ARIZONA WOMEN ARGUE FOR THE VOTE
The 1912 Initiative Campaign for Women's Suffrage
by
Amy de Haan

IN SEPTEMBER OF 1912, the Arizona Equal Suffrage Association (AESA) opened its campaign headquarters in a suite of the Adams Hotel on the corner of First and Adams in downtown Phoenix. Arizona had achieved statehood in February, but women's suffrage was not included in the state constitution. The document, however, did provide for the initiative—a device by which the electorate could amend it. The AESA prepared to spend the next ten weeks educating male voters in the forty-eighth state on the
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importance of granting women the franchise. A number of factors contributed to their success, including Arizona’s demographic make-up and the vitality of its Progressive and reform movements. The arguments suffragists advanced in newspapers and in person reflected how well they understood, and were able to use, these factors for their own benefit. Arizona women were not simply given the vote. Rather, they waged a sophisticated and thoughtful lobbying effort to sway public opinion to expand their political rights. 1

Arizona women’s suffrage activities took place within the context of the much older national movement for women’s rights. The organized campaign is often said to have started with the 1848 Seneca Falls Convention, which issued a Declaration of Sentiments stating that all men and women are created equal. Included in the declaration was the demand for equal voting rights. Women’s rights activists saw suffrage as both symbolic evidence of equality and a practical tool to gain other rights and protections. Two national associations worked separately for suffrage until 1890, when they merged into the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) and began the campaign for a federal constitutional amendment, as well as state amendments, legalizing the franchise for women. Because of the importance of local government in the American political system, the national organizations always placed a high priority on activities in the various states and territories. Western states and territories were especially important to the national movement because so many of the early victories took place there. Although women in Eastern states won some victories—such as the right to retain ownership of property after marriage and the protection of the eight-hour work day—they were denied the vote until passage of the Nineteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution in 1920. 2

For western suffragists, the intervening seventy-two years were a lot more interesting and encouraging. Only six years after the Seneca Falls Convention, Washington’s territorial legislature contemplated a woman suffrage bill. Seven western legislatures debated suffrage over the next few years. The 1,200 women residents of Wyoming Territory were granted the franchise in 1869, and 40,000 Utah Territory women gained voting rights a year later. The states of Colorado and Idaho adopted suffrage amendments in the late 1890s. Between 1910 and 1914, women in Washington, California,
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Arizona, Oregon, Kansas, Alaska, Montana, and Nevada gained the franchise. By 1914, New Mexico—which ratified the Nineteenth Amendment on February 18, 1920—was the only western state in which women could not vote. It is not surprising, therefore, that the national suffrage movement looked to the West for inspiration and hoped to energize enough women voters there to force through an amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Most major figures in the national movement—from Susan B. Anthony to Carrie Chapman Catt—spent a considerable amount of time on western speaking tours. Leaders of western suffrage associations were often invited to deliver inspirational talks at Eastern conventions. National leaders also approached public officials in the West for testimonials touting the benefits of women’s suffrage for their state or territory.

Arizona's early history, demographics, and settlement patterns all affected the suffrage movement. Through the terms of the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, Mexico ceded to the United States most of the land that would become Arizona. That land was part of New Mexico Territory until 1863, when President Abraham Lincoln signed a separate territorial act for Arizona. Over the next half century, Arizona experienced the rapid arrival of Anglo-American and European miners and settlers, including Mormon farming communities that relocated from Utah. By 1912, only 20 percent of Arizonans had been born in the West, 48 percent had migrated from another part of the United States, and only 32 percent were either European-born or Mexican-born immigrants. Arizona's population during this period was roughly 65 percent Roman Catholic, 15 percent Mormon, and 12 percent Protestant; the remaining 8 percent embraced Native American, Asian, and other religious beliefs. Mining towns, especially, were highly transient as workers constantly responded to the boom and bust of the mines, fluctuating cost of living, and the possibility of making a better living elsewhere. The influx of population and the transience of many Arizona communities created a political mix that could not be easily deciphered. The state's voting patterns and political affiliations were unpredictable, and Arizona's suffragists would have to respond to that political diversity.

