

The Remedial Herstory Project

INQUIRY-BASED LESSON PLAN

STAGING THE INQUIRY

For this inquiry, teachers should consider opening with an intriguing and open ended question, then provide some background on this topic generally in the form of a video, brief lecture, or presentation. Close the introduction by asking students what questions they have, guide them in discussion to the question for the inquiry, highlighted at the top of the next page.

ACTIVITY TASKS

- Pose a broad open ended question. Provide background information.
- Students respond to questions in this packet independently or with a partner.
- Consider doing one of the following to extend the exercise:
 - Facilitate student discussion of the compelling question.
 - Facilitate a 4-corner debate.
 - Facilitate a structured academic controversy.
 - Students assume the characters involved and discuss the compelling question in character.
- Students craft an argument.

C3 FRAMEWORK

D1.1.9-12. Explain how a question reflects an enduring issue in the field.

D1.2.9-12. Explain points of agreement and disagreement experts have about interpretations and applications of disciplinary concepts and ideas associated with a compelling question.

D2.His.4.9-12. Analyze complex and interacting factors that influenced the perspectives of people during different historical eras.

D2.His.5.9-12. Analyze how historical contexts shaped and continue to shape people's perspectives.

D2.His.10.9-12. Detect possible limitations in various kinds of historical evidence and differing secondary interpretations.

D2.His.11.9-12. Critique

the usefulness of historical sources for a specific historical inquiry based on their maker, date, place of origin, intended audience, and purpose.

D2.His.12.9-12. Use questions generated about multiple historical sources to pursue further inquiry and investigate additional sources.

D2.His.14.9-12. Analyze multiple and complex causes and effects of events in the past.

D2.His.16.9-12. Integrate evidence from multiple relevant historical sources and interpretations into a reasoned argument about the past.

Inquiry Activity: Were white suffragists racist?

In the last few decades increasing numbers of historians have begun to question the legacy of the women suffrage movement. What is it a women's movement? Or a white women's movement? In this inquiry students examine articles written for the suffrage centennial celebration. Students will pull specific evidence from each and form their own conclusion.

Below are differing articles on the legacy of women's suffrage.

1. As you read, record sentences or ideas that show the white suffragists were or were not racist in the middle columns.
2. After you finish the two middle columns, look back at the evidence. Which information is most persuasive to you? Mark that #8. Which evidence is least persuasive to you? Mark that #1.

<i>Rank</i>	Evidence white suffragists were racist	Evidence white suffragists fought for all women	<i>Rank</i>

Questions for Analysis

1. Add up the rank on each side. Which side weighed more? Why do you think it worked out that way?

2. In conclusion, were the white suffragists racist?

Document A: How the Suffrage Movement Betrayed Black Women by Brent Staples

Staples is a Black, male editor for the New York Times, with a doctorate in Psychology.

The suffragist heroes Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony seized control of the feminist narrative of the 19th century. Their influential history of the movement still governs popular understanding of the struggle for women's rights and will no doubt serve as a touchstone for commemorations that will unfold across the United States around the centennial of the 19th Amendment in 2020.

That narrative, in the six-volume "History of Women's Suffrage," betrays more than a hint of vanity when it credits the Stanton-Anthony cohort with starting a movement that actually had diverse origins and many mothers. Its worst offenses may be that it rendered nearly invisible the black women who labored in the suffragist vineyard and that it looked away from the racism that tightened its grip on the fight for the women's vote in the years after the Civil War.

Historians who are not inclined to hero worship — including Elsa Barkley Brown, Lori Ginzberg and Rosalyn Terborg-Penn — have recently provided an unsparing portrait of this once-neglected period. Stripped of her halo, Stanton, the campaign's principal philosopher, is exposed as a classic liberal racist who embraced fairness in the abstract while publicly enunciating bigoted views of African-American men, whom she characterized as "Sambos" and incipient rapists in the period just after the war. The suffrage struggle itself took on a similar flavor, acquiescing to white supremacy — and selling out the interests of African-American women — when it became politically expedient to do so. This betrayal of trust opened a rift between black and white feminists that persists to this day.

