This is a story about absence. One might expect that any tale of activist women, struggling to make their voices heard, improve their status, and effect real change in the world would necessarily be a tale of rights narrowly gained and tenuously retained. Yet it turns out that at least one significant group of activists fighting for what later generations of feminists, historians, and activists might label citizenship rights, reproductive rights, and human rights rarely spoke of rights at all. To be sure, American Jewish suffragists certainly incorporated “rights talk” into their activism. However, they also accompanied the broader United States suffrage movement in a partial shift from the nineteenth-century claim that suffrage was an inviolate natural right to a twentieth-century claim that suffrage was a potentially revocable privilege. As such, the rhetoric of the suffrage movement never abandoned the supposedly gender-neutral rhetoric of rights entirely but increasingly focused on highly gendered rhetoric about the special contribution women voters would make to American society. The early twentieth-century rhetorical switch proved effective but may have contributed to the paucity of ancillary women’s rights emerging from the suffrage victory of the Nineteenth Amendment. And when Jewish activist women, especially those outside the labor movement, turned their attention to other causes post-1920, most notably birth control and peace, rights talk disappeared almost completely from their vocabulary.

The difficulty in telling a tale of absence, of course, is abiding by that cardinal rule of good writing: show, don’t tell. Showing absence rather than merely asserting it is a challenge. Meeting
that challenge in this case is important, though, as the relative lack of rights talk holds meaning for several larger discussions about gender, rights, and political culture, Jewish integration into the American body politic, and successful activist strategies. This paper will seek to contribute to those discussions by first sketching the history of Jewish women’s participation in three major women’s movements during the first half of the twentieth century, including suffrage by way of contrast to birth control and peace; by next analyzing the arguments and rhetoric these Jewish women activists did use while working for their causes; and by finally offering some preliminary thoughts on why rights talk so rarely appeared in the birth control and peace movements despite its centrality in the precursor movement of suffrage. Implicit throughout the paper is Nancy Cott’s argument that feminism really solidified only after suffrage was won in 1920, as the scope of women’s activism expanded to encompass an array of causes.¹

********

The American Jewish population was relatively small during the pre-Civil War emergence of the temperance and abolitionist movements, and although individual Jewish women did support these causes, Jewish women had reason to fear the missionary impulses of many of the Protestant women who filled their ranks. By the turn of the twentieth century, however, American Jews were far greater in both number and confidence. The mass migration of Jews exerted a significant influence on all American Jewish women, whether immigrants themselves or not. American Judaism underwent profound transformations, including serious reconsiderations of women’s roles within various denominations. At the same time, American society was both reevaluating women’s status more generally and making a commitment to the ideals of progressive reform. At the nexus of all these religious and social changes, American Jewish women found in the suffrage, birth control, and peace movements causes that bridged the sacred and the secular.
Jewish women typically became involved in feminist activism in three different ways. First, individual Jewish women joined women’s organizations or began to fight for women’s agency and authority. Maud Nathan, vice president of the Woman’s Municipal League in New York, member of the Daughters of the American Revolution, vice president of the Equal Suffrage Society of New York, and long-time president of the Consumers’ League is a good example of someone who remained firmly embedded in the Jewish community but became active in women’s causes as an individual and did not want her life to be “bounded by the walls of the synagogue.” Second, the establishment of ties between Jewish women’s organizations and general women’s groups cleared another path toward Jewish women’s feminist activism. The early collaboration of the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) with the American Birth Control League in sponsoring birth control clinics exemplifies the links important Jewish women’s groups forged with some of the most visible activists of their day. Third, Jewish women, both as individuals and in groups, worked to expand the activist consciousness of the broader American Jewish community. The National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods (NFTS), for instance, achieved considerable success in encouraging widespread support for disarmament, international institutions, and progressive peace initiatives among American Jews by emphasizing the special relationship both women and Jews should have with peace.

The breadth of all this activism exceeds what historian Linda Gordon Kuzmack has labeled the “Jewish women’s movement,” consisting of politically oriented Jewish women’s groups affiliated with secular women’s movements. Though it was certainly the case that secular activism facilitated Jewish women’s insistence on greater equity in Jewish communal and religious affairs,
they harbored feminist goals outside their own religious communities as well. Their feminism is evident in the ways many of them privileged “woman” as their major identity category rather than ”Jew.” The foregrounding of gender deserves particular attention in the context of Jewish women’s organizations, such as NCJW, which began as groups with explicitly religious programs but moved during the first half of the twentieth century toward increasingly political agendas. Although class remained a salient identity category, the cross-class alliances of Jewish women in the birth control and peace movements also demonstrated the feminist priorities of sizable numbers of American Jewish women. A minority of Jewish women activists remained indifferent to their Jewish identity, but far more found a consonance of values in mainstream and Jewish thinking about women. Maternalism provided them with an important link, as most Jewish women believed in the preservation of gender difference and made their activist claims on the basis of such difference.