Arizona's territorial history includes quite a few landmarks for women's rights. In 1866, Arizona legislators passed a comprehen-
sive Married Women’s Property Act that predated similar legislation in Eastern states. In 1883, the Twelfth Territorial Legislature enacted a bill allowing women to vote in local school board elections. In 1887, a group of Phoenix-area women formed the Arizona Woman’s Equal Rights Association (AWERA), with branches quickly spreading to other towns. The AWERA regularly lobbied the territorial legislature. As a result, individual lawmakers submitted a women’s suffrage bill every three or four years during the last two decades of the nineteenth century. Often, the House passed these bills, only to have them either fail by small margins in the Territorial Council or pass and be vetoed by the presidentially appointed governor. In 1897, the legislature approved, and the governor signed, a bill that allowed women taxpayers to vote. The Territorial Supreme Court, however, declared it unconstitutional. A new wave of lobbying began with the formation in 1900 of the Arizona Equal Suffrage Association. Victory seemed possible several times between 1903 and 1909, but suffrage measures always fell short of the necessary votes in the legislature. While women’s suffrage was deferred during Arizona’s territorial period, at least it was regularly debated.⁶

Arizonans became interested in statehood as early as the 1870s, and had tried several times to push through an enabling act for consideration by Congress. A constitutional convention was held in Phoenix in 1891. The U.S. House of Representatives approved the proceedings, but the Senate ignored them. Several more attempts were made and failed. For a period of time, between 1904 and 1906, it looked as if the only way statehood would be granted was through jointure with New Mexico. New Mexican voters approved the measure, but Arizonans voted it down in 1906. Reluctance on the part of national Republicans to incorporate overwhelmingly Democratic Arizona into the federal legislative and electoral system dragged out negotiations for statehood. Finally, when the territory’s entry into the union no longer seemed a threat to the balance of power in Congress, both houses passed the enabling act for Arizona statehood. President William Howard Taft signed it into law in June of 1910. On September 12, Arizona voters elected forty-one Democrats and eleven Republicans to a constitutional convention. Deliberations opened in the Phoenix capitol at noon on October 10.⁷
Women’s suffrage became a central battleground between various Progressive groups represented at the convention. Arizonans were discussing statehood at the same time that the territory—and the country in general—was experiencing a wave of enthusiasm for Progressive reform. This very loosely organized nationwide movement involved a wide variety of groups whose general aim was a just, moral, and orderly society. Individuals and groups, however, interpreted justice, morality, and order according to their own understanding of the terms. While a majority of delegates to the Arizona Constitutional Convention considered themselves Progressive Democrats, they did not necessarily advocate the vote for women. Suffrage activists, on the other hand, saw enfranchising women not only as just, but as an essential tool for morality and order. The story of the 1910 constitutional convention, therefore, is the tale of two groups of Progressives—the politicians and the suffragists—each holding a different interpretation of how to achieve justice, morality, and order. The newly formed AESA lobbied each
convention member, and induced several delegates to submit women's suffrage propositions. Fred Colter of Apache County introduced Proposition 74, which read: "The rights of the citizens of the State of Arizona to vote and hold office shall not be denied or abridged on account of sex. Both male and female citizens of the State shall equally enjoy all civil, political, and religious rights and privileges." Although no one spoke out against the measure, delegates voted 31 to 8 to indefinitely postpone consideration. Three additional propositions that would have extended partial or full suffrage to women met similar fates. AESA chairwoman Frances Willard Munds scornfully recalled that "Members who proudly proclaimed themselves the only original 'progressives' were far too timid to put anything so 'radical' as woman suffrage in the constitution for fear that the voters would not accept it, and yet those same men wrote into it the initiative and referendum,
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recall of judges and many other far more radical measures and it was adopted by an overwhelming majority.°

On February 14, 1912, Arizona became a state, without provision for women's suffrage. Suffrage activists realized that they must act quickly or risk losing the window of opportunity created by the excitement of statehood. Consequently, AESA officers met that spring to formulate tactics. They looked first to California and Washington, where the legislatures had recently voted to place on the ballot amendments to their constitutions granting the franchise to women. In both cases, voters had approved the measures. The AESA, therefore, lobbied their newly formed state legislature to present the suffrage question to Arizona voters. State Senator John Hughes of Tucson wrote and introduced a bill that passed the House but failed by one vote in the Senate. 10

