

Viewpoint 22A

Women Hold an Exalted Status in America (1841)

Catharine E. Beecher (1800–1878)

INTRODUCTION *The issue of women's rights began to gain national prominence in the mid-1800s. During this time many people wrote and spoke of the importance of women in managing the household and instilling character in children. One of the most prominent advocates of this point of view was Catharine E. Beecher, a noted author and education reformer. She was a member of a leading New England family; her*

father and brother were both famous preachers, and her sister, Harriet Beecher Stowe, was the writer of Uncle Tom's Cabin. Beecher believed that homemaking and teaching were the proper roles for women in American society, and sought to improve the status of women by stressing their importance in the "domestic sphere." Although active in the abolitionist movement and other social reforms, Beecher opposed women's suffrage and the other goals of the nascent feminist movement.

The following viewpoint is excerpted from the opening chapter of *A Treatise on Domestic Economy*, for the Use of Young Ladies At Home, and at School, a how-to book on homemaking that was a best seller in the 1840s and 1850s. Beecher argues that women gain respect and equality with men by remaining in the domestic sphere. She compares the United States favorably with Europe regarding the position and treatment of women, by quoting extensively from *Democracy in America*, an influential 1835 book by French social philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville.

What choices do American women have regarding marriage, according to Beecher. What important responsibilities does she say American women have?

There are some reasons why American women should feel an interest in the support of the democratic institutions of their Country, which it is important that they should consider. The great maxim, which is the basis of all our civil and political institutions, is, that "all men are created equal," and that they are equally entitled to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." . . .

But, in order that each individual may pursue and secure the highest degree of happiness within his reach, unimpeded by the selfish interests of others, a system of laws must be established, which sustain certain relations and dependencies in social and civil life. What these relations and their attending obligations shall be, are to be determined, not with reference to the wishes and interests of a few, but solely with reference to the general good of all; so that each individual shall have his own interest, as much as the public benefit, secured by them.

THE DUTIES OF SUBORDINATION

For this purpose, it is needful that certain relations be sustained, that involve the duties of subordination. There must be the magistrate and the subject, one of whom is the superior, and the other the inferior. There must be the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, teacher and pupil, employer and employed, each involving the relative duties of subordination. The superior in certain particulars is to direct, and the inferior is to yield obedience. Society could never go forward,

From *A Treatise on Domestic Economy* by Catharine E. Beecher (Boston: March, Capen, Lyon, and Webb, 1841).

harmoniously, nor could any craft or profession be successfully pursued, unless these superior and subordinate relations be instituted and sustained.

But who shall take the higher, and who the subordinate, stations in social and civil life? This matter, in the case of parents and children, is decided by the Creator. He has given children to the control of parents, as their superiors, and to them they remain subordinate, to a certain age, or so long as they are members of their household. And parents can delegate such a portion of their authority to teachers and employers, as the interests of their children require.

In most other cases, in a truly democratic state, each individual is allowed to choose for himself, who shall take the position of his superior. No woman is forced to obey any husband but the one she chooses for herself; nor is she obliged to take a husband, if she prefers to remain single. . . .

The institutions of monarchical and aristocratic nations are based on precisely opposite principles. They secure, to certain small and favored classes, advantages which can be maintained, only by sacrificing the interests of the great mass of the people. Thus, the throne and aristocracy of England are supported by laws and customs, that burden the lower classes with taxes, so enormous, as to deprive them of all the luxuries, and of most of the comforts, of life. Poor dwellings, scanty food, unhealthy employments, excessive labor, and entire destitution of the means and time for education, are appointed for the lower classes, that a few may live in palaces, and riot in every indulgence.