Until the fragmented suffrage movement reunited under the rubric of the National American Woman Suffrage Association (NAWSA) in 1890, only a few exceptional Jewish women played much of a role. NCJW never formally endorsed woman suffrage, though many local sections incorporated suffrage activism into their programs. The most visible Jewish suffragist at the turn of the century was probably Maud Nathan, a noted orator who innovated tactics such as draping automobiles with suffrage banners and riding alongside suffrage parades and who also attended several International Woman Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) meetings as a United States delegate. In fact, a disproportionate number of leaders in the international suffrage movement were Jewish, although, unlike Nathan, most were invisible as Jews and presented themselves primarily by nationality. On the local level, too, individual Jewish women played important roles. Lawyer Felice Cohn wrote the legislation and led the successful 1913 suffrage campaign in Nevada. Gertrude Weil, president of the Equal Suffrage League of North Carolina, worked tirelessly for the
cause, keeping NAWSA president Carrie Chapman Catt apprised of every statewide campaign development, petitioning influential North Carolina political and judicial figures, and knocking on doors in towns all over the state.⁹ Caroline Katzenstein accompanied Alice Paul to her first street meeting in Philadelphia and then became a stalwart member of the National Woman’s Party, the more militant wing of the American suffrage movement.¹⁰

Once winning the vote became the focus of the women’s movement, more working-class Jewish women became involved.¹¹ The shift in suffrage logic, not just from justice to expediency but also from the natural rights of the individual to the national rights of citizens, was particularly appealing to immigrant Jewish women concerned about citizenship.¹² Suffrage organizations like California’s Votes for Women Club and New York’s Wage Earners’ League for Woman Suffrage found a receptive audience among union women, a group that already included a sizable number of Jewish women.¹³ These Jewish women came to believe through their labor activism that political power in the form of the vote was necessary for women’s industrial progress. Women like Rose Schneiderman, head of the Women’s Trade Union League, were exemplified working-class Jewish suffragists. Schneiderman declared, “I think that I was born a suffragist, but if I hadn’t been I am sure that the conditions of the working girls in New York . . . would have made me one.”¹⁴ In the 1917 New York suffrage referendum, 78 out of 100 pro-suffrage districts were Jewish, and within the Jewish districts, 76-93% of the total vote was pro-suffrage.¹⁵ As these numbers indicate, Jewish male voters as well as disenfranchised female activists supported woman suffrage.

Most Jewish suffragists affirmed their Jewish identity one way or another. Middle-class suffragists typically belonged to a variety of Jewish organizations as well as suffrage groups, and working-class suffragists typically lived in ethnic neighborhoods and belonged to Jewish labor,
socialist, or Zionist organizations. The Woman Suffrage Party’s Press and Publicity Committee published material in Yiddish and fed articles to the Yiddish press. After some dithering, the socialist Arbeter Ring (Workmen’s Circle) finally endorsed suffrage in 1917, which eased a potential conflict for Jewish women accustomed to prioritizing class over gender. That same year, the Reform movement’s Central Conference of American Rabbis (CCAR) also endorsed suffrage. Even the most traditional elements of American Jewry ultimately looked favorably on suffrage, as seen in Rabbi Jacob Levinson’s 1919 *The Equality of Women from the Viewpoint of Halakhah*, which summarized the religious evidence for women’s right to vote.

Once the vote was secured, significant numbers of former suffragists began to direct their energy into other causes, which then took on momentum of their own and drew in large numbers of women. During the 1920s and 1930s, Jewish women of diverse backgrounds and interests remained socially and politically active. Two of their most important feminist causes were birth control and peace.