The defeat forced the AESA to reassess its options. This time Arizona suffragists looked to Oregon. The Oregon Federation of Women's Clubs had overseen drives that collected enough signatures to place initiatives on the ballot in 1904, 1906, 1908, and 1910. None passed at that time. Finally, in 1912, the state legislature voted to endorse the petition. Perhaps the same tactic would work in Arizona. 11

In April, a delegation of women successfully lobbied Governor G. W. P. Hunt to issue a statement to the legislature supporting women's suffrage. During May and June, activists fanned out in all counties to collect the 2,500 signatures needed to put a constitutional amendment before voters. Their enthusiasm generated 25 percent more signatures than required. On July 5, they submitted the petition to the legislature, where it was endorsed and scheduled to be placed on the November ballot. 12

Suffragists now had approximately four months to drum up support for the amendment. The AESA immediately created a state central committee, which reviewed successful tactics employed in California and Washington, as well as those currently being used in Oregon and Kansas. Fifty or sixty women were selected to chair city or county committees responsible for coordinating local events around the state. Because education was a central focus of the Progressive movement, the AESA identified speaking tours and other education opportunities as vital methods of influencing public opinion.
Arizona’s experience confirms the view of contemporary historians who have shown that early twentieth-century suffrage campaigns adopted diverse tactics that reflected the growing diversity of the suffragists themselves. While Arizona women focused their primary effort on mobilizing effective speakers and launching extensive speaking tours, they also planned rallies, parades, and stunts to attract the attention of various voter constituencies. A “Votes for Women” banner, that originally spanned Central Avenue in Phoenix, made the news four times—as it mysteriously appeared and disappeared around the city. Rallies in Tucson, Phoenix, Yuma, and Prescott generated additional enthusiasm for the cause, as local suffrage groups canvassed house-to-house, passed out “Votes for Women” badges, and operated a booth at the state fair.\textsuperscript{13}

Suffrage activists would later point to a series of events between July and November of 1912 as being particularly helpful in their campaign. First of all, the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) supplied money and speakers. NAWSA president Anna Howard Shaw spoke throughout the state, while popular California suffragist Laura Gregg Cannon concentrated
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on winning the labor vote in mining towns. Several Maricopa County public officials also campaigned around the state, on their own initiative and without pay. A month before the campaign ended, a small group of self-described Progressive men and women purchased the Arizona Republican, Phoenix's widely read conservative newspaper. Now subtitled An Independent Progressive Journal, the paper immediately increased its coverage of women's suffrage from an article or two a month to several articles each day. The Republican also regularly published the Progressive party platform, which proclaimed that equal suffrage was essential to reform.¹⁴

The AESA vigorously applied political pressure throughout the campaign. Delegations of women spoke at both the Democratic and Republican state conventions in October, where they astutely reminded delegates that the Progressive party endorsed suffrage. The women urged similar Republican and Democratic endorsements in order to keep the suffrage campaign "non-political." Otherwise, they would throw their support behind the party that supported them. Wary of a recent upsurge in Progressive party

---
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membership, Arizona Democrats and Republicans responded to the encouragement—or threat—by endorsing suffrage. Looking back on the campaign, Frances Willard Munds felt that this was one of AESA’s shrewdest moves. Although the tactic ran counter to the national organization, which sought to maintain a reputation for political neutrality, the NAWSA Congressional Union would apply the same kind of pressure on the Democratic party during the 1914 and 1916 national elections.15

The AESA also formed coalitions with other Progressive groups. In October, Socialist party speakers stumped the state for women’s suffrage. Denver labor activist Mary Geffs, for example, spoke on “Working Women and the Ballot” around the state and at union halls in Phoenix. Several unions, including the Arizona Federation of Labor and the Phoenix Trades Council, issued statements supporting women’s suffrage. A Phoenix newspaper reported that 800 Arizona civic, industrial, labor, religious, fraternal, and political organizations endorsed the measure. With all this support, it may have seemed inevitable that the amendment would pass. But, with a thirty-year history of disappointment, Arizona activists could not risk relaxing their efforts.16