THE INTERESTS OF AMERICAN WOMEN

The tendencies of democratic institutions, in reference to the rights and interests of the female sex, have been fully developed in the United States; and it is in this aspect, that the subject is one of peculiar interest to American women. In this Country, it is established, both by opinion and by practice, that women have an equal interest in all social and civil concerns; and that no domestic, civil, or political, institution, is right, that sacrifices her interest to promote that of the other sex. But in order to secure her the more firmly in all these privileges, it is decided, that, in the domestic relation, she take a subordinate station, and that, in civil and political concerns, her interests be intrusted to the other sex, without her taking any part in voting or in making and administering laws. The result of this order of things has been fairly tested, and is thus portrayed by M. [Alexis] De Tocqueville, a writer, who, for intelligence, fidelity, and ability, ranks second to none.

The following extracts [from *Democracy in America*] present his views.

There are people in Europe, who, confounding together the different characteristics of the sexes, would make of man and woman, beings not only equal, but alike. They would give to both the same functions, impose on both the same duties, and grant to both the same rights. They would mix them in all things,—their business, their occupations, their pleasures. It may readily be conceived, that, by *thus* attempting to make one sex equal to the other, both are degraded; and from so preposterous a medley of the works of Nature, nothing could ever result, but weak men and disorderly women.

It is not thus that the Americans understand the species of democratic equality, which may be established between the sexes. They admit, that, as Nature has appointed such wide differences between the physical and moral constitutions of man and woman, her manifest design was, to give a distinct employment to their various faculties; and they hold, that improvement does not consist in making beings so dissimilar do pretty nearly the same things, but in getting each of them to fulfil their respective tasks, in the best possible manner. The Americans have applied to the sexes the great principle of political economy, which governs the manufactories of our age by carefully dividing the duties of man from those of woman, in order that the great work of society may be the better carried on.

In no country has such constant care been taken, as in America, to trace two clearly distinct lines of action for the two sexes, and to make them keep pace one with the other, but in two pathways which are always different. American women never manage the outward concerns of the family, or conduct a business, or take a part in political life; nor are they, on the other hand, ever compelled to perform the rough labor of the fields, or to make any of those laborious exertions, which demand the exertion of physical strength. No families are so poor, as to form an exception to this rule. . . .

As for myself, I do not hesitate to avow, that, although the women of the United States are confined within the narrow circle of domestic life, and their situation is, in some respects, one of extreme dependence, I have nowhere seen women occupying a loftier position; and if I were asked, now I am drawing to the close of this work, in which I have spoken of so many important things done by the Americans, to what the singular prosperity and growing strength of that people ought mainly to be attributed, I should reply,—to the superiority of their women.

WOMEN'S LOFTY POSITION

This testimony of a foreigner, who has had abundant opportunities of making a comparison, is sanctioned by the assent of all candid and intelligent men, who have enjoyed similar opportunities.

It appears, then, that it is in America, alone, that women are raised to an equality with the other sex; and that, both in theory and practice, their interests are regarded as of equal value. They are made subordinate in station, only where a regard to their best interests demands it, while, as if in compensation for this, by custom and courtesy, they are always treated as superiors. Universally, in this Country, through every class of society, precedence is given to woman, in all the comforts, conveniences, and courtesies, of life.

In civil and political affairs, American women take no interest or concern, except so far as they sympathize with their family and personal friends; but in all cases, in which they do feel a concern, their opinions and feelings have a consideration, equal, or even superior, to that of the other sex.

The democratic institutions of this Country . . . have secured to American women a lofty and fortunate position.

In matters pertaining to the education of their children, in the selection and support of a clergyman, in all benevolent enterprises, and in all questions relating to morals or manners, they have a superior influence. In all such concerns, it would be impossible to carry a point contrary to their judgement and feelings; while an enterprise, sustained by them, will seldom fail of success.

If those who are bewailing themselves over the fancied wrongs and injuries of women in this Nation, could only see things as they are, they would know, that, whatever remnants of a barbarous or aristocratic age may remain in our civil institutions, in reference to the interests of women, it is only because they are ignorant of it, or do not use their influence to have them rectified; for it is very certain that there is nothing reasonable which American women would unite in asking, that would not readily be bestowed.

