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In spring 1870 Portland newspaper editor John Neal sparked a debate in the city’s press about women’s suffrage. Neal had long advocated for voting rights for women, and his efforts on behalf of women’s suffrage came only months after black men had been given the right to vote as a result of the ratification of the fifteenth amendment. Maine Historical Society Collections.
"MR. EDITOR, HAVE WE DIGRESSED?"
NEWSPAPER EDITOR JOHN NEAL AND 
THE WOMAN SUFFRAGE DEBATE

BY SHANNON M. RISK

In May and June of 1870, Portland newspaper editor and reformer John Neal sparked a debate over women’s suffrage that elicited strong views on women’s place in society. Neal posted a call in the Daily Eastern Argus to like-minded women and men to meet to discuss how to bring about the women’s vote. His post led to a debate in Portland’s newspapers about the idea of women’s suffrage. Several respondents expressed outrage at women’s participation in politics, fearing it would lead to society’s downfall. Although the debate died down in June, Neal’s efforts gave renewed energy to Maine suffragists. The author is an assistant professor of history at Niagara University. She specializes in progressive-era American history, women’s history, and public history.

IN THE late spring and early summer of 1870, a man named John Neal rekindled the spirit of Maine woman suffragists, whose movement had been all but swallowed up during the Civil War years. Neal was the editor of the Portland Daily Eastern Argus, and already had a reputation as a nationally-renowned author and reformer. In 1870, he stirred up pro- and anti-suffrage sentiment, using his and other newspapers as his platform. This very public debate provided a solid foundation on which the suffragists could start again, and it sustained them through the turbulent decade ahead. Neal’s participation in the debate demonstrated that the early woman suffrage movement depended on both male and female reformers.

Neal and the other suffragists understood that their movement could reshape the American political landscape, as the roots of this particular debate went far deeper than the act of going to the polls. Women voting challenged the status quo of an emerging middle class. The arguments advanced at this time lingered into the new century. Historians, particularly Mary Ryan, have examined the rise of the middle class in the United States, from roughly the 1830s onward. They have also documented the challenges to middle class culture during the latter half of
the nineteenth century, one of which was voting rights for women. The woman suffrage question, posed in a two-month-long editorial debate like the one in which John Neal engaged, exposed the deep anxieties of the American public at this time. Many middle- and upper-class northerners feared the loss of defined gender roles and racial hierarchy and saw the influx of immigrants from the Canadian Maritimes, Ireland, and eastern and southern Europe as taxing to the social structure. These well-to-do northerners also remained ambivalent about pushing Native Americans further and further westward. In the realm of education, the promotion of women’s collegiate education and universal education for school children, regardless of class, created a division among the middle class. A society that still embraced some Puritan concepts struggled over scientific positivism and feared that Americans were no longer adhering to biblical scripture, which seemingly provided clearly defined roles for the sexes.

The *Daily Eastern Argus*, *Portland Transcript*, and the *Portland Daily Press* kept Mainers in touch with national events. The *Portland Transcript* was the most conservative newspaper in the city, and often published explicit jokes about women, blacks, Native Americans, and immigrants among its pages. The *Daily Eastern Argus* was more moderate, but still adhered to racist and sexist stereotypes common to the period. The *Portland Daily Press* was tied to the outlook of the Republican Party and often carried party news, such as the push for Radical Republicans in Congress to ratify the Fifteenth Amendment in 1870, which gave black men the right to vote.

The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments provoked controversy in the women’s suffrage ranks. The Radical Republicans who held sway in Congress after the Civil War argued that it was urgent to define citizenship rights with the Fourteenth Amendment, and women had reason to hope that the new law would include them as citizens. When the Fifteenth Amendment was debated in Congress, women’s suffragists learned that in further defining the rights of citizens, the word “male” would be added when it came to voting. National suffrage leaders such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony were outraged at the prospect and vigorously worked against the amendment because it did not include voting rights for all qualified adults. There was, however, another faction among the suffragists, which included Frederick Douglass, Lucy Stone and her husband, and Henry Blackwell, that argued that black males gaining the vote would ensure that both white and black women would get the vote next. Douglass, in particular, believed there was urgency to black men having the vote as to better protect their fami-
lies under the law. Ultimately, these disagreements split the young Equal Rights Association in 1869, and out of this division came two new organizations. The American Woman Suffrage Association, led by Stone and Blackwell, advocated for the Fifteenth Amendment. Stanton and Anthony's National Woman Suffrage Association, however, demanded immediate suffrage for women. These tensions would not be healed until long after the mid-century controversy, when the two combined into the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1890, after several years work by corresponding committees.5

