pennsylvania and New York, and lived most of her adult life in Rochester when she was not traveling for the cause of women's right to vote. Antoinette Brown Blackwell (1825–1921) was born in upstate New York, went to Oberlin, and then moved to the New York City area. The often scandalous Victoria Woodhull (1838–1927) was quite transient as a young woman. She briefly spent time in Ohio, Illinois, California, and Ohio again, before settling first in New York City (perhaps not a surprise) and then in England. Frances Willard (1839–98), the most conservative of this cohort of activists, preferred the Midwest to Rochester and lived in Ohio, Wisconsin, and Illinois. The Northeast region was where activist women were at home.

A second generation of reformers, born in the second half of the nineteenth century, ranged more widely but still clustered in the Northeast. Carrie Chapman Catt (1859–1947) went from Wisconsin to Iowa and California before settling in New York. Ida B. Wells-Barnett (1862–1931) was forced to leave the South for New York and Europe because of her staunch anti-lynching stance. Cornelia Pinchot (1881–1960) was born in Rhode Island and then lived and worked in New York, Pennsylvania, and Washington, DC. Alice Paul (1885–1977) was a New Jersey native and a University of Pennsylvania PhD who lived in New York City, Europe, and Washington, DC, before retiring to Connecticut.

It was not just the leadership of the rights movements that developed a regional orientation. The locations of the first women's rights conventions starting in 1848 followed the same pattern of favoring the Northeast and upper Midwest, meeting in upstate New York, Ohio, Massachusetts, and Philadelphia. Obviously these sites were chosen for their strong grassroots support for women's rights. Not until 1903 did the National American Women's Suffrage Association hold a meeting in the South as part of a "Southern Strategy" designed to produce a truly national movement—national, that is, in terms of white superiority. The strategy was in vain, not only because it further divided the movement along racial lines and undermined the argument that human equality required political equality, but also because most southern states were not persuaded.

The Debacle of 1915—A Different Take on the Northeast

By 1915 most western states and Illinois had opened the polls to women. By dint of considerable effort the women's movement had placed referenda

supporting female suffrage on the ballot in the four states that had been the core of their strength—New Jersey, Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. These were all urban and industrialized, all “motley” because of immigration, and most heirs to Quakerism, Congregational Calvinism, and religious toleration. The suffrage leadership was confident that the weight of these important states, long their regional stronghold, would tip the balance in favor of the vote throughout the remainder of the country.

New Jersey was the first to vote, on October 19, 1915. There were high hopes for a victory. President Woodrow Wilson had recently been converted to the suffrage cause and made a special, well-publicized trip to his home base in Princeton to cast his ballot in favor of women’s suffrage. When the votes were counted the next day, only Cape May County had a small majority in favor of women’s rights. The “Antis” had garnered 58 percent of the vote. Even Wilson’s own precinct was “a bad loser for the suffragists, as they only polled 64 votes there while the ‘antis’ got 150. The heavy negro vote probably decided the result in the district and the choice of the students of the University,” noted the *Philadelphia Inquirer*. The vicious racism engaged in by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony after the Civil War and the National American Women’s Suffrage Association’s “Southern Strategy” at the turn of the century rallied African American men against the suffragists. The outcome in New Jersey presaged the defeats to come in November.

On November 2, suffrage lost in Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts. Pennsylvania might have been carried by pro-suffrage supporters but for the large turnout in Philadelphia orchestrated by the Republican machine. In Massachusetts the Catholic Church issued “strongly worded statements” against women voting and the referenda were defeated there and in New York.¹⁸ The regional home of the women’s rights movement was also the region where industrialists feared the women’s vote would bring an end to child labor and to women workers as a cheap reserve labor force against strikers, while the American Federation of Labor generally argued that women in the workforce drove down men’s wages. The brewing industry alone was a major funder of anti-women’s rights organizations because they feared prohibition. Big city political machines felt that women voters would be harder to control than men. And women were in fact divided on the issue of rights. Some women preferred protection to equality. The women’s right activists had badly misjudged their core region.

After this defeat, the pro-vote forces acquired a new leadership that concentrated on a national strategy, civil disobedience, and publicity to

gain passage of the Nineteenth Amendment. The radicals in the Women's Party suffered arrest and forced feeding in their campaign for the vote. The regional strategies had not worked either in the South or the Northeast. While the northern states rallied to the cause of women's suffrage once passed by Congress, southern states would not ratify the Nineteenth Amendment to the federal Constitution until 1969–71, and Mississippi not until 1984. These may have been only symbolic votes since the amended federal Constitution trumped even reluctant states, but they indicate the perpetuation of entrenched regional differences regarding gender and rights.

The connection of a northeastern regionalism and expanded rights for women in the United States continues. The same southern states that refused to ratify the Nineteenth Amendment are the same states (plus a few others) that still refuse to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment, although there are current efforts in Virginia and Illinois to alter earlier failures to ratify. Other issues, including access to contraception and abortion, health care, marriage equality, child care, employment, domestic violence, and rape, have regional components. Much of the upper Midwest, snarkily labeled the “fly-over district,” no longer can be counted on to support progressive issues, while Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia now might be classed among the more progressive places on women's issues, with those places now more frequently identified as East Coast than as Northeast. Meanwhile, the “Left Coast” and East Coast are not dissimilar in politics. Information technology may be making physical proximity less salient. Historically, the Mid-Atlantic was almost always too narrow a category to encompass the activists interested in expanding women's rights to a public participation in politics. How this will play out remains to be seen now that it seems likely, as this is written in April 2015, that the first serious woman candidate for president will appear on the ballot in 2016.