This toxic legacy looms especially large as cities, including New York, prepare monuments and educational programs to celebrate the centennial of the 19th Amendment, ratified in 1920, which barred the states from denying voting rights based on gender. Black feminists in particular are eager to see if these remembrances own up to the real history of the fight for the vote — and whether black suffragists appear in them.

The famous suffrage convention convened in Seneca Falls, N.Y., in 1848 featured Stanton and her partner-in-arms, Lucretia Mott, in addition to the towering figure of Frederick Douglass, the abolitionist and dyed-in-the-wool supporter of women's rights who was on his way to becoming one of the most famous speakers of the century. Were it not for Douglass's oratory, the historian Lisa Tetrault tells us in "The Myth of Seneca Falls," the "controversial" resolution demanding the vote for women might actually have failed.

It became clear after the Civil War that black and white women had different views of why the right to vote was essential. White women were seeking the vote as a symbol of parity with their husbands and brothers. Black women, most of whom lived in the South, were seeking the ballot for themselves and their men, as a means of empowering black communities besieged by the reign of racial terror that erupted after Emancipation.

The tension escalated in the run-up to the 15th Amendment, a provision that ostensibly barred the states from denying Negro men the right to vote. Reasonable

people could, of course, disagree on the merits of who should first be given the vote – women or black men. Stanton, instead, embarked on a Klan-like tirade against the amendment. She warned that white woman would be degraded if Negro men preceded them into the franchise. Admiring historians have dismissed this as an unfortunate interlude in an exemplary life. By contrast, the historian Lori Ginzberg argues persuasively that racism and elitism were enduring features of the great suffragist's makeup and philosophy.

Similarly, the historian Faye Dudden wrote that Stanton “dipped her pen into a tincture of white racism and sketched a reference to a nightmarish figure, the black rapist,” and lashed out from the pages of the suffragist paper that she and Anthony published. Her message – that passage of the 15th Amendment would mean only degradation for women at the hands of Negro men – must have cheered the Ku Klux Klan as it terrorized the black South.

Douglass was clearly wounded by what he described as the “employment of certain names, such as ‘Sambo,’ and the gardener, and the bootblack ... and all the rest,” but gracefully declined to answer insult with insult. Instead, he summarized in dramatic fashion the differences between the interests of black and white suffragists – and the case for federal protection of black voters.

“When women, because they are women,” he said, “are hunted down through the cities of New York and New Orleans; when they are dragged from their houses and hung upon lampposts; when their children are torn from their arms and their brains dashed out upon the pavement; when they are objects of insult and outrage at every turn; when they are in danger of having their homes burnt down over their heads; when their children are not allowed to enter schools; then they will have an urgency to obtain the ballot equal to our own.”

Douglass cut to the central fallacy of the white suffragist push – that African-American women could magically separate their blackness from their femaleness.

The 15th Amendment was, of course, ratified. Women would wait another 50 years for the 19th. Racism intensified among suffragists as they neared their goals. African-American luminaries like the noted anti-lynching crusader Ida B. Wells and the civil rights leader Mary Church Terrell became more deeply and publicly engaged.

As in other instances, suffragists outside the South used the racism in the Jim Crow states as an excuse for their discriminatory treatment of their black suffragist sisters. Black women's suffrage clubs that sought formal affiliation with the national white suffrage movement were discouraged from doing so on the grounds that admitting them might anger white Southerners. It has since become clear that this was a ruse Northern whites used to obscure their own discriminatory policies.

The most blatant example of accommodationism came in 1913 when organizers of a huge suffragist parade in Washington demanded that black participants march in an all-black assembly at the back of the parade instead of with their state delegations. Wells famously refused. Terrell, who marched in a colored delegation as requested, believed at the time that white suffragists would exclude black women from the 19th Amendment – nicknamed the Anthony Amendment – if they thought they could get away with it. These episodes fueled within the African-American community a lasting suspicion of white suffragists and of the very idea of political cooperation across racial lines.