The preceding remarks, then, illustrate the position that the democratic institutions of this Country . . . tend to place woman in her true position in society, as having equal rights with the other sex; and that, in fact, they have secured to American women a lofty and fortunate position, which, as yet, has been attained by the women of no other nation. . . .

THE IMPORTANT TASK OF WOMEN

The success of democratic restitutions, as is conceded by all, depends upon the intellectual and moral character of the mass of the people. If they are intelligent and virtuous, democracy is a blessing; but if they are ignorant and wicked, it is only a curse, and as much more dreadful than any other form of civil government, as a thousand tyrants are more to be dreaded than one. It is equally conceded, that the formation of the moral and intellectual character of the young is committed mainly to the female hand. The mother writes the character of the future man; the sister bends the fibres that hereafter are the forest tree; the wife sways the heart, whose energies may turn for good or for evil the destinies of a nation. Let the women of a country be made virtuous and intelligent, and the men will certainly be the same. The proper education of a man decides the welfare of an individual; but educate a woman, and the interests of a whole family are secured.

If this be so, as none will deny, then to American women, more than to any others on earth, is committed the exalted privilege of extending over the world those blessed influences, that are to renovate degraded man, and “clothe all climes with beauty.”

No American woman, then, has any occasion for feeling that hers is an humble or insignificant lot.

Viewpoint 25B *Women Hold a Degraded Status in America (1848)*

Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815–1902) and the Seneca Falls Convention

INTRODUCTION *The Seneca Falls Convention, held on July 18–19, 1848, in Seneca Falls, New York, was the first public political meeting on women’s rights in the United States. It was organized by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott, two abolitionists who had met in 1840 at the World’s Anti-Slavery Convention in London. There Stanton and the other female delegates were denied participation because of their gender. Stanton and Mott resolved to start a women’s rights movement in the United States; their efforts resulted in the Seneca Falls Convention eight years later. Stanton drafted a Declaration of Sentiments (modeled after America’s 1776 Declaration of Independence) and a series of resolutions on women’s rights. Both the declaration and the resolutions were debated, reworded slightly, and adopted by the several hundred women and men assembled at Seneca Falls. All resolutions save one were passed unanimously; the resolution for women’s suffrage passed by only a narrow margin.*

What examples of female oppression does Stanton provide? Judging from the contents of viewpoints 25A,

which points of the Seneca Falls Declaration might Catharine E. Beecher, author of the opposing viewpoint, agree with? Which would she most oppose?

When, in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one portion of the family of man to assume among the people of the earth a position different from that which they have hitherto occupied, but one to which the laws of nature and of nature’s God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes that impel them to such a course.

We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights governments are instituted, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of those who suffer from it to refuse allegiance to it, and to insist upon the institution of a new government, laying its foundation on such principles, and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness. Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes; and accordingly all experience hath shown that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing the forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their duty to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security. Such has been the patient sufferance of the women under this government, and such is now the necessity which constrains them to demand the equal station to which they are entitled.

REPEATED INJURIES

The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.

He has never permitted her to exercise her inalienable right to the elective franchise.

He has compelled her to submit to laws, in the formation of which she had no voice.

He has withheld from her rights which are given to the most ignorant and degraded men—both natives and foreigners.

From *History of Women Suffrage*, vol. 1, edited by Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, and Matilda Joslyn Gage (New York: Fowler & Wells, 1881).

Having deprived her of this first right of a citizen, the
ive franchise, thereby leaving her without representa-
in the halls of legislation, he has oppressed her on all

He has made her, if married, in the eye of the law,
ly dead.

He has taken from her all right in property, even to
wages she earns.

He has made her, morally, an irresponsible being, as
can commit many crimes with impunity, provided
be done in the presence of her husband. In the cov-
ant of marriage, she is compelled to promise obedience
her husband, he becoming, to all intents and purposes,
er master—the law giving him power to deprive her of
liberty, and to administer chastisement.

He has so framed the laws of divorce, as to what shall
the proper causes, and in case of separation, to whom
the guardianship of the children shall be given, as to be
holly regardless of the happiness of women—the law
all cases, going upon a false supposition of the suprem-
cy of man, and giving all power into his hands.