The Suffrage Debate in Maine

John Neal held his suffrage meetings in Portland in the spring of 1870 at precisely the same time as this great debate over suffrage and the Fifteenth Amendment. The question of women's right to vote was hotly debated in the United States and elsewhere at this time. In May, the National Woman Suffrage Association held a convention, which Neal attended and addressed, in New York. Out West, the territory of Wyoming granted women suffrage and the right to serve on juries. In Britain, Parliament debated the issue of woman suffrage, just as the U.S. Congress was considering giving the vote to ex-slaves. The Portland newspaper debate on women's suffrage in 1870, then, was congruent with national and international debates on voting rights. Neal's suffrage activity and his writings elicited a strong response from Maine's anti-suffragists. In particular, Neal exchanged words with the Portland Transcript's editor, Edward H. Elwell. Elwell had been a reformer in the antebellum period, but in the postwar period he opposed women's suffrage.6

John Neal was no late bloomer to reform causes.7 Born in 1793 in Falmouth (now Portland), Neal had long sympathized with women's rights. In 1823, at a Delphian Club debate on slavery, he argued that apprentices, children, and wives could be counted among the nation's enslaved peoples.8 He and the British economist-philosopher John Stuart Mill both spoke in support of women's rights at the London Debating Society. “Wait until women are educated like men – treated like men – and permitted to talk freely,” Neal said, “without being put to shame, because they are women.” To them, educated women could be educated voters. Neal counted among his associates not only Mill, but also American women's rights advocates Elizabeth Oakes Smith and Margaret Fuller. In January 1843 in New York, at the Mechanic's Library Association, Neal spoke on the “Rights of Woman,” using the words of the founding fathers on rights and equality. In June 1843, he published a
tract in his book, *Brother Jonathan*, on the poor station of women in American law, arguing that married women had virtually no rights of ownership, and single women had to battle to keep the few rights they had. The editors of the *History of Woman Suffrage* wrote that Neal’s piece was “a scathing satire, and men felt the rebuke.”9 In 1845 Neal spoke at the New York Tabernacle on women’s rights, and in 1852 Elizabeth Oakes Smith read a supportive letter from Neal, who was also a delegate at that year’s Woman Suffrage Convention. He wrote the novel, *True Womanhood*, in 1859, for *The Una*, a pro-woman journal headed by Paulina Wright Davis, and contributed to Anthony and Stanton’s short-lived journal, *The Revolution*, in 1869. That year Neal also signed the memorial of the American Woman Suffrage Association.10

The 1870 suffrage editorial debate was probably sparked by two Portland suffrage meetings, in April and May 1870, and the articles that described them. Neal’s initial call was listed in several Portland area newspapers:

**ELEVATION OF WOMEN**

All who favor woman suffrage, the sixteenth amendment, and the restoration of woman to her natural and inalienable rights, are wanted to consultation at the audience room of the Portland Institute and Public Library.

Per Order, John Neal11

In April and May 1870, Neal held women’s suffrage meetings in Portland. He used his newspaper, the *Eastern Argus*, as a platform to promote his suffragist views, something that rankled anti-suffragists in the area. Maine Historical Society Collections.
A convention call, placed in a prominent newspaper like Neal’s, could attract people from across the state, with the prospect of establishing a statewide suffrage leadership, infusing the movement with professionalism, and achieving a higher level of organization than their opponents. Reinforced by nationally prominent speakers, conventioneers could muster arguments against anti-suffragist claims in the media; they could learn how to generate publicity and speak publicly themselves, and they could take this information back into their own communities. The convention was also a central meeting place for planning petition drives and introducing novice suffragists and their supporters to legislative practices and processes.

The Portland Daily Press printed the New York Tribune’s comments about Neal and his efforts:

The politics of Maine continue to be rather mixed and mysterious; but one present feature of them is worthy of being specially recorded. The veteran of American letters, Mr. John Neal, who is we dare not say how many years old, but who is one of the patriarchs, has called a meeting with a view to organizing a Woman Suffrage Party. Whether this is the Third, Fourth, or Sixteenth Party in Maine, we have no means of knowing.