American Jewish women’s participation in the birth control movement developed differently than in the suffrage movement, since they were involved at every level from the outset. As advocates, consumers, and distributors of contraception, Jewish women played critical roles. The organized movement is often dated to 1916, when Margaret Sanger opened her first birth control clinic in Brooklyn. She advertised the clinic in Yiddish and Italian as well as English, and Jewish mothers lined up for blocks, baby carriages in tow. Sanger’s own interest in birth control came out of her earlier socialist roots and her connections with radicals such as Emma Goldman. Goldman identified as anarchist rather than Jew, but she was popular among leftist Jews and gave frequent speeches in Yiddish linking revolutionary class struggle and women’s reproductive control. She used her publication *Mother Earth* to press for birth control, handed out literature on contraception at
her lectures, and gave demonstrations of contraceptive techniques, for which she went to jail.\textsuperscript{20} Sanger, too, found many allies in the American Jewish community. Her pamphlet *What Every Girl Should Know* was translated into Yiddish almost immediately, and all the American Jewish periodicals conducted a lively debate on the topic of birth control.

Nearly all birth control activists believed that trained professionals should distribute contraception through independent facilities free of the organized control of American medicine.\textsuperscript{21} The clinics that resulted from this innovative thinking offered unique opportunities to female Jewish doctors and patients alike. At a time when anti-Semitism restricted American Jewish doctors’ abilities to secure medical residencies and positions and the Jewish hospitals reserved the bulk of their staff jobs for men, Jewish women doctors turned to birth control clinics as places where they could practice medicine, conduct research, and contribute to a cause they virtually all believed in.\textsuperscript{22} Clinics throughout the country were primarily staffed by Jewish women doctors, despite the dubious legal status of the clinics through the mid-1930s. These doctors took case histories, performed gynecological exams, fitted diaphragms, and taught women about their bodies. Dr. Cheri Appel, who worked at a clinic in New York, “felt that I was doing, making a contribution. It was a place where women could come and feel free to talk about sexual things, where they had no other place to go.”\textsuperscript{23}

Jewish women doctors also served as primary figures in the legal battles that surrounded birth control work. Dr. Hannah Mayer Stone was arrested during a raid on a New York birth control clinic after an undercover female detective visited the clinic and was prescribed a diaphragm.\textsuperscript{25} Upon receiving a package of contraceptive materials from Japan, Stone also became the center of the
court case that ultimately yielded a 1936 Supreme Court ruling that it was legal to mail contraceptive
items that would be used by physicians for legitimate medical purposes.26

Like the professional Jewish women who provided the medical services, the working-class
Jewish women who flocked to the clinics did not pay much attention to the legality of their actions.
In some cities the proportion of Jewish clients matched the proportion of Jews in the general
population, but in other cities it was considerably higher.27 A 1935 study showed that 45% of
Jewish couples used birth control techniques immediately after marriage and 87% before a second
pregnancy.28 The New York Academy of Medicine criticized independent birth control clinics for
hiring only female doctors, including immigrants with accents, and for housing clinics in settlement
houses or other locations in crowded areas, but these were features that appealed to working-class
Jewish women.29 Many poor Jewish women thought of birth control as literally a matter of life and
death for themselves and their families, especially during the difficult years of the Depression. Dora
G., who only learned about contraception after several marriages, said sadly in later life, “Why do
you think I had so many miscarriages? The miscarriages I didn’t have to feed, I only had to feed the
living children.”30 A network of family, friends, and neighbors that had once supplied home
remedies and well-meaning but ineffective contraceptive advice now provided unofficial referrals to
birth control clinics.31 It was often difficult for working-class women living in decidedly unhygienic
conditions to cope with the diaphragms that were the most up-to-date contraceptives during the
1920s and 1930s, but the observably lower birth rates of Jewish women during these decades
indicate the degree to which Jewish women of all class backgrounds limited their families as best
they could.32

A public Jewish discussion of birth control dated at least to the earliest years of the twentieth
century. Progressive thinkers concluded that birth control was consonant with a fundamental
morality of Judaism that was concerned with the health and well-being of all Jews. After much debate and consideration of both halakhic and sociological issues, the Reform and Conservative movements passed resolutions during the late 1920s and early 1930s condoning birth control for health and economic reasons, while reminding the Jewish public of the sanctity of family in religious tradition. There were several Yiddish plays advocating birth control, with titles such as A Woman’s Duty in Birth Control. In 1928 a group of Jewish women in Detroit raised money privately to open the Mothers Clinic for Family Regulation, at the time the only birth control clinic between New York and Chicago, which then operated openly as a community institution with the cooperation of the local Jewish Social Service Bureau and the Jewish Centers Association.

Unsurprisingly, these efforts met with great condemnation from some Jewish quarters. In 1932 a Rabbi Bril wrote in disgust that “Many women prefer a dog or cat to a child.” A Jewish marriage manual distributed by the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations insisted, “The Jewish religion does not permit direct birth control. Mechanical means to avoid contraception are allowed the woman only in cases where childbirth might endanger her life.” For the most part, however, American Jewish social and cultural life supported birth control use and activism.