After depriving her of all rights as a married woman,
single, and the owner of property, he has taxed her to
support a government which recognizes her only when
her property can be made profitable to it.

He has monopolized nearly all the profitable employ-
ments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she
receives but a scanty remuneration. He closes against
her all the avenues to wealth and distinction which he
considers most honorable to himself. As a teacher of the-
ology, medicine, or law, she is not known.

He has denied her the facilities for obtaining a thor-
ough education, all colleges being closed against her.

He allows her in Church, as well as State, but a sub-
ordinate position, claiming Apostolic authority for her
exclusion from the ministry, and, with some exceptions,
from any public participation in the affairs of the Church.

He has created a false public sentiment by giving to
the world a different code of morals for men and women,
by which moral delinquencies which exclude women
from society, are not only tolerated, but deemed of little
account in man.

*Women do feel themselves aggrieved,
oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of*

He has usurped the prerogative of Jehovah himself,
claiming it as his right to assign for her a sphere of action,
when that belongs to her conscience and to her God.

He has endeavored, in every way that he could, to
destroy her confidence in her own powers, to lessen her
self-respect and to make her willing to lead a dependent
and abject life.

Now, in view of this entire disfranchisement of one-
half the people of this country, their social and religious
degradation—in view of the unjust laws above men-
tioned, and because women do feel themselves aggrieved,
oppressed, and fraudulently deprived of their most sacred
rights, we insist that they have immediate admission to all
the rights and privileges which belong to them as citizens
of the United States.

In entering upon the great work before us, we antici-
pate no small amount of misconception, misrepresentation,
and ridicule; but we shall use every instrumentality within
our power to effect our object. We shall employ agents,
circulate tracts, petition the State and National legisla-
tures, and endeavor to enlist the pulpit and the press in
our behalf. We hope this Convention will be followed
by a series of Conventions embracing every part of the
country.

RESOLUTIONS

Whereas, The great precept of nature is conceded to be,
that “man shall pursue his own true and substantial hap-
piness.” [William] Blackstone in his *Commentaries [on the
Laws of England]* remarks, that this law of Nature being
coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself, is
of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding
over all the globe, in all countries and at all times; no
human laws are of any validity if contrary to this, and
such of them as are valid, derive all their force, and all
their validity, and all their authority, mediately and imme-
diately, from this original; therefore,

Resolved, That such laws as conflict, in any way with
the true and substantial happiness of woman, are contrary
to the great precept of nature and of no validity, for this is
“superior in obligation to any other.”

Resolved, That all laws which prevent woman from
occupying such a station in society as her conscience
shall dictate, or which place her in a position inferior to
that of man, are contrary to the great precept of nature,
and therefore of no force or authority.

Resolved, That woman is man’s equal—was intended
to be so by the Creator, and the highest good of the race
demands that she should be recognized as such.

Resolved, That the women of this country ought to be
enlightened in regard to the laws under which they live,
and to cease to longer publish their degradation by
declaring themselves satisfied with their present position,
nor their ignorance, by asserting that they have all the
rights they want.

Resolved, That inasmuch as man, while claiming for
himself intellectual superiority, does accord to woman

moral superiority, it is pre-eminently his duty to encourage her to speak and teach, as she has an opportunity, in all religious assemblies.

Resolved, That the same amount of virtue, delicacy, and refinement of behavior that is required of woman in the social state, should also be required of man, and the same transgressions should be visited with equal severity on both man and woman.

Resolved, That the objection of indelicacy and impropriety, which is so often brought against woman when she addresses a public audience, comes with a very ill-grace from those who encourage, by their attendance, her appearance on the stage, in the concert, or in feats of the circus.

Resolved, That woman has too long rested satisfied in the circumscribed limits which corrupt customs and a perverted application of the Scriptures have marked out for her, and that it is time she should move in the enlarged sphere which her great Creator has assigned her.