NOTES

1. My own work has sometimes used the Delaware Valley to suggest broader themes in American history, both for practical reasons relating to archival accessibility and because US Census data shows that the adoption of family limitation proceeded more rapidly to the north and more slowly in the South. The Mid-Atlantic was in fact the middle. Susan E. Klepp, *Revolutionary Conceptions: Women, Fertility and Family Limitation in America, 1760–1820* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009), 28–29.

2. Michael Zuckerman, "Introduction: Puritans, Cavaliers and the Motley Middle," in *Friends and Neighbors: Group Life in America's First Plural Society*, ed. Zuckerman (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982), 3–25.
3. Gunlög Fur, *A Nation of Women: Gender and Colonial Encounters among the Delaware Indians* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009), 187. See also Jane T. Merritt, *At the Cross Roads: Indians and Empires on a Mid-Atlantic Frontier, 1700–1763* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), 220–24; and Dawn G. Marsh, *A Lenape among the Quakers: The Life of Hannah Freeman* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2014), 143.
4. Mary Maples Dunn, "Saints and Sisters: Congregational and Quaker Women in the Early Colonial Period," *American Quarterly* 30 (1978): 582–601; Margaret Hope Bacon, *Mothers of Feminism: The Story of Quaker Women in America* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986); Rebecca Larson, *Daughters of Light: Quaker Women Preaching and Prophesying in the Colonies and Abroad, 1700–1775* (New York: Knopf, 1999); and Catherine La Courreye Blecki and Karin A. Wulf, eds., *Milcab Martha Moore's Book: A commonplace Book from Revolutionary America* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1997).
5. Daniel B. Shay, "Elizabeth Ashbridge and the Voice Within," in *Journeys in New Worlds: Early American Women's Narratives*, ed. William L. Andrews et al. (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1990), 130–31.
6. Elaine Forman Crane, *Ebb Tide in New England: Women, Seaports, and Social Change, 1630–1800* (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1998), 86; Carol F. Karlson, *The Devil in the Shape of a Woman: Witchcraft in Colonial New England* (New York: Norton, 1987); Susan Juster, *Disorderly Women: Sexual Politics and Evangelicalism in Revolutionary New England* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994). See also works by Marybeth Norton, Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, and others on women in New England.
7. Carol F. Karlson and Laurie Crumpacker, eds., *The Journal of Esther Edwards Burr, 1754–1757* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1984), 20.
8. David Hackett Fischer, *Albion's Seed: Four British Folkways in America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 887.
9. John L. Brooke, *Columbia Rising: Civil Life on the Upper Hudson from the Revolution to the Age of Jackson* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2010), 362.
10. Brendan McConville, *These Daring Disturbers of the Public Peace: The Struggle for Property and Power in Early New Jersey* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1999), 124–29; David E. Narrett, "Men's Wills and Women's Property Rights in Colonial New York," in *Women in the Age of the American Revolution*, ed. Ronald Hoffman and Peter J. Albert (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1989), 91–133.
11. See the articles in Larry D. Eldridge, ed., *Women and Freedom in Early America* (New York: New York University Press, 1997).
12. Cynthia A. Kierner, *Scandal at Bizarre: Rumor and Reputation in Jefferson's America* (New York: Palgrave/Macmillan 2004). See also Alan Pell Crawford, *Unwise Passions: A True Story of a Remarkable Woman—and the First Great Scandal of Eighteenth-Century America* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000). Two other examples are Patricia Cline Cohen, *The Murder of Helen Jewett* (New York: Vintage, 1999); and Amy Gilman Srebnick, *The Mysterious Death of Mary Rogers: Sex and Culture in Nineteenth-Century New York* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).

13. See Rosemarie Zagarrì, *Revolutionary Backlash: Women and Politics in the Early American Republic* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); and Judith Apter Klinghoffer and Lois Elkins, "'The Petticoat Electors': Women's Suffrage in New Jersey, 1776–1807," *Journal of the Early Republic* 12 (1992): 159–93.
14. Erica Armstrong Dunbar, *A Fragile Freedom: African American Women and Emancipation in the Antebellum City* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).
15. Jean Fagan Yellin and John C. Van Horne, eds., *The Abolitionist Sisterhood: Women's Political Culture in Antebellum America* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1994); Richard Newman and James Mueller, eds., *Antislavery and Abolition in Philadelphia* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2011).
16. Judith Wellman, "The Seneca Falls Women's Rights Convention: A Study of Social Networks," in *Women's America: Refocusing the Past*, ed. Linda K. Kerber and Jane Sharron De Hart, 4th ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 203–15; Lori D. Ginzberg, *Untidy Origins: A Story of Woman's Rights in Antebellum New York* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005).
17. Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, ed., *One Woman, One Vote: Rediscovering the Woman Suffrage Movement* (Troutdale, OR: NewSage, 1995). For the social and intellectual bonds of northerners and southerners before the Civil War, see Daniel Kilbride, *An American Aristocracy: Southern Planters in Antebellum Philadelphia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), and Mary Kelley, *Learning to Stand and Speak: Women, Education, and Public Life in America's Republic* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2006).
18. "Wilson's Precinct Opposes His Wishes," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, October 20, 1915, 1. Eleanor Flexner and Ellen Fitzpatrick, *Century of Struggle: The Women's Rights Movement in the United States* (Cambridge: Belknap Press/Harvard University Press, 1996), 262–64.