The Press responded by saying, “whatever Mr. Neal’s age may be, or whatever his faults or follies, his faculties have not become impaired, like those of the Tribune, so as to destroy his generous enthusiasm for the right and his zeal for reform and progress. In this respect, he is as young as ever.”12 The Daily Eastern Argus followed up on Neal’s announcement by noting that “strong minded women have an earnest supporter in the person of John Neal, Esquire, and he is willing to sacrifice himself on their behalf. All present were convinced of the truth of his sayings, and all of a like mind; they cried, ‘Go on Moses, go it.’”13

The Woman’s Journal, a Boston- and Chicago-based publication of the American Woman Suffrage Association, also documented the Portland suffrage meeting. W.W. McCann, a Maine correspondent to the Journal, noted: “notwithstanding the suspicion and prejudice with which this movement is regarded, quite a large and highly respectable audience assembled at an early hour to witness the new and wonderful phenomenon of a meeting to aid in giving the ballot to women.” As the first speaker, Neal retraced his association with John Stuart Mill more than forty years before. Mill had not been a believer in woman suffrage back then, but readily changed his mind, going so far as to sponsor pro-
woman legislation in the British Parliament. McCann wrote that during the antebellum years, those against slavery were often regarded as fanatics, but their views had been vindicated as a result of the Civil War. So too, he thought, would the public tide turn towards favoring woman suffrage. The suffrage meeting, held in early May 1870, received local and national attention and helped fuel the debate in the Portland area.

The war of words began soon after Neal’s May suffrage meeting. Although many of the leading participants were men, women also participated in this editorial debate. In the *Portland Transcript*, “A Woman Tax-Payer” took editor Edward H. Elwell to task on his stance against the vote for women:

Mr. Editor – I am just a little surprised at the attitude of the Transcript on the Woman Suffrage question, as indicated by your editorial in this week’s issue. Many women, taxpayers and the heads of families, desire to say how their money shall be spent, how their children shall be educated, in what manner the State shall interfere in the matter of temperance. As to the talk about the “womanliness” of women being at stake, I cannot see how it will be more affected by dropping a bit of paper into a box, than by the new spheres of activity you express a readiness to allow them. [I am] only wishing to suggest there is a principle at stake – the very principle indeed upon which our revolutionary war was fought. The old war-cry, “taxation without representation,” is again heard in the land. We women are not all represented by husbands and sons – some of us are greatly misrepresented. Forbidding us to vote does not stop our having opinions on political topics.

Thus, “A Woman Tax-Payer” used the legacy of the American Revolution to bolster her pro-suffrage views. If American colonists should not have been taxed without representation, she argued, neither should American women in the mid-nineteenth century.

Other women balked at what they thought should be a political sphere reserved wholly for men. On May 10, “May” wrote to the *Daily Eastern Argus* about the recent talk of woman suffrage in Portland. Her long editorial response to the suffrage question introduced key themes inherent in the growing apprehension of the middle class to socio-economic forces around them. First, May identified what kind of woman might want to vote: “we knew the progressive woman was on a rampage a long time ago. We know who wants to vote.” May argued that only lunatic women, bursting out of control, would desire the franchise. A real woman, May believed, would help to raise male voters and her influence would be felt once her sons went to the polls, a view reminiscent of the
revolutionary generation’s idea of Republican Motherhood — the assumption that all women should be mothers and, inasmuch, should entrust their needs to male voters. Woman, May wrote, was not strong enough for public life. But if woman did succeed in gaining the ballot, she would also have lost “her moral power and unsexed herself before the world.” To May and to so many others, unsexing women represented the complete unraveling of society. If women tried to be like men, political morality would disappear; the institution of motherhood would evaporate into thin air. This fear, expressed so vehemently in the late spring and early summer editorials of the three Portland newspapers, continued.

Anti-suffragists believed if women jumped from their sphere into the man’s world, many other social problems would surely gain a foothold in America. If women gained the vote, May wrote, they would march into Congress and even the White House. In this world, they would have to “wade through political corruption deep enough to sink and doom their souls.” Thus the institution of motherhood, the assumed goal of every woman, would be forever closed to them.