At the same time as some Jewish women activists participated in every level of the birth control movement, others flocked to the rapidly expanding peace movement. NCJW had established a committee on peace as early as 1908, but it was in the aftermath of the cataclysmic first world war that large numbers of Jewish women turned to peace work. Many affiliated formally with one of the major women’s peace organizations, such as the National Committee on the Cause and Cure of War (NCCCW) and the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), each of which adopted different strategies and degrees of pacifism. Others worked through NCJW or NFTS, the
two major Jewish women’s organizations that made peace a priority. To those who questioned the need for Jewish women’s organizations to take positions on such contested 1920s and 1930s issues as arbitration, elimination of compulsory military training, disarmament, and the United States’ participation in international institutions, Jennie Kubie, Chairman of NFTS’s National Committee on Peace, explained, “We, as Jewish women, have, I feel a distinct duty in this work. For Peace has always been the prayer and the hope of our People, and Peace is truly our mission.”

As women, too, they shared with thousands of other peace activists a belief that women had the power to stop war. A widely distributed book entitled *The Jew Looks at War and Peace* stated, “Men have been seeking peace for eternity without finding it. The search must now rest in the hands of women.” As mothers and religious teachers, as voters and as members of communities, all Jewish women could be moral forces for peace.

During the 1920s and 1930s, Jewish women demonstrated an increasingly sophisticated, and sometimes cross-class, commitment to peace activism as both individuals and as members of organizations. For example, Jennie Franklin Purvin, a middle-class Chicago native active in many causes, attended peace meetings at private homes, participated in city-wide international affairs forums, and became a member of the Speakers Bureau run by the Chicago branch of WILPF. NCJW produced a steady stream of articles about peace and international relations, often using Jewish texts to support the cause. This approach to peace as a religious issue echoed the pronouncements of such groups as the CCAR, which in 1926 “affirm[ed] the vision and the wisdom in the assertion of the ancient prophets of Israel that the ultimate aim of mankind is peace.” The Texas State Federation of Temple Sisterhoods appointed a peace committee, made a donation to the National Council for Prevention of War, and called on the United States to exert world leadership in the causes of peace, international cooperation, and disarmament. At the 1929 convention of the
socialist Arbeter Ring’s ladies auxiliaries, branch leaders encouraged their members to join WILPF, which in some cities like New York and Chicago had local chapters with significant working-class Jewish membership. Large numbers of male and female Jewish students at colleges ranging from the elite Columbia and Barnard to the working-class dominated City and Hunter took a version of the Oxford Pledge promising not to participate in any war.

It is important to note that despite Jewish communal support, the suffrage, birth control, and peace movements presented serious challenges to Jewish women activists as Jews. Though NAWSA dissociated itself from Elizabeth Cady Stanton’s *Woman’s Bible*, the linking of patriarchy and Judaism remained a theme throughout the final decades of the suffrage campaign. It was difficult for religiously observant Jewish women to participate in the movement when suffrage organizations consistently scheduled parades, business meetings, and conventions on Friday nights and Saturdays. Despite working with numerous Jewish colleagues, some suffrage leaders, such as Alice Paul, made little effort to disguise their “antagonism for Jews.” Birth control activists generally experienced less blatant anti-Semitism, but they had problems of their own. Jewish enthusiasm became a factor in birth control’s condemnation by other religious groups. In 1931 the Missouri Synod of Lutherans denounced birth control advocates as “camp followers” who were mostly unmarried and Jewish. The link between birth control and eugenics—though initially endorsed by Jewish activists, including rabbis—appeared increasingly sinister to Jewish observers of events abroad during the 1930s.

Jewish women in the peace movement faced the greatest difficulties. Jewish pacifists constantly confronted anti-Semitic stereotypes of Jews as cowardly and weak that hurt their credibility outside the Jewish community. After World War I, charges of radicalism leveled at peace
groups often conflated Judaism and Communism and, for good measure, referenced the notorious forgery *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* as evidence of a vast Jewish conspiracy behind the peace movement. NCJW became so associated in the public arena with peace work that it appeared on the infamous “Spider Web Chart” of supposedly dangerous and subversive women’s organizations. Even such avowedly internationalist and politically open-minded organizations as WILPF were not free of anti-Semitism. WILPF’s ambivalence throughout the period leading up to World War II ultimately led the heavily Jewish Bronx and Brooklyn chapters to withdraw altogether from the national organization. The 1930s drew American Jewish women in the peace movement into an increasingly serious crisis of faith, as they agonized over what would happen to their decades of activism based on abstract, universal ideas about peace if they were now forced to acknowledged Nazism’s concrete, particular threat to Jews and Judaism.

