

Readings

Unit 14

- Introduction—Interest Groups: Organizing To Influence
- Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*: “That the Americans Combat the Effects of Individualism by Free Institutions” and “Of the Use Which the Americans Make of Public Associations in Civil Life”
- “The Whole World’s Temperance Convention Held at Metropolitan Hall in the City of New York”
- “An Appeal to the Women of the United States by National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee”
- I.W.W. Song: “Long-Haired Preachers”

Questions

1. What did Tocqueville suggest was the consequence of a free government for individual relationships?
2. What were the relationships between the rich and the poor in a democracy, according to Tocqueville?
3. According to the National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee, what did the Constitution provide concerning the political participation of women?

Introduction—Interest Groups: Organizing To Influence

In any acceptable version of democratic government, people organize to influence public policy—well-organized groups are called interest groups. Tocqueville explained that above the government's institutions, “and beyond all these characteristic forms, there is a sovereign power, that of the people, which may destroy or modify them at its pleasure.” The many ways that the sovereign people influenced the government was a central concern for Tocqueville. “It remains to be shown in what manner this power, superior to the laws, acts; what are its instincts and its passions, what the secret springs that retard, accelerate, or direct its irresistible course, what the effects of its unbounded authority, and what the destiny that is reserved for it” (179). Interest groups perform a wide range of functions in American politics including acting as a conduit for the power of the people. The destiny of the government of the United States is directed and resisted by citizens acting in accordance with each other. Interest groups perform an important representative function—they speak for their members. Not only do these institutions speak for people, they give people a way to be politically involved in their society. Interest groups, furthermore, educate people—they send members magazines, email, and notices; keeping them abreast of the latest events and problems in their area of interest. They teach people to be involved in their world and ways to participate. Interest groups also educate non-members and the larger political community in such a way that they help to set the concerns and issues faced by the larger community.

Within political science, the study of interest groups was a way to critically engage with sociological studies that succeeded in demonstrating that politics was often highly influenced by a very small group of people. Sociologists argued that these people move between business and government, always retaining their positions of privilege and power. Their families, furthermore, retain their wealth for generations. Studies of this powerful elite criticized American society as maintaining a surprising degree of privilege for the very wealthy. America, they reported, was not quite the land of opportunity it often pretended to be. Political scientists responded with attempts to define the United States as a pluralist or interest group society. They maintained that society in the United States was so plural that no group could sustain cohesion over a very wide range of issues for very long. Citizens had too many interests, too many issues and too many ways to make their opinions heard for any one group to dominate for very long.

The previous and following units explore many of the issues of how and who influences government—questions of the media, political parties, and political participation. This unit explores some documents generated by interest groups—pamphlets, leaflets, fliers, songs, and membership appeals—in order to flesh out the day-to-day functioning of interest groups that were involved in grand questions of voting rights and imperialism.

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*: “That the Americans Combat the Effects of Individualism by Free Institutions”

(Volume II, Part II, Chapter IV)

DESPOTISM which by its nature is suspicious, sees in the separation among men the surest guarantee of its continuance, and it usually makes every effort to keep them separate. No vice of the human heart is so acceptable to it as selfishness: a despot easily forgives his subjects for not loving him, provided they do not love one another. He does not ask them to assist him in governing the state; it is enough that they do not aspire to govern it themselves. He stigmatizes as turbulent and unruly spirits those who would combine their exertions to promote the prosperity of the community; and, perverting the natural meaning of words, he applauds as good citizens those who have no sympathy for any but themselves.

Thus the vices which despotism produces are precisely those which equality fosters. These two things perniciously complete and assist each other. Equality places men side by side, unconnected by any common tie; despotism raises barriers to keep them asunder; the former predisposes them not to consider their fellow creatures, the latter makes general indifference a sort of public virtue.

Despotism, then, which is at all times dangerous, is more particularly to be feared in democratic ages. It is easy to see that in those same ages men stand most in need of freedom. When the members of a community are forced to attend to public affairs, they are necessarily drawn from the circle of their own interests and snatched at times from self-observation. As soon as a man begins to treat of public affairs in public, he begins to perceive that he is not so independent of his fellow men as he had at first imagined, and that in order to obtain their support he must often lend them his co-operation.

When the public govern, there is no man who does not feel the value of public goodwill or who does not endeavor to court it by drawing to himself the esteem and affection of those among whom he is to live. Many of the passions which congeal and keep asunder human hearts are then obliged to retire and hide below the surface. Pride must be dissembled; disdain dares not break out; selfishness fears its own self. Under a free government, as most public offices are elective, the men whose elevated minds or aspiring hopes are too closely circumscribed in private life constantly feel that they cannot do without the people who surround them. Men learn at such times to think of their fellow men from ambitious motives; and they frequently find it, in a manner, their interest to forget themselves.

I may here be met by an objection derived from electioneering, intrigues, the meanness of candidates, and the calumnies of their opponents. These are occasions of enmity which occur the oftener the more frequent elections become. Such evils are doubtless great, but they are transient; whereas the benefits that attend them remain. The desire of being elected may lead some men for a time to violent hostility; but this same desire leads all men in the long run to support each other; and if it happens that an election accidentally severs two friends, the electoral system brings a multitude of citizens permanently together who would otherwise always have remained unknown to one another. Freedom produces private animosities, but despotism gives birth to general indifference.