Historians are rightly warning groups involved in suffrage commemorations not to overstate the significance of the 19th Amendment. It covered the needs of middle-class white women quite nicely. But it meant very little to black women in the South, where most lived at the time and where election officials were well practiced in the art of obstructing black access to the ballot box. As African-American women streamed in to register, Southern officials merely stepped up the level of fraud and intimidation.

By this time, the former suffragists of the North were celebrating the amendment and were uninterested in fighting discrimination against women who were suffering racial, as opposed to gender, discrimination. As the historian Rosalyn Terborg-Penn writes: "Within a few years, white supremacy was victorious throughout the South. Unlike Black men, who had been disenfranchised within 20 years after the ratification of the 15th Amendment, Black women had lost the vote in less than a decade." It would take another half-century – and a new suffrage campaign, with black women in a leading role – before that black community was fully enfranchised, through the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

The recent uproar over the monuments to white supremacy that dominate public spaces in the South has put civic groups on notice that memorials often convey pernicious messages and perpetuate historical wrongs. Organizers need to keep that in mind as they commemorate a movement in which racism clearly played a central role.

...

The ratification of the 19th Amendment set off celebratory parades all across the country. But confetti was still rustling in the streets when black women across the South learned that the segregationist electoral systems would override the promise of voting rights by obstructing their attempts to register.

Some black women succeeded in adding their names to the rolls. But as the historian Liette Gidlow shows in her revelatory study of the period, the files of the Justice Department, the N.A.A.C.P. and African-American newspapers were soon bursting with letters, investigations and affidavits documenting the disenfranchisement of black women, especially in but not limited to former Confederate states.

In Virginia, Gidlow writes, a college-educated mother of four named Susie W. Fountain was required to take "a "literacy test" that consisted of a blank sheet of paper; the registrar subsequently determined that she had failed. She later told an N.A.A.C.P. investigator she was "too humiliated and angry to try again." A Birmingham, Ala., teacher, Indiana Little, was arrested and sexually assaulted after leading a large crowd to the registrar's office. As Little said in a sworn affidavit, she was "beat over the head unmercifully and ... forced upon the officer's demand to yield to him in an unbecoming manner."

In what became known as "The Election Day Massacre," a white mob burned to the ground a prosperous black community in the Central Florida town of Ocoee after African-Americans tried to vote.

By this time, white suffragists had declared the battle for women's voting rights won and embarked on a campaign to prove the amendment successful. They had no interest in signing on to a cause that would undercut that story line.

This betrayal was especially painful for the black suffragists like Coralie Franklin Cook, who had once said of her idol, Susan B. Anthony, who died 14 years before the ratification of the 19th Amendment, that "thousands of torches lighted by her hand will

yet blaze the way to freedom for women." By 1921, however, Cook lamented that, even though she had been "born a suffragist," she had no choice but to retire from the field. The movement, she said, had "turned its back on women of color." Organizations that are gearing up to commemorate next year's centennial of the 19th Amendment are at risk of repeating that insult.

Staples, Brent. "How the Suffrage Movement Betrayed Black Women." *The New York Times*. Last modified July 28, 2019.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/28/opinion/sunday/suffrage-movement-racism-black-women.html?action=click&module=RelatedLinks&pgtype=Article>.

Staples, Brent. "When the Suffrage Movement Sold Out to White Supremacy: African-American women were written out of the history of the woman suffrage movement. As the centennial of the 19th Amendment approaches, it's time for a new look at the past." *The New York Times*. Last modified February 2, 2019.
<https://www.nytimes.com/2019/02/02/opinion/sunday/women-voting-19th-amendment-white-supremacy.html>.