******

Despite the challenges they faced as Jews, Jewish women rarely allowed themselves to be chased away from the causes they believed in and worked hard for. Activist movements enriched their lives and increased their sense of autonomy. Though in retrospect the gendered and sometimes separatist nature of activism during this period may seem limiting, most women developed strong commitments to the idea that their power to effect change in the world stemmed from gender difference, not in spite of it. Hardly ever conceiving of their work as a means to expand women’s rights per se, Jewish women developed a wide array of justifications for their causes.

Jewish women played a variety of roles in the birth control movement: married women who sought information and contraception, doctors and nurses who provided it, and advocates who fought to make it freely available to all married women. Very few agitated for unmarried women’s access to contraception. Regardless of their varying roles, all Jewish women in the movement basically
agreed with birth control clinic nurse Elizabeth Cohen Arnold’s succinct statement that she was “trying to help people have babies when they could have them, afford to have them, and want to have them.”\(^5^4\) Occasionally activists for whom birth control was only part of a more radical political program of social change actually referred to rights in the context of birth control. For example, leftist journalist Rose Pastor Stokes, the immigrant cigar roller who married a non-Jewish millionaire, declared at a 1916 birth control rally, “I believe that since science has shown the way, the mothers of the world should have the power and the right to control birth.”\(^5^5\) However, this mention of rights in relation to birth control was rare. Instead, Jewish activists typically made their case for the legalization and spread of birth control with a host of medical, psychological, economic, and moral arguments.

In 1909, a typical study concluded that among 1600 poor families in Chicago, both the birth and the death rates of children in large families were significantly higher.\(^5^6\) Activists continually used such statistics to argue that birth control would help poor families improve the health of a smaller number of children. The Yiddish press focused on the health benefits to women and publicized Jewish women doctors whose research proved that use of contraception protected mothers.\(^5^7\) Many birth control advocates preferred to talk about mothers rather than the more generic category of women in order to make the point that women wanted to have fewer children, not to have no children at all. Depending on their state of residence, Jewish women doctors who worked at birth control clinics routinely acted illegally to help their patients. Lucille Lord-Heinstein, a doctor in the Boston area, recalled years later, “I continued to break the law, oh I certainly did. I was thoroughly convinced with [every] cell in my body, and I would stand there with my fist upraised that this was good medicine.”\(^5^8\) Poor Jewish women bore witness to the damage uncontrolled childbearing could
do them. Testifying before Congress in 1934, Brooklyn mother Rose Halpern said, “Having had seven births in eleven years, I have suffered enough. . .I was left a physical wreck. . .I could safely say that Mrs. Sanger saved my life.” One of her neighbors was not so lucky. The twenty-eight year old woman, pregnant for the fifth time in five years, died even before giving birth.59

In addition to citing the medical advantages of her experiences with birth control as prescribed by Sanger’s New York clinic, Halpern also said she no longer “live[d] in constant fear of bringing another child into the world.”60 Activists pointed to the psychological as well as the medical advantages of birth control. Because the delivery model for birth control, for working-class mothers, at least, was the clinic, clinic doctors found that tending to their patients’ psychological needs as important as their bodily needs. Dr. Rachelle Yarros, a Jewish doctor who was a long-time resident of Hull House in Chicago, wrote in 1924 that since modern science recognized that sexual abstinence was not conducive to adult well-being, the need for birth control was obvious.61 Jewish activists dismissed as foolish the Catholic Church’s recommendation of continence or abstinence as a realistic possibility for married couples. Birth control would not just limit births but encourage them in an atmosphere of choice, control, and marital happiness unsullied by constant fear of pregnancy. The middle-class Jewish women who helped support birth control clinics for poor women understood the psychological benefits in harmonious family relationships. The New York section of NCJW reported with satisfaction in 1936 that its Mothers’ Health Bureau provided birth control to many patients on relief and was of “utmost importance not only to their economic but to their marital happiness.”62