Our grandmothers were women who loved labor. They washed, ironed, cooked, made and mended clothes. Their hands and hearts were in their work, at 70 they were as fresh and fair as the daughters today at 50. . . . ‘The divine injunction multiply and replenish the earth’ our grandmothers complied with. A baker’s dozen of little ones, was a medium sized family. It kept the mother’s hands busy to supply their wants, so also it kept her heart overrun with the purest of all love.

May sought to build up traditional motherhood and domesticity as the most positive experiences in a woman’s life. By engaging in politics, women threatened this sanctified position in society, and in May’s eyes, gained nothing. Women, through their work in the home, kept society running in a way more important than politicians ever could. Women not only tended to torn garments, but they tended to the very fabric of society. They bonded civilization, one home at a time. Through motherhood, they passed on these same morals and beliefs to the next generation, assuring a peaceful transition to each new age. To trade away this power in the home, May thought, was incomprehensible.

But it was more than that. May identified the worst fear of white, middle class Americans, including middle-class Mainers, when she wrote: “the old stock are dying off and it’s out of fashion for American ladies to have children. The increase of our population at the present
time is from foreign sources.” Her fear was that foreigners would overrun native-born Protestants of British descent, thereby altering American society for the worse. Without Anglo-Saxon rule, anarchy would reign. And who would these foreign-born mothers be? May provided the answer: the Irish. May closed out her editorial with a warning: “Mr. Editor, have we digressed? Well it may be that Maine women do some foolish things, but nary a vote.” To May and others, the female vote, especially that of foreign women, would represent the downfall of civilization – a digression of culture. Still, the pro-woman suffragists were often no better in their assessment of the foreign (and, indeed African American) vote, often asking for literacy and citizen tests for voter qualification for both men and women.

The Pro-Suffrage Response

John Neal responded to May’s editorial two days later. His first task was to identify May as a man. He wrote: “this, we are to believe, is the language of a Maine woman? But Maine women do not talk slang, nor balderdash, to the best of my knowledge and belief.” He wondered: “does ‘May’ wear a wide-awake or a shoo fly with trousers?” Once he identified
what he thought was a female imposter, Neal stated his beliefs as a woman suffragist: “that woman may be paid for their labors as men are, and not be driven into garrets, or cellars, or dog holes nor into the streets – nor into untimely graves by the men who employ them, for lack of a vote.” He continued: “I am only arguing with a woman, who thinks ill of her sex – complains of them – and yet will do nothing for their relief.” He summed up his argument by saying: “here we have the old story of woman’s power growing out of her helplessness and inefficiency!”

This short editorial flap between May and John Neal succeeded in spawning rebukes on the woman suffrage issue in other Portland newspapers. Portland Transcript editor Edward H. Elwell was a community leader in his own right. Born in 1825 in Portland, Elwell published numerous works on Maine history and culture. Prone to bigotry against the French and women, he debated the very nature of gender: “is sex an accident?” he asked. “Had the Creator no design when he gave a dual nature to human-kind? Man and woman are not identical, and sex establishes the essential and specific difference between them.” Because the woman was born female, Elwell believed, she was not physically or mentally equipped for the political realm: “the experience of all ages establishes the fact that it is not, and cannot be, the duty of woman to subdue the earth, to found states, to fight in their defense, to frame laws or to administer justice. She cannot therefore have a nature and inherent right to participate in the government of States.”

Neal responded by treating Elwell’s editorial like part of a chess game. His position on whether or not the sexes had differences was under scrutiny. This was the basic argument with which many late-nineteenth-century reformers grappled: whether to rely on religious explanations for gender roles or to point to science, especially the newly-developing fields of psychology and sociology. Neal, a spiritual man, chose to assess how women became “women” in society. He wrote a column for the Portland Daily Press asking, “have women no out-door life? And is it really true, and not to be questioned, that the management of public affairs ‘appertain solely to his sex?’” He addressed the separation of gender: “we are not talking of bodies, but of soul’s minds and capabilities. Are these boundaries fixed? Are they to be found?” Neal wrote subsequently that women must have no limits. “There are,” he said, “limits to man’s strength, and to woman’s patience; women lecture, preach, report for the papers, transact large business, hold office, write books and practice medicine. Men cook, sew, wash, iron, bake and brew.” Each time he responded to a point from Elwell’s editorial, he wrote,
“check!” and at the end, “check mate!” Threaded through this suffrage debate was the question of what defined female behavior in the post-Civil War era, and what separated that from male behavior. Neal’s insistence that there were no fixed boundaries between the sexes struck a raw nerve, especially for those who relied on strict biblical definitions of gender roles.