The Americans have combated by free institutions the tendency of equality to keep men asunder, and they have subdued it. The legislators of America did not suppose that a general representation of the whole nation would suffice to ward off a disorder at once so natural to the frame of democratic society and so fatal; they also thought that it would be well to infuse political life into each portion of the territory in order to multiply to an infinite extent opportunities of acting in concert for all the members of the community and to make them constantly feel their mutual dependence. The plan was a wise one. The general affairs of a country engage the attention only of leading politicians, who assemble from time to time in the same places; and as they often lose sight of each other afterwards, no lasting ties are established between them. But if the object be to have the local affairs of a district conducted by the men who reside there, the same persons are always in contact, and they are, in a manner, forced to be acquainted and to adapt themselves to one another.

That the Americans Combat the Effects of Individualism by Free Institutions, cont'd.

It is difficult to draw a man out of his own circle to interest him in the destiny of the state, because he does not clearly understand what influence the destiny of the state can have upon his own lot. But if it is proposed to make a road cross the end of his estate, he will see at a glance that there is a connection between this small public affair and his greatest private affairs; and he will discover, without its being shown to him, the close tie that unites private to general interest. Thus far more may be done by entrusting to the citizens the administration of minor affairs than by surrendering to them in the control of important ones, towards interesting them in the public welfare and convincing them that they constantly stand in need of one another in order to provide for it. A brilliant achievement may win for you the favor of a people at one stroke; but to earn the love and respect of the population that surrounds you, a long succession of little services rendered and of obscure good deeds, a constant habit of kindness, and an established reputation for disinterestedness will be required. Local freedom, then, which leads a great number of citizens to value the affection of their neighbors and of their kindred, perpetually brings men together and forces them to help one another in spite of the propensities that sever them.

In the United States the more opulent citizens take great care not to stand aloof from the people; on the contrary, they constantly keep on easy terms with the lower classes: they listen to them, they speak to them every day. They know that the rich in democracies always stand in need of the poor, and that in democratic times you attach a poor man to you more by your manner than by benefits conferred. The magnitude of such benefits, which sets off the difference of condition, causes a secret irritation to those who reap advantage from them, but the charm of simplicity of manners is almost irresistible; affability carries men away, and even want of polish is not always displeasing. This truth does not take root at once in the minds of the rich. They generally resist it as long as the democratic revolution lasts, and they do not acknowledge it immediately after that revolution is accomplished. They are very ready to do good to the people, but they still choose to keep them at arm's length; they think that is sufficient, but they are mistaken. They might spend fortunes thus without warming the hearts of the population around them; that population does not ask them for the sacrifice of their money, but of their pride.

It would seem as if every imagination in the United States were upon the stretch to invent means of increasing the wealth and satisfying the wants of the public. The best-informed inhabitants of each district constantly use their information to discover new truths that may augment the general prosperity; and if they have made any such discoveries, they eagerly surrender them to the mass of the people.

When the vices and weaknesses frequently exhibited by those who govern in America are closely examined, the prosperity of the people occasions, but improperly occasions, surprise. Elected magistrates do not make the American democracy flourish; it flourishes because the magistrates are elective.

It would be unjust to suppose that the patriotism and the zeal that every American displays for the welfare of his fellow citizens are wholly insincere. Although private interest directs the greater part of human actions in the United States as well as elsewhere, it does not regulate them all. I must say that I have often seen Americans make great and real sacrifices to the public welfare; and I have noticed a hundred instances in which they hardly ever failed to lend faithful support to one another. The free institutions which the inhabitants of the United States possess, and the political rights of which they make so much use, remind every citizen, and in a thousand ways, that he lives in society. They every instant impress upon his mind the notion that it is the duty as well as the interest of men to make themselves useful to their fellow creatures; and as he sees no particular ground of animosity to them, since he is never either their master or their slave, his heart readily leans to the side of kindness. Men attend to the interests of the public, first by necessity, afterwards by choice; what was intentional becomes an instinct, and by dint of working for the good of one's fellow citizens, the habit and the taste for serving them are at length acquired.

Many people in France consider equality of condition as one evil and political freedom as a second. When they are obliged to yield to the former, they strive at least to escape from the latter. But I contend that in order to combat the evils which equality may produce, there is only one effectual remedy: namely, political freedom.

Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*: “Of the Use Which the Americans Make of Public Associations in Civil Life”

(Volume II, Part II, Chapter V)

I DO not propose to speak of those political associations by the aid of which men endeavor to defend themselves against the despotic action of a majority or against the aggressions of regal power. That subject I have already treated. If each citizen did not learn, in proportion as he individually becomes more feeble and consequently more incapable of preserving his freedom single-handed, to combine with his fellow citizens for the purpose of defending it, it is clear that tyranny would unavoidably increase together with equality.

Only those associations that are formed in civil life without reference to political objects are here referred to. The political associations that exist in the United States are only a single feature in the midst of the immense assemblage of associations in that country. Americans of all ages, all conditions, and all dispositions constantly form associations. They have not only commercial and manufacturing companies, in which all take part, but associations of a thousand other kinds, religious, moral, serious, futile, general or restricted, enormous or diminutive. The Americans make associations to give entertainments, to found seminaries, to build inns, to construct churches, to diffuse books, to send missionaries to the antipodes; in this manner they found hospitals, prisons, and schools. If it is proposed to inculcate some truth or to foster some feeling by the encouragement of a great example, they form a society. Wherever at the head of some new undertaking you see the government in France, or a man of rank in England, in the United States you will be sure to find an association.