The Depression brought to the forefront several economic perspectives on birth control. For some time, it had been all too clear to birth control providers like Dr. Sarah Marcus in Cleveland that families with the fewest resources had the most children. Activists hoped to convince a wide
audience that people who could not afford to have children should not be forced to by their own ignorance or lack of access to contraceptive options. Marcus urged public health programs to incorporate birth control in the public interest while emphasizing that birth control should never be forced on any woman.\(^6^3\) What particularly outraged Marcus and most other Jewish activists was the fact that more economically privileged women had always had access to birth control through their private doctors, regardless of the legal status of contraception. Poor women with no regular medical care had far fewer sources of contraception. For this reason, in 1935 Rachelle Yarros urged the Committee on the Social Security Act to include funding for birth control, prenatal, and postnatal clinics in the Social Security plan.\(^6^4\)

Yarros’s position in this case matched her long-standing conviction that birth control should be as freely available as possible. During the 1920s, she had supported Mary Ware Dennett’s campaign to repeal birth control’s inclusion in obscenity statutes, rather than Margaret Sanger’s campaign to grant doctors a medical exception from those statutes.\(^6^5\) Other Jewish doctors disagreed. Sanger protégée Dr. Nadine Kavinoky of San Francisco argued that women’s interests were best served by receiving birth control information only from trained doctors.\(^6^6\) This was a class distinction of another kind, related to education. For Kavinoky, birth control was privileged information, while for Yarros it was a natural part of women’s health care. Neither used the word “rights” to discuss the issue of women’s access to birth control.

Rather than incorporating rights talk, the birth control movement focused on morality instead. One of the most effective arguments activists made was that birth control would prevent abortion. Tanya N., an immigrant Jewish woman in New York, grew up hearing her mother trying to resist her father’s sexual pleading and knew all about the twelve abortions that followed her mother’s
unsuccessful attempts to put him off.\textsuperscript{67} Abortion may have been a last resort, but it was in fact resorted to by a growing number of women during the early twentieth century. The hope that birth control would quickly and sharply reduce the number of abortions found a great deal of support and helped arouse the public’s sympathy for the cause.\textsuperscript{68}

Just after Sanger’s first clinic opened and closed in Brooklyn, Yarros defined morality as “beneficial to the individual and the community.” On those terms, it was easy to define birth control as moral and just. Birth control would not lead to race suicide because the best people naturally wanted and would have children, but on their own terms. Birth control would not lead to any further sexual depravity than already existed and would allow, for the first time, “a single sexual standard of morals for both men and women.” The better sex education implicit in birth control would help Americans reach the higher sexual ideals that were a hallmark of modern civilization.\textsuperscript{69} And in the broadest sense of all, birth control was moral because it would reduce overpopulation, one of the major causes of war. Throughout the 1920s, activists argued that birth control would pave the path to world peace.\textsuperscript{70}

This Neo-Malthusian connection between population and peace represented the more abstract, though no less compelling, nature of much of the rhetoric of the peace movement in comparison to the birth control movement. In order to make their case for peace, Jewish women mounted at least three different kinds of arguments, all far removed from rights talk. They offered convincing reasons to value and pursue peace as citizens of the world, as women, and as Jews, the latter arguments distinguishing their pacifism. Not every Jewish pacifist believed in every one of these arguments, but the combination created a distinctively Jewish peace movement for those who found secular peace movements hostile to Jews or whose activist energies were enmeshed in their Jewish identities and communities.
Even before the cataclysm of World War I galvanized pacifism into a much more viable political and moral stance, Jewish women officially took a humanitarian stand against war. NCJW created a standing committee on peace in 1908, a year after Maud Nathan stated in a forceful speech that war was too expensive in both human and monetary cost and should not be part of the new century. The focus on expense remained salient. When Boston attorney Jennie Loitman Barron protested the 1921-1922 Congressional appropriations for the army and navy, she pointed out that the same amount of money could build hundreds of thousand of homes and would be better spent on cities and education.

Some of the prominent Jewish women who pled the cause of peace primarily on the grounds of citizenship in the world or humanitarianism were also the ones more sensitive to class concerns than many in the women’s peace movement in the United States more generally. At the very beginning of World War I, socialist Rose Pastor Stokes wrote in horror that surely the “unthinkable madness” of “that stupendous slaughter-house” in Europe would convince workers of the futility of war. Fifteen years later, labor organizer Rose Pesotta cautioned that “the imperialists are preparing another World War” and warned the heavily Jewish membership of the International Ladies Garment Workers’ Union that it was their responsibility to demand peace and refuse to become “cannon fodder.” Both Stokes and Pesotta were concerned about the scale of war in the modern world and opposed war as an aggressive, repressive instrument that could do especial violence to the working class.