In planning its campaign, the AESA took into account Arizona’s demographic composition. Males were not grouped in any obvious voting blocks. The rapid influx of American- and foreign-born immigrants, and the mobility of the urban and mining populations, presented daunting communication challenges for campaign organizers. Suffragists needed to respond creatively to each segment of a diverse voting public that was further divided along broad racial, ethnic, and religious lines. They also had to travel long distances on primitive roads, or by train, to the state’s isolated and widely dispersed ranching, farming, and mining communities. Although popular wisdom presumed that Arizona’s American-born, European-born, and Mexican-born populations would each respond differently to the women’s suffrage issue, in an era when polling was non-existent, the AESA could not reliably predict how they would vote. No single tactic or style would convince all these groups, or even all members within a seemingly coherent group, of the benefits of equal suffrage.17

One of the AESA’s primary goals was getting the suffrage message into newspapers, where it would reach voters who did not
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attend rallies or public speeches. As a result, these pro-suffrage arguments not only reflected what activists believed would be most palatable to male voters, but also presented a view of the world that suffragists believed in and wanted to promote. With Socialist, Progressive Democrat, Progressive Republican, and labor union representatives all campaigning in the state, local chairs interpreted AESA arguments for their particular communities. The state central committee could only hope that local women and traveling campaigners were appropriately gauging their audiences. 18

Although a suffrage activist might use several different—and even seemingly contradictory—arguments in a single speech or article, the appeals advanced during the campaign can be roughly divided into four different types. The most often used argument emphasized the “justice and fairness” of women’s suffrage. A second appeal stressed the superior qualities women would bring to the ballot box. A third argument emphasized the cultural and vocational changes in women’s lives that necessitated giving them the vote. And a final appeal highlighted the alleged superiority of white women over Arizona’s immigrant and non-white population. Each argument tells us something about the activists themselves, the male voters they were hoping to persuade, and the state’s political and cultural atmosphere at the turn of the century. 19

Some activists believed that suffrage was so obviously just and fair that they offered no explanation. Maricopa County judge A. C. Baker, for example, bluntly advocated giving women the vote as a simple “matter of justice and right.” Frances Willard Munds, who regularly stressed fairness, told the Arizona Democrat that “it is now a mere question of justice and right, and only needs an appeal to reason” to secure the franchise for Arizona women. A poster that appeared around the state clearly stated the argument: “Give the Women of Arizona a Square Deal. They Want the Ballot.” 20

Sometimes, though, a suffragist felt the need to go beyond a simple appeal to reason and explain what she meant by “justice and right.” Anna Howard Shaw noted in an October 18 speech in Flagstaff that equal suffrage was the key to a true republic; without it, one-half the population was tyrannized by laws for which it had not voted. Many women, and the AESA suffrage poster, equated it to the unfairness of taxation without representation. The argument that “men have had to make the same fight for the
ballot in the past that we are doing” reminded male voters that they had waged a similar struggle to correct past injustices directed toward them. Shared history underscored their argument. Josephine Brawley Hughes, a long-time suffrage activist and wife of former territorial governor Louis C. Hughes, wrote an election-day article for the *Arizona Republican*, in which she reminded male voters that women had struggled alongside them, settling farms, establishing schools, and building Arizona communities. Bisbee attorney W. B. Cleary went a step further, when he explained: “Why am I for equal suffrage? First and foremost because I am a man. A real man never wants an unfair advantage.”