I met with several kinds of associations in America of which I confess I had no previous notion; and I have often admired the extreme skill with which the inhabitants of the United States succeed in proposing a common object for the exertions of a great many men and in inducing them voluntarily to pursue it.

I have since traveled over England, from which the Americans have taken some of their laws and many of their customs; and it seemed to me that the principle of association was by no means so constantly or adroitly used in that country. The English often perform great things singly, whereas the Americans form associations for the smallest undertakings. It is evident that the former people consider association as a powerful means of action, but the latter seem to regard it as the only means they have of acting.

Thus the most democratic country on the face of the earth is that in which men have, in our time, carried to the highest perfection the art of pursuing in common the object of their common desires and have applied this new science to the greatest number of purposes. Is this the result of accident, or is there in reality any necessary connection between the principle of association and that of equality?

Aristocratic communities always contain, among a multitude of persons who by themselves are powerless, a small number of powerful and wealthy citizens, each of whom can achieve great undertakings single-handed. In aristocratic societies men do not need to combine in order to act, because they are strongly held together. Every wealthy and powerful citizen constitutes the head of a permanent and compulsory association, composed of all those who are dependent upon him or whom he makes subservient to the execution of his designs.

Among democratic nations, on the contrary, all the citizens are independent and feeble; they can do hardly anything by themselves, and none of them can oblige his fellow men to lend him their assistance. They all, therefore, become powerless if they do not learn voluntarily to help one another. If men living in democratic countries had no right and no inclination to associate for political purposes, their independence would be in great jeopardy, but they might long preserve their wealth and their cultivation: whereas if they never acquired the habit of forming associations in ordinary life, civilization itself would be endangered. A people among whom individuals lost the power of achieving great things single-handed, without acquiring the means of producing them by united exertions, would soon relapse into barbarism.

Unhappily, the same social condition that renders associations so necessary to democratic nations renders their formation more difficult among those nations than among all others. When several members of an aristocracy agree to combine, they easily succeed in doing so; as each of them brings great strength to the partnership, the

Of the Use Which the Americans Make of Public Associations in Civil Life, cont'd.

number of its members may be very limited; and when the members of an association are limited in number, they may easily become mutually acquainted, understand each other, and establish fixed regulations. The same opportunities do not occur among democratic nations, where the associated members must always be very numerous for their association to have any power.

I am aware that many of my countrymen are not in the least embarrassed by this difficulty. They contend that the more enfeebled and incompetent the citizens become, the more able and active the government ought to be rendered in order that society at large may execute what individuals can no longer accomplish. They believe this answers the whole difficulty, but I think they are mistaken.

A government might perform the part of some of the largest American companies, and several states, members of the Union, have already attempted it; but what political power could ever carry on the vast multitude of lesser undertakings which the American citizens perform every day, with the assistance of the principle of association? It is easy to foresee that the time is drawing near when man will be less and less able to produce, by himself alone, the commonest necessities of life. The task of the governing power will therefore perpetually increase, and its very efforts will extend it every day. The more it stands in the place of associations, the more will individuals, losing the notion of combining together, require its assistance: these are causes and effects that unceasingly create each other. Will the administration of the country ultimately assume the management of all the manufactures which no single citizen is able to carry on? And if a time at length arrives when, in consequence of the extreme subdivision of landed property, the soil is split into an infinite number of parcels, so that it can be cultivated only by companies of tillers will it be necessary that the head of the government should leave the helm of state to follow the plow? The morals and the intelligence of a democratic people would be as much endangered as its business and manufactures if the government ever wholly usurped the place of private companies. Feelings and opinions are recruited, the heart is enlarged, and the human mind is developed only by the reciprocal influence of men upon one another. I have shown that these influences are almost null in democratic countries; they must therefore be artificially created, and this can only be accomplished by associations.

When the members of an aristocratic community adopt a new opinion or conceive a new sentiment, they give it a station, as it were, beside themselves, upon the lofty platform where they stand; and opinions or sentiments so conspicuous to the eyes of the multitude are easily introduced into the minds or hearts of all around. In democratic countries the governing power alone is naturally in a condition to act in this manner, but it is easy to see that its action is always inadequate, and often dangerous. A government can no more be competent to keep alive and to renew the circulation of opinions and feelings among a great people than to manage all the speculations of productive industry. No sooner does a government attempt to go beyond its political sphere and to enter upon this new track than it exercises, even unintentionally, an insupportable tyranny; for a government can only dictate strict rules, the opinions which it favors are rigidly enforced, and it is never easy to discriminate between its advice and its commands. Worse still will be the case if the government really believes itself interested in preventing all circulation of ideas; it will then stand motionless and oppressed by the heaviness of voluntary torpor. Governments, therefore, should not be the only active powers; associations ought, in democratic nations, to stand in lieu of those powerful private individuals whom the equality of conditions has swept away.