Source

1. Who wrote this document?
2. What qualifies this person to write about women's suffrage?

Document B: The Suffragists were not Racists by Myriam Miedzian

Miedzian is a white, female philosopher who has written several books on women and gender issues. She has her doctorate in philosophy.

President Barack Obama:

“This idea of purity and you’re never compromised and you’re always politically ‘woke’ and all that stuff. You should get over that quickly.”

“The world is messy; there are ambiguities. People who do really good stuff have flaws.”

As a result of the 1970’s women’s rights movement, Women’s History departments were introduced in universities. Black History researchers found that the role of Black women in the 19th and early 20th century suffrage movement was largely invisible. Many concluded this was due to the alleged racism of white suffragists, including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony.

Op-ed writers and journalists relying on academics have been misled. They have brought accusations of suffragist racism to millions of readers-- The New York Times, The Washington Post, the Smithsonian, and other publications, as well as radio and TV shows have featured it. And so it has become “common knowledge” that the Suffrage movement including Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony was racist.

Morgan State University History Professor Rosalyn Terborg-Penn is one of the most influential historians promoting this view, In her 1998 book *African American Women in the Struggle for the Vote 1850-1920*, she asserted that apart from Sojourner Truth, “the words of other Black female suffragists were all but absent” from the first volume of the *History of Woman Suffrage*--the first three volumes were edited by Stanton and Anthony.

In keeping with this, in an April 9, 2019 *Smithsonian Magazine* article, Alicia Ault writes that in the *History of Woman Suffrage*, Stanton and Anthony “left out the contributions of African American women.”

Wrong. The first three volumes by Stanton and Anthony contain 85 references to Black suffragists. Some of their speeches are quoted extensively. Considering that Black women made up 6% of the population, this represents an impressive number.

Terborg-Penn also asserted that the 1913 Washington D.C. Suffragist parade held the day before Woodrow Wilson’s inauguration was segregated--“Black women delegates were relegated to the end of the line.”

In keeping with this, in a January 17, 2019 *New York Times* op-ed, Ginia Bellafonte writes that Black women “were forced by white organizers to congregate in the back during a famous women’s march, in Washington, in 1913.”

Wrong again! The April 1913 issue of the NAACP magazine, *The Crisis*, provides a detailed description of the march which includes Black women walking with their state delegations and respective professions, and Howard University women walking with the university women.

Terborg-Penn claimed that in the 20th century when Suffrage leaders were focused on getting a Suffrage Amendment passed, “Black women were virtually abandoned by white female suffragists... [who] attempted to keep black suffragists disfranchised. [sic]”

In keeping with this, in a February 2, 2019 op-ed, *New York Times* columnist Brent Staples writes that “as the push for white women’s rights neared its goal-- a

constitutional amendment-- the movement hedged its bets by compromising with white supremacy."

WRONG:

The Amendment for all women's voting rights. could not pass without some Southern votes, but most Southern legislators were dead set against it. Suffragist leaders faced with a classical "does the end justify the means," problem decided that it did in this case. A few went South and when confronted with the "antis" told them that women getting the vote would not alter their way of life. They also asked black suffragists to keep a low profile; while some were offended by these requests, many understood the need to do so in the South. They complied, and put off some requests until after the amendment was passed. In Tennessee, Black women made no attempt to appear in the gallery when the state legislature passed the Amendment by one vote.

How can Terborg-Penn and so many other historians be so wrong?

Going back to the 1970's, historians disregarded the fact that when it comes to prejudice, black women are twice cursed. In addition to racism they are the victims of sexism. Shirley Chisholm, the first black woman elected to congress, in 1968, spent fourteen years as a congresswoman and commented "I have certainly met much more discrimination in terms of being a woman than being black in politics." She does not suggest what is now described as intersectionality-- her emphasis is clearly on gender.

Historians picked the wrong underlying variable. Before the 1970's Black women and White women were barely recognized as part of American history. (More on this later.)