Arizona’s suffrage activists also emphasized that women would bring special qualities to public life that were essential for achiev-
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ing civility, efficiency, and reform. They pointed, sometimes perhaps overenthusiastically, to the role of the women's vote in the success of California and Colorado's Progressive reform efforts. Frances Munds compared Arizona's Progressive reform movement to a Civil War regiment losing a battle because it was badly in need of fresh reserves—in this case, the women's vote—and yet would not take advantage of them. In Munds's view, the participation of women promised to elevate political discourse. Instead of the usual public drunkenness and brawling, people would chat and exchange pleasantries in the street. The 1912 election-day scene in Prescott appeared to confirm her prediction.22

Gender seems to have frequently influenced the appeal to women's special qualities. Male suffrage activists most often used it to emphasize the ways in which female characteristics enhanced public life. Arizona senator Henry F. Ashurst sent home from Washington several hundred copies of a speech in which Colorado senator Edward T. Taylor demanded that women be given the vote. "A woman's vote is always a patriotic one . . .," Taylor argued. "The country needs the influence of her ballot." Maricopa County judge A. C. Baker evidently agreed. "Voting by women will improve humanity because it will compel men to . . . earn the approval of women," he predicted. A headline in the *Arizona Republican* quoted a local minister who pronounced the "Weaker Sex the Stronger in Qualities of Patience, Self-Control, [and] Long Suffering." These "Qualities should be Expressed at Polls," he argued. Another Phoenix newspaper headline boasted that "With Superior Intuition Than Firmer Sex, She Understands Better Than Does He Even With Experience."23

Many speakers pointed out that women already took part in much of public life; the vote would merely be legal confirmation of their role. Laura Gregg Cannon presented suffrage as the only self-protection America's six million working women had in the country's harsh labor environment. In front of large audiences of male miners and factory workers, she touted women's suffrage as the key to labor union success. Women would naturally vote to protect their families. To the charge that by campaigning for suffrage in Arizona she was neglecting her own home and children, one suffragist responded that without the vote she could not protect her home and children.24
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At this time, Arizona newspapers seemed fascinated with new and unusual careers that had opened up for women. During the ten weeks of the suffrage campaign, the Arizona Republican reported on a woman who had applied for a job as motorcycle police officer in Los Angeles, a woman fire inspector in New York, a police women’s convention in Oregon, and a female trial lawyer in California. As transformations in women’s roles became apparent, Arizonans made a more or less explicit connection between women’s abilities as wage laborers and in taking on new careers, and their abilities as voters. As a Phoenix reporter put it, “the old phrase about the ‘Stay-at-Home attend-the-baby’ woman is becoming a joke and the woman of the hour is the one who advances with the times.” Advocates also frequently noted the modernity of equal suffrage. Senator Taylor, for one, observed that “the continued disenfranchisement of women is a relic of antiquity that belongs to other days.” Frances Munds contrasted forward-thinking Arizona to the “eastern and less progressive states” who had yet to embrace women’s suffrage.25

Even as they commended the state’s Progressive and liberal bent, some Arizona suffragists advanced blatantly racist and nativist arguments to make their case for enfranchising women. Implicit in Josephine Hughes’s argument for suffrage was the civilizing influence of Arizona’s white women. Men should vote for women’s suffrage because “they know that Arizona’s pioneer women stood side by side with them in fighting the bloodthirsty Apache Indians, defending their homes, their farms, their mines, scores of them falling victims of the savages.” As another suffragist framed the argument in a Phoenix newspaper: “Does it not stand to reason that the enlightened educated woman is better qualified to vote than the illiterate, uneducated . . . uncivilized foreigner?”26

These sentiments help clarify our understanding of what Progressivism meant to Arizona’s early twentieth-century Anglo-American men and women. Progressive reforms were intended to benefit a particular segment of the population—groups that were most like the reformers themselves. And yet, because there were so many different self-described Progressives in the state, we cannot assume that every member of the suffrage movement was motivated by racism or nativism. The AESA did attempt to reach out to a variety of Arizona communities. The state and local committees
worked to organize a Mexican-American civic league, provided material to Spanish-language newspapers, and dispatched speakers to mining towns composed of large numbers of foreign-born workers. While the racism and nativism expressed in suffrage literature mirrored contemporary Arizona prejudices, it did not necessarily reflect straightforward intolerance.