As soon as several of the inhabitants of the United States have taken up an opinion or a feeling which they wish to promote in the world, they look out for mutual assistance; and as soon as they have found one another out, they combine. From that moment they are no longer isolated men, but a power seen from afar, whose actions serve for an example and whose language is listened to. The first time I heard in the United States that a hundred thousand men had bound themselves publicly to abstain from spirituous liquors, it appeared to me more like a joke than a serious engagement, and I did not at once perceive why these temperate citizens could not content themselves with drinking water by their own firesides. I at last understood that these hundred thousand Americans, alarmed by the progress of drunkenness around them, had made up their minds to patronize temperance.

They acted in just the same way as a man of high rank who should dress very plainly in order to inspire the humbler orders with a contempt of luxury. It is probable that if these hundred thousand men had lived in France, each of them would singly have memorialized the government to watch the public houses all over the kingdom.

Of the Use Which the Americans Make of Public Associations in Civil Life, cont'd.

Nothing, in my opinion, is more deserving of our attention than the intellectual and moral associations of America. The political and industrial associations of that country strike us forcibly; but the others elude our observation, or if we discover them, we understand them imperfectly because we have hardly ever seen anything of the kind. It must be acknowledged, however, that they are as necessary to the American people as the former, and perhaps more so. In democratic countries the science of association is the mother of science; the progress of all the rest depends upon the progress it has made.

Among the laws that rule human societies there is one which seems to be more precise and clear than all others. If men are to remain civilized or to become so, the art of associating together must grow and improve in the same ratio in which the equality of conditions is increased.

The Whole World's Temperance Convention Held at Metropolitan Hall in the City of New York on Thursday and Friday, Sept. 1st and 2d, 1853

NEW YORK: FOWLERS AND WELLS, PUBLISHERS
Clinton Hall, 131 Nassau Street. 1853.

Compiled from the Reports in Tribune, Times and Herald; principally from the Tribune.

E. O JENKINS, PRINTER AND {Omitted text, 1 word}

[CALL.] WHOLE WORLD'S TEMPERANCE CONVENTION.

Whereas, In response to a call for a preliminary meeting of the friends of Temperance in North America, to make arrangements for a World's Temperance Convention in the City of New York, during the World's Fair, a meeting assembled in that City, on the 12th of May, 1853, which assumed the power to exclude several regularly elected Delegates because they were Women;

And *whereas*, A portion of the members of that meeting retired from it, regarding it as false both to the letter and spirit of the call;

The undersigned, consisting in part of such seceding Delegates, hereby invite all those in favor of a **World's Temperance Convention**, *which shall be true to its name*, to meet in the City of New York on Thursday and Friday, the 1st and 2d of September next, to consider the present needs of the Temperance Reform.

New York, July 15, 1853.

PREFACE To The WHOLE WORLD'S TEMPERANCE CONVENTION.
Call for the Preliminary Meeting.

The following call appeared in the N.Y. Tribune, April, 7, 1853:

World's Temperance Convention. —The undersigned, in concurrence with a resolution of the Massachusetts Temperance Convention, respectfully invite the friends of Temperance in each State, and in Canada, to appoint some person or persons to meet in the City of New York, on Thursday the 12th of May next, at 9 A. M., to make arrangements for the holding of a great Temperance Convention, in said City, during the World's Fair. Place of meeting will be duly notified. All communications relative to such

New York, April 6, 1853. The following report of the doings at the preliminary meeting is taken from the Tribune and the Herald of May 13, 1853:

WORLD'S TEMPERANCE CONVENTION.

Meeting of Delegates.

EXCITING PROCEEDINGS; EXPULSION OF FEMALE DELEGATES.

Agreeably to a call previously, a number of the friends of Temperance met yesterday morning in the Lecture Room of the Brick Church, with a view to adopt the necessary preliminaries to hold a grand World's Convention in the City of New York, some time during the continuance of the World's Fair. The meeting was called to order by E. M. Jackson, Corresponding Secretary of the State Central Committee of Pennsylvania, who moved the Hon. A. C. Barstow, Mayor of Providence, to the Chair, which was carried *nem. con.*; upon which, the Rev. George Duffield, Jun., of Philadelphia, and the Rev. R. S. Crampton, of Rochester, New York, were appointed to act as Secretaries. After prayer by the Rev. Dr. Hewett:

Rev. **John Marsh**, of New York, moved that all gentlemen present; who were friends of Temperance, be admitted as delegates.

Dr. **Trall**, of New York, stated that there were delegates present from the Women's State Temperance Society, and moved that the word "ladies" be inserted in the motion offered by Mr. Marsh, which was carried unanimously.

The Whole World's Temperance Convention, cont'd.

The motion as amended was then adopted, and the names of the gentlemen and ladies present were collected by the Secretaries, and enrolled by States. Those holding credentials also handed them in to the Secretaries.

Mr. **Higginson**, of Massachusetts, one of the above-named Committee, rose and said That as women were very properly acting as delegates in the Convention, they should be represented on the Committee, and moved that Miss Susan B. Anthony, of Rochester, be admitted a member of the above-named Committee.

Dr. **Hewett** hereupon arose and said, that in certain parts of the country women had received a good deal of celebrity and notoriety. He did not mean to disparage them; but it was quite sufficient for his purpose merely to state that he was not prepared to give to women that prominent place in arranging the affairs of mankind which hitherto was the province, and was given to others. It was with very great hesitation, and not without a sacrifice of feeling, that he was induced to take the stand he was determined upon in relation to the subject now before the convention. His years, and the place he had occupied in the great work of temperance, betrayed some of the relics of a former age; and he was not prepared to acquiesce in any such invasion as would tend to interfere with the settled laws of society "revolution was one thing and reformation was another."