It is not uncommon, once a particular theory becomes dominant, for it to influence and even constrict later thinkers. The tendency will be to pay more attention to facts that seem to support the theory and less to those that don't, especially when the theory is consistent with cultural and political trends. Historical context, and pragmatic concerns tend to be overlooked. Instead of going back to original texts, the writings of previous authorities often become primary sources. These tendencies, by no means limited to historians, are important in explaining the "racism dominates" views of so many historians in this field.

U.S. history is tainted by the rabid racism of prominent politicians, supreme court justices, and organizations. Stanton, Anthony, and the Suffrage movement do not belong on this list, or even in its vicinity. This is not to deny that there were racist suffragists, especially in the South. How could there not be during a deeply racist historical period. Nor is it to deny that after the Civil War, Stanton and Anthony used some racist language. But it is to deny that these characteristics were in any way universal or dominant.

Conspicuously absent from most of the assessments of Stanton and Anthony's alleged racism, are references to their relationship with Frederick Douglass who worked with them for over fifty years. He admired them so much portraits of both hung in his home.

He strongly disagreed with their post-Civil War negative stance on black men only getting the vote, and disliked some of their verbiage including "Sambo" and "bootblack." But unlike contemporary accusers, he distinguished between distasteful

comments made in anger at what they experienced as terrible injustice, and their deep dedication to the abolitionist movement which he considered far more important.

In 1861 Stanton-- despite her husband's warning that she would be risking her life-- accompanied Anthony on a northern New York anti-slavery speaking tour. The danger was such that in Albany, the mayor sat on the platform with them, had police stationed all over the hall and outside the building, and with armed police, escorted them to and from their hotel

The threat of violence was not new to Anthony. Her nation-wide anti-slavery speeches were at times met by slavery supporters equipped with knives and guns.

During the Civil War, the Women's Loyal National League, founded by Stanton and Anthony, collected close to 400,000 signed petitions to press in favor of a 13th Amendment freeing all slaves. Senator Charles Sumner, a staunch supporter, credited these petitions as the principal force behind the drive for the amendment which Lincoln approved in 1865.

On a personal level, both Douglass and abolitionist/suffragist, former slave, Sojourner Truth, had been Stanton's house guests. In her biography, Sojourner Truth Princeton Professor Nell Irvin Painter states, "Recalling her hospitality in the days when respectable white people turned away blacks, he [Douglass] praised her for personal freedom from racial prejudice."

The contemporary failure to acknowledge Stanton and Anthony's deep commitment to abolitionism is typical of what President Obama warned against--the "rush to arms against anyone who makes some mistakes while ignoring the main thrust of that person's behavior and work."

Ta-Nehisi Coates, expressed the same concern specifically about Stanton and Anthony. In an October 2011 Atlantic article he describes moving from accepting accusations of racism against them. to asking, how could they have gone from devoted abolitionism to racism?

To find the answer, he looked at the "unbridled sexism" abolitionist women were subjected to, including the 1840 London World Anti-Slavery Convention which a young Stanton attended. The women delegates were made to sit in the back behind a curtain. He comments, "Lady Byron ...Lucretia Mott and many remarkable women, speakers and leaders...were compelled to listen in silence to the mass of masculine platitudes on women's sphere... Judging from my own feelings, the women on both sides of the Atlantic must have been humiliated, and chagrined."

In conclusion, he writes, "I find myself in sympathy for both Stanton and Anthony who after devoting so much of their early lives to abolitionism, hoped for some reciprocity which did not come ... I think of Stanton and Anthony mis-stepping, but always pushing, always agitating, always expanding." He concluded "I don't need my personal pantheon to be clean. But I need it to be filled with warriors."

Few historians share Coates's empathy for the humiliations and injustices Stanton and Anthony suffered. As a result, the reputations of these two extraordinary women who worked together for fifty years to free the slaves and free all women from the "serfdom" to which second class citizenship condemned them, are sullied.