Resolved, That it is the duty of the women of this country to secure to themselves their sacred right to the elective franchise.

Resolved, That the equality of human rights results necessarily from the fact of the identity of the race in capabilities and responsibilities.

Resolved, therefore, That, being invested by the Creator with the same capabilities, and the same consciousness of responsibility for their exercise, it is demonstrably the right and duty of woman, equally with man, to promote every righteous cause by every righteous means; and especially in regard to the great subjects of morals and religion, it is self-evidently her right to participate with her brother in teaching them, both in private and in public, by writing and by speaking, by any instrumentalities proper to be used, and in any assemblies proper to be held; and this being a self-evident truth growing out of the divinely implanted principles of human nature, any custom or authority adverse to it, whether modern or wearing the hoary sanction of antiquity, is to be regarded as a self-evident falsehood, and at war with mankind.

Resolved, That the speedy success of our cause depends upon the zealous and untiring efforts of both men and women, for the overthrow of the monopoly of the pulpit, and for the securing to women an equal participation with men in the various trades, professions, and commerce.

FOR FURTHER READING

Virginia Bushnell and Elizabeth F. Gamble, eds., *The Birth of American Feminism: The Seneca Falls Woman's Convention of 1848*. St. James, NY: Brandywine Press, 1995.

Jeanne Boydston et al., *The Limits of Sisterhood: the Beecher Sisters and Women's Rights and the Women's Sphere*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988.

Jeff Hill, *Women's Suffrage*. Detroit, MI: Omnigraphics, 2006.

Judith Wellman, *The Road to Seneca Falls: Elizabeth Cady Stanton and the First Woman's Rights Convention*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2004.

Barbara Anne White, *The Beecher Sisters*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

MANIFEST DESTINY AND WAR WITH MEXICO

Viewpoint 26A

America Should Not Annex Texas (1844)

Henry Clay (1777–1852)

INTRODUCTION *Henry Clay served a long and distinguished career as Speaker of the House of Representatives, secretary of state under President John Quincy Adams, and U.S. senator from Kentucky. He was known as the "Great Compromiser" because of his work in Congress in settling disputes such as those between Northern and Southern states over the issues of territorial expansion and slavery. Clay was nominated for president by the Whig Party three times, including in 1844, when his opponent was James K. Polk and the central issue facing the nation was Texas.*

Texas, a former Mexican province with a large population of settlers from the United States, had declared independence from Mexico in 1836, and had almost immediately inquired about admission into the Union. For several years the United States, under Presidents Andrew Jackson and Martin Van Buren, decided only to recognize Texas as an independent nation, mindful that annexation of Texas might lead to war with Mexico. Slavery was also an issue, as some antislavery leaders expressed strong opposition to adding another potential slave state to the Union. These two basic concerns—war with Mexico and slavery—are prominent in the following viewpoint, excerpted from Henry Clay's "Raleigh Letter." (He wrote it while in Raleigh, North Carolina.) Responding to President John Tyler's 1844 annexation of Texas (just submitted to the Senate for ratification), Clay argues against incorporating Texas into the Union. The letter was published in various newspapers in April 1844 when Clay was all but assured of the Whig Party's nomination for president. Clay later pulled back somewhat from his opposition to Texas annexation, but that was not enough to prevent Polk, a former Tennessee senator and committed expansionist, from winning the 1844 general election.

Does Clay express unconditional opposition to Texas annexation? Why might admission of Texas into the Union lead to possible U.S. expansion into Canada, according to Clay?

Gen
land [C
received
lages an
of my o
Texas to
ture of T
United S
ing had
had seen
the part
ple, tha
United
tion, we
been ac
senate f

DESIR!

Annexa
one, I c
foreign
there a
and as
Mexic
this co
regard
ble, an
this co
union,
ness o
induc
war.—
from t
And,
any p
of the
inflict
But at
in a s
count
and f
comr
on e
other
losse:
This
confi
gerer

Mex

From
1844.

VO