Other Jewish women took more abstract positions in their public condemnations of war. During the late 1920s, Gertrude Weil wrote a letter to a North Carolina newspaper editor explaining that she and many others had taken seriously the idea that the last war would indeed be
the last war. Civilized nations, she wrote, should abhor war as an barbaric, unsuccessful means of settling disputes with no place in today’s world. Speaking in a radio address from London in 1937, Edith Zangwill agreed. “The abolition of war is humanity’s supreme need today,” she said. “Thus in working toward this end, woman takes her place in world progress.”

That the progress of the world toward ending war depended on women formed another rhetorical strand of Jewish women’s peace activism. All women’s peace groups shared certain tenets. They believed motherhood meant that women were naturally inclined to preserve life and provide the best quality of life. They believed women were especially attuned to and therefore opposed to wartime violence against women and children. They believed that women had a special gift for solving big problems without violence in word or deed, as seen in their successful forays into municipal affairs. And they believed that since men had made such a mess of the world, it was up to women to devise peaceful solutions. All these beliefs, deeply essentialist in nature, assumed that gender difference not only existed but offered salvation to the world. Women’s capacity for motherhood, unique to women, would give women a moral advantage in envisioning and enacting peace. Former suffragist Lillian Cantor Dawson, a Pittsburgh teacher, traveled to the Hague for a 1934 WILPF conference and left convinced that the “natural female role of helping the culture survive might lead to peace.” Caroline Katzenstein spoke for many Jewish women in the peace movement when she argued, “We women, because we are the mothers of the race, know perhaps better than men the true value of life, and it is up to us to show that war and the causes that lead to it can be abolished.”

Jewish women concerned with their traditional roles as mothers found that peace work appealed to them as both women and Jews. A NCJW founder and one of the first women to speak from a synagogue pulpit, Hannah Greenebaum Solomon delivered a sermon in 1904 entitled
“The Religious Mission of Women” that tied together pacifism, womanhood, and Jewishness. She credited international organizations such as the International Council of Women and IWSA with bringing together women of many nationalities to work for peace. Solomon also pointed out that since Jews were themselves already international in scope, Jewish women had unique opportunities to seek international cooperation. The idea that as residents of many countries Jews both needed and desired peace persisted in Jewish women’s peace rhetoric. Non-Jewish peace leaders shared this conviction. As Carrie Chapman Catt, former suffrage leader and founder of the NCCCW, said in a 1934 speech, “I have long believed that the Jews, being the only people scattered among all the nations, have a peculiar and distinct call to leadership against war.”

The American Jewish community as a whole engaged in a serious debate about peace during the years between the wars. NCJW traditionally drew on religious texts to bolster their peace pronouncements and supported congregational rabbis such as Joseph Kornfeld, who delivered a widely distributed sermon in 1930 that compared passages from Isaiah to the Kellogg Peace Pact. Many Jewish communal organizations urged the United States to advocate arms reduction, participate fully in the World Court, and oppose compulsory military training. In 1935, NFTS commissioned Rabbi Roland Gittelsohn to write The Jews Looks at War and Peace, which added to other specific Jewish argument for peace the reminder that as a constantly persecuted population, Jews had even more reason to abhor violence and seek worldwide cooperation.

This reminder rang true for many Jewish women, especially those whose peace work was national or international in scope. While in Geneva for the 1920 IWSA meeting, Maud Nathan attended an event where a speaker referred repeatedly to “Jew Profiteers” as the cause of war. Nathan publicly protested but saw the incident as a harbinger of growing anti-Semitism, even within
the peace movement, that made Jewish commitment to peace all the more urgent. Fifteen years later, Lillian Cantor Dawson was dismayed that officials at the 1935 WILPF conference would not entertain a resolution condemning Hitler’s actions in Germany. Whichever arguments about world citizenship, maternalism, or Jewishness initially brought Jewish women into the peace movement, there was little doubt that it was their Jewish identity that left many of them with agonizing conflicts as conditions deteriorated during the 1930s.

After outlining the participation of American Jewish women in the suffrage, birth control and peace movements and exploring briefly the variegated arguments they used to advance their causes, the question remains: why so little evidence of rights talk among Jewish peace and birth control activists? The question becomes all the more salient considering the many ways in which rights talk permeated the suffrage movement. There are several possible explanations, each of which deserves far more extended analysis than can appear in these preliminary musings.

One basic explanation has to do with the competing versions of feminism that emerged after the vote was won. As Annelise Orleck, Kristi Anderson, Dorothy Sue Cobble and others have shown, all feminisms agreed that there were multiple sources of women’s disadvantages and therefore multiple reforms were necessary to address them. However, the different strands of feminist thought disagreed on methods and even logic. Class played a major role in these disagreements. Middle-class women were more likely to focus on individual rights and perhaps even equality under law, while working-class women were more likely to look to collective solutions and value legal protection.