Rev. Mr. **Fowler**, of Utica, hoped the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. Higginson) would not be pressed. If so, and it prevailed, those ladies, as well as others, should be appointed.

Mr. Higginson was proceeding to reply, when he was interrupted by cries of "Out of order," "Lay the motion on the table," and loud demonstrations of disapprobation, when the following were handed in by Mrs. Lydia F. Fowler, of New York. The names of the other ladies were Miss Mary S. Rich, Miss Emily Clark, of Le Roy, N. Y.; Miss Anthony, of Rochester; Mrs. Mary Vaughn, Oswego; Lucy Stone, Mass; and Abby K. Foster, Mass. Their unexpected presence created quite a sensation. The following is a copy of the credentials of Mrs. Fowler:

Seneca Falls, N. Y., April 25, 1853.

To Mrs. Lydia F. Fowler:

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of "Woman's New York Temperance Society," held at Seneca Falls on the 23d instant, you were appointed a delegate to attend the meeting called by Neal Dow, to be held in your city on the 12th May, to make arrangements for holding a World's Temperance Convention in New York some time during the World's Fair.

AMELIA BLOOMER, *Corresponding Secretary.*

The other document read as follows:

At a meeting of the Executive Committee of the "Woman's New York Temperance Society," held on the 23d inst, the following persons were appointed as delegates to attend a meeting to be held in new York city, on 12th May, for the purpose of making arrangements for a World's Temperance Convention, some time during the World's Fair, viz:—Mrs. E. F. Ellet, Mrs Horace Greeley, Mrs. L. F. Fowler, Miss Mary Rich, Miss Emily Clark, (Le Roy, N. Y.,) and Susan B. Anthony. S. B. ANTHONY, *Secretary Woman's State Temperance Society.*

The question on Mr. Higginson's motion to receive the name of Miss Anthony was then put from the chair, and negatived, amid some excitement, when

Mr. **Thompson**, of Mass, rose and said this was a "World's Temperance Convention," and the great portion of the world had to be represented, if they desired it understood that this was World's Convention at all. He would, therefore, move a reconsideration, and to take the motion from the table.

Mr. **Higginson** here rose, and requested to have his name stricken out from the list appointed to act as a business committee. He would give his reasons if permitted to do so.

The convention voted by a small majority not to receive Mr. Higginson's resignation and the committee retired.

Hon. **Bradford R. Wood**, of Albany, then moved that the convention do adjourn *sine die*, for there is party here who are abound to run this affair right straight into the ground, and they came here for that express purpose, and no other; but on request, he withdrew the motion, and moved that a Committee on Credentials be appointed.

Rev. John Chambers, Hon. Bradford R. Wood, and Dr. Condit were appointed such committee.

The Whole World's Temperance Convention, cont'd.

Rev. Mr. **Marsh**—Let the matter be referred to the committee just selected, and they can then report.

Mr. **Higginson**—I am not here, Mr. Chairman, as a gentleman or as a lady, but as a friend of temperance; and that committee is not a fair representation of the friends of temperance, when you exclude women, who have attended here in compliance with your call. He thought that in a World's Convention woman should be represented, otherwise it would be only a Semi-World's Convention. The ladies present have done good work in the cause in this city, through the State of New York, and in the Assembly. He felt that they were entitled to have an equal voice in the proceedings.

Rev. Mr. **Fowler**, of Utica—I hope the gentleman will be excused from serving, as he desire it.

Chairman—I should be sorry if he did. He a very active member, and did a great deal to bring about this convention.

Mrs. **Abby K. Foster** here rose, amid considerable confusion and cries of order. She said: Mr. Chairman, (cries of "Order," "Sit down," "I claim the privilege. ("Order, order.") I hope, sir, that this is to be no sectarian test. ("Order" from different parts of the room, and cries of "We don't want to hear your remarks.") I hope that gentlemen will allow me to express my opinions, as I only take the liberty to express my views—

Rev. Dr. **Hewett** here rose to order, and Chairman requested Mrs. Foster to take her place. The excitement was considerably increased by this personal rencontre in the meeting, upon which

Joseph A. Dugdale, a Quaker, rose, and denounced the proceeding of the Convention with much indignation. He requested that his should be expunged, as they had excluded the women from the Convention.

Col. **E. L. Snow** stated that he received much support and encouragement from the ladies, when in the Assembly, and he felt that what they had in their hearts to do for the cause they should be allowed to do without hindrance.

Rev. **J. B. Wakely** and others also spoke in favor of the ladies being represented on the committee.

Mr. **Thompson** (Mass.) here made a separate motion; he moved that the name of Miss Lucy Stone be added to the committee.

Miss **Emily Clark**, of Leroy, New York, here rose to second the motion, amid much confusion and alternate cries of "order," "hear her," "hear her," "order," "order." Miss C. Still holding on to floor.

Chairman—If that motion is put, I shall certainly resign. I honor women as much as most men, but I am opposed to their taking part in such proceedings as these.