On November 5, 1912, Arizona men went to the polls and voted 13,452 to 6,202 in favor of the women’s suffrage amendment to the state constitution. Despite the overwhelming victory, it is unclear which argument resonated with any particular demographic segment of the population. Men who voted for a third-party candidate in the general election—Theodore Roosevelt of the Progressive party or Socialist Eugene V. Debs—were most likely to have also voted for women’s suffrage. The highest correlation between the third-party vote and women’s suffrage was in mining communities. In regions of the state with a high concentration of farmers, those localities with the most native-born Westerners—including Mormon communities—also tended to vote in large numbers for women’s suffrage. A striking difference in voting patterns between mining and farming communities appears in the choice for or against a prohibition amendment that also appeared on the ballot. While farmers cast their votes heavily in favor of prohibition, miners decisively rejected the measure. Women’s suffrage, then, was not simply part of a package of reforms endorsed by
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everyone who saw themselves as Progressives. Rather, it was a thoughtfuly considered individual choice.²⁸

Arizona’s suffrage campaign clearly benefited from statewide interest in Progressivism, third-party politics, and an assortment of reform movements. Arizona women, however, did not passively wait for men to hand them the vote. AESA members organized throughout the state, borrowed ideas from successful campaigns in other states, and selected tactics that they felt would work best in Arizona.

The swift formation of city and county suffrage organizations enabled the AESA to tap into the enthusiasm and energy of women and men all over the state. While AESA leaders risked forfeiting control over the suffrage message being promoted around the state, they greatly expanded their audience by allowing different Progressive groups to endorse the franchise in whatever way they chose. Even as the AESA risked offending conservative voters by promoting Socialist speakers, they garnered votes they might have otherwise lost in areas where the Socialist message enjoyed widespread support. AESA activists prudently employed speakers who appealed to distinct Progressive camps around the state, dispatching special speakers to mining and farming communities, organizing rallies and stunts to attract the attention of urban voters, and recruiting well-respected state officials to convince more moderate voters.

The various arguments that women suffrage activists used reflect their understanding of their audience. In that sense, they reveal quite a bit about the diverse political views of early twentieth-century Arizonans. Appeals to “justice and right” tapped memories of unfair treatment and played on feelings of obligation to women. The “special quality” argument indicates that men, especially, felt that the emphasis on women’s higher morality, patriotism, and intuition resonated with other men. Pointing to women’s presence in the labor pool and in other areas of public life drew attention to culture changes taking place in gender roles. The fact that suffragists apparently employed these arguments without fear of criticism indicates that these changes were generally accepted by most Arizona men and women. The resort to racist and nativist arguments exposes the dark assumptions underlying the Progressive and women’s suffrage movements. This negative picture, however, should be balanced against the AESA’s attempts to build coalitions with various groups of voters across the state.
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Arizona in 1912 was home to a diverse population, and the aims of its various Progressive elements were not always compatible. Yet, the AESA found ways to reach out to all of these groups for support. While suffragists gladly embraced differences in order to build coalitions and gather endorsements for their cause, they stopped short of accepting all Progressives and their goals at face value. AESA leaders, for instance, refused to allow state legislators to dictate their brand of political Progressivism. Instead, they used the initiative process in the new constitution to promote their own vision of a forward-looking state. By tailoring their arguments to a multiplicity of constituencies, Arizona's women suffragists proved that they had done their homework, studied their audience, and pressed home their advantage when conditions were most favorable.

NOTES


8. Goff, Arizona Civilization, pp. 50-51. Arthur S. Link and Richard L. McCormick, Progressivism (Arlington Heights, Ill.: Harlan Davidson, 1983), review the literature and conclude that Progressivism was essentially a loose grouping of mass movements, rather than a single cohesive movement. Although all Progressive groups advocated morality, justice, and order, their strategies for achieving these goals were widely divergent, and often contradictory. It is not at all unlikely that the self-proclaimed Progressive members of Arizona's constitutional convention and the suffragists would have had differing opinions.