Elwell was not swayed by Neal’s arguments. He responded in the *Portland Transcript*:

> It is our ‘move now,’ is it, Mr. J.N.?:... Do you hold that the powers and capabilities of the sexes are indeterminate and interchangeable? If woman is as well fitted for political action as man, should not the converse hold true that man is as well adapted as woman to perform the soft ministrations of domestic life? Or are we to believe that woman has two distinct spheres of action, while man has but one?30

Perhaps many women would disagree that their never-ending domestic work could be called “soft ministrations.” Although their work appeared voluntary, it was a compulsory part of being a woman in nineteenth-century American society.

On May 25, a reader labeling himself “Shoofly,” (referring to Neal’s earlier inquiry into the gender of “May”) challenged Neal’s pro-suffrage stance couched in the words of a chess game. “Shoofly” argued that there were fixed boundaries to male and female behavior, and that “two women are very much more alike, than a man and a woman. Check!” He argued that Neal contradicted himself, first saying that women should have choice, and then, through his words, forcing women towards the ballot box. “Shoofly” ended his editorial arguments with a cutting remark: “It only remains to oblige her to vote; – which don’t seem to be a success judging from the number and quality at the Wednesday night meetings.”31

The debate disappeared by early June 1870. However, by 1873, Neal and others formed the Maine Women’s Suffrage Association, which repeatedly petitioned the Maine State Legislature for women’s suffrage from 1873 to 1897. The 1870 debate stirred both pro-suffrage and anti-suffrage sentiment, and while these arguments are useful to the historian in sorting out the motives that drove the suffrage movement and the deep anxieties of those who opposed it, the debate no doubt also caused many contemporary readers to think deeply about their own views on the subject. Neal, Ellwell, and the other editorialists probably changed few local opinions in their brief flourish of editorial pens, but
Edward H. Elwell was editor of the Portland Transcript during the spring 1870 newspaper debate on women’s suffrage. Although he was reform-minded before the Civil War, in 1870, Elwell opposed extending voting rights to women. In the Portland press, Elwell led the charge against Neal and other suffragists, arguing that women’s suffrage might lead to the downfall of American civilization. Maine Historical Society Collections.

they set Portland and the rest of Maine to thinking. Neal’s boldness in opening this thorny issue provided a solid foundation that sustained suffragists through the turbulent decades between 1870 and 1920. In 1920, Maine women, as well as those throughout the United States, finally gained the right to vote with the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment.

NOTES


4. On women’s suffragists’ reactions to the Fifteenth Amendment see DuBois, Feminism and Suffrage, p. 162-163.


7. Some of Neal’s writings that encompassed reform and religious work include: *Address Delivered Before the Portland Association for the Promotion of Temperance, February 11, 1829* (Portland, ME: Day & Frasier, 1829); *The Fear of God the Only True Courage...* (Portland, ME: Arthur Shirley, Printer, 1838); and *One Word More: Intended for the Reasoning and Thoughtful Among Unbelievers* (Portland, ME: Ira Berry, Printer, 1838).

8. The exclusive Delphian Club, a congregation of the nation’s top artists and scientists, of which John Neal was a member, was founded by successful attorney and publisher William Glynn in Philadelphia.


11. *Portland Daily Press*, May 5, 1870, p. 3. John Neal wrote to Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, of the National Woman Suffrage Association, about the meeting on May 5, 1870, and his report appeared in Stanton et al, *History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. III, 353-355. At that time, Neal believed that “probably no organization will be attempted, lest it might serve to check free discussion.”


the first indigenous suffrage petition to the Maine State Legislature in 1872) served on the Executive Committee. See *The Woman’s Journal*, May 14, 1870, 153. Also, Mrs. D.M. Stockwell of Eddington, Reverend Battles, and Mrs. Dennett participated as Vice Presidents of the Woman Suffrage Bazar [sic] held in Fraternity Hall in Boston in the fall of 1870. See *The Woman’s Journal*, June 25, 1870, p. 196. The *History of Woman Suffrage*, vol. III, 352-353, also printed McCann’s report verbatim from *The Woman’s Journal*.