Mr. **Wood**—I move that we adjourn, if we are to be subjected to such interruptions as these.

Mr. **Wheeler**, of New York—I move that we proceed without any further interruptions, and that the speakers be restricted to ten minutes upon the floor while speaking. I also move that no speaker be allowed to address the meeting more than once without the consent of the convention.

Mr. **Armstrong**, of Saratoga, wished to know if this convention was to be considered a deliberative body or a delegated body?

Mr. **Chairman** referred to the minutes, and the requisition calling the meeting was at the same time read, showing that the friends of temperance were invited, upon which other names were handled in.

Mrs. **Foster** again took the floor, and made an effort to be heard, but was repeatedly interrupted, and obliged to resume her seat amid much confusion; she then joined the part of the convention who supported the women, who had congregated by this time pretty strong at one side of the room.

Rev. Mr. **Buckhart** here rose, and stated that he was opposed to the entire proceedings before the convention, since its opening to-day. He was opposed to women interfering with matters out of their own sphere.

Mrs. Foster was about to reply and was opposed, when Mr. **Higginson** again rose to press his motion, and moved that it be adopted.

Chairman—If so I will not preside over the Convention.

The Whole World's Temperance Convention, cont'd.

The committee who had been appointed to examine the credentials of Delegates, hereupon returned from their deliberations, and presented their report. The Chairman reported that the committee were unanimous in favor of not receiving the "Women Delegations." This gave rise to a second debate, more exciting by far than the first, and brought Mr. Higginson again to the floor. He said, the Committee had excluded the names of several ladies, and he wished to know the particular ground. He supposed the design was—

Mr. **Wood** (the Chairman of the Committee)—The grounds we took were to exclude all women. The Committee were unanimously of opinion that it was not intended by those whom called this meeting that female delegates should be received, that their credentials should be disregarded, and that otherwise the roll should remain as completed by the Secretary.

Mr. **Higginson**—I know something about this call, as it originated by a resolution from myself, which I offered at the Massachusetts State Convention. I certainly never would have dreamed of setting my hand to pen such a resolution or propose it, if I considered that women were to be excluded from this meeting. (Loud and continued applause from the "woman" side of the house.) It is not the matter of "woman's rights" we are considering, or have to consider, at all. It is the question as to whether this is to be considered a meeting of the friends of temperance. Are these women not the friends of temperance? Are they not advocates of temperance? Then why exclude them? Let us but exclude them, and then they have a right—

Mr. **Condit**, of New Jersey, here rose and called the gentleman to order.

Mr. **Bradford Wood**—I move that the gentleman be heard for five minutes longer.

Mr. **Higginson** here resumed the floor, and continued:—I did not speak at first to this question at all. I have no desire to throw a firebrand into this meeting. I have only made one speech on the "woman question." After some further remarks on a point of order, Mr. H. moved to amend the report of the Committee on Credentials.

Dr. **Hewett** quoted from Paul and other Scriptural authorities, which he claimed to be against women speaking in the Church, and in favor of asking her husband at home, &c. He would have nothing to do with the women.

Rev. Mr. **Chambers** was particularly severe upon one of the excluded ladies, (Abby Kelly Foster,) whose name he declined to give, charging her with outraging the proprieties of her sex, trampling the very Son of God under her blasphemous feet. For his part, he was glad these women were gone; they had thus gotten rid of the scum of the Convention.

Much confusion prevailed at this stage of the proceeding.

E. W. **Jackson**, of Penn., said he had known some of these women for twenty years. They were in the habit of disturbing the Anti Slavery meetings in the same way, with their stuff and nonsense about "Women's Rights." They had come to this Hall, expressly, to do what they had attempted to-day. But he would inform the gentleman over the way, (Dr. Townsend,) that they had not come to New York to attend this Convention, but *other* Conventions with which their names would be found associated. He was very severe upon the expelled ladies, and received warm applause from the majority.

The President of the Convention, (Mr. **Barstow** of R. I.,) followed in some remarks of equal severity. He referred to "*women in breeches*" as a disgrace to their sex, &c. He did not know what such women were good for. He believed they were never *productive* in anything but mischief. (Laughter and cheers.)

The discussion was here closed by the final withdrawal of Dr. Townsend's motion to pay the expenses of the rejected female delegates.

A collection to pay the keeper of the hall, and to defray other incidental expenses, was taken up, the President exhorting to liberality, and remarking that any surplus could go into the hands of Dr. Marsh, in aid of the American Temperance Union. The meeting then adjourned *sine die*.

An Appeal to the Women of the United States by the National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee, Washington, D.C.

Hartford: Case, Lockwood & Brainard, Printers. 1871.

Dear Friends:—The question of your rights as citizens of the United State, and of grave responsibilities which a recognition of those rights will involve, is becoming the great question of the day in this country, and is the culmination of the great question which has been struggling through and ages for solution, that of the highest freedom and largest personal responsibility of the individual under such necessary and wholesome restraints as are required by the welfare of society. As you shall meet and act upon this question, so shall these great questions of freedom and responsibility sweep on, or be retarded, in their course.