The class distinctions appeared among Jewish women as well. The arguably narrow political and legal definition of equality demanded through the Equal Rights Amendment by the National
Woman’s Party attracted some individual professional Jewish women, but not many. Even middle-
class Jewish women were heavily influenced by the collective labor organizing ethic of so many of
their working-class counterparts. For Jewish women of all class backgrounds, who were typically
invested in a deeply felt communal ethos, a highly individualistic claim of equal rights seemed
unappealing and even wrongheaded.

Both peace and birth control required state intervention to succeed, and activists could see
that demanding rights might not be the best way to achieve their goals. This was especially the case
for the peace movement, as it was difficult to answer the question of whose rights they were fighting
for. Human rights had not yet entered the popular lexicon, though clearly the foundation was laid
during the interwar period. The birth control movement eventually gained more rights for women,
but not by focusing on individual rights as such. The birth control clinics proceeded in most cases
without state legitimation and did not bother to claim rights. The arm of the birth control movement
focused on changing laws mounted legal challenges on the basis of public health interests and
construal of obscenity clauses, an approach resting on sociological jurisprudence rather than legal
formalism. The birth control movement did establish the legal right to use and distribute birth
control, but not as a result of arguments about individual women’s rights to contraception. Indeed,
such a right was not fully guaranteed for women until the 1965 Griswold v. Connecticut Supreme
Court decision.

A generational difference may also help explain the absence of rights talk from the peace and
birth control movements. Though at least some suffragists were accustomed to thinking about their
activism within a conceptual framework of rights, women whose activism began after 1920 did not
necessarily share that strain of reform thought. It seems to be the case, though not universally, that
older women who moved directly into peace or birth control from suffrage were more likely to refer occasionally to rights than younger women who found in birth control or peace their first expression of feminist activism. Since rights talk seemed more radical to the general public, however, the older generation of female activists found it prudent to keep the focus elsewhere. This speculation admittedly bears further investigation, especially given the tendency in the 1930s of older feminists to denounce younger women for indulging their selfish concentration on themselves as individuals rather than concerning themselves with the welfare of all women. Perhaps that critique was aimed primarily at younger women who were not active in such feminist causes as birth control and peace.

Finally, the Jewishness of birth control and peace activists may provide another explanation for the rarity of rights talk among them. Though Judaism no doubt has a legalistic aspect—for example, the legal obligations of both husband and wife encoded in the traditional Jewish marriage contract—relatively few Jewish activists observed the letter of Jewish law in their own lives. The prophetic, social justice aspect of Judaism played a far greater role in their activism. Again and again Jewish women cited their upbringing in a culture of concern for other Jews and for the wider world as primary factors in their social activism. The memoirs, speeches, correspondence and diaries of suffragists, pacifists, and birth control activists, as well as the organizational documents produced by groups such as NCJW and NFTS, bear significant witness to the central importance of Jewish identity. Nowhere in this testimony do discussions of rights appear. Jewish women seem to have been more concerned with doing the right thing than claiming anything as a right. Jewish concepts of tzedakah, usually rendered as “charity” but more accurately translated as “righteous justice,” and tikkun olam, or “repairing the world,” provided ample Jewish justification for women’s activism. When questioned within the Jewish community about their causes, these were the responses Jewish activists gave. Rights talk might have been perceived as a foreign ideology, but seeking to set the
world to rights was so familiar and natural a concept to American Jews that little more needed to be said.

*********

The omission of Jewish women from American women’s history, except for the important but sometimes stereotyped figures of sweatshop workers and labor activists, is particularly glaring in the historiography of first wave feminism. Despite their near invisibility, Jewish women played important roles in the activist movements of their day. What they did not do—and neither did many of their non-Jewish counterparts—was conceptualize their activism within a framework of rights. It would be anachronistic to look for specific catch phrases such as “reproductive rights” and “human rights” in the rhetoric of pre-World War II activists. Still, it is striking how rarely any women in the birth control or peace movements used concepts of rights to justify either their own activism or the merits of their causes. Jewish women, in particular, were much more concerned with doing right than protecting rights per se. This distinction is more than semantic. While perhaps less intellectually tidy, Jewish women’s abiding commitment to women and the world as seen in their significant birth control and peace activism may have been rooted as much in an amorphously defined Jewish identity as in a well-defined demand for rights as we might now understand them.
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