9. Munds, "Arizona," p. 10; John S. Goff, ed., The Records of the Arizona Constitutional Convention of 1910 (Phoenix: Arizona Supreme Court, 1991), pp. 1117-1358. There was very little discussion on Proposition 74. Proposition 27, stating that "All persons, male or female, of the age of 21 years, or over, possessing the qualifications provided by this Constitution, shall be entitled to vote at all elections," was postponed indefinitely and no vote was recorded. Proposition 142 was indefinitely postponed with a vote of 28 ayes and 14 nays. Goff, ed., Records of the Arizona Constitutional Convention, pp. 302-307, 415-420, and 274-58, respectively; Munds, "Arizona," pp. 12-13.


Arizona Women Argue for the Vote

Arizona Republican (Phoenix), September 1, 15, October 7, 8, 10, 12, 1912; Arizona Democrat, June 14, August 31, October 3, 1912.

14. Arizona Republican, September 15, 1912; Munds, "Winning the Woman's Fight in Arizona," Progressive Weekly, February 15, 1913; Link and McCormick, Progressivism, p. 41. The takeover of the Phoenix newspaper occurred following the spring 1912 contest between Theodore Roosevelt and President Taft in the direct-vote state primaries for the Republican party nomination. Roosevelt won, but conservative Republicans ignored the primary votes and forced through Taft's nomination. This split the party, with Progressive Republicans following Roosevelt into the Progressive party. A similar split likely occurred within the Arizona Republican ownership. This was fortunate for the suffrage campaign. The Arizona Democrat had always supported women's suffrage. Now readers of the state's two largest newspapers would be encouraged to support the franchise. Arizona Republican, October 6, 11, 1912.


16. Arizona Republican, October 10, 1912. Eugene Debs apparently spoke in Arizona for women's suffrage during this period, but I have found no contemporary confirmation of his speaking tour. Ibid.


19. Based on an examination of articles on woman's suffrage in Arizona Democrat, Arizona Republican, and Coconino Sun (Flagstaff) between February and November 1912.

20. Arizona Democrat, October 5, 12, 1912; "Votes for Women" poster, n.d., Newspapers box 1, Suffrage Collection, ASLAPR.

21. Coconino Sun, October 25, 1912; Arizona Democrat, July 5, September 28, 1912; Arizona Republican, November 5, 1912; "Votes for Women" poster; Suffrage Papers, in Newspapers folder, box 1, RG 99, ASLAPR.

22. Munds, "Election Day in Arizona," n.d., Newspapers box 1, Suffrage Collection, ASLAPR. Munds, "Do Arizona Women Want the Ballot?" Arizona: The New State Magazine (February 1912), pp. 7, quotes the findings of the "Inter-Parliamentary Union" that, "in Colorado, where they have had equal suffrage for seventeen years, they have the sanest, most humane, most progressive and most scientific laws relating to the woman and the child to be found on any statute books in the world."

23. Arizona Democrat, October 19, 1912; Arizona Republican, October 13, 20, 1912.


25. Arizona Democrat, September 7, 1912; Munds, "Do Arizona Women Want the Ballot?" Arizona Republican, October 10, 15, 19, November 3, 1912, pointed out that if women could take on new careers, they could or should also be able to assume the responsibilities of voting. Arizona Democrat, October 18, 1912, discussed whether Who's Who in Arizona would list prominent women suffragists.

26. Arizona Republican, November 5, 1912; Arizona Democrat, October 4, 1912.

27. Arizona Democrat, October 4, 1912. Ibid., October 5, 1912, mentions these AESA attempts to reach out to non-white or non-native populations. In 1909, the Arizona Territorial Legislature passed an English literacy voting law. The same stipulation was included in the state constitution. Even though the law effectively disenfranchised many non-English speaking Arizonans, the AESA made some effort to reach these populations.

[393]
28. The Arizona majority was larger than in any of the other three states considering a suffrage amendment that same year. "In Oregon the vote stood at 61,265 for to 57,104 against; in Kansas, 175,276 for to 159,197 against." Newspaper clipping, n.d., Newspapers box 1, Suffrage Collection, ASLAPR. Berman, "Male Support for Woman Suffrage," pp. 288-90, concludes that Progressive issues were deliberated individually. His statistics on other Progressive issues point to the same conclusion, which would be in keeping with the diversity of Progressive groups and ambitions in Arizona.