This is pre-eminently the birth-day of womanhood. The material has long held in bondage the spiritual; henceforth the two, the material refined by the spiritual, the spiritual energized by the material, are to walk hand in hand for the moral regeneration of mankind. Mothers, for the first time in history, are able to assert, not only their inherent first right to the children they have borne, but their right to be a protective and purifying power in the political society into which those children are to enter. To fulfil, therefore, their whole duty of motherhood, to satisfy their whole capacity in that divine relation, they are called of God to participate, with man, in all the responsibilities of human life, and to share with him every work of brain and of heart, refusing only those physical labors that are inconsistent with the exalted duties and privileges of maternity, and requiring these of men as the equivalent of those heavy yet necessary burdens which women alone can bear.

Under the constitution of the United States justly interpreted, you were entitled to participate in the government to the country, in the same manner as you were held to allegiance and subject to penalty. But in the slow development of the great principles of freedom, you, and all, have failed both to recognize and appreciate this right; but to-day, when the rights and responsibilities of women are attracting the attention of thoughtful minds throughout the whole civilized world, this constitutional right, so long unobserved and unvalued, is becoming one of prime importance, and calls upon all women who love their children and their country to accept and rejoice in it. Thousands of year ago God uttered this mingled command and promise, "Honor thy father AND THY MOTHER, that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.: May we not hope that in the general recognition of this right and this duty of woman to participate in government, our beloved country may find her days long and prosperous in this beautiful land which the Lord hath given her.

To the women of this country who are willing to unite with us in securing the full recognition of our rights, and to accept the duties and responsibilities of a full citizenship, we offer for signature the following Declaration and Pledge, in the firm belief that our children's children will with fond veneration recognize in this act our devotion to the great doctrines of liberty in their new and wider and more spiritual application, even as we regard with reverence the prophetic utterances of the Fathers of the Republic in their Declaration of Independence:

Declaration and Fledge of the Women of the United States concerning their Right to and their Use of the Elective Franchise.

"We, the undersigned, believing that the sacred rights and privileges of citizenship in this Republic were guaranteed to us by the original Constitution, and that these rights are confirmed and more clearly established by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, so that we can no longer refuse the solemn responsibilities thereof, do hereby pledge ourselves to accept the duties of the franchise in our several States, so soon as all legal restrictions are removed.

"And believing that character is the best safe-guard of national liberty, we pledge ourselves to make the personal purity and integrity of candidates for public office and *first* test of fitness.

"And lastly, believing in God, as the Supreme Author of the American Declaration of Independence, we pledge ourselves in the spirit of that memorable Act, to work hand in hand with our fathers, husbands, and sons, for the maintenance of those equal rights on which our Republic was originally founded, to the end that it may have, what is declared to be the first condition of just government, *the consent of the governed.*"

An Appeal to the Women of the United States, cont'd.

You have no new issue to make, no new grievances to set forth. You are taxed without representation, tried by a jury not of your peers, condemned and punished by judges and officers not of your choice, bound by laws you have had no voice in making, many of which are specially burdensome upon you as women; in short, your rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are daily infringed, simply because you have heretofore been denied the use of the ballot, the one weapon of protection and defense under a republican form of government. Fortunately, however, you are not compelled to resort to force in order to secure the rights of a complete citizenship. These are provided for by the original Constitution, and by the recent amendments you are recognized as citizens of the United States, whose rights, including the fundamental right to vote, may not be denied or abridged by the United States, nor by any State. The obligation is thus laid upon you to accept or reject the duties of citizenship, and to your own consciences and your God you must answer if the future legislation of this country shall fall short of the demands of justice and equality.

The participation of woman in political affairs is not an untried experiment. Woman suffrage has within a few years been fully established in Sweden and Austria, and to a certain extent in Russia. In Great Britain women are now voting equally with men for all public officers except members of Parliament, and while no desire is expressed in any quarter that the suffrage already given should be withdrawn or restricted, over 126,000 names have been signed to petitions for its extension to parliamentary elections; and Jacob Bright, the leader of the movement in Parliament, and brother of the well known John Bright, says that no well informed person entertains any doubt that a bill for such extension will soon pass.

In this country, which stands so specially on equal representation, it is hardly possible that the same equal suffrage would not be established by law if the matter were to be left merely to the progress of public sentiment and the ordinary course of legislation. But as we confidently believe, and as we have before stated, the right already exists in our national constitutions, and especially under the recent amendments. The interpretation of the Constitution which we maintain, we cannot doubt, will be ultimately adopted by the Courts, although, as the assertion of our right encounters a deep and prevailing prejudice, and judges are proverbially cautious and conservative, we must expect to encounter some adverse decisions. In the mean time it is of the highest importance that in every possible way we inform the public mind and educate public opinion on the whole subject of equal rights under a republican government, and that we manifest our desire for and willingness to accept all the rights and responsibilities of citizenship, by asserting our right to be registered as voters and to vote at the Congressional elections. The original Constitution provides in express terms that the representatives in Congress shall be elected "by the PEOPLE of the several States"—with no restriction whatever as to the application of that term. This right, thus clearly granted to all the people, is confirmed and placed beyond reasonable question by the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. The act of May, 1870, the very title of which, "*An Act to enforce the rights of citizens of the United States to vote,*" is a concession of all that we claim, provides that the officers of elections throughout the United States shall give an equal opportunity to all citizens of the United States to become qualified to vote by the registry of their names or other pre-requisite; and that where upon the application of any citizen such pre-requisite is refused, such citizens may vote without performing such pre-requisite; and imposes a penalty upon the officers refusing either the application of the citizen to be qualified or his subsequent application to vote. The constitution also provides that "each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members." When therefore the election of any candidate for the lower House is effected or defeated by the admission or rejection of the votes of women, the question is brought directly before the House, and it is compelled to pass at once upon the question of the right of women to vote under the Constitution. All this may be accomplished without the necessity of bringing suits for the penalty imposed upon public officers by the act referred to: but should it be thought best to institute prosecutions where the application of women to register and to vote is refused, the question would thereby at once be brought into the Courts. If it be thought expedient to adopt the latter course, it is best that some test case be brought upon full consultation with the National Committee, that the ablest counsel may be employed and the expenses paid out of the public fund. Whatever mode of testing the question shall be adopted, we must not be in the slightest degree discouraged by adverse decisions, for the final result in our favor is certain, and we have besides great reason to hope that Congress at an early day will pass a Declaratory Act affirming the interpretation of the Constitution which we claim.