MANY ACCUSATIONS; LITTLE UNDERSTANDING OR EMPATHY

Shortly before the Civil War, two wealthy businessmen gave bequests for women's suffrage and abolishing slavery. In 1865 at the war's end, the bequest executor abolitionist Wendell Phillips decided to keep virtually all the funds for black male suffrage. Phillips told Stanton and Anthony they should defer to black males whose chances of getting the vote would be harmed if women asked for it simultaneously. (Isn't it common bargaining strategy to start asking for more, in this case universal suffrage and settling for less, black male suffrage only?) He also insisted that "women were not ready for the vote."

How could Stanton and Anthony not feel deeply disappointed and irate?

This male abolitionist behavior has rarely if ever led to accusations of sexism. In keeping with the focus on racism, in her recent book *The Woman's Hour* Elaine Weiss suggests that Stanton and Anthony's racist pronouncements led Phillips to withdraw the funds!

ACCUSATIONS

Stanton's "vile elitism and racism" is allegedly exemplified in her statement, "Think of Patrick and Sambo and Hans and Yung Tung who do not know the difference between a Monarchy and a Republic, who never read the Declaration of Independence . . . making laws for Lydia Maria Child, Lucretia Mott, or Fanny Kemble."

Ta Nehisi Coates understood the "humiliation and chagrin" that the women experienced at the sexist London Anti-Slavery conference, Isn't it just as understandable that Stanton and Anthony experienced as humiliating and deeply unjust that recent male immigrants-- many didn't understand or speak English-- and former slaves kept illiterate by their masters would have voting rights, but women wouldn't?

But for Pennsylvania State Professor Lori Ginzburg, author of *Elizabeth Cady Stanton*, the Patrick and Sambo statement is "ugly... and unforgivable."

In her book, *Suffrage* U.C.L.A Professor Ellen Dubois suggests these comments were so racist and elitist they left a taint on Stanton's legacy "which equaled and at times overshadowed" her extraordinary understanding and leadership. This, in spite of Dubois's recognition that Stanton often followed her "racist, elitist" speeches by affirming that "suffrage is a natural, inalienable right" belonging to all citizens, black, white, male, female.

Clearly the first comments expressed anger; while the second affirmed deep convictions. Critics eager to prove racism, focus primarily on the angry utterances, and give short shrift to those advocating universal suffrage.

An examination of *The Revolution* archives does not substantiate the accusation that it frequently contained accusations of black on white rape.

There is only one frequently quoted article that can be interpreted as pointing to black on white rape despite the fact that it does not depict rape victims as white.

In an 1869 article Stanton wrote that "the Republican cry of 'manhood suffrage' creates an antagonism between black men and all women, that will culminate in fearful outrages on womanhood, especially in the Southern states..."

She might have thought that by giving some voice to white legislators fears, she would encourage them to vote for suffrage which would greatly increase the white vote since there were about eight times more white than black women.

This article is disturbing, as are some other Stanton assertions -- references to the "pauperism, ignorance, and degradations" of male immigrants and freed slaves among

them. The imagery in Anthony's assertion, "I will cut off this right arm of mine before I will ever work or demand the ballot for the Negro and not the woman." is unfortunate.

In his recent acclaimed book *Frederick Douglass: Prophet of Freedom*, Yale professor David W. Blight informs us that in the 1888 congressional election, Douglass supported a former confederate general, instead of a progressive black jurist as the Republican candidate for congress. Blight attributes this shocking decision to "an ugly rivalry." As for Douglass's early speeches on abolishing slavery, he apparently regularly described a drunken "Pat fresh from the Emerald Isle," at the polls "leaning on the arms of friends, unable to stand." Douglass "also contrasted Black people who admired modernity with uncivilized Native Americans who preferred primitive life. Blight deplores Douglass's behavior in the 1888 election as well as his racist statements, especially those about Native Americans who were in the midst of losing battles to keep their land. But he deals with all this in passing, and this behavior in no way affects the main focus of his book which is a history of an extraordinary man who had a major positive effect on American history. Douglass's blemishes represent short asides in the book. This is how it should be.