An Appeal to the Women of the United States, cont'd.

The present time is specially favorable for the earnest presentation before the public mind of the question of the political rights of women. There are very positive indications of the approaching disintegration and re-formation of political parties, and new and vital issues are needed by both the great parties of the country. As soon as the conviction possesses the public mind that women are to be voters at an early day, as they certainly are to be, the principles and the action of public parties will be shaping themselves with reference to the demands of this new constituency. Particularly in nominations for office will the moral character of candidates become a matter of greater importance.

To carry on this great work a Board of six women has been established, called "The National Woman Suffrage and Educational Committee," whose office at Washington it is proposed to make the centre of all action upon Congress and the country, and with whom through their Secretary, resident there, it is desired that all associations and individuals interested in the cause of woman suffrage should place themselves in communication. The committee propose to circulate the very able and exhaustive Minority Report of the House Judiciary Committee on the constitutional right of woman to the suffrage, and other tracts on the general subject of woman suffrage. They also propose ultimately, and as a part of their educational work, to issue a series of tracts on subjects vitally affecting the welfare of the country, that women may become intelligent and thoughtful on such subjects, and the intelligent educators of the next generation of citizens.

The Committee are already receiving urgent appeals from women all over the United States to send them our publications. The little light they have already received concerning their rights under the constitution, and the present threatening political aspect of the country, make them impatient of ignorance on these vital points. A single Tract has often gone the rounds in a neighborhood until worn out, and the call is for thousands and thousands more.

A large printing fund will therefore be needed by the Committee, and we appeal first to the men of this country, who control so large a part of its wealth, to make liberal donations toward this great educational work. We also ask every thoughtful woman to send her name to the Secretary to be inserted in the Pledge Book, and if she is able, one dollar. But as many working women will have nothing to send by their names, we welcome these as a precious gift, and urge those who are able, to send us their fifties and hundreds, which we promise faithfully to use and account for. Where convenient it is better that many names should be sent upon the same paper, and the smallest contributions in money can be put together and sent with them. Every signature and every remittance will be at once acknowledged by the Secretary, and one or more tracts enclosed, with a circular as to the work to be done by individuals.

- **Isabella Beecher Hooker**, President
- **Josephine S. Griffing**, Secretary
- **Mary B. Bowen**, Treasurer

Washington D. C., April 19, 1871

- **Paulina Wright Davis**
- **Ruth Carr Denison**
- **Susan B. Anthony**

I.W.W. Song: “Long-Haired Preachers”

The Industrial Workers of the World (the I.W.W.) was started in Chicago in June of 1905 by Big Bill Haywood of the Western Federation of Miners and others who were dissatisfied with the lack of progress of the craft unions under Sam Gompers’ American Federation of Labor. They were a radical group, mostly anarchist-syndicalists. They intended to sign up all the workers in One Big Union, improve their conditions, and eventually call a general strike to decide who was going to run the world—the workers or the bosses. Every member received a little red songbook with their union card that included about 50 protest songs, usually sung to popular tunes of the day.

Long-Haired Preachers

First published in the July 6, 1911 edition of the Industrial Worker “Little Red Songbook” as “Long-Haired Preachers,” credited to F. B. Brechler (subsequently credited to Joe Hill in March 6, 1913, fifth edition).

Long-haired preachers come out every night,
Try to tell you what’s wrong and what’s right;
But when asked how ‘bout something to eat
They will answer with voices so sweet:

CHORUS:

You will eat, bye and bye,
In that glorious land above the sky;
Work and pray, live on hay,
You’ll get pie in the sky when you die.

The starvation army they play,
They sing and they clap and they pray
‘Till they get all your coin on the drum
Then they’ll tell you when you’re on the bum:

Holy Rollers and jumpers come out,
They holler, they jump and they shout.
Give your money to Jesus they say,
He will cure all diseases today.
If you fight hard for children and wife—
Try to get something good in this life—
You’re a sinner and bad man, they tell,
When you die you will sure go to hell.

Workingmen of all countries, unite,
Side by side we for freedom will fight;
When the world and its wealth we have gained
To the grafters we’ll sing this refrain:

FINAL CHORUS:

You will eat, bye and bye,
When you’ve learned how to cook and to fry.
Chop some wood, ‘twill do you good,
And you’ll eat in the sweet bye and bye.