Why isn't it so with Stanton and Anthony? They are extraordinary women whose writings, speeches, addresses to congress, and organizational skills played a major role in getting women the most basic rights-- to their children, to their salaries, to admittance to universities and professional schools, and to vote.? Why do a few distasteful words or sentences spoken in anger "overshadow" their life's work? Is their an unconscious gender issue operating here?

BACK TO THE MISTAKEN ASSUMPTION

The assumption that black suffragists' invisibility is due to white suffragist racism has got to go since both are invisible.

The real problem is sexist ignoring of women's history. I recently examined middle and high school history books currently used in California, one of the more progressive states. Not one devoted an entire chapter to the subject of the subjugation of one half of the population, and the seventy-year struggle that won major rights for women. A page here and there was deemed sufficient.

When San Diego State University Professor of Education, Ronald Evans, asked a class of 30 students, how many had had a good amount of women's history in High School, only two answered in the affirmative. It's a topic that's doesn't get much attention in California schools, he told me. "It's the occasional teacher who does it."

Not much has changed since in 1909, Pauline Perlmutter Steinem (Gloria's grandmother) chairwoman of the Committee on Education of the National Woman Suffrage Association, investigated Public School History and Civics textbooks. Her conclusion: they "did not show the slightest appreciation of the significance of the 'woman's movement... The impression conveyed by our textbooks is that this world has been made by men and for men... "

Even more disturbing, little has changed since the 1990's when Drs. Myra and David Sadker, authors of *How America's Schools Cheat Girls*, documented the extreme absence of women from high school textbooks.

It is true that very few people have heard of Frances E. W. Harper, the 19th century black poet and ardent suffragist, but my personal experience and an informal survey I have run with respect to Elizabeth Cady Stanton reveals that only a tiny

minority have heard of this leading 19th century women's rights advocate. Sadly, her name is more familiar now as "that racist."

Susan B. Anthony and Sojourner Truth's names tend to be more familiar. Anthony has a coin named after her, and six statues from coast to coast honor Truth. Nevertheless little is known about them.

In the May 2019 New York Times, columnist Brent Staples writes, the "History of Woman Suffrage... still dominates popular thinking on the early women's rights struggle."

My first reaction to reading this was "if only that were true." I doubt that anyone but women's history professors have ever heard of it.

In a Washington Post Op-Ed, Johns Hopkins History Professor, Martha S. Jones refers to "the figures of Stanton, Anthony, and Mott...memorialized in the Capitol in 1920." She is referring to the statue donated to Congress in celebration of the 19th amendment. She assumes that since it was of white women, it was celebrated by its recipients. In fact it was of no interest to sexist congressmen, and spent 70 years in a basement broom closet. Thanks to the efforts of newly minted congresswomen, activist feminists, and descendants, the statue was brought up to the Rotunda in 1997. In 2009, Sojourner Truth's bust was placed in the Capitol's Executive Hall.

As Martin Luther King understood, the only way to bring about social change is through alliances between different groups of citizens.

The invisibility of all women should unite black and white feminists in working to take women's history out of the basement and place it in the light. A powerful alliance of women across races and ethnicities could among many other important actions, apply intense pressure-- on state and local levels-- to having the 19th and early 20th century movements for women's rights including suffrage represented in American history books, so that high school students, male and female, would become aware that women -- black and white-- make up half of our history.

Miedzian, Myriam. "The Suffragists were not Racists: So Cancel the Cancel Culture and Celebrate An Accusation-Free Suffrage Centennial." *Medium*. Last modified August 19, 2020. <https://www.myriammiedzian.com/suffragists-were-not-racists>.

Source

1. Who wrote this document?
2. What qualifies this person to write about women's suffrage?